

Original citation:

Banegas, Dario Luis. (2014) An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks : issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Volume 17 (Number 3). pp. 345-359.

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/58561>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

"This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article Banegas, Dario Luis. (2014) An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks : issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Volume 17 (Number 3). pp. 345-359. published in. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2014. © Taylor & Francis, available online at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13670050.2013.793651>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: publications@warwick.ac.uk



<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/>

An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks: issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market

Darío Luis Banegas

The current ELT global coursebook market has embraced CLIL as a weak form of bilingual education and an innovative component to include in General English coursebooks for EFL contexts. In this paper I investigate how CLIL is included in ELT coursebooks aimed at teenaged learners, available to teachers in Argentina. My study is based on the content analysis of four series which include a section advertised as CLIL-oriented. Results suggest that such sections are characterised by (1) little correlation between featured subject specific content and school curricula in L1, (2) oversimplification of contents, and (3) dominance of reading skills development and lower-order thinking tasks. Through this study, I argue that CLIL components become superficial supplements rather than a meaningful attempt to promote weak forms of bilingual education.

Key words: CLIL; EFL; language learning; language skills; content and language integrated learning

1. Introduction

Although the integration of curricular content and second language learning has always been at the heart of bilingual education (Cummins 2008; Lotherington 2004), it is currently associated with CLIL, an umbrella approach which involves diverse models at different levels of education (Coyle et al. 2010; Dalton-Puffer 2011; Ruiz de Zarobe and Jimenez Catalán 2009). Due to the growing interest in and uptake of CLIL (Kiely 2011; Pérez-Cañado 2012), the current ELT global coursebook market has embraced it as an innovative component for general English coursebooks for EFL contexts.

However, the content side of CLIL rarely corresponds with students' L1 curriculum. CLIL is used as a brand name to add value to General English coursebooks. In this article I investigate how CLIL is included in four ELT coursebook series for teenagers available to teachers in Argentina as an example of how language-driven CLIL, as a weak form of bilingual education, operates in EFL contexts. This article is based on the content analysis of CLIL components in four series marketed for use in secondary education in Argentina.

2. Review of the literature

2.1. International coursebook production

Despite a growth in online resources, coursebooks still dominate the ELT market despite arguments around their benefits and shortcomings (Tomlinson 2012), and principles for coursebook development have become more sophisticated (Tomlinson 2003, 2010, 2012; Tomlinson and Masuhara 2010). Regarding principles and practices for coursebook production, Tomlinson (2012: 152) points out that coursebook writers do not necessarily seek originality since some authors report ‘replicating previous materials.’

Replications are usually found at the level of coursebook topics. Based on the content analysis of three international General English coursebooks, Gray (2010: 53) asserts that coursebooks have a tendency to resemble each other ‘not only in terms of format and methodology but also in terms of content.’ Coursebook topics may be deemed as bland, trivial and irrelevant (Banegas 2011b; Bell and Gower 2011; Tomlinson 2012). In a study of five ELT coursebooks for adults, Tomlinson et al. (2001: 87) agreed that ‘the topic contents of many of the units, in many of the courses, is distinctly trivial for adult learners.’ Even when more complex topics are included, these are featured in courses targeted at advanced learners. For example, Jacobs and Goatly’s (2000: 261) investigation of the treatment of ecological issues in coursebooks suggests that these ‘occur less often in coursebooks for lower proficiency students.’

In relation to types of topics, Cook (1983) originally suggested that language teaching should include another academic subject, student-contributed content, language, literature, interesting general facts, and culture. While some of these areas anticipated CLIL, culture was envisioned as a detached entity from academic subjects. Gray (2010) remarks that when ‘culture’ appeared in ELT coursebooks, it meant general historic-political facts about the UK and the USA, or overgeneralisations about cultural customs in those countries. It seems that there has been little progress in this respect. Based on content analysis of ELT coursebooks used in Argentina, López Barrios (2008) found that global coursebooks feature trivial as well as unrelated topics which highlight a disregard for sequence or organisation. Similarly, Moirano (2012) examined three coursebooks used in three different secondary schools in Argentina and concluded that topics were usually related to daily life and culture-related

topics were associated to the USA or UK or did not address Argentinian students' cultural needs and context. This may show that inner circle countries (Rajagopalan 2004) are still portrayed as cultural and linguistic models in ELT, and that publishers, as Ballman (1997) claims, need to produce coursebooks which are contextualised in learners' experiences.

