

**UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID  
MÁSTER EN LINGÜÍSTICA INGLESA:  
NUEVAS APLICACIONES Y COMUNICACIÓN INTERNACIONAL**

**Scaffolding oral interaction in a CLIL context:**

**A qualitative study**

**Presented by: Olga Gerakopoulou  
Tutor: Dr. Emma Dafouz-Milne  
June 2011**

## **SUMMARY IN SPANISH / RESUMEN EN ESPAÑOL**

Durante los últimos años se está realizando una gran investigación en torno a una aproximación educativa relativamente novedosa dentro del marco de la Unión Europea que se llama Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas. Este aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lenguas en el aprendizaje de de una segunda, o incluso tercera, lengua se había iniciado a partir de las clases de inmersión principalmente de Canadá. En la recién establecida Unión Europea temas de internacionalización, de movilidad, de interculturalidad y de multilingüismo crearon la necesidad de una enseñanza rápida, con los mejores resultados, y de un aprendizaje de más lenguas teniendo como objetivo la comunicación. Bajo estas condiciones el aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lenguas en el entorno escolar apareció como una solución con unos resultados prometedores.

Conforme el Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas (AICLE) suponía una nueva aproximación de dimensiones políticas, educativas y socio-culturales, suscitó el interés de muchos estudiosos, pero también de los centros educativos, de los profesores, de los alumnos, incluso de los padres, que habían de adaptarse a la nueva realidad educativa y colaborar en el establecimiento del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas. La socialización del alumno en el aula del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas se expresa en la interacción profesor-alumno o entre los mismos alumnos. La interacción que tiene lugar durante la clase se logra con la enseñanza planeada y la ayuda que ofrece el profesor a sus alumnos. La metodología y las estrategias lingüísticas que utiliza el profesor para ayudar a sus alumnos a desarrollar sus capacidades cognitivas y lingüísticas, para ampliar su capacidad de comprensión y llegar a ser unos estudiantes capaces e independientes de una segunda lengua, estando comprendido todo esto en la noción del “andamio o apoyo”.

El Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas está basado en antiguos métodos que proponían el aprendizaje de la lengua dentro del contenido, como por ejemplo la Enseñanza Comunicativa de la Lengua y la Instrucción basada en el contenido. El filólogo y psicólogo ruso Lev Vygotsky desarrolló la Teoría Sociocultural que sostiene que el aprendizaje está directamente vinculado e influido por la cultura y la

interacción social del niño. Vygotsky habló de la Zona de Desarrollo Central la cual comprende el curso del alumno/a para llegar a pasar de estudiante dependiente a independiente. El papel del profesor/a es el de apoyar al alumno/a con técnicas de apoyo dentro de la Zona de Apoyo Central hasta llegar a ser un estudiante autónomo. Características básicas del andamiaje son la extensión de la comprensión, el apoyo temporal que ofrece, como también el “macro andamio” y “micro andamio”.

A pesar de que las técnicas de apoyo son un elemento muy importante para la enseñanza en el ámbito del aprendizaje de una segunda lengua, hay una generalidad en relación con las técnicas de apoyo que puede aplicar el profesor/a en el marco del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas. Objeto, pues, de este estudio es investigar y describir casos de técnicas de andamio que son aplicadas a la enseñanza secundaria por profesores del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas. Para este fin quince vídeos elegidos, de corta duración que provienen de clases holandesas de Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas de educación secundaria, fueron analizados y comentados. Los resultados mostraron que los profesores aplicaron técnicas verbales y no verbales las cuales diferían según la especialidad del profesor y la edad de los alumnos. También, un resultado todavía importante es que los profesores promovían la interacción dentro del aula y la activa participación.

En conclusión, se espera que los resultados de este estudio contribuyan a una investigación más amplia que se lleva a cabo en torno a la aproximación del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas en las prácticas que aplican en clase y que constituyan el comienzo de otras investigaciones que están relacionadas con el Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas y las técnicas de apoyo.

## **Abstract**

In the last years the learning of languages as a basic prerequisite in the European Union has created a new educational paradigm called Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). This integration of content and language for the learning of a second / foreign language has been followed, among others, by research in the field of second language acquisition. In the CLIL classroom the role of the teacher has become twofold; to assist students in the learning of content and language at the same time. The support that the teacher offers to the learners to accomplish this dual target is expressed through the notion of *scaffolding* (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1985), that is a temporary assistance until the student is able to work autonomously. The purpose of this study is to investigate and describe instances of scaffolding strategies applied in the CLIL secondary education classroom. Fifteen videos of CLIL practice were analyzed in detail to show that CLIL teachers apply a number of verbal and non-verbal techniques to extend their students' understanding and aim at promoting interaction and the students' participation in order to help them become independent learners.

Key words: second / foreign language learning, CLIL, socialization, scaffolding strategies, classroom interaction

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u></b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Aims and Research Questions of the study	2
1.2 Structure of the current paper	3
<b><u>Chapter 2: Theoretical Background</u></b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Theories of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching	4
2.1.1 Communicative Language Teaching	4
2.1.2 The Natural Approach	5
2.1.3 Content-based instruction	6
2.2 Language Pedagogy in the European Union	7
2.2.1 CLIL Definitions and Development	7
2.2.2 CLIL Dimensions and Outcomes	9
2.3 Conceptual Frameworks on Scaffolding	10
2.3.1 Vygotsky and the Sociocultural Theory of Learning	11
2.3.2 Bruner's (1985) scaffolding model	13
2.3.3 Scaffolding and Language	14
2.3.4 Main characteristics of Scaffolding	16
2.3.4.1 <i>Extending understanding</i>	16
2.3.4.2 <i>Temporary support</i>	17
2.3.4.3 <i>Macro and micro focuses</i>	17
2.3.5 Scaffolding in Second Language Acquisition	18
2.3.5.1 The teacher – learner relationship	18
2.3.5.2 Features and levels of scaffolding	19
2.3.5.3 Scaffolding strategies: an approach to different taxonomies	20
<b><u>Chapter 3: Data, Methodology &amp; Qualitative Analysis</u></b>	<b>22</b>
3.1 Data collection	22
3.1.1 CLIL in the Netherlands	22
3.1.2 The Dutch research	23
3.1.2.1 The Dutch CLIL teachers	23

3.1.2.2 Schools and students	24
3.1.3 Data of the current study	24
3.1 Methodology	25
3.2.1 Qualitative analysis of videotaped material	25
3.2.2 Procedure and method of analysis	25
3.3 Qualitative data analysis	29
3.3.1 History Teacher 1	29
3.3.2 The Geography Teacher	33
3.3.3 History Teacher 2	36
3.3.4 The Biology Teacher	45
3.3.5 English Teacher 1	48
<b><u>Chapter 4: Findings, Comments &amp; Discussion</u></b>	<b>52</b>
4.1 Findings of the study and comments	52
4.2 Discussion of the findings	56
<b><u>Chapter 5: Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications</u></b>	<b>59</b>
5.1 Restrictions and pedagogical implications of the study	60

### **LIST OF FIGURE AND TABLES**

<b>Figure 1</b> Expanded ZPD	<b>19</b>
<b>Table 1</b> Subjects, teachers and students in CLIL and EFL lessons	<b>24</b>
<b>Table 2</b> Disciplines, corresponding videos and extracts of the analysis	<b>26-27</b>
<b>Table 3</b> Scaffolding strategies identified in the specific study	<b>28-29</b>
<b>Table 4</b> Scaffolding strategies used by History Teacher 1	<b>52</b>
<b>Table 5</b> Scaffolding strategies used by the Geography Teacher	<b>53</b>
<b>Table 6</b> Scaffolding strategies used by History Teacher 2	<b>54</b>
<b>Table 7</b> Scaffolding strategies used by the Biology Teacher	<b>55</b>
<b>Table 8</b> Scaffolding strategies used by English Teacher 1	<b>55</b>
<b>Table 9</b> Scaffolding techniques used more by the CLIL teachers analyzed	<b>58</b>

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

In recent years there has been a great proliferation of research on a relatively new area of an educational paradigm in the European Union called Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The integration of content and language for the acquisition of a second, or even third, language (Baetens-Beardsmore, 2001) had started long ago in the immersion classes of North America, mainly in Canada, seeking for teaching methodologies to cover the linguistic differences that existed in their society and their schools (Genesee, 1994; Swain and Lapkin, 2002; Walqui, 2006). In Europe the same need came up when, in the newly-constituted European Union, the issues of internationalization, mobility, cross-culturalism and multilingualism came to the surface. The teaching and learning of more languages for communication became a target that had to be reached in a short time and with the best possible outcomes. Under these conditions, the integration of content and language in the school curriculum was viewed as a solution with hopeful results.

As CLIL was a novel approach with political, educational and socio-cultural dimensions, it attracted the interest of many scholars and created inquiries for academic research (see Coyle, 2000; Dalton-Puffer 2008). De Bot (2001: 12) notices that “In the recent past a number of research projects have been carried out to establish the effectiveness of the CLIL approach” and comments the need for more research on CLIL in present time. Apart from the academic interest in the area, though, directly involved with the European programme were educational institutions, teachers, students and even parents who, on the one hand, saw CLIL as an innovative attempt for language learning and, on the other, had to adjust to the new educational reality. Schools started to incorporate CLIL into the school curriculum, content and language teachers had to be trained, students and parents had to be informed and convinced about the advantages of CLIL methodology. In whole, CLIL became accepted with enthusiasm from all stakeholders whose cooperation and collaboration was necessary for its establishment.

One aspect of CLIL which is connected to the way the language learner is confronted in the classroom is its social nature. The language learner's socialization is expressed through the practice of *interaction* between teacher and student. Interaction during the lesson is accomplished through carefully planned instruction, class practices and the help that the teacher offers to the students when it is considered necessary. The methodology and the linguistic strategies that the teacher employs in order to assist students to develop their cognitive and linguistic skills, extend their understanding and become competent and independent second language learners are all included in the notion of *scaffolding*. Learning that is retrieved through scaffolding and interaction and the role of the 'reflective practitioner' are considered basic concepts in CLIL education (Hansen-Pauly, M. A., project coordinator, *et al*, 2009: 1).

The metaphor of scaffolding is directly connected to the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978) which refers to the child's gradual development towards independence as a learner. In the educational stream, the role of the teacher is associated with the assistance s/he should offer to the student through his/her ZPD until s/he reaches linguistic competence. In CLIL contexts the teacher's scaffolding is twofold due to its dual nature. The CLIL teacher has to scaffold both on the content and on the linguistic area and apply a number of techniques, verbal or non-verbal, that will challenge and at the same time support the student's learning.

### **1.1 Aims and Research Questions of the study**

Although scaffolding appears to be essential in the field of second language acquisition and is considered an important element of effective teacher instruction (Mercer, 1994; Walqui and van Lier, 2010), there is still certain vagueness and generalization on the scaffolding strategies that the teacher can employ in a CLIL context. One reason for this generalization could be the fact that scaffolding refers to all areas of instruction, oral and written, and a specific framework is difficult to be developed. The teacher is given the freedom to choose among a number of techniques what is most beneficial and appropriate for the students, depending on their comprehension level and their linguistic competence.

In this regard and through a qualitative analysis the present study is aimed at:

- A. Investigating educational practices in a CLIL context
- B. Describing instances of scaffolding strategies applied by CLIL teachers in their oral production
- C. Reporting on the findings and developing their implications for the establishment of scaffolding strategies as a pedagogical practice in CLIL secondary education

It is expected that the study in question will give a more specific picture and will summarize a number of scaffolding techniques that might prove to be useful for the CLIL teachers and effective for the learners' acquisition of a second language in general. Therefore, the current research intends to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What scaffolding strategies do CLIL teachers use to assist students in their content, linguistic and cognitive development?
2. Are there differences in the scaffolding strategies that each CLIL teacher uses depending on their subject discipline and the students' age / CLIL level?
3. How does teacher instruction encourage classroom interaction?
4. Do teachers stimulate the students' participation in the construction of the lesson?

## **1.2 Structure of the current paper**

This paper is organized in five different chapters starting from the introduction that is presented above. Chapter two contains the theories and the conceptual frameworks that underline CLIL and the notion of scaffolding. Subsequently, chapter three refers to the data collection and the methodology selected for the analysis of the research in question. Data analysis is included in the same chapter divided in five subsections, each one corresponding to one CLIL teacher analyzed. Next, chapter four presents the findings and a discussion of the results follows. Finally, the conclusions and implications of the current study are included in the final chapter, chapter five.

## **Chapter 2: Theoretical Background**

### **2.1 Theories of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching**

There is a variety of theories and approaches related to second language teaching and learning. Their analyses provide information about the way people acquire language in general, as well as the methods that are most suitable for teaching the language successfully. As the theory of scaffolding is highly related to interaction and a socio-cultural view of language, there will be a reference to the communicative approaches on which second language teaching and learning are based in our days.

#### **2.1.1 Communicative Language Teaching**

Changes in the socio-political scenery of Europe and North America in the early 1970s (for example, high immigration and population movement) led to linguistic and pedagogical changes as well. Classes adopted a more communicative behaviour, with interaction being the central point of language teaching and learning. The focus was now on the learner and notions such as ‘negotiation of meaning’ came to the surface. All these elements are the concrete characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), an approach with significant implications for the science of language pedagogy among others. According to Savignon (2002: 4) “communicative language teaching derives from a multidisciplinary perspective that includes, at the least, linguistics, psychology, philosophy, sociology, and educational research”.

Basic in CLT is the theory of Communicative Competence introduced from the sociolinguist Dell Hymes (1966). Hymes developed this theory as an answer to Chomsky’s idea of linguistic competence. In his theory Chomsky made a distinction between “*competence*, the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language” and “*performance*, the actual use of language in concrete situations” (Chomsky, 1965: 4), considering the first an innate process. Hymes, on the other hand, spoke of the learner’s competence to combine grammatical and socio-cultural knowledge as well.

This theory was further enhanced by Canale and Swain (1980) who stressed the division of communicative competence into *strategic*, *grammatical* and *sociolinguistic*. This division did not underestimate the importance of grammar, it just put grammatical competence into a more widely defined communicative competence model (Savignon, 2002: 7). Later on, *discourse* competence was added to comprise with the other three components of a learner's communicative competence (Savignon, 2002: 7-9). Today CLT includes a variety of interactive activities, games, use of songs and movies, use of the internet, among others, so that the learner will be able to expand most effectively his/her communicative competence of a second language.

### **2.1.2 The Natural Approach**

The Natural Approach was developed in 1977 by a teacher, Tracy Terrell, in cooperation with the famous linguist, Stephen Krashen. Their communicative views on second language learning and teaching immediately found many supporters. Terrell and Krashen (1983) claimed that there is a natural way of learning the language. In the field of language acquisition, Krashen (1982) distinguishes between the terms *acquiring* a language and *learning* a language. He asserts that the competence of acquiring a language is a subconscious process that applies both to children and adults, while the learning of a language is a conscious procedure that is accompanied by a series of rules. Krashen developed five hypotheses that surround and characterize second language acquisition (SLA). He talked about 'the acquisition/learning distinction' which was previously explained, the 'monitor hypothesis' which refers to the way the already acquired input is monitored by learning and the 'natural order hypothesis' which claims that there is an order in the way grammar rules are learned. Furthermore, the idea that language is better acquired if it is offered one level beyond the existing linguistic level of the learner belongs to the 'input hypothesis', while the 'affective filter hypothesis' posits that second language acquisition is affected by different factors, as for example the psychological state of the learner. Krashen's views, although they were questioned by many scholars, have highly contributed to second language teaching and learning, and "influenced the development of integrated instruction at all levels" (Crandall, 1994), as it will be discussed immediately after.

