

Complutense Journal of **English Studies**

ISSN: 2386-3935

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/CJES.54908>EDICIONES
COMPLUTENSE

Review: Wilkinson, Robert and Mary Louise Walsh (eds.). 2015. *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: From Theory to Practice. Selected Papers from the 2013 ICLHE Conference*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 341 pp. ISBN: 978-3-631-65726-3.

As the title suggests, this volume is a selection of the papers presented at the third ICLHE Conference held in Maastricht in April 2013. Its central theme is a main concern in current higher education research, namely the integration of content and language (see Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra 2013, Fortanet-Gómez 2013, Smit and Dafouz 2012, Wilkinson and Zegers 2007, 2008). In fact, an increasing number of universities are offering content instruction through foreign languages as a strategy to face globalization and attract more students (Wächter and Maiworm 2014). In addition to this, the need for university students to develop advanced academic language skills in both their first language and in foreign languages seems to be of paramount importance for academic success. This book addresses these two issues, among others.

Structurally, the book consists of an introduction and five different sections, namely Keynote addresses, Policies, Frameworks and Design, Integration and Competences. Robert Wilkinson and Mary Louise Walsh start their introduction to the book with an overview of the changes undergone by higher education over the last 25 years, with particular insight into the integration of content and language. The introduction touches upon previous ICLHE Conferences and the main topics they dealt with, before going into more detail about the 2013 ICLHE Conference. The editors then provide an outline of the keynote papers by Cecilia Jacobs and François Grin, as well as some words on the structure of the remaining of the volume.

In her contribution to the volume, titled “Mapping the terrains of ICLHE: A view from the south”, Jacobs reviews the frameworks on which ICLHE previous conferences drew in order to explore how this field is understood. After identifying eight broad frameworks, namely English/Language studies, Genre theories, Learning theories, New Literacy Studies, Cultural Studies, Education, Activity Theory and Intedisciplinarity, the author argues for the need of a coherent theoretical framework. She emphasizes the fact that some approaches to ICLHE have focused on language rather than on content, and calls for the need to take into account the integration of these two elements:

The notion of ICL implies a false separation of Content and Language, which most researchers would know are inextricably bound in practice. However, the practice of language development in Higher Education, particularly English

development in Higher Education, has been to separate the language from the disciplinary content, hence the need for a focus on the integration of language and content, one might argue (27).

This chapter is particularly enlightening since it provides an understanding of the contextual differences and complexities in ICLHE, such as how the issue of knowledge can be approached. Jacobs argues that by placing knowledge at a meta-level, a common framework for ICLHE research and work could be achieved.

The second chapter of this section, by François Grin, is titled “Foreign Language Skills, ‘linguistic work’ and the economic theory of value”. Broadly speaking, ‘linguistic work’ refers to language used to achieve an activity or purpose. Grin argues that the value of language resides in its actual use, that is, in linguistic work, rather than in the product as such (e.g. “language as communication”, 52). He further explains that the use of one language instead of another or a combination of two languages will have an impact on the outcome of linguistic work, since unlike physical capital, linguistic capital increases with its use. Grin then moves onto the implications that the economic theory of value has for higher education. The author clarifies that the choice of the language used for instruction has an impact on the value of learning outcome. As a result, it is a key issue for institutions whether to choose English as the medium of instruction or to provide other language combinations for instruction.

Section 2 of the book focuses on Policies in ICLHE, ranging from issues such as lecturers’ proficiency in English to diverging policies in different countries. The chapter by Dimová and Kling reports on a study on Formative Feedback conducted through semi-structured interviews with 10 lecturers involved in English Medium Instruction (EMI) programs at the University of Copenhagen (UCPH). Following the policy for quality assurance of instructional programs in English at UCPH, the participants had taken the Test of Oral Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS). Dimová and Kling found that the results of the test and the formative feedback received did not seem to have a noticeable impact on neither lecturers’ English language development nor on their way of using English for content instruction. Generally, participants’ interpretation and reaction to the formative feedback was influenced by individual results and by the language policy implementation at departmental level. This chapter also gives food for thought on our understanding of English proficiency for EMI teaching, since the authors suggest that rather than “the native-speaker reference”, the TOEPAS should take into account the ability to communicate cross-culturally (72).