Tomlinson (2012) adds that global coursebooks are not cognitively engaging or relevant for the contexts in which they are used. International series are also incompatible with local curricula as they feature predetermined content matter formed according to other contextual realities (Maley 2011). In response to this issue, Bell and Gower (2011: 136-137) explain that international coursebooks are designed to cater for a wide range of educational settings 'no matter how suitable they are for the context' (p. 136). However, I contend that this feature precisely makes international coursebooks unsuitable for any context as this 'one-size-fits-all' approach fails to effectively target specific learning situations. In effect, the authors define the global coursebook as 'a coursebook for a restricted number of teaching situations in all countries' (p. 137). Therefore, international coursebooks may clash with bilingual education for the integration of subject matter content and language learning. That said, I shall focus on CLIL and CLIL materials.

2.2. Content and language integrated learning

Considering CLIL as an umbrella term, CLIL experts agree on the notion of a continuum (Costa and D'Angelo 2011; Coyle et al. 2010). The CLIL continuum moves from content-driven models such as bilingual education in which a school subject is taught in another language to language-driven models such as project work in which a school curriculum content is addressed by different teachers (Coyle et al. 2010). In a reflective article about content and language in bilingual education, Leung (2005) places the different varieties of CLIL as manifestations of the many configurations found in bilingual education.

Following Cummins' (1992; also Baker 2003; Lotherington 2007) views on strong and weak bilingual education, language-driven CLIL is considered weak bilingual education since language-driven CLIL programmes are not implemented for content learning and additive bilingualism is not an intended outcome. In this paper I mainly focus on language-driven CLIL models which figure predominantly in my corpus. In language-driven CLIL, lessons are taught by EFL teachers (Banegas 2011a) who incorporate content systematically

into the regular EFL lesson to increase meaningful learning (Coyle et al. 2010). Such content originates in the students' L1 school curriculum, but is primarily designed to further language development. With regards to language skills, Banegas (2013) observed that students in a secondary school in Argentina preferred listening and speaking opportunities in their language-driven CLIL lessons.

According to Evans et al. (2010: 141), language-driven CLIL features the 'frequent use of content for language practice.' However, such content is normally superficial and familiar to the students. In other words, language learning is prioritised and content learning is incidental. As a reaction to this practice, Coyle et al. (2010: 96) warn that 'CLIL programmes are not about re-teaching already-learned material in another language.' With the aim of strengthening CLIL pedagogies, Coyle (1999) developed the 4Cs framework where each 'C' stands for content, communication, cognition, and culture. In Coyle's approach (2007: 550), '[c]ulture(s) permeates the whole' framework.

Regarding the balance between linguistic and cognitive complexity in CLIL, authors (Coyle et al. 2010: 31; Mehisto et al. 2008: 154-155; Reiss 2005; Yassin et al. 2010) employ Cummins' BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency), and Bloom's revised taxonomy (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001). While BICS are connected with a social environment and familiar situations, CALP posits the students' broader curriculum as the focus, and involves a more complex and extended process given the lack of familiar context in its development.

In Cummins's view, the integration of language and content should progressively move from cognitively undemanding or low-order processing tasks such as recognising and context-embedded activities (BICS) to cognitively demanding tasks such as critiquing, and context-reduced activities so that learners gradually manage curricular load (CALP) and language in equal measure. Kong and Hoare (2011) found that when depth of content processing and language proficiency intersect, the former may enhance students' cognitive development if it is scaffolded through higher-order tasks. Results showed that more complex content matter led to more engaged students, who could use language to reproduce knowledge, including subject-matter discourse. Consequently, materials for the CLIL classroom should cater for language and content learning through cognitively engaging activities and sources.

2.3. CLIL materials

The dearth of context-responsive CLIL materials may be evaluated as one of the major drawbacks educators find as it leads to a greater workload for teachers, in seeking to address this discrepancy between materials and needs (Mehisto 2008; Cammarata 2009; Ricci Garotti 2007; Vázquez 2007).

Consequently, CLIL teachers in EFL contexts such as Argentina may use Geography textbooks originally addressed to English L1 British secondary learners, as a source to develop their CLIL lessons. The drawback of authentic materials or ‘unadapted NS [native speaker] materials’ (Somers and Surmont 2012: 114) is that they lack contextualisation as most examples are British-based, compelling teachers to produce new materials which look at the same topic in their own countries (Smit 2007). Whilst authentic textbooks are at the appropriate age level, the higher linguistic demands may actually impede learners’ content understanding (Vázquez 2007). In relation to this concern, Lucietto (2009) adds that publishing houses will not produce CLIL materials on an international scale given the extent to which contextual factors (learners’ age and cognitive/linguistic level, curriculum, educational policies, etc.) affect the materials production process. In that sense, she speculates that marketed coursebooks will continue featuring one-off activities disjointed from the school curriculum.