### 2.1.3 Content-based instruction

Under the umbrella of Communicative Language Teaching lies the approach of Content-based instruction. CBI is defined as the integration of content and language in second language teaching and learning with special emphasis on the subject matter. “CBI is a teaching method that emphasizes learning *about something* rather than learning *about language*” (Davies, 2003). Although the idea of integrating content and language existed many years ago, for example in immersion classes in Canada and the USA, it has been in the last few years that this new approach applies in the European L2 classes as well.

In CBI classes the focus is mainly on the content area rather than on the language. Genesee (1994: 2) observes that “language serves as a vehicle for discussions of academic matters and is only a secondary focus of instructional attention”. However, the acquisition of language comes forth from the constant contact of the learner with language as s/he is taught the subject matter but at the same time learns and practises in the target language. “They [the students] learn about this subject [a subject they are interested in] using the language they are trying to learn, rather than their native language, as a tool for developing knowledge and so they develop their linguistic ability in the target language” (Peachey, 2003). Cummins (1994) and Grabe and Stoller (1997) claim that CBI is supported by Krashen’s (1983) comprehensible input hypothesis which, as Krashen and Terrell state (1983: 37), says that “we acquire by understanding language a bit beyond our current level of competence. This is done with the help of context” (cited in Troncale, 2002). The academic input, as new material to be learned, offers to the student the opportunity to practise and acquire language in a level above the comprehension level s/he already has. On this topic Snow, Met and Genesee (1989) argue that there is more effective language acquisition when language is learned in meaningful and important situations for communication, such as the subject matter content offered at school (cited in Genesee, 1994). The main point is that the integration of content and language in CBI offers to the student along with content knowledge also the opportunity for second language acquisition in a communicative environment that s/he might not find in a class of solid language instruction. In the last years a variety of content-based approaches have been issued for more effective language pedagogy, such as *sheltered content instruction*, *sustained*

*content teaching, theme-based and adjust language instruction* and, in the European curriculum in particular, *content and language integrated learning* or *CLIL* (Lyster, 2007: 6).

## **2.2 Language Pedagogy in the European Union**

In the last ten years there has been a shift in the way language pedagogy is treated in the European Union. In fact, great attention has been paid to the learning of languages and its educational perspectives which have caused a significant amount of research in the scholars', language educators' and teacher trainers' circles. This special attention was promoted by the Commission of the European Communities which in November 1995 issued a *White Paper* on education called *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society* that caused changes and established new policies in the educational scene of Europe (European Commission, 1995: 47). The upgrading of the business and market needs, the cultural unification of the European citizens and the necessity for foreign language acquisition in an early age were mainly the reasons for the European Committee to propose the 2+1 formula in languages, which means that every citizen of the European Union is suggested to learn and speak, apart from the mother tongue, two more Community languages in a proficient level. This new formula led to the inquiry of educational practices and approaches suitable for the promotion of 2+1 languages, one of which is Content and Language Integrated Learning, or else CLIL.

### **2.2.1 CLIL Definitions and Development**

The entry of Content and Language Integrated Learning in the educational system of the European schools started as a prerequisite in order to assist the scheme of multilingualism that characterizes the European Union. On this go, the parallel teaching of language and subject matter in a language different from the mother tongue was proposed. In 2006 a report on the European Union's educational system on bilingualism was issued defining CLIL as follows:

The acronym CLIL is used as a generic term to describe all types of provision in which a second language (a foreign, regional or minority language and/or another

official state language) is used to teach certain subjects in the curriculum other than the language lessons themselves (Eurydice, 2006<sup>1</sup>)

There is not a limitation in the second language chosen for instruction in CLIL. Due to the internalization and expansion of the English language, though, most students in the European schools that attend a CLIL programme are instructed in English. However, there are some cases in which a regional or minority language has been selected. Besides, one of the scopes of the European Committee is the preservation of languages, especially the minority ones, and the promotion of multilingualism at the same time.

The integration of content and language was again chosen as the most adequate educational paradigm. CBI and immersion programmes had already built the ground for the integration of content and language teaching and learning in the school curriculum. Pérez-Vidal (2009: 6) explains that “CLIL is essentially the natural development of communicative approaches, updated with the incorporation of the effects of recent developments” and on the go, she sets three factors that seem to have strengthened the emergence of CLIL:

Factor 1: The European Union political project and increasing globalisation and mobility, which Union policies promote.

Mobility of young people in the European Union became an important feature for the expansion of multilingualism and cross-cultural attitudes. Mobility was expressed through exchange programmes such as Erasmus, Comenius and Leonardo, among others.

Factor 2: New pedagogical insights such as the key role played by individual differences, attitude and motivation in the development of autonomy in language learning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eurydice (2006) [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/index\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/index_en.php) [Accessed 12/05/2011]

The new pedagogical perspectives created teaching strategies which set as target the language learner's autonomy that is translated as the learner's development of cognitive and linguistic abilities in order to become responsible for his/her own learning.

Factor 3: Technological progress.

The incorporation of new technologies in language education, firstly with Computer Assisted Learning (CALL) and later on with Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), contributed to the development of CLIL which, as a modern approach to language learning, depends on new technologies for the promotion of the language learner's autonomy.

### **2.2.2 CLIL Dimensions and Outcomes**

The reasons for the implementation of CLIL in the European schools was launched in 2001 in a book called the *Profiling European CLIL Classrooms – Languages Open Doors* (Marsh *et al*, 2001) accompanied by the *CLIL Compendium* website<sup>2</sup> which contain the analysis of significant research that provides information on the effectiveness of CLIL in the school curriculum. Marsh, Maljers and Hartiala (2001) propose five dimensions and focuses of CLIL, which Pérez-Vidal (2009: 8-11) summarizes in three in the subsequent way:

1. Socio-cultural dimension: This dimension is related to the general vision hidden behind the unification of the European Union and the sharing of values which are accomplished through the exchange of cultural elements among its members and the learning of languages for better communication.
2. Educational / curricular dimension: The main idea in this dimension is the way knowledge is presented and introduced in the CLIL classroom. A socio-constructivist idea thus is suggested in which oral interaction and communication, a socio-constructivist type of learning, are considered the best

---

<sup>2</sup> Available at <http://www.cilcompendium.com/> [Accessed 15/05/2011]

methodology. On this issue, Do Coyle (2000) proposes the 4 Cs curriculum, i.e. Culture, Content, Cognition and Communication, explaining that, if these four elements are combined, successful learning will occur in the CLIL context.

3. Psycholinguistic and Language Acquisition dimension: This third dimension focuses on the linguistic acquisition that learners have when they attend a CLIL programme. CLIL puts more emphasis on the language acquisition than previous approaches of CLT. Factors that contribute to successful linguistic achievement are sufficient and meaningful exposure to input for more hours per week than the conventional language classes along with the students' beneficial production of the language in the classroom setting as much as possible.

The general outcomes of the establishment of CLIL in the European school system may be reached from a pedagogical, linguistic and social perspective (Marsh *et al*, 2001). Schools re-organise their curriculum structure to be in accordance with the new European standards and support exchange programmes that promote communication and internalization. Teachers are trained on and become agents of new methodologies and technologies. They contribute to the students' acquisition of knowledge in a basically socialized environment that prepares students to become competent and multilingual European citizens. Finally, students of CLIL courses gain in terms of content, develop their cognitive abilities and are more successful language learners as they acquire the second language more effectively than students of solid language instruction (Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 4).

### **2.3 Conceptual Frameworks on Scaffolding**

Scaffolding is a multi-faceted and, many times, misunderstood term that is related to second language teaching and learning and has been subject to intensive research by scholars and educators (Bruner, 1985; Mercer, 1994; Hammond, 2001; Walqui, 2006; Walqui and van Lier, 2010). Its literal meaning refers to the constructions (scaffolds) that workers make little by little in order to be helped when they arise a building and which they dismantle when the building is ready to stand on its own. Metaphorically, the term has been borrowed from the fields of children's psychology and pedagogy and

seems to be part of a more modern view of second language teaching and learning which posits the child into learner-centered and task-based approaches and theories, and where the learner is seen as a social being who acquires knowledge in general and language more specifically through interaction with the teacher and his/her peers and not as an individual unit.

### **2.3.1 Vygotsky and the Sociocultural Theory of Learning**

The notion of scaffolding was initially presented and analyzed in the learning theories of the Russian lawyer, philologist and psychologist Lev S. Vygotsky (1896-1936), although it should be mentioned that he did not use the exact word, 'scaffolding', in the description of the support that a child may receive from others as it mentally and psychologically grows up.

Vygotsky introduced the idea of Sociocultural Theory (SCT), opposite to already established theories of second language teaching and learning (for example Piaget's theories), which supports that learning is closely related to and influenced by culture and the child's social interaction. Aida Walqui (2006: 160) summarizes the most significant points of SCT, as they were developed by Vygotsky:

- Learning precedes development.
- Language is the main vehicle (tool) of thought.
- Mediation is central to learning.
- Social interaction is the basis of learning and development. Learning is a process of apprenticeship and internalization in which skills and knowledge are transformed from the social into the cognitive plane.
- The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is the primary activity space in which learning occurs.

Vygotsky elaborated on the relationship between learning and development by explaining that first comes learning and, then, maturation (1978: 84-85), rejecting at the same time previous theories that wanted development to precede learning, the two of them to coincide, or not. In order to make clearer the relationship between learning

and development he distinguished two developmental levels, the actual developmental level (1978: 85), which corresponds to the level of mental development that a child has in reality and accomplishes it by “independent problem solving” (1978: 86), and a potential developmental level (1978: 86), for which Vygotsky notes:

If we offer leading questions or show how the problem is to be solved and the child then solves it, or if the teacher initiates the solution and the child completes it or solves it in collaboration with other children – in short, if the child barely misses an independent solution of the problem – the solution is regarded as indicative of his mental development. (1978: 85)

The distance between these two levels is what he called the Zone of Proximal Development which later became a fundamental feature of scaffolding and second language acquisition and which is most widely defined as: “...the distance between the actual development level [of the learner] as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978: 86).

Another key concept of SCT that Vygotsky elaborated on in relation to learning is *mediation*. He explained that people use a number of tools (physical, symbolic or psychological) and signs to deal with issues that concern themselves or their relationship with others (Lantolf, 2000:1). A child’s mental and linguistic development is influenced by these tools and especially by language. Walqui points out that these tools “are made available to the child in social interaction” and “when language comes along, it provides the most powerful mediation tool of all: mediation by signs, or semiotic mediation” (2006: 161).

Finally, in his SCT Vygotsky paid great attention to the importance of social interaction. He believed that young children use speech to communicate firstly with the people around them, their parents or other adults, so as to be able to make their message clear, to find solution to problems and cover their needs, thus they socialize and do not learn individually, as Piaget used to portray. But Vygotsky moves further on and says that on the course of things children turn this socialized speech inwards and start possessing language not only for social interaction but also for the development of their own capacities and the expansion of their cognitive field.

According to Vygotsky the *interpersonal use* of language acquires an *intrapersonal function* (1978: 27) and it is communication with adults that is responsible for this change. Donato (1994: 37) claims that “the dialogically constituted interpsychological event between individuals of unequal abilities is a way for the novice to extend current competence”. This procedure affects children’s cultural development not only linguistically and cognitively but also psychologically, firstly on the social level and then on the individual level. As the Russian psychologist asserts, an external activity becomes internal and, in continuation, the interpersonal process is turned into an intrapersonal one through a series of developmental events (1978: 56-57). For Vygotsky the socialization process is evident in the child’s learning as well, since at the beginning the child needs to interact and cooperate with the teacher or its peers, and not work individually, in order to grasp the desired knowledge and, then, to internalize this knowledge and master it cognitively and psychologically.

### **2.3.2 Bruner’s (1985) scaffolding model**

Vygotsky’s theories concerning the cultural and social dimension of learning were met and supported by the American psychologist J. Bruner. Bruner was more specific in his analysis of the zone of proximal development on the grounds that he connected it with the cognitive and social development of a child that learns from a tutor, who transmits culture and an understanding of the world, and he was the one who first spoke of the term ‘scaffolding’ to characterize the assistance and support offered by the tutor to the child when it encounters new learning material.

As it was mentioned above, Bruner paid special attention to the role of the tutor who has the task of transmitting the language to the child. He argued that “*learning to know* the language” may be accomplished without considerable external help while “*learning to use* the language” cannot be conquered solely without the assistance of other factors, such as the tutor, because the use of language demands the learning of notions that someone has to explain thoroughly (Bruner, 1985: 26).

As far as the Zone of Proximal Development is concerned, Bruner analyzes Vygotsky’s definition in his own understanding by saying that:

If the child is enabled to advance by being under the tutelage of an adult or a more capable peer, then the tutor or the aiding peer serves the learner as a vicarious form of consciousness until such a time as the learner is able to master his own action through his own consciousness and control. When the child achieves that conscious control over a new function or conceptual system, it is then that he is able to use it as a tool. Up to that point, the tutor in effect performs the critical function of “scaffolding” the learning task to make it possible for the child, in Vygotsky’s word, to internalize external knowledge and convert it into a tool for conscious control (1985: 24).

For Bruner the learner’s consciousness and control form an internal goal, they are significant for the acquisition of new material, because when the learner conquers these characteristics s/he will be able to work autonomously. However, until that happens, the tutor will scaffold so as to support the child within its zone of proximal development.

### **2.3.3 Scaffolding and Language**

Vygotsky was concerned with the child’s mental development and learning from a psychological point of view within its zone of proximal development. Following a similar theoretical line but going a step further, Bruner focused more on the language taught in the classroom and the importance of the role of the teacher who scaffolds. Both scholars developed their theories based on the cultural influence and the social interaction as essential features in learning.

Special notice should be made, though, on the function of the language used in teaching and learning. Based on the theory which encounters language as a social semiotic system, Jennifer Hammond (2001: 22) proposes that “the functional model of language developed by Halliday (1978; 1994) and his colleagues, which draws on the notion of language as a semiotic system, complements the notion of scaffolding”. The connection between the social identity of language and scaffolding will be analyzed further on.

A view of language as a social semiotic system means that language is not just a tool that transmits meaning and helps in communication. Language is seen as a sign system whose function is to create meaning depending on the occasion and the way it is used by the speakers (Halliday, 1978; 1994; 2004). In a classroom situation teaching and learning are affected by this constructivist use of language and

interaction is considered central between teacher and student or student with his/her peers. Hammond maintains that “a social semiotic view of language ultimately implies a social constructivist model of teaching and learning, where teacher and students are seen as actively engaged in the process of negotiating understandings” (2001: 21). This view of language shares common characteristics with features of teaching and learning within the ZPD. More specifically, Wells points out that “rather than being a ‘fixed’ attribute of the learner, the ZPD constitutes a potential for learning that is created in the interaction between participants as they engage in a particular activity together” (1999: 330). The cooperation between teacher and student is a prerequisite in order for an activity or a task to be accomplished. Interaction and exchange of personal ideas, thus socialization, are necessary to construct meaning and the student to reach the desirable level of knowledge and become independent through the use of the language.