Coyle et al. (2010) devote one entire chapter to the evaluation, adaptation and development of CLIL materials. Without specific reference to the presence of CLIL sections in general English coursebooks, the authors warn that ‘the danger for CLIL is that a conventional TESOL approach to materials could focus attention only on linguistic, rather than both content and linguistic, aspects of courses, modules, and units’ (p. 87). Consequently, they advocate that CLIL material designers should focus on student and teacher roles, affective factors such as motivation and anxiety, and cognitive factors. In general, they assert that while the main objective of the CLIL lesson is the teaching of new concepts through familiar language, well-designed tasks could also cater for the factors outlined above. In their design, materials writers are encouraged to develop tasks which

promote cooperation, self-evaluation, accessibility of the input material and language progression. As for text types, they suggest (1) continuous, (2) bullet-point, (3) tables and diagrams, and (4) visuals (including artwork). They encourage a balanced incorporation of such texts, and emphasise that graphic organisers, bullet-point texts, or visuals are as informative as continuous texts and offer important scaffolding for complex language and content. While this classification may be useful at a surface level, teachers need to ensure that texts respond to the different genres found in other secondary school subjects. Llinares et al. (2012: 109-153) offer a general picture of genres and text types in CLIL subjects and include the analysis of sample texts. Similarly, Filardo Llamas et al. (2011) recommend that texts should be selected according to an analysis of genres, contextual features, and discourse properties.

Evans et al. (2010) contribute to the development of content-based materials by means of links between materials principles and curricular principles. Firstly, CLIL materials writers should follow the principle of responsiveness by which the materials correspond with stakeholders' and learners' needs as well as school curriculum aims. Secondly, CLIL materials should be cohesive in terms of skills, topics, learning strategies, and roles. Lastly, stability should ensure that CLIL components are systematic and coherent. Nonetheless, excessive stability may lead to repetitiveness and predictability in materials which may lead to teachers' and students' demotivation (Banegas 2012).

While the CLIL literature abounds in suggestions for materials, little is said about the ways in which CLIL is already included in existing coursebooks.

3. Method

The aim of this study was to examine how CLIL is included in general English international coursebooks. To this effect, I selected four international UK-produced series with a CLIL component marketed in Argentina:

Series A: *More!* (Cambridge University Press)

Series B: *Insights* (Macmillan)

Series C: *Champions* (Oxford University Press)

This is not the published version

Series D: *Upbeat* (Pearson)

My selection criteria were that (1) they are branded as featuring a CLIL approach, (2) they are targeted at teenage learners whose level of English ranges from A1 to B1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference, and (3) they are widely adopted by teachers of English in state secondary education in Argentina who wish to explore weak versions of bilingual education.

My results were derived from the content analysis of the CLIL section in the student's coursebooks of the four series mentioned. According to Harwood (2010), content analysis may include the quantification of references to a particular topic/category or identification of content categories and calculation of space devoted to each category. Whether content analysis includes the development of categories inductively or deductively, Gray (2010) recommends that materials analysis should start by offering a description of the coursebooks to be analysed and interpreted.

3.1. Procedures

As a preliminary approach to the content analysis of the four CLIL-oriented series, I first considered where CLIL was physically placed within the series and the number of pages devoted to the approach. I also compared how CLIL was advertised on the back-cover blurbs. For my content analysis, I divided data into (1) the school subjects linked to the CLIL section and (2) topics which each CLIL section features in the series. These are descriptive, inasmuch as I only reproduced what is on the page. The table also included (3) the topic units in which the CLIL section appears, (4) the correspondence between these topics and a secondary school curriculum in Argentina, (5) the type of activities according to the procedures and cognitive skills involved and the language skills they seem to cater for, (6) the type of sources of input (e.g. written texts, tables, videos, audio interviews), and (7) whether there were explicit references to grammar and vocabulary learning. I classified the activities according to cognitive skills following Bloom and Cummins, and Coyle et al.'s (2010) hierarchy of text types, both mentioned above. I have decided to represent quantification through the actual number of occurrences and direct proportionality through percentages for comparisons across the four series, given the relatively low number of series analysed.

4. Results

4.1. CLIL-oriented series: general features

In terms of physical features of Series A-D, Table 1 offers my initial approximations:

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 1. General features of Series A-D

As a result of direct proportionality between the number of coursebook pages (n=100%) and those for CLIL (n= x) to represent the weighting of CLIL in each series, I obtain the following percentages: 9.52 (Series A), 6.25 (Series B), 2.94 (Series C), and 5.71 (Series D). In addition, the table shows that the CLIL section is (1) found in every two units with the exception of Series D, and (2) linked to the students' broader school curriculum in Series A and D.