As it was mentioned above, Halliday developed a functional model of language which uses as its basic source a view of language as social semiotic. Halliday (1994: 27) spoke of the importance of the semantic system for a sociolinguistic context and explained the role the three components of the semantic system, the interpersonal, the ideational and the textual which “are present in every use of language in every social context”. In addition, the functional model of language is derived from the interrelation between language and context which are affected by the field, the tenor and the mode that correspond to each situation (Halliday, 1994). In a classroom situation the teacher is responsible for the language s/he is going to employ depending on the material or context s/he wishes to teach each time. Especially, in the case of scaffolding, the teacher has to plan in advance (if s/he already knows what s/he is going to teach) or think well (if it is a spontaneous case of scaffolding, usually oral) and make such linguistic choices that will eventually assist students within their zone of proximal development until they progress and are able to work on their own in the new context. This careful planning and choice of words will make the process of scaffolding effective.

### 2.3.4 Main characteristics of Scaffolding

Theories concerning the creation of the notion of scaffolding from a psychological and linguistic point of view have already been discussed. It is considered rather important, however, to mention some of the main characteristics of scaffolding in relation to its educational dimension that have concerned several scholars and researchers. Jennifer Hammond and Pauline Gibbons identify three “key features” (2001: 3) of scaffolding, 1) *extending understanding*, 2) *temporary support* and 3) *macro and micro focuses*. Let’s take a closer look to each one of these characteristics.

#### 2.3.4.1 *Extending understanding*

The purpose of the teacher who scaffolds is not only to help the student acquire new knowledge, but also to provide him/her with such assistance and support so as to be able to receive the new context, to internalize it and, then, use it on his/her own. Scaffolding helps the learner to understand better and in depth the new material that is offered to him/her. Hammond (2001: 3) comments:

The argument here is that teachers, through their sequencing of teaching activities, and through the quality of their support and guidance, are able to challenge and extend what students are able to do. It is by participating in such activities that students are pushed beyond their current abilities and levels of understanding, and it is then that learning occurs and students are able to ‘internalize’ new understandings.

The type of support and challenge that the teacher will choose to offer is basic in the extension of students’ understanding. According to Mariani (1997), support and challenge in classroom may be combined in three ways: 1) high challenge – low support, which might be interesting to the students but it will lead to their frustration and insecurity if they are not able to understand or solve a task, 2) low challenge – low support, which will make the students be bored and unmotivated and they will probably learn little, and 3) low challenge – high support, which might prove easy or enjoyable to the students but again they will not learn much (cited in Hammond and Gibbons, 2001: 4). All three combinations seem to lack something that will ensure students’ learning and the teacher has to be very careful on each case. “It is when the learning context provides both high challenge and high support that most learning takes place”, explain Hammond and Gibbons (2001: 4). This means that the new material should be well organized and the teacher well prepared to deal with such a

combination, but this is a case that will be discussed later on in *macro and micro focuses* subsection.

#### **2.3.4.2 Temporary support**

Apart from the quality of the challenge and the support that the teacher provides to students for effective understanding, it is equally significant for the teacher to know when the students have grasped the desired knowledge and are therefore ready to work on their own. In this case the teacher stops scaffolding and withdraws his assistance so that students can work independently.

Furthermore, temporary support is related to *contingency* (see Hammond and Gibbons, 2001: 5; van Lier, 1996; Wells, 1986, and others). Most classes are formed by mixed-ability students who have a different level of understanding and acquire knowledge with a different pace, others faster, others not. This situation creates the need for the teacher to be capable of scaffolding in such a way that his support will be truly effective to all his learners. “The notion of contingency emphasizes the importance of teaching strategies being based on, and responsive to, student’s current understandings”, point out Hammond and Gibbons (2001: 5), meaning that the teacher has to be able to judge his/her students’ level of knowledge or understanding so as to use the correct teaching strategies that will be mostly effective.

#### **2.3.4.3 Macro and micro focuses**

Behind macro and micro scaffolding hide the teacher’s preparation and educational goals. Effective scaffolding depends both on the general area of knowledge that the material to be taught belongs to, but also on the activities prepared by the teacher and the spontaneous interactions between teacher and student or student with his peers on the course of learning. Hammond and Gibbons (2001: 6) argue that effective scaffolding needs clear goals and learning activities prepared in such a way that students will go beyond the level of understanding they already have and for this reason a particular activity has to belong into the general curricula which in turn has got its own broader goals. In more details, Tina Sharpe (2001:33) talks about the *designed – in* scaffolding, which corresponds to the macro level, and *point-of-need* scaffolding, which corresponds to the micro level. In the first one “the teacher uses the unit-planning stage to consider both the outcomes to be assessed (knowledge,

skills and understandings) and the students' previous experiences", while in the second one "this *contingent* scaffolding relies on the teacher being able to identify a 'teachable moment' and maximize the learning potential of that moment" (Sharpe, 2001: 33). Each one of these types of scaffolding, either on a whole unit or during interaction in class, include a number of teaching strategies which may lead to successful teaching and learning if they are well-planned by a well-prepared and qualified teacher.

### **2.3.5 Scaffolding in Second Language Acquisition**

In all educational contexts teachers tend to scaffold but scaffolding is mostly connected to the teaching of language. L1 acquisition lends theories and strategies to second language teaching and learning with students struggling to master a second language. The learning of English as a basic second language is a prerequisite and the tendency for integration of content and language creates new conditions for research. Learning theories are extended being adapted to the modern educational and pedagogical data and frameworks. Under these circumstances, scaffolding as well appears to be a significant term in SLA and the need for teachers and ELLs (English Language Learners) to adjust to these new conditions seems to be obligatory. Notions connected to the socio-cultural view of scaffolding continue to be the basis of the specific theory but are also strengthened and combined as it may be seen underneath.

#### **2.3.5.1 The teacher – learner relationship**

Another important characteristic that has been added to the theory of the ZPD is related to the relationship of the teacher, who offers his/her support, and the learner, who takes over this support. The relationship between an adult and the child or a teacher and the student is the most common one. Donato (1994), among other scholars, spoke of knowledge that is 'co-constructed' and he researched over the assistance offered from student to student, i.e. scaffolding between peers, which he called 'collective scaffolding'. However, in addition to these two cases of scaffolding, van Lier (1996) added two more, first the case where a student takes the role of scaffolding another weaker student and second the case in which a student assists

himself/herself by drawing from the knowledge already taken from the teacher or other contents. Figure 1 represents the four cases of scaffolding underneath:



**Figure 1** Expanded ZPD (cited in Walqui, 2006; van Lier, 2004)

Therefore, within his/her ZPD the student has got the opportunity to learn supported by his/her teacher, in collaboration with the classmates, by assisting another student with less understanding of the new material and, finally, on his/her own by using his/her background knowledge. The ultimate goal is for the student to learn and this is accomplished in all four cases.

### 2.3.5.2 Features and levels of scaffolding

Wood (1988: 96, cited in Walqui, 2006: 163) characterizes scaffolding as “tutorial behaviour that is contingent, collaborative and interactive”. Walqui (2006: 163) explains that contingent behaviour is the one that influences and is influenced by other actions, collaborative behaviour is when the result is co-constructed, and interactive behaviour is when two or more people work together for a common result. In continuation, she extends the macro and micro levels of scaffolding into “three related pedagogical ‘scales’” (Walqui, 2006: 164) under the following schema:

Scaffolding 1 Planned curriculum progression over time (e.g. a series of tasks over time, a project, a classroom ritual)

Scaffolding 2 The procedures used in particular activity (an instantiation of Scaffolding 1)

Scaffolding 3 The collaborative process of interaction (the process of achieving Scaffolding 2)

Walqui is slightly more analytical on the procedure of scaffolding which starts with the planning of a unit, moves on to the development of this planning in the classroom and ends with the unexpected part where the teacher grabs opportunities to scaffold on new material offered from the interaction with the students. What is interesting to notice is Walqui's comment that, although the abovementioned procedure seems to require a top-to-bottom lining, a bottom – up scaffolding could also be proposed. The fact that students receive the teacher's support and eventually evolve linguistically and cognitively and become more autonomous as learners may engender changes in the planned curriculum so as to be readjusted to the students' abilities.

### **2.3.5.3 Scaffolding strategies: an approach to different taxonomies**

There is an abounding number of scaffolding techniques that may be appropriate for second language learners. Teachers choose depending on the needs of their students, their linguistic abilities and the material they have to cover. Moreover, language researchers propose and analyze different strategies depending on the object of their study. For instance, Aida Walqui remarks that there are numerous ways to help students learn English either as a second language or in content subjects and she identifies six kinds of instructional scaffolding which she considers “especially salient” (2006: 170). These strategies are presented underneath<sup>3</sup>:

- *Modelling*
- *Bridging*
- *Contextualization*
- *Building schema*
- *Re-presenting text*
- *Developing metacognition.*

---

<sup>3</sup> A detailed explanation of their function will follow in the Methodology section of Chapter 3

Another set of scaffolding strategies useful for team-work are *brainstorming*, where a student takes notes of the ideas discussed over a topic, and *floorstorming*, where the teacher uses pictures, probably located on the floor, to raise a discussion over a topic. These techniques are considered ways of “negotiating field knowledge” (Jones, 2001: 78). The notion of negotiating field knowledge is very significant in language pedagogy because it contributes to the co-construction of knowledge between the teacher and his/her students for a better acquisition of a second language.

A taxonomy of scaffolding strategies devised at the Australian setting is the *genre-based curriculum cycle* (Hammond, 2001: 28) which includes:

- *building the field* (the teacher sets activities which focus on curriculum knowledge and relevant language)
- *modelling* (the teacher introduces a genre and guides students through demonstration)
- *joint construction* (the teacher co-constructs with the students through joint participation but at the same time starts withdrawing his/her support taking the role of the monitor)
- *independent construction* (the teacher withdraws support and the student works independently on the genre)

Finally, Sharpe (2001: 37) suggests for point-of-need scaffolding, appropriate for building on technical vocabulary mostly, the following techniques:

- repetition of students’ remarks
- recasting ( the teacher repeats the student’s remark modifying it in the appropriate form)
- appropriation (the teacher takes the idea behind the student’s remark and modifies it to be technically appropriate)

The scaffolding strategies that a teacher may use in the CLIL classroom are many and, as it was mentioned before, it depends on the instructed material and the students’ needs, level of knowledge and understanding which ones are suitable to apply.

## **Chapter 3: Data, Methodology & Qualitative Analysis**

### **3.1 Data collection**

The data of this study were obtained and selected from material originally collected by Dutch researchers (de Graaf *et al*, 2007) who conducted a research on CLIL classes of secondary education. For a comprehensive picture of the study there will be firstly a reference to the CLIL programme in the Netherlands, subsequently details will be provided about the Dutch research regarding the nature of data collection and the participants, and, finally, information related to the current study will follow.

#### **3.1.1 CLIL in the Netherlands**

The CLIL programme in the Netherlands was implemented in the Dutch educational system in 1989 and since then there has been an advance in the number of schools that participate in the programme (de Graaf *et al*, 2007: 605). According to the europeesplatform (European Platform) website<sup>4</sup> which is responsible for internationalization in the Netherlands (Coleman, 2006: 36) and coordinates the Dutch bilingual education programming, in the school year 2008-2009 there were 101 schools registered in the CLIL stream while 49 have already been certified from the European Platform as qualified with the necessary standards for bilingual education.

Students may attend CLIL classes when they enter secondary education in a number of subjects (for instance History or Biology) but there is usually a turn to mother tongue instructed content courses as it is obligatory the final exams to be taken in Dutch (see de Graaf *et al*, 2007; Marsh *et al*, 2001). Great importance is also given to the training of the teachers who decide to become CLIL instructors. In their majority they are Dutch professors who attend training courses that might even last three to four years in language and didactics, called Classroom English, before they are allowed to enter the CLIL programme. In the language level they have to become proficient users of the English language and preferably be holders of a C2 level degree, according to the

---

<sup>4</sup> Available at <http://www.europeesplatform.nl/> [Accessed 25/05/2011]

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages<sup>5</sup>, which is required by most Dutch schools (Coleman, 2006: 36).

The fact that the CLIL programme has been running in the Netherlands for so many years and with such a great acceptance and participation from the schools somewhat proves its effectiveness. According to Dutch CLIL evaluating data, the learning results are hopeful and remove any misbeliefs about the effects of CLIL (Huibregtse, 2001 cited in De Graaf *et al.*, 2007). It appears therefore that for the Dutch curriculum the implementation of CLIL works well with emphasis on the good organisation of the programme and the high standards for the teachers.

### **3.1.2 The Dutch research**

According to de Graaf *et al.* (2007: 603), the purpose of the Dutch research, from which the data of this study were extracted, was to identify “effective CLIL teaching performance facilitating [students’] language development and proficiency”. The original material was collected and videotaped by CLIL teacher trainees who observed nine CLIL lessons from the subjects of History, Geography, Maths, Biology, Arts and Crafts, and English.

#### **3.1.2.1 The Dutch CLIL teachers**

Nine CLIL secondary education teachers of different specialization participated in the Dutch research, more specifically three male teachers of History, one male teacher of Geography, one female teacher of Biology, one female teacher of Maths, one female teacher of Arts and Crafts, and two female teachers of English. Apart from one English teacher who was a native speaker, the other eight teachers’ mother tongue was the Dutch language. All of them had an almost five year teaching experience and a two year CLIL experience, and were holders of the Cambridge Proficiency certificate. Moreover, they all taught their subjects in the English language.

---

<sup>5</sup> CEFR: Available at [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre_en.asp) [Accessed 26/05/2011]

### 3.1.2.2 Schools and students

Three medium-sized schools that ran the CLIL programme for six years were chosen for the specific research. Of the 1200 students that each school hosted, almost 300 attended the CLIL classes. Students aged from 12 to 17 years old and ranged from the first until the fifth year of CLIL education.

### 3.1.3 Data of the current study

For the current paper twenty instances of scaffolding were chosen from a CD entitled “*Identifying effective CLIL pedagogy for L2 learning*, Utrecht University, IVLOS”. The CD, which contains videotaped moments of the abovementioned material and other relevant information concerning the Dutch research, was created in 2006 by the Dutch researchers De Graaf, R. and Koopman, G.J. and a copy of it is attached at the end of this paper. Each case of scaffolding is included in a video of short duration that shows either teacher instruction or oral interaction between teacher and student. The selected videos are fifteen in total and consist of the subjects of History (two male teachers), Geography (one male teacher), Biology (one female teacher) and English (one female teacher).