4.2. Contents in the CLIL section

CLIL sections across series A-D are associated with school subjects such as Geography or History, which are core in secondary education in Argentina. The CLIL sections within each series are linked to a different subject. For example, the first book of Series A has six CLIL sections and therefore six different subjects are included in only one book. When looking at all the books in each series, there are 8 school subjects represented in Series A, 12 in Series B, 11 in Series C, and 5 in Series D. Some of these subjects may be repeated within the same book and may appear more than once in the series. Through cross-examination of the four series, the combination of what their authors call 'Science', 'Biology', and 'Health' appears 12 times. Other generally repeated subjects are History (10 times), Geography (9), and English Language and Literature (9).

Interestingly, the four series share the similarity of offering a section which I shall summarise under 'Culture' in line with Coyle's words (2007). This section also appears every other unit across the series and it includes topics such as general facts about the USA, the UK (Series A and B), American parks, sports, and summer camps (Series A, C, and D), cities or

landmarks in the UK and the USA (Series B, C, and D), or topics such as education, lifestyle, fashion, and social customs in Britain and the USA (Series B, C, and D).

In terms of comparing the topics within the school subjects featured in every CLIL section across the series, Table 2 illustrates how responsive each series is to students' secondary school curriculum in Argentina.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Table 2. Comparison between topics in Series A-D and a school curriculum

In principle, Series A and B look promising in terms of correspondence between the coursebook curriculum and the Argentine official curricula even when these series are not localised or targeted to the Argentine market exclusively. Nonetheless, while Series A-D are for teenagers, topics are presented as if targeted to primary school students. For example, in *Champions Starter* (Series C), one of the topics is 'muscles' and it appears under 'Biology'. In the reading input for the unit students learn that 'Muscles are very important. Muscles help you do everything' (p. 67). Another example to serve my purpose may be found in Series D. In *Upbeat Intermediate* one of the topics is 'glaciers' (Geography). Glaciers are defined as 'big rivers of ice, water, and rocks' and students are told that 'the ocean liner *Titanic* sank because it hit an iceberg' (p. 50).

Additionally, some topics are shared across series. For example, 'glaciers' appears in Series A and D, 'energy resources' in Series A and B, and 'fashion' in Series B and C. Furthermore, the same topics may appear in the CLIL section of one series and in the 'Culture' section of another. This could be exemplified through how facts about the history of the USA are interpreted. For example, while Series A presents basic information under the title 'Early US history' in *More! 4* (pages 12-13), Series B systematically includes this under a section entitled 'General knowledge integration', which emphasizes culture from inner circle countries (Rajagopalan 2004). Additionally, both the CLIL section in *More! 2* (pages 92-93, Series A) and the 'Across cultures' section in *Upbeat Intermediate* (pages 40-41, Series D) introduce contemporary writers.

4.3. Types of activities and language skills

Overall, the CLIL sections in Series A and D include activities for the development of listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Series B and C do not include activities for listening. Table 3 presents the total number of activities which develop the skills mentioned above. The activities come from the students' book as well as suggestions found in the teacher's book. By 'activities' I considered all those which involved interaction with the input presented. Activities were connected with a language skill and varied in the level of cognitive engagement required.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Table 3. Skills development in CLIL sections – Series A-D

Table 3 shows that readings skills are prioritised in CLIL activities. Exceptionally, only Series D acknowledges this feature through the explicit clarification that reading is the focus of the CLIL section. Work on reading is usually followed by writing, speaking, and listening in terms of CLIL-related skills priorities.

Since reading predominates, its relation to what students are asked to do becomes important. Table 4 below thus indicates the number of activities (n) and the percentage they represent in terms of cognitive/thinking skills in each series.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Table 4. Thinking skills involved in CLIL activities

The table shows that reading activities only involve lower-order thinking skills, 'remember' in particular. What should be remarked is that under this process all questions are explicit – the answers are easily recovered from the texts. For example, in *Champions 1* (page 64, Series C) young students read that 'The Oscar Niemeyer Museum in Curitiba is like an eye.' The second question in the activity below the text is: 'What does the Oscar Niemeyer Museum look like?' The same level of explicitness is replicated in subsequent volumes for more advanced learners in the same series. In *Champion 3* (page 64, Series C) there is a text with the following sentence: 'Homer, a famous Greek writer, wrote two poems called The Illiad and the Odyssey.' The first question in the read-and-answer activity is 'Who wrote The Illiad and The Odyssey?' The same features for reading activities are also found in listening

Darío Luis Banegas (2013): An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks: issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI:10.1080/13670050.2013.793651

activities. In *More! 2* (p. 13, Series A), students hear that ‘the government in Britain started to ask Americans to pay money, taxes.’ Students are then asked to determine if the sentence ‘Americans had to pay taxes to Britain’ is true or false.

With regards to text types for reading and listening activities and following Coyle et al.’s (2010) classification, Table 5 represents the number (n) of text types used across the CLIL sections and their respective weighting in percentages. Results reveal that continuous texts and artefacts/visuals (especially pictures for labeling), which include artwork, are by far the most used.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Table 5. Types of texts in CLIL section (Series A-D)

While reading and listening feature continuous texts and visuals to engage students in lower-order thinking tasks, speaking development offers opportunities for higher-order thinking tasks. With the exception of Series C, the other series feature speaking activities after reading and listening activities, and in combination with writing skills (see below). While the writing activities include description, narration, or creation, speaking activities range from lower-order thinking tasks such as predicting or roleplaying to higher-order thinking tasks such as discussion or evaluation. For instance, *Upbeat Intermediate* (p. 77, Series D) asks students to work in pairs or groups to choose one of the featured charity organisations and decide how they would like to help.

The development of writing skills is usually found in the ‘project’ suggested at the end of the CLIL section in Series A, B, and C. Series A and C appear to equate ‘project’ to writing skills. Teachers who use Series A and C are encouraged to promote collaborative work among students. Most student productions such as posters, leaflets, report, or magazines seem to be for display. In *More! 2* (p. 93, Series A), students are asked to ‘write a short summary of a book that you have read and enjoyed.’ Series B features a slightly different view of project work since it involves finding information, writing, producing a poster, and making a group presentation in front of the class. While these three series often ask students to produce isolated paragraphs or posters, Series D includes the writing of diaries, descriptions, blogs, articles and letters. As regards cognitive processes, all the activities found in the four series are examples of Bloom’s UNDERSTAND and CREATE categories since students are frequently asked to describe and compare, or narrate and produce.

Finally, while grammar is not highlighted, vocabulary does play a role. Series A, B, and D offer a vocabulary box on top of each CLIL section. Only Series B contains activities such as sentence completion or labeling. These are normally simple regardless of the level in the series. For instance, students are asked to label pictures such as a computer (*Insights 1*, p. 33) or an ear (*Insights 3*, p. 41) using the words provided. However, *Insights 3* also includes complex vocabulary-related activities such as ‘find a word in the text for each definition’ (p. 113).

5. Discussion

The aim of this paper is to investigate how CLIL is included in General English coursebooks marketed in EFL contexts such as Argentina.

In general, Series A-D are advertised as having a CLIL component through varied forms and terms. However, less than 10% of these series is devoted to the integration of curricular content and language (Table 1). Nonetheless, content is not limited to the CLIL component as it reappears in other sections such as ‘culture’, ‘general knowledge’, or ‘real life issues.’ This diversification may suggest that according to Series A-D’s authors content in the CLIL classroom or the L1 school curriculum does not involve culture (this in fact represents the USA or UK), general knowledge or issues such as gender equality. This practice is in sharp contrast with Coyle’s 4Cs Framework and her view of culture penetrating all aspects of CLIL pedagogies. It may also reflect an encyclopedic view of a school curriculum for the textbook authors, who do not seem to be aware of how new contents and current issues are part of L1 syllabi at least in Argentina.

Series A-D appear to be stable in terms of their layout and foci. Under the light of the responsiveness principle (Evans et al. 2010) presented above, the subjects found in the CLIL section appear to be successful (Table 2). Nevertheless, their contents are trivial and not linked to any school context thus projecting a context-free school curriculum which makes weak links with a real L1 curriculum. Furthermore, the principle of cohesion is not exercised as each CLIL section does not show topic/subject sequence or increasing complexity since one section could be about glaciers and the following could be about the history of fashion with the same type of texts and activities across a single series. Although reduced topic coherence and sequencing is also a feature among most ELT global coursebooks, ‘CLIL’-

oriented series fail to innovate by offering focus, coherence and development to the organisation of the topics they include.

Regarding content and language integration, the target of the series and the input offered in the series indicate that secondary school students whose level of English is not highly proficient are expected to be given diluted content through undemanding texts. In this respect, students with a low level of EFL are treated as students with low cognitive abilities. Such a limited scope for students' development also materialises in skills treatment across the series (Table 3). Attention to reading skills in language-driven CLIL is common to all four series. Nonetheless, reading is developed at the expense of other skills. Listening in particular is downplayed and therefore we may conclude that CLIL may be equated to the reading of trivialised content when, in fact, secondary school students may demand complex texts and significant listening development through authentic sources (Banegas 2013). This exposes the poor response of international CLIL-oriented coursebooks to weak forms of bilingual education (Baker 2003; Leung 2005).