Table 1 underneath presents the profile of the subjects, teachers and students used specifically in this study:

Subject	Teacher	Students	
		Year of CLIL education	Age
History	History Teacher 1	First year	12-13
History	History Teacher 2	Second year	13-14
Geography	Geography Teacher	Third year	14-15
Biology	Biology Teacher	Third year	14-15
English	English Teacher 1	Fourth year	15-16

**Table 1** Subjects, teachers and students in CLIL and EFL lessons (adapted from de Graaff *et al*, 2007: 611)

## **3.2 Methodology**

### **3.2.1 Qualitative analysis of videotaped material**

Being a relatively new pedagogical area in second language teaching and learning, CLIL classes attract researchers' and teacher trainers' interest, while CLIL teachers and students are very often subjected to study and analyses either of a quantitative research method, for instance questionnaires or tests, or a qualitative research method, i.e. interviews, videotaping, recordings and others. This study follows a qualitative analysis and uses as form of data videotaped material that was obtained from the abovementioned Dutch CLIL classes.

Classroom observation is a common type of method chosen from researchers who wish to carry out a qualitative research in the field of language acquisition (see Nunan, 1992: 91; Mackey and Gass, 2005: 175-176). The main reason for using videotaped material is that it can be kept inalterable and be reused as many times as the researcher wishes to see or hear it for the purposes of his/her analysis. Mackey and Gass (2005: 175) explain that "audio or visual recordings allow the researcher to analyze language use in greater depth later and involve outside researchers in the consideration of data". The researcher can transcribe and answer to 'how' and 'why' questions related to language teaching and learning. This is also the reason why it was decided that videotaped material from a CLIL setting would be the most adequate material to analyze for the investigation and precise identification of scaffolding strategies used in these particular contexts.

### **3.2.2 Procedure and method of analysis**

The original CD<sup>6</sup> contains in total thirty-three short-duration videos of CLIL instruction which were all carefully observed. However, from the thirty-three videos, only fifteen were selected for a detailed turn-by-turn analysis, the reasons being the following:

---

<sup>6</sup> Before the CD with the data was used for the current study, an approval was asked and taken for their use and analysis from one of the four Dutch researchers who participated in the Dutch research.

- First of all, not all videos were suitable for the purposes of this study, i.e. they did not offer instances of scaffolding, but they showed and served other pedagogical contexts.
- Secondly, the duration of some videos was so short that there was lack of basic contextual information and comprehension related to these videos, for example there was lack of what was said before the recorded material.
- Thirdly, the analysis of more videos would go beyond the space limitations of this paper, so the most representative and characteristic cases of scaffolding were analyzed.

The fifteen selected videos were firstly observed and later on classified according to the discipline of the teacher. Therefore, five different sections were created each one for a different teacher. Afterwards, the fifteen videos were distributed to the corresponding disciplines and they were transcribed creating in turn a number of extracts for analysis. The discipline of each teacher, the corresponding videos and the extracts transcribed from each video are presented in detail in Table 2 for a complete picture of the analysis while the transcripts of the fifteen videos can be found in the Appendix.

<b>Subject Disciplines</b>	<b>Videos</b>	<b>Extracts</b>
History Teacher 1	Video 1_1T	Extracts 1 and 2
	Video 1_4T	Extracts 3 and 4
Geography Teacher	Video 1_3A	Extracts 5 and 6
	Video 2_3A	Extract 7
History Teacher 2	Video 1_4Wa	Extract 8
	Video 2_1Wa	Extract 9
	Video 2_1Wb	Extract 10
	Video 4_6Wa	Extract 11
	Video 4_6Wb	Extracts 12, 13 and 14
	Video 3_5Wa	

	Video 3_5Wb	
	Video 2_3Wa	Extract 15
Biology Teacher	Video 2_4K	Extracts 16, 17 and 18
English Teacher 1	Video 3_1Wi	Extract 19
	Video 5_4Wi	Extract 20

**Table 2** Disciplines, corresponding videos and extracts of the analysis

Following this, a discursive analysis was developed for each extract with a detailed description of the exchanges between teacher and students or of the teacher's instruction. Apart from the description of the interactions, the discourse analysis also worked as an indicator of the non-verbal scaffolding techniques, for example gestures, facial expressions, intonation, etc., that were used by the teachers during instruction. At the end of each video analysis, observations on the findings followed. The purpose of the observations was the identification of the scaffolding instances that were found in each video separately and the interpretation of what was noticed, for example in what area of language acquisition the teacher has worked on, what he has accomplished or what the students have gained as learners.

After the data analysis was finished, five tables were presented and commented. These tables displayed the general picture of the scaffolding strategies that each teacher applied depending on the topic s/he was talking about. At this point it should be mentioned that, although this study does not analyze the data based on a specific framework or taxonomy, it intends to identify the general scaffolding techniques used by CLIL teachers. Nevertheless, there was major influence from two main frameworks proposed by scholars<sup>7</sup>, namely by Walqui (2006) and Mercer (1994).

Walqui (2006: 170-177) analyzes six main scaffolding strategies. These include:

- *modelling* (the teacher offers examples that students can imitate or clearly demonstrates what they have to do)

<sup>7</sup> Scaffolding strategies are many and there is not a framework that teachers use exclusively, some of them are just used more often than others.

- *bridging* (connecting new input with students' previous knowledge, for example activating knowledge they already have from personal experience)
- *contextualizing* (the teacher enhances learning with pictures, graphs, etc. or verbally with metaphors or analogies to make the input more comprehensible)
- *schema building* (the teacher helps students organize their thinking or knowledge by creating schemas that are mutually connected)
- *re-presenting text* (students change a text into another written or visual form, for instance a story can be changed into a dialogue)
- *developing metacognition* ( students learn how to evaluate themselves and are taught strategies of thinking)

Another category of strategies taken under consideration in data analysis came from the list suggested by Mercer (1994: 99) which are the following:

- the teacher sets themes and elicits responses that draw students along a line of reasoning. Sharpe (2001: 41) explains that drawing students along a line of reasoning leads to a *metastatement*, a kind of summary of what has been said.
- the teacher elicits responses through cues in the form of questions (for instance “a term that starts with ‘a’ ...”)
- the teacher elaborates and redefines what the students should do in an activity
- the teacher uses ‘we’ to show shared experience

As a summary, the resulting taxonomy used in this study is presented in Table 3:

<b><u>Taxonomy of scaffolding strategies</u></b>
1. Modelling
2. Bringing
3. Contextualizing
4. Schema building
5. Re-presenting
6. Developing metacognition
7. Elicitation of responses → Drawing students along a line of reasoning → Metastatement
8. Elicitation of responses through cues (in the form of questions)

9. Elaboration and redefining on an activity  
 10. Showing shared experience → use of pronoun 'we'

**Table 3** Scaffolding strategies identified in the specific study (Gerakopoulou, 2011)

Keeping the aforementioned taxonomy in mind the author of this study moved to the analysis of the scaffolding strategies found in the fifteen selected videos. After the presentation of the five tables and their comments, a general discussion on the findings and a final table that included the most predominant scaffolding strategies were developed so as to present and report on the outcomes of this study in relation to its aims and research questions.

### **3.3 Qualitative data analysis**

This subsection includes the analyses of the scaffolding techniques that the Dutch CLIL teachers have engendered in order to assist their English language students understand either the subject matter material or the linguistic material (i.e. vocabulary, grammar, etc) that might be difficult for them. For each teacher whose instruction has been chosen here to be analyzed, there will be, firstly, a detailed discourse analysis of the scaffolding techniques that s/he has used followed by a short discussion.

#### **3.3.1 History Teacher 1**

- **Video 1\_1T:**

In video 1\_1T History Teacher 1 and his students talk about Stonehenge and the transferring of heavy material for its construction. The students have to choose between 'sledges', 'timber cranes' and 'logs'. A student gives a possible answer, which is 'log', the teacher accepts it and then he elaborates explaining how logs were used. As can be seen in Extract 1, through the description of the procedure with logs the teacher intends to create an image to the students' mind so as to comprehend the procedure better:

**Extract 1**<sup>8</sup>

**S: Yeah, log.**

**HT1: Yeah. (1) That is the theory I heard as well. (2) They used logs, *boomstammen*<sup>9</sup>, and they put all these logs next to each other and they put the stone on it and they roll and they put the log at the backside of the stone and put it in front and they roll.**

The teacher in video 1\_1T offers feedback and then goes further in order to scaffold and support his students' learning. In (1) he involves himself agreeing on what the students have just read by saying "That is the theory I heard as well", in order to enhance the meaning of what they are learning and make it more believable. With simple words he explains how the procedure with logs worked so that the heavy stones to be carried. What is actually worth commenting in exchange 2 is that the teacher, during the explanation of the procedure with the logs, uses his body, his voice and intense gestures so that students can have a visual picture of his description and better comprehension. The teacher uses his hands to show how the logs were put one next to the other and rapidly jumps from one place of the classroom to the other to explain how logs were transferred from the front to the back to continue the procedure. He also gives special emphasis to the verb 'roll' by pulling his voice each time he uses it. In that way he shows the motion that the verb 'roll' includes. Moreover, in (2) the teacher translates the word 'log' in the native language, *boomstammen*, so as for students not to be confused with misunderstanding in vocabulary.

In Extract 2 now the teacher continues his explanation and elaborates more into the students' understanding.

**Extract 2**

**HT1: Ok. So we've got three answers. We've got sledges, sledges, no (inaudible word), big sledges, we've got cranes. (3) Do you believe the cranes? And we've got the timber logs. (4) There was a teacher in England, did I tell you about that? And he was teaching his first class, he was talking about Stonehenge. (5) Who has been to Stonehenge? Here. And Stonehenge is in England. And they have these very very very big (pause) stones. Em, and they cannot find these stones in the place of**

---

<sup>8</sup> HT1=History Teacher 1 and S=Student

<sup>9</sup> The Dutch translation of the word 'logs'

**Stonehenge themselves, so they had to move them some (teacher is thinking) I'm not sure, I think sixty or seventy miles...**

The teacher tries to make sure that the students actually grasp the function of the objects given in the three answers. In (3) he asks them to share their hunch about the use of 'cranes' and then he involves the students in a real life example (4) about a teacher who was teaching about Stonehenge, creating a new context. Firstly, he asks in (5) "Who has been to Stonehenge?" trying to see if any of the students has a personal experience of the place that could probably share in class. He puts his hand up to show that he himself has been to Stonehenge and involves himself once more to share his own personal experience. The teacher's story is a pleasant way to involve himself and the students into a real life example which helps the latter extend their comprehension beyond their current learning level.

### **Observations on video 1\_1T**

In video 1\_1T the teacher applies a number of scaffolding strategies such as use of repetitive language, body language, contextualizing and real life examples, teacher's personal engagement and translation to the mother tongue. He aims at adapting language into the students' comprehension level and presents the material he wants to teach in such a way that it is interesting and simple to the students' understanding. The visual aids and the fact that he tries to adjust the new historic material to his experiences, or the fact that he gives the example of another class that had the experience of Stonehenge, transform learning into background knowledge and support the learners' understanding which is the ultimate goal.

- **Video 1\_4T**

In his attempt to bring the students closer to the material he wishes to teach, History Teacher 1 uses the picture of an Egyptian woman. In fact, he puts the picture in front of his face replacing his head with the head of the Egyptian woman and he excuses this movement by saying that he does this because he feels nervous, as can be seen in Extract 3:

**Extract 3**

**HT1: But when I get nervous, and we teachers sometimes get a bit nervous when somebody is looking at you, I want to hide myself and I'll do like that, so probably I'll be on the video now, emm, so they won't see me anymore. So this woman Pharaoh was (inaudible word) but there was one Pharaoh, and we are going to read about her at the end of the hour, and his name is Tutenkhamon, and you know about him, and he was married to this beautiful young lady.**

This movement creates a relaxing atmosphere in the class. The teacher attracts the students' attention and this joyful game with the picture will allow them to connect the historic persons that the teacher talks about with his little theatrical attempt, keeping the input in their long-term memory. Just after that, the teacher reminds his students of the personal experience he had in Egypt. He adds new elements on the teaching material, the fact that in Egypt there is the statue of Tutenkhamon's wife 'in reality' as he argues below, and he creates new expectations for the students (Extract 4):

**Extract 4**

**HT1: And you know I went to Egypt two years ago and I saw the statue, (Dutch translation), of this lady in reality.**

For the word 'statue' the teacher gives the translation in the mother tongue probably because he believes that the students might not be aware of the word 'statue' in English.

**Observations on video 1\_4T**

In the same format as in video 1\_1T, History teacher 1 applies scaffolding strategies that target at introducing the new material in order to support and enhance the students' learning. His methods here summarize in contextualizing, i.e. the use of a picture, also simple language, teacher's personal engagement and translation to the native language.

### 3.3.2 The Geography Teacher

#### ▪ Video 1\_3A

The main concern of the Geography Teacher is the explanation of the word 'infrastructure', whose definition the students do not know. In order to make it clear to them he attempts different strategies as it is seen in the Extracts below:

#### Extract 5<sup>10</sup>

**GT:** Ok. So, infrastructural works for instance, (1) sewers is a part of the infrastructure, (2) any other things in the infrastructure for instance?

**S:** Emmm

**GT:** (3) What kind of infrastructure do we have here in the Netherlands? Come on, wake up. Come on. Floris, what kind of infrastructural work do we have here in the Netherlands?

As he is seeking for an answer, at the beginning the teacher gives an example himself, the word 'sewers' in (1), to model to the students what kind of answer they should be looking for. Then he asks for more examples (2) and when the student does not respond, he becomes more specific and narrows the field of request (3). In fact he leads students to familiar settings, their own country, and he uses 'we' to show that this is knowledge they all share in common. In Extract 6 underneath the teacher keeps on scaffolding with more questioning:

#### Extract 6

**GT:** (4) How did you get here this morning?

**S:** By bike.

**GT:** (5) By bike. So, what did you need to ride your bike?

**S:** Bike.

**GT:** (6) Yeah, your bike, that's the first thing. A house to go away from, to part, but also...

**S:** A school to run to.

**GT:** (7) Yeah, right, but also...in between, come on.

**S:** A road.

**GT:** (8) A road, yes, a cycle-path for instance. That's part of infrastructure, telephone lines, eh, telephone line, network, eh emm, waterworks, things like that. Those are all infrastructure. You

---

<sup>10</sup> GT=Geography Teacher and S=Student

all had that last year, you heard about that last year, didn't you? You didn't? Ok. So it's a new idea for you.

**S:** Yes.

**GT:** (9) Ok. A network, an infrastructural network, our works, also things you can't see really because your...Emm. Give me one thing that you can't see but it's a network.

**S:** Internet

**GT:** (10) Internet. Even it's not by cable for instance. Yeah, so, if it's infared for instance. You don't see the network but it's there alright. And your...

**S:** Mobile phones.

**GT:** (11) Mobile phone. Right. Ok. So that's also a network that you can't see but you can see the stations for instance, you can't see the net...the real network itself.

In Extract 6 the Geography teacher makes things even more personal and addresses questions to the students that correspond to their everyday life, for instance in (4), "How did you come here this morning?", as well as in (10) and (11). Even though the students give one-word answers, the teacher draws them along a line of reasoning, goes one step further and extends their answers (5-11). In (5), after the students have come up with a correct answer, the teacher extends their understanding with more examples, like 'road', 'cycle-path', 'telephone lines', 'waterworks'. When he sees that all these are new to the students, he elaborates more (9-11). He asks for networks that we cannot see and the students correspond with examples very familiar to teenagers' life, i.e. the internet and the mobile phones. The teacher provides feedback, repeats the students' responses extending and explaining once again the characteristics of the answers that the students have provided. Characteristic also in this interaction is the elicitation technique that the teacher applies in (5), (6), (9) and (10) where he leaves his sentence unfinished and expects the students to complete it, thus he tries to elicit the answer by pausing (Lyster, 1998: 65) or else 'fill in the blank' (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), a technique that gives students the opportunity to think and find the answer themselves with the help of their teacher and not receive it ready-made from the teacher.