The data presented in Table 4 testifies to the consistent lack of challenge throughout the four series. Activities for skills development, particularly reading, mainly promote lower-order thinking skills with interspersed speaking tasks involving higher-order thinking skills. In this respect, the overwhelming presence of continuous texts (Table 5) does not guarantee an increase in content since texts frequently have the same length. Furthermore, this aspect reveals the unbalanced nature of sources of input and the extent to which visuals are not considerably exploited. Rather than being useful tools to scaffold learning, visuals and artwork are employed to make the series cosmetically attractive but devoid of serious educational potential.

Despite the shortcomings discussed so far, project work, although associated with writing skills, is seen as a channel for language-driven CLIL explorations. Project work in Series A-D emphasises collaborative and autonomous learning since students are asked to search for information outside the classroom and some tasks include the design of posters, PowerPoint presentations and magazines in groups.

Overall, CLIL is included as an approach which is peripheral or 'extra' in international general English coursebooks. While subjects may resonate with an L1 curriculum, its topics do not necessarily respond to the actual, complex contents in secondary

education. Furthermore, CLIL is equated to trivial reading and unchallenging activities that students may complete without engaging with the texts included at length or in depth.

In relation to language learning, it may be claimed that because (1) grammar is not treated separately, (2) vocabulary may appear in boxes, and (3) there is a correlation between the topic and language focus of the units preceding the CLIL section, there is an attempt to integrate language and content learning. Nonetheless, shallow topic treatment and the minimal cognitive challenge underlying activities may indicate that the authors of Series A-D do not believe that learning content in English could help develop language since the CLIL section does not promote cognitive development at a higher level. For CLIL to be successful, topic treatment, sources of input, and activities should be complex and correspond to the cognitive stage of secondary school students regardless of their English proficiency.

What in principle appears to be a genuine interest in infusing curricular content into the EFL lesson, may result in the artificial superficial naming of a coursebook as ‘CLIL-driven’ or in the use of CLIL as an extra approach which cannot be independent or self-contained. CLIL is included as an extra section characterised by oversimplified content or the teaching of familiar content and shallow activities which do not correspond to any L1 curriculum or the cognitive development of potential users. This type of CLIL inclusion is not a fair representation of Cummins’ BICS and weak bilingual education. Along these lines, it could be argued that naming a section ‘CLIL’ does not constitute a serious and innovative integration of content and language, but rather a half-hearted investment which cannot realise its intended benefits. In fact, following Coyle et al.’s (2010) suggestion that CLIL is not about re-teaching familiar content, I believe that what appears in these sections should not be considered as CLIL per se. The suggestions by Evans et al. (2010), Mehisto et al. (2008), Wolff (2010) or Coyle et al. (2010) need to be incorporated if coursebook publishers wish to reverse this tendency.

I argue that such an erratic incorporation comes from the fact that CLIL remains underdefined (but see Dale and Tanner 2012 or Llinares et al. 2012) and that for market reasons, publishers overstretch the scope of CLIL and forms of bilingual education, creating confusion among practitioners and school administrators and undermining CLIL’s intended benefits in the classroom.

6. Conclusion

Coursebook production for the international market is a commercial activity which needs to capture, follow, meet, and create new demands in second language learning. Hence, the acronym 'CLIL' is incorporated as a brand name but there seems to be little evidence of genuine innovation or development in CLIL-related coursebooks.

The content component of the integration should be intimately related to the L1 curriculum not only in terms of subjects, but most importantly in terms of topic complexity and cognitive development (Wolff 2010). It is my view that CLIL needs to be narrowed down and further contextualised for specific educational settings. It is moreover time for international publishers to reconsider the promotion of coursebooks as 'CLIL-oriented' when in fact there are few responsible curriculum links for the settings in which they are adopted (Moirano 2012). In order to achieve responsiveness, language-driven CLIL materials, envisaged as scaffolds for weak bilingual education, should be locally produced as a joint enterprise between publishers, curriculum designers, content teachers, and teachers of English so that contents accurately reflect the complex curricula of secondary education. There nonetheless needs to be a careful programme which allows students to move from BICS to CALP through formal education. Future studies may investigate other types of CLIL materials, including teachers' materials and other CLIL-oriented coursebooks, and their deployment in classrooms in different educational settings.

References

- Anderson, L. W. and D.R. Krathwohl. 2001. *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. A revision of Bloom's taxonomy for educational objectives*. Abridged Edition. New York: Longman.
- Baker, C. 2003. Education as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 23, 95-112.
- Ballman, T. 1997. Enhancing beginning language courses through content-enriched instruction. *Foreign Language Annals* 30, no. 2: 173-186.
- Banegas, D.L. 2011a. Content and language integrated learning in Argentina: 2008-2011. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning* 4, no. 2: 32-48.
- Banegas, D.L. 2011b. Teaching more than English in secondary education. *ELT Journal* 65, no. 1: 80-82.
- Banegas, D. L. 2012. Motivation and autonomy through CLIL. A collaborative undertaking. In *Views on motivation and autonomy in ELT: Selected papers from the XXXVII FAAPI Conference*, ed. L. Anglada and D.L. Banegas, 39-45. San Martín de los Andes: APIZALS.
- Darío Luis Banegas (2013): An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks: issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI:10.1080/13670050.2013.793651

- Banegas, D. L. 2013. Developing language-driven CLIL through collaborative action research. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Warwick.
- Bell, J. and R. Gower. 2011. Writing course materials for the world: a great compromise. In *Materials development in language teaching*. 2nd Ed, ed. B Tomlinson, 135-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cammarata, L. 2009. Negotiating curricular transitions: foreign language teachers learning experience with content-based instruction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des la langues vivantes* 65, no. 4:559-585.
- Cook, V. 1983. What should language teaching be about? *ELT Journal* 37, no. 3: 229-234.
- Costa, F., and L. D'Angelo. 2011. CLIL: A suit for all seasons? *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning* 4, no. 1: 1-13.
- Coyle, D. 1999. Theory and planning for effective classrooms: Supporting students in content and language integrated learning contexts. In *Learning through a foreign language*, ed. J. Masih. London: CILT.
- Coyle, D. 2007. Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10, no. 5: 543 - 562.
- Coyle, D., P. Hood, and D. Marsh. 2010. *CLIL Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. 1992. Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers*, eds. P. A. Richard-Amato and M. A. Snow, 16–26. New York: Longman.
- Cummins, J. 2008. Introduction to volume 5: Bilingual education. In *Bilingual education: Encyclopedia of language and education volume 5*, eds. J. Cummins and N.H. Hornberger, xiii-xxiv. New York: Springer.
- Dale, L. and R. Tanner. 2012. CLIL activities. A resource for subject and language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. 2011. Content-and-language integrated learning: from practice to principle? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31, no. 1: 182-204.
- Evans, N.W., K. James Hartshorn and N.J. Anderson. 2010. A principled approach to content-based materials development for reading. In *English language teaching materials. Theory and practice*, ed. N. Harwood, 131-156. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Filardo Llamas, L., E. González-Cascos Jiménez and L. Riesco Canduela. 2011. On the validity of systemic functional approaches as a tool for selecting materials in CLIL contexts. A case study. *Porta Linguarum* 16, no. 1: 65-74.
- Gray, J. 2010. *The construction of English. culture, consumerism, and promotion in the ELT global coursebook*. London: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Harwood, N. 2010. Issues in materials development and design. In *English language teaching materials. Theory and practice*, ed. N. Harwood, 3-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, G.M. and A. Goatly. 2000. The treatment of ecological issues in ELT coursebooks. *ELT Journal* 54, no. 3: 256-264.
- Kiely, R. 2011. Understanding CLIL as an innovation. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 1, no. 1: 153-171.
- Kong, S. and P. Hoare. 2011. Cognitive content engagement in content-based language teaching. *Language Teaching Research* 15, no. 3: 307-324.
- Leung, C. 2005. Language and content in bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education* 16, no. 2: 238-252.
- Darío Luis Banegas (2013): An investigation into CLIL-related sections of EFL coursebooks: issues of CLIL inclusion in the publishing market, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI:10.1080/13670050.2013.793651

- Llinares, A., T. Morton and R. Whittaker. 2012. *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- López Barrios, M. 2008. Content: The stuff ELT is made of. In *Using the language to learn and learning to use the language: What's next in Latin America. XXXIII FAAPI Conference Proceedings*, ed. D. Fernández, Santiago del Estero: FAAPI.
- Lotherington, H. 2005. Bilingual Education. In *The handbook of applied linguistics*, eds. A. Davies and C. Elder, 695-718. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lucietto, S. 2009. Writing materials for CLIL: A lost cause? *Folio* 13, no. 1: 12-14.
- Maley, A. 2011. Squaring the circle – reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In *Materials development in language teaching*. 2nd ed, ed. B. Tomlinson, 379-402. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mehisto, P. 2008. CLIL counterweights: Recognising and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal* 1, no. 1: 93-119.
- Mehisto, P., D. Marsh, and M. Frigols. 2008. *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Moirano, M.C. 2012. Teaching the students and not the book: Addressing the problem of culture teaching in EFL in Argentina. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 6, 71-96.
- Pérez-Cañado, M.L. 2012. CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15, no. 3: 315-341.
- Rajagopalan, K. 2004. The concept of 'World English' and its implication for ELT. *ELT Journal* 58, no. 2: 111-117.
- Reiss, J. 2005. *Teaching content to English language learners: Strategies for secondary school success*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Ricci Garotti, F. 2007. Five methodological research questions for CLIL. In *Diverse contexts – converging goals*, eds. D. Marsh and D. Wolff, 131-144. *CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. and R. M. Jiménez Catalán, eds. 2009. *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Smit, H. 2007. Free teaching materials for CLIL lessons. In *Good practice in content and language integrated learning*, ed. B. Roza González, 66-69. BeCLIL: Gijón.
- Somers, T. and J. Surmont. 2012. CLIL and immersion: how clear-cut are they? *ELT Journal* 66, no. 1: 113-116.
- Tomlinson, B. 2003. Developing principled frameworks for material development,' In *Developing materials for language teaching*, ed. B. Tomlinson, 107-129. London/New York: Continuum.
- Tomlinson, B. 2010. Principles of effective materials development. In *English language teaching materials. Theory and practice*, ed. N. Harwood, 81-108. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. 2012. Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching* 45, no. 2: 143-179.
- Tomlinson, B. and H. Masuhara, eds. 2010. *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence from best practice*. London: Continuum.
- Tomlinson, B., B. Dat, H. Masuhara, and R. Rubdy (2001). ELT coursebooks for adults. *ELT Journal* 55, no. 1: 80-101.
- Vázquez, G. 2007. Models of CLIL: An evaluation of its status drawing on the German experience. A critical report on the limits of reality and perspectives. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada*, no. 1: 95-111.