### **Observations on video 1\_3A**

The abovementioned interaction between teacher and students is a typical example of micro or point-of-need scaffolding (see Chapter 2) which means that the Geography

teacher has not planned this interaction. Instead, as soon as the teacher understands that 'infrastructure' is a notion beyond the students' understanding, he starts building on their field of knowledge using several scaffolding techniques to extend their learning on the particular issue. The teacher never gives an answer himself, his unfinished sentences with a change in intonation show that he wants to elicit the responses from the students, and he accomplishes that through careful questioning.

Questioning is characterized by two different interactive processes which serve different purposes, scaffolding and IRF, i.e. Initiation-Response-Feedback. If the teacher in Extract 6 had only given positive feedback with responses such as 'right', 'ok' or just repeated the student's correct answer and stopped elaborating, then it would be a case of IRF, in which the teacher asks the question, the student responds and the interaction ends when the teacher just accepts the answer. Walqui (2006: 165) remarks that this kind of interaction creates a 'recitation script', quoting Tharp and Gallimore's (1988) term, because the dialogue between teacher and student is short and standardized, it does not go any further than it is expected. On the contrary, the Geography teacher, through constant questioning, grasps any opportunity given from the learners' responses to scaffold, clarify and elaborate on the material he works on. In summary, the scaffolding strategies that he applies are drawing students along a line of reasoning, facilitating student participation, elicitation with pausing, elaborating and redefining the requirements of an activity, bridging through prior knowledge activation and showing shared experience with 'we', and repeating the students' answers to build on their vocabulary. With challenge and high support the Geography teacher manages to scaffold students on the notion of 'infrastructure'.

- **Video 2\_3A**

On a discussion about Ghana and its economy, the geography teacher addresses a question and after a student responds, the teacher further clarifies notions, as it is shown in Extract 7:

**Extract 7**

**GT:** Is there also for Ghana an economical reason, eh, and I'd like you to ponder on this question. (He addresses to a student). (1) Is there also an economical reason for Ghana to...

**S:** (Student responds)

**GT:** Right, right, ok. (2) So the problem of, eh, of debts is a fierce problem in Ghana also. That's the reason why it is a LEDC, a less economically developed country.

The teacher asks students to think deeper on the issue they are talking about and asks for their engagement. Once again in (1) he leaves his sentence unfinished expecting the student to complete it and when the student responds correctly, the teacher offers positive feedback through affirmation. Finally, in (2) he makes a summary, as a conclusion to their interaction, leaving the students with the most important concepts they should keep in mind.

### **Observations on video 2\_3A**

In Extract 7 the scaffolding technique applied from the Geography Teacher is a case of metastatement. Tina Sharpe (2001: 41) comments that "...the teacher can extend or reformulate responses from students (even-single word responses) and develop a line of reasoning which leads to a 'section summary' or 'metastatement'". The Geography teacher wants to scaffold students' understanding, so firstly he builds on their field knowledge and in the end he makes a summary of the most important notions as a conclusion of what has already been said with the purpose of supporting students to extend their understanding. As a consequence, this summary of the most central concepts functions as a 'conceptual hook' (Sharpe, 2001: 41) which the teacher may use in order to work on new concepts later on. Apart from the metastatement strategy the teacher also uses facilitating student participation and elicitation with pausing.

### **3.3.3 History Teacher 2**

- **Video 1\_4Wa**

In Extract 8 below, History Teacher 2 talks to the students about the colonials and their government:

**Extract 8<sup>11</sup>**

**HT2: Nope, ok, not such a strong government. They just wanted to (1) fill their wallets, (pause), and if that was ok, everything was ok.**

As it is shown in video 1\_4Wa, when the teacher mentions the phrase “fill their wallets” (1), he makes a specific gesture with his hands to show that he refers to money. In that way he helps students comprehend that the phrase “fill their wallets” is connected to money.

**Observations on video 1\_4Wa**

Once more body language, in particular a gesture, is used from the teacher in order to support the students’ understanding. The teacher does not give any definition, instead with a gesture he provides the students with the meaning of the phrase “fill their wallets”. In a case like that the students’ profit is both conceptual and linguistic because on the one hand they comprehend what the teacher is talking about and on the other hand learn new vocabulary.

- **Video 2\_1Wa**

In Extract 9 below History Teacher 2 asks the students to provide the explanation of a cartoon. Giving them time to think, the teacher leads the students’ thinking from the picture to the slogan, “Join or die”, to a specific element of the picture, a snake, and then asks a student to answer:

**Extract 9**

**HT2: Ok then, I wanna have a look at the picture above. ‘Join or die’. I want an explanation, for this sort of cartoon. (Pause). (2) An explanation. (Pause). Think of an explanation. (3) Why does it say ‘join or die’? (4) Take a close look at the snake. Robin, can you answer this?**

---

<sup>11</sup> HT2=History Teacher 2

## Observations on video 2\_1Wa

As part of scaffolding in a macro level, the teacher has planned the contents of the lesson he is going to teach. While students are in the procedure of thinking what to say, the teacher emphasizes certain points that will help the students give an answer. Firstly, in (2) he uses repetition so that they focus on what they should do, i.e. give an explanation and be encouraged to think deeper, emphasizing at the same time on vocabulary acquisition. In continuation, the teacher scaffolds students and tries to elicit the answer by giving certain clues, as it can be seen in (3) and (4).

### ▪ Video 2\_1Wb

A case of scaffolding an unknown word, the word “purpose”, is described in Extract 10 that follows:

#### Extract 10

**HT2: (5) Can you explain the last sentence to me?**

**S1: (6) Mmm...**

**HT2: (7) Yes, you can. What is a “purpose”?**

**S1: (8) I have to explain in English or...?**

**HT2: (9) Preferably, but if you can’t you may use one Dutch word.**

**S1: (10) I don’t know how to explain.**

**HT2: (11) Oh my God. (Student’s name), can you help him?**

**S2: (12) No.**

**HT2: (13) What does the word “purpose” mean? (T addresses the whole class). Aaa, (student’s name).**

**S3: (14) That it isn’t an (inaudible word).**

**HT2: (15) That is when it is “on purpose” (emphasis on ‘on’ with his voice), but this is “a purpose” (emphasis on ‘a’ with his voice).**

**S4: (16) That you mean to do.**

**HT2: (17) That you mean<sup>12</sup> (emphasis on ‘mean’ with his voice) to do, (18) that is your goal (emphasis on ‘goal’ with his voice) to do, to reach...Yeah, Ok. (19) So, (the teacher reads the sentence to be answered) “these reasons gave the new nation”, and that’s of course America, “a purpose (emphasis on ‘purpose’ with his voice) that they wouldn’t forget”, a goal (emphasis on ‘goal’ with his voice), “to reach”. Yeah?**

---

<sup>12</sup> The underlined words show that the teacher stresses the word with his voice

History Teacher 2 asks a student to explain a sentence they have read. As the student hesitates to answer, in (5), (6) and (7) the teacher insists on asking the definition of the word “purpose” that is included in the sentence perhaps because he considers that this is a key vocabulary term in their reading. Also he might have judged that this could be an unknown word that will help the students explain the sentence. In (8) the student still finds it difficult to answer and wonders if he has to explain in English. The teacher gives him the opportunity to use the mother tongue to help him (9), but the student expresses inability to do so (10). As another student is unable to answer as well, the teacher addresses a third student (13) who gets confused and whose answer is not correct (14). In (15) the teacher makes clear that the student’s answer is a definition for the expression ‘on purpose’, and not for ‘a purpose’, emphasizing on ‘on’ and ‘a’ to help students distinguish the difference between the expression and the noun. When, finally, a student gives a correct definition, the teacher acknowledges the student’s answer by repeating it (17) and, then, he paraphrases by providing a more exact term, the word ‘goal’ (18), that is more appropriate. In continuation, the teacher reads the whole sentence and when he arrives at the word “purpose” he puts emphasis with his voice on it and then he replaces it by giving its synonym, the word ‘goal’ (19), which he stresses as well with his voice.

### **Observations on video 2\_1Wb**

Instances of scaffolding vocabulary are presented in video 2\_1Wb. The techniques used by the teacher are teaching key vocabulary terms, body language in the form of stressing the scaffolded vocabulary, repetition, paraphrasing, giving a synonym and putting vocabulary into context. The aim of the teacher is to elicit the definition from the students and when they do so, he makes sure that the students have completely comprehended the meaning of the word in question. If the teacher had given the definition of the word “purpose” himself, the abovementioned interaction would have been terminated very soon and it is not certain that the students would have understood the meaning of the word and that they would have been able to remember it later on. However, through interaction and the students’ personal involvement in the request of the definition of the particular word students are able to extend their understanding and thus their learning.

- **Video 4\_6Wa**

In video 4\_6Wa History Teacher 2 describes how the colonial system worked in America and, after his description, he assigns students an in-class writing exercise, as it can be seen in Extract 11:

**Extract 11**

**HT2: (20) If you are talking about the old colonial system, ladies and gentlemen, listen carefully because I will only say it once. (The teacher starts his description that lasts a few minutes). (21) That's the old colonial system. (22) Please, write it down in your notebook, what you heard, what I said, try to make it your own sentence.**

History Teacher 2 announces to the students what he is going to talk about and he warns them to be careful so as to assimilate the new information (20). After he finishes, he summarizes in a sentence (21) what he has just described and instructs students (22) to reproduce what he has just said about the old colonial system.

**Observations on video 4\_6Wa**

As the teacher unfolds the planning of the unit he is teaching, he has chosen to follow some techniques to scaffold students' listening and writing abilities. It is basic that the teacher knows the students' linguistic level and current understanding. This will determine the degree of difficulty of the exercises he wants to assign. In his short speech he explains the input that might be incomprehensible to the students using simple language and short sentences. As this is a CLIL class, his description of the old colonial system, on the one hand, facilitates comprehension of the content area and, on the other hand, it works as a listening practice (linguistic area). After the teacher finishes his description, he supports students' independent writing by assigning them a writing exercise. In that way the students enhance their understanding, practise on their production of written speech and use some cognitive skills such as short-term memory and concentration. The result is that the teacher succeeds in working on the students' autonomy as language learners.

- **Videos 4\_6Wb, 3\_5Wa and 3\_5Wb**

Videos 4\_6Wb, 3\_5Wa and 3\_5Wb are all connected in the order they are presented here and it is considered necessary to be analyzed together as History Teacher 2 uses several strategies to scaffold the students' content and linguistic development.

**Video 4\_6Wb:** In video 4\_6Wb History Teacher 2 has asked students to write down their opinion on a specific question and then exchange notebooks with their classmates, as it seen in Extract 12 underneath:

**Extract 12**

**HT2: Ok. Your final statement. (Teacher waits for a while) Ok. Stop writing please. Ok. Well, you all wrote down what your opinion is (23) but might be slightly different from someone else in this classroom, and I want you to read one another's answer to this question. We're going to do it like this. (24) You give your notebook with your answer to the person sitting two places on the left in a circle...(the teacher coordinates the exchange of the notebooks). Then I would like you to read it carefully and get your pen and maybe if you don't agree what one of these arguments or of what this idea, write down what part you don't agree, what your idea is about that...**

Students have been called upon to write their opinion on a topic. The teacher asks them to stop writing and then he explains what they are going to do and why (23). Afterwards, he carefully guides them on how the procedure of exchanging their writings will take place and coordinates them (24) so as no misunderstandings to occur. Finally, he instructs students on what they have to do, i.e. read the text and write down if they disagree on something and what their personal idea on that is.

**Video 3\_5Wa:** In Extract 13 that follows, the teacher asks students, who have already exchanged their writings, to check and remark now on the linguistic mistakes that they may encounter:

**Extract 13**

**HT2:** After you wrote down your own ideas about this answer, could you please check on the English used by your fellow classmate and maybe write down some remarks about (25) “this is wrong sonny”. Let’s see if you can be an English teacher.

The students have finished with checking the contents of their classmates’ writings and this time the teacher asks them to comment on the language their classmates have used. He gives an example (25) so as to show what kind of comments they should write down.

**Video 3\_5Wb:** In Extract 14 below, after the teacher and the students have elaborated on the contents of their writings, the teacher proceeds to the analysis and correction of the linguistic mistakes the students may have found in the writings of their classmates, as far as the use of the English language is concerned:

**Extract 14**

**HT2:** Hey, I asked you at the same time to see what, and possibly correct, use of English. Who did not find anything to correct? Talking about the English. (Teacher’s comments). Ok. Who would like to mention one mistake he or she read? Word, words, letters? Yes.

**S:** Millou, she wrote...

**HT2:** I don’t want to know the name.

**S:** Ok. Somebody...

**HT2:** But Ok, Millou... Yeah.

**S:** (26) Everything was not in the past but...

**HT2:** In the present.

**S:** In the present. Yeah.

**HT2:** Ok. Ok. Well. Good for her. She’s got a bright imagination. Wonderful. Another mistake? An important one? Yeah? Mariam.

**S:** (27) Yeah. I think someone understood wrong about, emm, hardly trained, emm...

**HT2:** Because...

**S:** (28) She thought it wasn’t, they were hard trained, they were good trained.

**HT2:** (29) Ok. Ok. Good. Yeah, that’s a nice mistake. And what is it in fact?

**S:** That they were almost not trained.

**HT2:** (30) Almost no training at all. Perfect. Ok. One more...

Two students provide two different examples of mistakes. The mistake that the first student comments upon in (26) is related to grammar. The specific student notices that her classmate made a wrong choice of tense, that is, she used a present tense instead of

a past one. After the teacher gives positive feedback to the first student's answer, a second student follows (27) who comments on another classmate's mistake related to a misunderstanding of the meaning between the adverb "hardly" and the adjective "hard". In (28) she explains what the mistake is about, what her classmate understood wrong. The teacher gives positive feedback as well (29) and then requests for the correct answer. The second student responds and the teacher repeats the answer to confirm that it is correct (30).

### **Observations on videos 4\_6Wb, 3\_5Wa and 3\_5Wb**

History Teacher 2 gives the opportunity to his students to work autonomously and enhance their own learning. The teacher stimulates students by deliberately putting them in the procedure of evaluating their classmate's work. This is a CLIL class and the teacher has to combine content and language teaching. Therefore, the purpose of the exercise that the teacher assigns is twofold: firstly, the students to work on the content area of the lesson and, secondly, to practise their linguistic knowledge. The teacher works on both areas in the following way:

- Content area: History Teacher 2 facilitates comprehension of content area by making students write their own opinion on a topic but also by making them interfere in their classmates' writing. Inevitably the students will have to compare their ideas with their classmate's, they will be troubled on and will have to judge whose opinion is correct, their own or their classmate's. Apart from building on their field of knowledge, the teacher also builds on his students' confidence as learners.
- Language area: After the students work on the content area, the teacher proceeds to the analysis of the use of language. Students check on the language elements their classmates have used and become responsible of their own and their classmates' linguistic development. When the time comes for the analysis of the linguistic errors, the students notice troubles with tenses or misunderstandings of meaning. They work independently and they become responsible for their own learning even though they reflect on somebody else's work. The teacher is there just to confirm on the students' findings.

- In general, the teacher facilitates students' participation into their own learning. Through monitoring and evaluating their classmate's work, the students will learn how to evaluate their own self. This is part of the students' metacognitive development and their socialization process which is very significant when a scaffolding situation takes place. The teacher offers high challenge and support and motivates the students while at the same time he works with them on their way to become autonomous learners.
  
- **Video 2\_3Wa**

In Extract 15 that follows, the teacher interacts with the students asking them to give arguments on a topic they discuss. He listens to individual students who express their opinion:

**Extract 15**

**HT2: Because... Ok. An American. Arguments. (Teacher points to a student)**

**S: (student answers)**

**HT2: (31) (Teacher writes on the board) Ok. Freedom their own situation. And that was important you say. They fight for themselves and not for a government, or whatever. Ok. And you think that's the final argument why the Americans had to win? (student nods). Ok. Bendon?**

**S: (32) (As the student answers, the teacher writes on the board)**

**HT2: The territory was their own? Ok. More. (Teacher points to a student)**

**S: (33) (As another student answers, the teacher writes on the board)**

**HT2: From their fields and barnes? Yeah. Ok. No long supply roots. But, hey, lets be honest. (34) Do you think the British were fed by ships coming from Great Britain? (Students say "No") No. Where did they get from? What do you think? (addresses to a student)**

**S: The Americans?**

**HT2: I think so. I think so. (35) So this is the strongest argument. But of course you can get this in a friendly way. Although I seriously doubt that if, that the Americans decently bought their food. I think they just took it. But I'm not sure about this one.**

The important part of this interaction between teacher and students is that the teacher is trying to prompt students to a logical argument that will be the answer to the issue they are analyzing. Each time a student gives an explanation, the teacher writes on the

board the answer in a few words (exchanges (31), (32), (33)). He accepts all three responses and, when it is needed, he elaborates more. However, when he sees that the students do not find the exact answer he is looking for, through questioning (34) he eventually guides students to the desirable response. The teacher gives feedback and then he says (35): “So this is the strongest argument”, showing that this is the answer he has been looking for and the most important concept the students have to keep in their mind.

### **Observations on video 2\_3Wa**

In video 2\_3Wa the teacher scaffolds students explaining difficult concepts of the input. He does not directly provide the answers himself but he devotes some of the class time to put students in the procedure of finding the answer themselves through interaction. The interaction is teacher-centered and it takes place between teacher and individual students so that the teacher can control the interaction better. The scaffolding techniques described in the analysis are contextualizing (use of the board as a visual aid), questioning, summarizing (in a list form) and drawing students on a line of reasoning. The teacher accomplishes the following. Firstly, he organizes the students' thoughts and he provokes their sequential thinking in order to reach logical assumptions when they meet troublesome and not understandable concepts. Secondly, when he writes the students' answers on the board, he creates a list of the students' responses that works as a visual aid and assists their reading skills and the content understanding. Finally, the teacher provokes the students' oral language production, he gives them the opportunity to speak and produce language, and enhances their language learning and acquisition.

### **3.3.4 The Biology Teacher**

- **Video 2\_4K**

The Biology Teacher instructs students on the way human teeth are separated. As it is seen in Extract 16 she has created a chart on the board and, with the students' participation, she marks down the presentation of human teeth:

**Extract 16**<sup>13</sup>

**BT: Ok. And what we are going to do is writing down the different kind of teeth. (1) You can do it in colours or you can make a small arrow to show. (2) Here we are going to write in orange colour the “incisors” (the teacher writes on the board “incisors” in orange colour), next to it we are going to write in white the “canines”, and at last I have yellow, it’s not very clear, let’s make it green, it’s a bit better. The green one are the “molars”, (3a) *de kiezen*<sup>14</sup>. Ok. How many incisors do we have? Let’s say we have a full set of teeth. How many incisors do we have in the right upper jaw? (3b) (The teacher asks the question in mother tongue and addresses a student).**

The teacher considers that the new input that she is going to teach is difficult for the students’ understanding, so she has prepared a visual aid using the board. First she models with clear guidelines what students are going to do and then she advises them (1) on how to do it since the students are copying the chart from the board to their notebooks. In order to make things more clear for them she uses a different colour for each category of teeth (2) and, as it shown on the video, she writes the name of each category of teeth on the board with the colour that corresponds to it, for example she writes ‘incisors’ in orange colour. Moreover, she turns to mother tongue twice, once to translate a medical term (3a), and secondly, she translates a question that contains vocabulary that could be unknown to the students (3b), thus she makes sure that the students understand her question.

An interaction follows, in Extract 17, between teacher and individual students with the first asking the latter about the number of each category of teeth and how they are separated in the mouth. After each answer the teacher draws on the schema:

**Extract 17**

**S: Emmm. How many...?**

**BT: How many incisors?**

**S: Four?**

**BT: Four. (4) And I want to split it up in left and right side? So only...?**

**S: Two?**

**BT: Two. Yeah. (5) So we have two on the right side, two on the left side and also in our lower jaw. Two by two. How many canines do we have? Simona?**

---

<sup>13</sup> BT=Biology Teacher

<sup>14</sup> *de kiezen*: Dutch translation for the word ‘molars’

**S: Emmm. Four?**

**BT: Four. (6) And how should I divide them?**

**S: Emmm...**

**BT: (7) If I want to put them on the scheme? In tooth formula?**

**S: Emmm...Two in the lower jaw...**

**BT: Yes. Two in the lower jaw. (8) And I also want to divide them over right and left?**

**S: One in each part...**

**BT: Yes. One in each part of your jaws. Now, the last ones, the molars. (9) Well, let's say it's an adult, and this adult, well it's not me, but this adult still has her or his set of teeth. How many molars are there then? (10) Look in the picture, you can count them. Yeah. (addresses to a student who gives the answer). Yeah. Twenty. So how do we divide them?**

**S: Five in each.**

**BT: Equally, yeah? Ok. (Teacher writes number five on the board) Five, five, five, five. So this is the ideal situation...**

This is a predetermined oral interaction that the teacher has prepared in order to involve students in the learning process actively, her intention is to make them search and give the answers on their own. The students seem to be uncertain of the answers they are asked to give. They hesitate to respond and, when they do, they respond in a question form. The reason could be that they either lack content knowledge or they have trouble understanding the language. However, the Biology Teacher assists them by cueing responses and eliciting the correct answer with questions that require simple, one-word answer. Every time she gets a correct response she writes it on the board to fill in the schema she has created to help students visually. Furthermore, using 'I' and 'we' she involves the students personally, for example in (4) – (8). Also, she gives an example in (9) to make it easier for the students to picture the situation and find the answer. Finally, she urges them to look in the book for help (10) since they are still in the procedure of acquiring the input. This interaction is an example of joint-construction between teacher and students who work together to extend the students' understanding.

In Extract 18 that follows the Biology Teacher concludes the teaching of input by assigning two tasks to the students:

**Extract 18**

**BT: What I want you to do. I mean...well...Seven minutes left. That's possible. I want you to make the tooth formula of your neighbour and homework is for next week, that's for Monday, I want you to make at least two tooth formulas of family members or your neighbour or your baby sister, whatever. Yeah? Ok. So now you choose your neighbour...**

The teacher considers that there is enough time for the students to practise what they have just learned in class, so she assigns them an in-class activity and she also gives them instructions for a homework activity to practise further. At this stage the teacher will be able to walk around the class and monitor what the students produce individually so as to check on their understanding and intervene to scaffold if necessary.

### **Observations on video 2\_4K**

The goal of the Biology Teacher is to teach specific input which she has planned, within the overall macro-level scaffolding. Firstly, she provides clear and detailed instructions to the students on how she is going to present them the new material and prepares a chart to offer them a visual aid for better assimilation of the input. Secondly, she elicits from the students the input in the form of oral interaction using a lot of repetition and questioning. Also she gives an example and contextualizes the input to make it more comprehensive for the students. Finally, she withdraws her help, she gives the initiative to the students who are called to work on what they have just learned and to practise instantly on the new material with an in-class activity, but also to prepare homework for further enhancement. To accomplish her goal the teacher uses modeling with clear and detailed instructions, contextualizing, for instance the board and variety of colours, text-representation, elicitation with clues, repetition, questioning, examples, bridging through sharing experience with 'we' and in-class learning activities for micro-level scaffolding and further support.

### **3.3.5 English Teacher 1**

- **Video 3\_1Wi**

English Teacher 1 assigns students an activity in which they have to prepare a talk about past events in a country. She considers it necessary to revise or remind to her students the time structures used to talk about past events so as to help them with the task they are going to prepare. In Extract 19 below it is seen how she scaffolds students on the use of the appropriate past tenses:

**Extract 19**<sup>15</sup>

**ET1: Now. (The teacher writes on the board) This is about it I think. (1) And what I suggest you to do is not only prepare your talk but really pay attention to the structures you use. Why is that? (2) Because when you talk about the things that happened in the past in a country, what type of tense structure would you use?**

**S: (inaudible answer)**

**ET1: Of course. Simple as that. So, here could say we need to have a look at time structures and I'm going to write then what kind of time structures I mean. (3) So can you think of other time structures for the past or for the history beat?**

**S: Past Perfect?**

**ET1: Yeah. Can you give an example?**

**S: They had been exercising something...**

**ET1: They had been?**

**S: They had been doing something for ages.**

**ET1: Yeah. Like when you talk about, say, Brighton, you go visit Brighton and you talk about the Past Perfect. Is that what you mean? You say, well, people in...Can you fill it in now?**

**S: Brighton had always had something...**

**ET1: Excellent. Yeah. So Simple Past is a suggestion, Past Perfect is a suggestion...**

As it is noticed in (1), the teacher draws students' attention to the fact that the content but also the grammatical structure as well are significant in the talk they are going to prepare. She explains what she means by setting a situation and seeks for an answer from the students about the tense they would use in such a situation (2). A student answers correctly and the teacher finds the opportunity to revise the time structures which she writes on the board. She asks the students' participation again trying to elicit types of past tenses (3). When a student suggests a tense, she asks for an example and then she helps him complete his thought by setting again a situation in which the tense may be used. In that way she gives the opportunity to the student to put the tense in a context and the other students to understand better. Finally, she gives

---

<sup>15</sup> ET1=English Teacher 1 and S=Student

feedback and repeats the time structures they have mentioned writing them at the same time on the board.

### **Observations on video 3\_1Wi**

English Teacher 1 has planned an activity for the students and in order to make sure they will use the appropriate time structure she involves them in an interaction about what kind of time structure they should use for reference to past events. Her strategy includes modeling, contextualizing through writing on the board to give visual aid to the students and putting the use of past tenses into context to assist their understanding and acquisition, facilitating their participation, giving and asking for examples, summarizing in a list form and. Apart from preparing the students to avoid possible mistakes in the tenses they are going to use in their writing, her goal is to enhance them also from a language point of view. Therefore, the scaffolding that she offers will make students feel confident when they start developing their task.

- **Video 5\_4Wi**

In Extract 20 below English Teacher 1 instructs her students on a task they have been given, to make a presentation:

#### **Extract 20**

**ET1: And if you have finished that, which should not take too long because you needn't write down everything, you are going to get this small white card on which you write down your slots, they say, that means that the one item you're discussing is going to be written down in telegramme style. (4) Because you are going to present it, you are not going to read it aloud. You are going to present your item. Yeah? And there is one help, of course are more helps because the other people at the back, (5) the trainees, are going to help you as well, and Mr. ... is going to help you and I am going to help you. So, (6) if you need any assistance there are dictionaries here, and you know these cards we've been working with them last year. They give you suggestions of sites and language that you use when you go to a particular place, that is worth seeing or visiting. Right? So that is a help as well.**

The students are going to prepare a presentation and the teacher guides them on what material to use and what kind of speech to choose, i.e. of telegraphic style and she explains the reason for this choice (4). She also explains that the students will receive help from more qualified people like the professors and the trainees (5), while at the same time she informs them that they will also get extra help from dictionaries and cards with information on the subject they are going to present whose use they are familiar with, as it seen in (6).

### **Observations on video 5\_4Wi**

In video 5\_4Wi English Teacher 1 explains the steps the students will have to take and the assistance they will receive in order to complete the activity they have been given. She knows that the students will come up with difficulties either linguistic or cognitive and she has prepared a plan of development for the students' presentations. The teacher's scaffolding contains material in a combination of contextual support that each one serves a purpose. Firstly, the students will use the white cards to write down what they are going to say in their presentation, like in a real life situation. Thus, they will produce written language of a certain style, i.e. writing in a note form. Afterwards the students will use cards whose function they already know and which contain information and appropriate to the situation language. This means they will have more practice on the foreign language and they will acquire content knowledge as well. The dictionaries, an important tool in foreign language learning, will be helpful for unknown words, so the students will learn new vocabulary and will practise on how to search words in a dictionary. Finally, they will be helped by more qualified people who will monitor their work and this will give them confidence and will involve them in interaction with the trainees or the professors. This will consist part of their socialization in the classroom environment. The techniques applied here from English Teacher 1 are modelling, in particular guiding students with strategies and offering content and language information to help students work independently, contextualizing (white cards, dictionary, cards with information), and monitoring from more qualified people for support.

## Chapter 4: Findings, Comments & Discussion

The analysis of the CLIL teachers' instruction carried out in Chapter 3 examined teaching practices and instances of scaffolding strategies used by CLIL teachers in their oral practice considering as basic variables for the application of these strategies the teachers' subject discipline, the students' age, the promotion of interaction and students' participation, as well as of their content, linguistic and cognitive development.

### 4.1 Findings of the study and comments

The findings of the study are presented underneath in the form of Tables regarding the subject discipline, the topic discussed and the scaffolding strategies that each CLIL teacher used in the analyzed videos while the relevant comments follow after each Table.

**A. Table 4** Scaffolding strategies used by History Teacher 1

Subject discipline	Topic	Scaffolding strategies
History Teacher 1	Stonehenge	-repetitive language -body language (intense gestures, intonation) -contextualizing and real life examples -teacher's personal engagement -translation in mother tongue
	Egypt	-contextualizing (use of a picture) -simple language -teacher's personal engagement -translation to mother tongue

The results in Table 4 show that History Teacher 1 used similar scaffolding strategies in the two topics that he instructed to build mainly on the students' understanding of the content. An important variable in his case is that the students in his class were first year CLIL students, 12-13 years old, and therefore less competent in the comprehension of the input and the production of the output in the second language. Therefore, to facilitate acquisition of the input he combined instruction with a lot of body language, contextualizing and real life examples. Also, although translation to mother tongue is frequently criticized in foreign language teaching, History Teacher 1 turned some vocabulary from English to Dutch probably to make sure that students

understand key concepts and used simple and repetitive language. Moreover, he turned many times to the technique of personal engagement either referring to his personal experiences or asking the students to share their personal hunches and experiences.