- Wolff, D. 2010. Developing curricula for CLIL: Issues and problems. In *Language learner autonomy. Policy, curriculum, classroom. A Festschrift in honour of David Little*, eds. B. O'Rourke and L. Carson, 103-120. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Yassin, S.M., O.E. Tek, H. Alimon, S. Baharom, and L.Y. Ying. 2010. Teaching Science through English: Engaging pupils cognitively. *International CLIL Research Journal* 1, no. 3: 46-59.

	Series A	Series B	Series C	Series D
Year(s) of publication (still in print)	2007-2009	2009-2011	2011	2009-2010
Books in the series	4	3	4	3
Pages per book	126	144	102	136-144
CLIL pages per book	12	9	3	8
Units per book	12	18	6	12
Number of CLIL sections per book	6	9	3	4
Where CLIL appears in the series	2 consecutive pages every other unit	1 page every two units	1 page every other unit (in the contents page) but placed at the end of the book.	2 consecutive pages every three units
How CLIL is described in the book cover and teacher's book.	CLIL (Cross-curricular learning). CLIL is said to teach students new facts and vocabulary related to their school curriculum.	A CLIL page that integrates language with subject specific content.	Curriculum-extra	CLIL as Curriculum-link with a focus on readings skills. It reflects topics students may encounter in other school subjects

Table 1. General features of Series A-D

	Number of topics in the series	Number of coincidences with the Argentinian school curriculum.	Percentage of representativeness /coincidence
Series A	8	6	75 %
Series B	27	16	59.2%
Series C	12	5	41.2%
Series D	12	4	33.3%

Table 2. Comparison between topics in Series A-D and a school curriculum

	Series A		Series B		Series C		Series D	
	Number of activities	% in the series	Number of activities	% in the series	Number of activities	% in the series	Number of activities	% in the series
Listening	7	15.5	0	0	0	0	14	18.7
Reading	18	40	40	41.2	15	53.6	27	36
Speaking	4	9	28	28.9	1	3.6	22	29.3
Writing	16	35.5	29	29.9	12	42.8	12	16
Total	45	100	97	100	28	100	75	100

Table 3. Skills development in CLIL sections – Series A-D

Thinking skills involved	Read/Listen and...	Series A		Series B		Series C		Series D	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
REMEMBER	(no activity)	9	66.7	4	50	-	60	-	55.5
	Answer	3		14		9		9	
	Complete	-		2		-		5	
	Identify	1		-		-		1	
UNDERSTAND	Match	4	33.3	7	50	2	40	4	40.7
	Summarise	1		-		-		2	
	Choose	-		4		-		5	
	Label	-		1		1		-	
	Correct	-		1		-		-	
	Classify	-		2		-		-	
	Say True/False	-		5		3		-	
ANALYSE	Order/sequence	-	0	-	0	-	0	1	3.8

Table 4. Thinking skills involved in CLIL activities

Type of text	Series A		Series B		Series C		Series D	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Continuous	8	36.3	19	37.2	10	43.5	12	40
Bullet-point	1	4.54	3	5.9	1	4.35	2	6.7
Tables/diagrams/flowcharts	1	4.54	13	25.4	2	8.7	4	13.3
Artefacts/visuals	12	54.5	16	31.4	10	43.5	12	40
Total	22	100	51	100	23	100	30	100

Table 5. Types of texts in CLIL section (Series A-D)

WORD COUNT: 6,946 (including abstract, refs, and tables)