**B. Table 5** Scaffolding strategies used by the Geography Teacher

Subject discipline	Topic	Scaffolding strategies
Geography Teacher	Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-elicitation with pausing</li> <li>-body language (intonation)</li> <li>-drawing students along a line of reasoning</li> <li>-questioning</li> <li>-elaborating and redefining the requirements of an activity</li> <li>-bridging (prior knowledge activation and showing shared experience with 'we')</li> <li>-repetition of the students' answers to build on vocabulary</li> <li>-facilitating student participation</li> </ul>
	Economic situation in Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-metastatement</li> <li>-elicitation with pausing</li> <li>-facilitating student participation</li> </ul>

From Table 5 it can be seen that the Geography Teacher placed a lot of emphasis on the point-of-need scaffolding and he supported the students' content understanding with interaction and knowledge that comes from the students themselves. This could be the reason for applying extensively the techniques of drawing students along a line of reasoning, elicitation with pausing, questioning and facilitating student participation. In addition he activated students' prior knowledge and used the personal pronoun 'we' to connect students' knowledge of everyday life with the academic knowledge they gain in the classroom and thus made learning more meaningful to them. The strategies of metastatement, repetition, elaborating and redefining the requirements of an activity were used by the Geography Teacher to show students what is important to keep in mind. It is also noticed from the results that the Geography Teacher, apart from intonation, did not use any other form of body language, neither contextualizing nor translation but he tried to elicit from the students unknown meanings. A possible reason could be that his class was a third year CLIL class, 14-15 year old students who were capable of acquiring and producing language, contributing in that way into their own learning.

**C. Table 6** Scaffolding strategies used by History Teacher 2

Subject discipline	Topic	Scaffolding strategies
History Teacher 2	Colonization	-body language (gesture)
	Explanation of a cartoon	-repetition of what is requested and encouragement of deeper thinking -elicitation through clues
	Explanation of the word 'purpose'	-teaching key vocabulary terms -body language (stressing vocabulary and important notions) -putting vocabulary into context -synonymy -paraphrasing
	The American colonial system	-description in simple language with simple words -explanation of complex input -making students summarize
	Evaluation of classmate's content and linguistic work	-metacognitive development -facilitating student participation -monitoring and evaluating classmate's work
	Argumentation on a topic	-contextualizing (use the board to give visual aid) -questioning -summarizing in a list form -drawing students on a line of reasoning

The findings in Table 6 indicate that History Teacher 2 approached the topic of the colonization in America applying a significant number of scaffolding techniques which did not focus only on the content and linguistic development of his students but also on their cognitive development. He worked on their self-awareness as learners through written interaction by putting his students in the procedure of learning how to learn (metacognitive development) by evaluating their classmate's content and linguistic work, and built on their self-confidence. Also, he applied questioning, summarizing in a list form and drawing students along a line of reasoning to argue reasonably on a topic and reach a logical assumption. Moreover, from the results it is shown that he paid a lot of attention to building on the students' linguistic development and he worked on vocabulary using gestures, stressing of words with his voice, synonyms, paraphrasing and putting vocabulary into context to make sure that his students would

assimilate vocabulary well. His students were 13-14 years old, second year CLIL students, and therefore needed a lot of support on vocabulary acquisition.

**D. Table 7** Scaffolding strategies used by the Biology Teacher

Subject discipline	Topic	Scaffolding strategies
Biology Teacher	Human teeth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-modelling (clear and detailed instructions)</li> <li>-contextualizing (the board, colours)</li> <li>-text representation</li> <li>-elicitation with clues</li> <li>-repetition</li> <li>-questioning</li> <li>-bridging (showing shared experience with 'we')</li> <li>-giving examples</li> <li>-assignment of in-class activity in pairs for practice and monitoring from the teacher</li> </ul>

The results in Table 7 reveal that the Biology Teacher's instruction focuses mainly on the content area. She had planned a well-organized instruction of the topic which she presented by giving clear and detailed guidelines and constructing a chart on the board with the use of chinks in different colours. Also, the Biology Teacher bases the students' comprehension of the input on coming from the students themselves with elicitation, questioning and bridging. Repetition and examples were used for deeper acquisition while the teacher activated with an in-class task interaction between peers and possibly with herself as monitor of the situation.

**E. Table 8** Scaffolding strategies used by English Teacher 1

Subject discipline	Topic	Scaffolding Strategies
English Teacher 1	Preparation for oral talk (time structures)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-modelling (clear and detailed instructions)</li> <li>-contextualizing (use the board to give visual aid)</li> <li>-teaching key grammatical structure before writing</li> <li>-facilitating student participation</li> <li>-contextualizing (putting form-focused input into context)</li> <li>-giving and asking for examples</li> <li>-summarizing in a list form</li> </ul>
	Instructions on students' presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-modelling (guiding students with strategies to help them work independently)</li> <li>-contextualizing (cards to write on, cards with information, use of dictionary)</li> <li>-monitoring from more qualified people</li> <li>-modelling (offering content and language information to help students work independently)</li> </ul>

It is apparent from Table 8 that the strategies that English Teacher 1 applied had a dual purpose. On the one hand, she put a lot of emphasis on the linguistic development of the students, specifically on grammar, and, on the other hand, on the clear explanation of the strategies that the students had to follow in order to complete correctly the oral tasks that she had assigned to them. The results show that for the first topic she drew students' attention to grammar and revised time structures because it was an important point of development in the students' task. She used examples and asked students to put the relevant time structures into context. For the second topic she also tried to help her students linguistically with dictionaries and cards which contained relevant language to the students' presentation and also with the oral interaction promoted through the cooperation between professors, trainees and students. Tentatively, it could be said that the reasons why she paid special notice to the students' linguistic development could be, firstly, the fact that she is a language and not a content teacher and, secondly, the level of her students who are 15-16 years old, i.e. in their fourth year of the CLIL programme, and thus have a good mastering of the second language.

#### **4.2 Discussion of the findings**

This study has aimed at investigating educational practices and describing instances of scaffolding strategies used by CLIL teachers whose target is to promote interaction in the classroom and help students become competent second language learners. In general, the findings indicated that CLIL teachers include in their instruction a wide range of scaffolding strategies that especially contribute to the students' understanding in the second language.

More specifically, it was found that the teachers' subject discipline and the students' age are variables that affect the choice of scaffolding strategies. Thus, specific subject disciplines such as History Teachers 1 and 2, the Geography Teacher and the Biology Teacher tended to focus mainly on the students' content development and applied techniques that targeted at the students' content area understanding. On the aspect of language they seemed to scaffold on the explanation of vocabulary and different concepts which are important for the students' comprehension of the content area. On the other hand, the language teacher focused mostly on the students' linguistic

development applying techniques related to grammar, vocabulary, genre writing and output production. Moreover, for the students' cognitive development few techniques were used by the teachers apart from History Teacher 2 who put the students in the procedure of activating their cognitive skills. The reasons for this lack of practising on the students' cognitive development could be, firstly, the fact that CLIL teachers have to teach content and language simultaneously and thus concentrate less on the students' cognitive skills. A second reason could be that teachers are usually trained on the teaching of their subject discipline and not on how to support the students' cognitive development.

Regarding students' age, it seemed that the teachers took under consideration the students' level of linguistic knowledge and competence and applied scaffolding strategies that would be more helpful for them depending on their age and thus their CLIL experience. It was noticed that the younger the CLIL students, the more body language and contextualizing were used by the teachers, as well as translation to mother tongue, for example in the case of History Teacher 1. In fact, all CLIL teachers used either body language or contextualizing, or both, probably because they consider them helpful for the transmission of meaning and vocabulary, especially in the content area.

Another significant finding was the fact that almost all teachers encouraged the students' participation through elicitation and questioning. These scaffolding techniques promoted oral interaction between teacher and students. In general, teaching was mostly teacher-centered and interaction between teacher and student was the predominant interaction pattern since only the Biology Teacher seemed to promote interaction between students with a collaborative activity, as well as English Teacher 1 who suggested the students' collaboration with the trainees or the professors as they would prepare their presentations. Once more, the language teacher was differentiated as she was the one who appeared to aim more on the students' oral and written production, probably due to the fact that her discipline is explicitly related to language teaching.

As a summary, Table 9 below presents the most predominant scaffolding techniques applied from the CLIL teachers of the selected videos:

Subject disciplines	Predominant Scaffolding Techniques
CLIL teachers of History, Geography, Biology and English	Body language Contextualizing Repetition Elicitation Questioning Facilitating student's participation

**Table 9** Scaffolding techniques used more by the CLIL teachers analyzed

It is probably the dual nature of the CLIL approach that pushes the teachers in a constant application of scaffolding techniques that will ensure successful teaching and learning on the part of the students. The CLIL teachers are aware of the students' language level which will affect the acquisition of the subject matter knowledge. Their scaffolding strategies not only aim at the students' content and language acquisition, but also to their socialization through interaction and participation.

## **Chapter 5: Conclusions and Implications**

This study has attempted to investigate educational practices of the CLIL context and to analyze scaffolding strategies mainly in the oral discourse of CLIL teachers in secondary education, concentrating on the socio-cultural dimension of the CLIL approach which gives attribute to interaction in the classroom and promotes the second language learner's autonomy. Being a relatively new area of research, the CLIL paradigm needs to cover the educational and pedagogical inquiries that are raised in relation to its effectiveness in the field of second language teaching and learning. In the CLIL classroom the teacher has to guide and support students in the learning of both the content and the language area. Walqui (2006: 169) comments that English language learners need more good teaching than the rest of the learners because they struggle to combine English and subject matter learning at the same time. One part of this good teaching is offered by the CLIL teachers through the scaffolding techniques that they apply in order to assist their students' acquisition of the input and the production of the output in the best possible way.

As evidenced in the selected videos that constitute the data of this research, CLIL teachers apply scaffolding techniques that stimulate students and, although their instruction is mainly teacher-centered, they attempt to co-construct the lesson along with the learners. More specifically, key findings of this study reveal that teachers tend to use different forms of body language and contextualizing to support their instruction especially with the younger learners, that is, with the students belonging to lower secondary classes. Another significant result of this research is that students' participation is encouraged and the teachers try to lead students to the production of the output mainly through the technique of elicitation. Moreover, CLIL teachers appear to concentrate more on the development of content and linguistic competence while less attention seems to be paid to the students' cognitive development perhaps due to the teachers' priority of teaching content and language into the CLIL context. As far as the teachers' discipline is concerned, the results show that the language teacher scaffolds students on strategies that instruct them on the steps they should follow for greater linguistic development.

## **5.1 Restrictions and pedagogical implications of the study**

One main restriction of this study is the limited size of the data from which a selection was made so as to comply with the needs of this paper. Moreover, the analysis of videotaped material excludes the opportunity of having a complete explanation of the results since the author of this study did not participate in the selection of the original data. Furthermore, this study could have benefited from complementary data accompanying the videotaped material, as for example the distribution of questionnaires and teachers' interviewing about the scaffolding techniques that would add elements to the overall picture of the findings.

Although the discussions about the realization of CLIL as a new European teaching approach started almost ten years ago, research in the area is considered still young. Dalton-Puffer (2008: 15) observes that "research activities in the area of CLIL have gained momentum over the last three or four years and are producing first interesting results". Findings on scaffolding students' oral production reveal that students maximize their learning when they are offered high challenge and high support (Dansie, 2001: 65). The results obtained from the present study indicate that CLIL teachers are aware of their students' need for support in their oral interaction and therefore scaffold them using numerous techniques.

In conclusion, the implications of this study are related to teaching practices and further research. More specifically, different teacher profile seems to affect the use of scaffolding strategies. Thus, in teaching contexts it might be advisable to expose pre-service teachers to the existent variety of scaffolding strategies. Moreover, classroom observation could be used as a resource for teacher training as it offers exposure to authentic classroom situations and raises awareness of good teaching within the CLIL context. Furthermore, the results of the present study could be used comparatively for further research with other national contexts in which CLIL is already applied, for example in Spain, or as data basis for national contexts in which CLIL is in a very initial level, for instance in Greece. Finally, the students' age appeared to be an important factor in the choice of the scaffolding techniques the teachers applied in secondary education. Therefore, it would be interesting these findings to be compared

with evidence from research carried out in primary education so as to report on the CLIL teaching practices used in younger ages and check on common scaffolding strategies which apply in both educational levels.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (2001). *Profiling European Classrooms*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä
- Bruner, J.S. (1985). "Vygotsky: A Historical and Conceptual Perspective". In Wertsch, J. (Ed.), *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*. MA: Cambridge University Press
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing". *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1-47
- Chomsky, N. (1965). "Methodological Preliminaries". *Aspects of the Theories of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Coleman, L. (2006). "CLIL behind the dykes: the Dutch bilingual model". In W. Arnold, N. Joseph, H. Mol and R. Mitchell-Schuitevoerder (Eds.). *Young Learners and the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Continuum*. Kent: IATEFL YL SIG
- Coyle, D. (2000). "Meeting the challenge: developing the 3Cs curriculum". In S. Green (Ed.). *New Perspectives on teaching and learning modern languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Crandall, J. (1994, January). "Content-Centered Language Learning". *Center for Applied Linguistics*. <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/cranda01.html> [Accessed 20/05/2011]
- Cummins, J. (1994). Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as a second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.). *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). "Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): current research from Europe". In W. Delanoy and L. Volkmann (Eds.). *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter
- Dansie, B. (2001). "Scaffolding oral language: 'The Hungry Giant' retold" In J. Hammond (Ed.) *Scaffolding: Teaching and Learning in Language and Literacy Education*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association
- Davies, S. (2003, February). "Content Based Instruction in EFL Contexts". *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. IX, No 2. <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Davies-CBI.html> [Accessed 19/05/2011]
- De Bot, K. (2001). *Profiling European Classrooms*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä

- De Graaff, R. *et al* (2007). "An Observation Tool for Effective L2 Pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)". *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Vol. 10, No. 5, 603-624
- De Graaf, R. *et al* (2007). Identifying effective L2 pedagogy in CLIL. In U. Smit and C. Dalton-Puffer (Eds.) *Views* (Vienna English Working Papers) 16/3, pp. 36-42
- Donato, R. (1994). "Collective scaffolding in Second Language learning". In J.P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.). *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- European Commission (1995). *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society*. White Paper on Education and Training. Available from [http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white\\_papers/pdf/com95\\_590\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf) [Accessed 20/05/2011]
- Genesee, F. (1994) *Integrating Language and Content: Lessons from Immersion*. Educational Practice Reports, 11. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics
- Grabe, W. and Stoller, F. (1997). Content- based instruction: Research Foundations. In M.A. Snow & D. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content*. White Plains, NY: Longman
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). "Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning". In J. Maybin (Ed.) *Language and Literacy in Social Practice*. England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. London: Edward Arnold
- Hammond, J. (2001). "Scaffolding and Language". In J. Hammond (Ed.) *Scaffolding: Teaching and Learning in Language and Literacy Education*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association
- Hammond, J and Gibbons, P. (2001). "What is scaffolding?" In J. Hammond (Ed.) *Scaffolding: Teaching and Learning in Language and Literacy Education*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association
- Hansen-Pauly, M.A., project coordinator, *et al* (2009). *CLIL across Contexts: A scaffolding framework for CLIL teacher education* <http://clil.uni.lu> [Accessed 03/05/2011]
- Hibler, A. (2010). *Effective Collaboration between Native and Nonnative Speakers in the Spanish CLIL Context: The case of the Language Assistants in primary education*. Unpublished Master's thesis for the Department of English Philology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain .

- Huibregtse, I. (2001). In de Graaf *et al* (2007). *Effecten en didactiek van tweetalig voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland [Effects and Pedagogy of Bilingual Secondary Education in the Netherlands]*. Utrecht: WCC
- Hymes, D. H. (1966). "Two types of linguistic relativity". In W. Bright (Ed.) *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 114-158
- Jones, P. (2001). "Mind in the classroom" In J. Hammond (Ed.) *Scaffolding: Teaching and Learning in Language and Literacy Education*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon
- Krashen, S.D. and Terrell, T. (1983). In Troncale (2002). *The Natural Approach*. New York: Pergamon
- Lantolf, J.P. (2000). "Introducing sociocultural theory". In J.P. Lantolf (Ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press. Vol. 19, No 2, p. 37-66
- Lyster, R. (1998). "Form in immersion classroom discourse: In or out of focus?" *CJAL*, Vol. 1, No 1-2, pp. 53-82
- Lyster, R. (2007). "Introduction". *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Mackey, A. and Gass, S. M. (2005). "Qualitative Research". *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Mariani, L. (1997). In Hammond, J. and Gibbons, P. (2001) "Teacher Support and Teacher Challenge in Promoting Learner Autonomy". *Perspectives* 23 (2). Italy
- Marsh, D., Maljers, A. and Hartiala, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Profiling European Classrooms*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä
- Mercer, N. (1994). "Neo-Vygotskian Theory and Classroom Education". In B, Stierer and J, Maybin (Eds.). *Language, Literacy and Learning in Educational Practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Nunan, D. (1992). "Classroom observation and research". *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Panselinas, G. and Komis, V. (2009). "'Scaffolding' through talk in groupwork learning". *Thinking Skills and Creativity*. Vol 4, No 2, pp. 86-103  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871187109000261> [Accessed 25/05/2011]

- Peachey, N. (2003, August). *Content-based instruction*. <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/articles/content-based-instruction> [Accessed 19/05/2011]
- Pérez-Vidal, C. (2009). "The Integration of Content and Language in Classroom: A European Approach to Education (The Second Time Around)" In E. Dafouz and M. Guerrini (Eds.). *CLIL across Educational Levels: Experiences from Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Contexts*. London: Richmond Publishing
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). "Communicative Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice." *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. London: Yale University Press
- Sharpe, T. (2001). "Scaffolding in action: Snapshots from the classroom". In J. Hammond (Ed.) *Scaffolding: Teaching and Learning in Language and Literacy Education*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association
- Snow, M.A., Met, M. and Genesee, F. (1989). In Genesee (1994). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, pp. 201-217
- Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (2002). "Talking it through: two French immersion learners' response to reformulation". *International Journal of Educational Research*. Vol.37, No 3-4, pp. 285-304
- Tharp, R.G. and Gallimore, R.G. (1988). In Walqui, A. (2006). *Rousing Minds to Life: Teaching, Learning, and Schooling in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Troncale, N. (2002). "Content-Based Instruction, Cooperative Learning, and CALP Instruction: Addressing the Whole Education of 7-12 ESL Students". *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 2, No 3. <http://journals.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/view/19/0> [Accessed 19/05/2011]
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy and Authenticity*. London: Longman
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of Higher Psychological Processes* (Cole, M. et al. eds). Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Walqui, A. (2006). "Scaffolding Instruction for English Language Learners: A Conceptual Framework". *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 159-180
- Walqui, A. and van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the Academic Success of Adolescent English Language Learners*. San Francisco: WestEd
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education*. MA: Cambridge University Press

Wood, D. J. (1988). In Walqui, A. (2006). *How Children Think and Learn*. Oxford: Blackwell

## APPENDIX

### **Video 1\_1T**

HT1: Log.

S: Yeah. Log.

HT1: Yeah. That is the theory I heard as well. They used logs, (Dutch word), and they put all these logs next to each other and they put the stone on it and they rolled and they put the log at the backside of the stone and they put it and they rolled. (pause). Do you believe that one? No? I want you to believe it.

Ok. So we've got three answers. We've got sledges, sledges, no sledgous, big sledges, we've got cranes. Do you believe the cranes? And we've got the timber logs. There was a teacher in England, did I tell you about that? And he was teaching his first class, he was talking about Stonehenge. Who has been to Stonehenge? Here. And Stonehenge is in England. And they have these very very very big ... stones. Em, and they cannot find these stones in the place of Stonehenge themselves, so they had to move them some...I'm not sure, I think sixty or seventy miles. And he told his class and they did it with sledges, and they did it with timber logs and the class, ahhh, we don't believe it, we don't believe it. So this class took a week off their holiday and they went altogether to move one of these stones. Neal, do you believe it? No? No? That he mentioned... That he... (dutch) So in the next holiday we are going to Egypt, all of us, right? And the university of Egypt, Utrecht is going to pay for it because they are here, and we are going to move a stone.

Emm, question number three.

### **Video 1\_4T**

HT1: But when I get nervous, and we teachers sometimes get a bit nervous when somebody is looking at you, I want to hide myself and I'll do like that, so probably I'll be on the video now, emm, so they won't see me anymore. Because at the end of the hour I want all the boys in this class to say "ahh, she is beautiful". No? Oh, that could be, yeah, no. So this...No, that's not true, no. So this woman Pharaoh was...but there was one Pharaoh and we are going to read about her at the end of the hour and his name is Tutenkhamon, and you know about him, and he was married to

this beautiful young lady. And you know I went to Egypt two years ago and I saw the statue (Dutch) of this lady in reality. So when I'm nervous I'll do like that.

### **Video 1\_3A**

GT: Ok. So, infrastructural works for instance, sewers is a part of the infrastructure, any other things in the infrastructure for instance?

S1: Emmm

GT: What kind of infrastructure do we have here in the Netherlands? Come on, wake up. Come on. Floris, what kind of infrastructural work do we have here in the Netherlands? How did you get here this morning?

S2: By bike.

GT: By bike. So, what did you need to ride your bike?

S2: Bike.

GT: Yeah, your bike, that's the first thing. A house to go away from, to part, but also...

S2: A school to run to...

GT: Yeah, right, but also...in between, come on.

Ss: A road.

GT: A road, yes, a cycle-path for instance. That's part of infrastructure, telephone lines, eh, telephone line, network, eh emm, waterworks, things like that. Those are all infrastructure. You all had that last year, you heard about that last year, didn't you? You didn't? Ok. So it's a new idea for you.

Ss: Yes.

GT: Ok. A network, an infrastructural network, our works, also things you can't see really because your...Emm. Give me one thing that you can't see but it's a network.

S3: Internet

GT: Internet. Even it's not by cable for instance. Yeah, so, if it's infared for instance. You don't see the network but it's there alright. And your...

S4: Mobile phones.

GT: Mobile phone. Right. Ok. So that's also a network that you can't see but you can see the stations for instance, you can't see the net...the real network itself.

### **Video 2\_3A**

GT: Is there also for Ghana an economical reason, eh, and I'd like you to ponder on this question. (Addresses to a student). Is there also an economical reason for Ghana to...

S: (student responds)

GT: Right, right, ok. So the problem of, eh, of debts is a fierce problem in Ghana also. That's the reason why it is a LEDC, a less economically developed country.

### **Video 1\_4Wa**

HT2: Nope, ok, not such a strong government. They just wanted to fill their wallets, (pause), and if that was ok, everything was ok.

### **Video 2\_1Wa**

HT2: Ok then, I wanna have a look at the picture above. 'Join or die'. I want an explanation, for this sort of cartoon. (Pause). An explanation. (Pause). Think of an explanation. Why does it say 'join or die'? Take a close look at the snake. Robin, can you answer this?

### **Video 2\_1Wb**

HT2: Can you explain the last sentence to me?

S1: Mmm...

HT2: Yes, you can. What is a 'purpose'?

S1: I have to explain in English or...?

HT2: Preferably but if you can't you may use one Dutch word.

S1: I don't know how to explain.

HT2: Oh my God. (Student's name), can you help him?

S2: No.

HT2: What does the word 'purpose' mean? (T addresses the whole class). Aaa, (students name).

S3: That it isn't an (inaudible word).

HT2: That is when it is "on purpose", but this is "A purpose" (emphasis on 'a').

S4: That you mean to do it.

HT2: That you mean (emphasis on 'mean' with his voice) to do, that is your goal (emphasis on 'goal' with his voice) to do, to reach... Yeah, Ok. (The teacher reads the sentence to be answered) So, "these reasons gave the new nation", and that's of course America, "a purpose (emphasis on 'purpose' with his voice) that they wouldn't forget", a goal (emphasis on 'goal' with his voice), "to reach". Yeah?

#### **Video 4\_6Wb**

HT2: Ok. Your final statement. (Teacher waits for a while) Ok. Stop writing please. Ok. Well you all wrote down what your opinion is, but might be slightly different from someone else in this classroom, and I want you to read one another's answer to this question. We're going to do it like this. You give your notebook with your answer to the person sitting two places on the left in a circle...(the teacher coordinates the exchange of the notebooks). Then I would like you to read it carefully and get your pen and maybe if you don't agree what one of these arguments or of what this idea, write down what part you don't agree, what your idea is about that...

#### **Video 3\_5Wa**

HT2: After you wrote down your own ideas about this answer, could you please check on the English used by your fellow classmate and maybe write down some remarks about "this is wrong sonny". Let's see if you can be an English teacher.

#### **Video 3\_5Wb**

HT2: Hey, I asked you at the same time to see what... and possibly correct use of English. Who did not find anything to correct? Talking about the English. You didn't find anything to correct? Wow! Those were some great (inaudible). Ok. Who would like to mention one mistake he or she read? Word, words, letters? Yes.

S: Millou she wrote...

HT2: I don't want to know the name.

S: Ok. Somebody...

HT2: But Millou...Ok, yeah.

S: Everything was not in the past but...

HT2: In the present.

S: In the present. Yeah.

HT2: Ok. Ok. Well. Good for her. She's got a bright imagination. Wonderful.

Another mistake? An important one? Yeah? Mariam.

S: Yeah. I think someone understood wrong about, emm, hardly trained, emm...

HT2: Because...

S: She thought it wasn't hard trained, they were good trained.

HT2: Ok. Ok. Good. Yeah, that's a nice mistake. And what is it in fact?

S: That they were almost not trained.

HT2: Almost no training at all. Perfect. Ok. One more...

### **Video 2\_3Wa**

HT2: Because... Ok. An American. Arguments. (Teacher points to a student)

S: (student answers)

HT2: (Teacher writes on the board) Ok. Freedom their own situation. And that was important you say. They fight for themselves and not for a government, or whatever. Ok. And you think that's the final argument why the Americans had to win? (student nods). Ok. Bendon?

S: (As the student answers, the teacher writes on the board)

HT2: The territory was their own? Ok. More. (Teacher points to a student)

S: (As the student answers, the teacher writes on the board)

HT2: From their fields and barnes? Yeah. Ok. No long supply roots. But, hey, lets be honest. Do you think the British were fed by ships coming from Great Britain? (Students say "No") No. Where did they get from? What do you think? (addresses to a student)

S: The Americans?

HT2: I think so. I think so. So this is the strongest argument. But of course you can get this in a friendly way. Although I seriously doubt that if, that the Americans decently bought their food. I think they just took it. But I'm not sure about this one.

### **Video 4\_6Wa**

HT2: If you are talking about the old colonial system, ladies and gentlemen, listen carefully because I will only say it once. (The teacher starts his description that lasts a few minutes). That's the old colonial system. Please, write it down in your notebook, what you heard, what I said, try to make it your own sentence.

## **Video 2\_4K**

BT: Ok. And what we are going to do is writing down the different kind of teeth. You can do it in colours or you can make a small arrow to show. Here we are going to write in orange colour the incisors, next to it we are going to write in white the canines, and at last I have yellow, it's not very clear, let's make it green, it's a bit better. The green one are the molars, de kiezen. Ok. How many incisors do we have? Let's say we have a full set of teeth. How many incisors do we have in the right upper jaw? (teacher asks the question in mother tongue and addresses a student).

S: Emmm. How many...?

BT: How many incisors?

S: Four?

BT: Four. And I want to split it up in left and right side? So only...?

S: Two?

BT: Two. Yeah. So we have two on the right side, two on the left side and also in our lower jaw. Two by two. How many canines do we have? Simona?

S: Emmm. Four?

BT: Four. And how should I divide them?

S: Emmm...

BT: If I want to put them on the scheme? In tooth formula?

S: Emmm Two in the lower jaw...

BT: Yes. Two in the lower jaw. And I also want to divide them over right and left?

S: One in each part...

BT: Yes. One in each part of your jaws. Now, the last ones, the molars. Well, let's say it's an adult, and this adult, well it's not me, but this adult still has her or his set of teeth. How many molars are there then? Look in the picture, you can count them. Yeah. (addresses to a student who gives the answer). Yeah. Twenty. So how do we divide them?

S: Five in each.

BT: Equally, yeah? Ok. (Teacher writes number five on the board) Five, five, five, five. So this is the ideal situation. Well, if you ask a lot of adults they don't have them anymore. Maybe some grandparents don't have tooth at all anymore, so that's a problem (Teacher laughs) What I want you to do. I mean...well...Seven minutes left. That's possible. I want you to make the tooth formula of your neighbour and homework is for next week, that's for Monday, I want you to make at least two tooth formulas of family members or your neighbour or your baby sister, whatever. Yeah? Ok. So now you choose your neighbour. I hope you do not very bad breath...

### **Video 3\_1Wi**

ET1: Now. (The teacher writes on the board) This is about it I think. And what I suggest you to do is not only prepare your talk but really pay attention to the structures you use. Why is that? Because when you talk about the things that happened in the past in a country what type of tense structure would you use?

S: (inaudible answer)

ET1: Of course. Simple as that. So here could say we need to have a look at time structures and I'm going to write then what kind of time structures I mean. So can you think of other time structures for the past or for the history beat?

S: Past Perfect?

ET1: Yeah. Can you give an example?

S: They had been exercising something...

ET1: They had been?

S: They had been doing something for ages.

ET1: Yeah. Like when you talk about, say, Brighton, you go visit Brighton and you talk about the Past Perfect. Is that what you mean? You say, well, people in...Can you fill it in now?

S: Brighton had always had something...

ET1: Excellent. Yeah. So Simple Past is a suggestion, Past Perfect is a suggestion...

### **Video 5\_4Wi**

ET1: And if you have finished that, which should not take too long because you needn't write down everything, you are going to get this small white card on which you write down your slots, they say, that means that the one item you're discussing is going to be written down in telegramme style. Because you are going to present it, you are not going to read it aloud. You are going to present your item. Yeah? And there is one help, of course are more helps because the other people at the back, the trainees are going to help you as well, and Mr. ... is going to help you and I am going to help you. So if you need any assistance there are dictionaries here, and you know these cards we've been working with them last year. They give you suggestions of sites and language that you use when you go to a particular place, that is worth seeing or visiting. Right? So that is a help as well.