Also in this section, Inmaculada Fortanet offers an insight into the challenges faced by the Universitat Jaume I in Spain when implementing a multilingual language policy in June 2011, a time of economic restrictions. After reviewing the rationale for pursuing multilingualism in universities, the author reports on the attitude of the Study Committee Members at Universitat Jame I towards the implementation of multilingualism at this university. Then, she gives an outline of the different measures adopted for EMI instruction in other universities from Spain and finally suggests some actions for supporting the Multilingual Language Policy at Jaume I.

The last chapter in Section 2 by Frank van Splunder draws on language policy documents and interviews with 20 Dutch and Flemish university lecturers on attitudes towards EMI, with the aim of contrasting language policies and practices regarding EMI in the Netherlands and Flanders. As explained in the chapter, while the Netherlands and Flanders share, to a certain extent, a common language policy that places Dutch in a central position as the language of instruction in higher education, their language practices seem to be strikingly different. Whereas “the Netherlands appear to go English” (94), language policies regarding EMI in Flanders are very detailed and there is also a strict legislation that safeguards the role of Dutch, which results in a quite limited number of EMI courses at Flemish universities. Van Splunder explains that such language consciousness regarding Dutch was also revealed in the interviews with Flemish lecturers, while it was largely absent in the case of Dutch lecturers. In spite of this, the author concludes that, in general, participants in Flanders also showed quite positive attitudes towards EMI. This tendency was particularly found in younger lecturers (born in the 1970s or later) (95).

Section 3, Framework and Design, is concerned with the implementation of ICLHE in specific contexts. This section is of special interest to those readers who want to learn more about the local and national practices of the integration of content and language in different settings. In the opening chapter of Section 3, “Introducing content and language-integrated learning at a Saudi Arabian university”, Saeed Aburizaizah first reports on existing practice in the preparatory year (Foundation Year) for university –which in terms of language instruction focuses on General English– and then makes some suggestions for improvement based on integrating content and language. In terms of the purpose of the Foundation Year (FY), the author argues that it should enhance students’ skills, integrate content and English and provide students with research and thinking skills. Aburizaizah puts forward two suggestions: first, focusing on terminology, as well as on reading and writing skills through the use of authentic materials and task-based learning; second, changing the structure of the FY to that of an integrated course focused on English language learning in the first semester and content in the second semester. The author also encourages English teachers and Content teachers to work cooperatively and to evaluate the program jointly, with a focus on the use of English language in the content context.

In the next chapter, Margaret Franken focuses on the process of becoming a researcher in a study abroad context. During a semester long workshop program, she helped international students in New Zealand to draft a proposal for their Masters in Education theses. The participants in her study came from Pacific, Melanesian and South and East Asian countries. Starting from questions, comments and interviews with students, the author brings forward the need to help student researchers in the process of resituation of knowledge, that is, in the significant changes undergone by student researchers in their learning path whereby they integrate previous and new knowledge to face new challenges. Franken explains that, as part of their learning trajectory, the participants in her research went through different transition points at which their identity underwent transformations according to the different roles they adopted (e.g. from a postgraduate coursework student to a beginning researcher and research writer).

The author further describes and analyzes the challenges faced by the participants following Eraut's (2000) knowledge categories: personal knowledge, codified knowledge, personalized codified knowledge and cultural knowledge.

Also focused on challenges faced by the students, Gustafsson et al. report on a pilot study on students' and supervisors' understanding and interpretation of generic criteria for theses in Master of Science and Bachelor of Engineering at Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden. Their paper is concerned with the integration of these criteria for specific theses, as well as with measures that students and supervisors can undertake for enhancing thesis quality. The authors point to the fact that rubric-articulated supervision rather than in-text comments on students' theses may be of help in making criteria for theses more explicit, as well as in developing students' awareness of the process of conducting a research thesis. Another contribution in this same vein is the chapter by Kilfoil and Horner. Focusing on graduate programs in the area of rhetoric and composition in the US, they advocate for moving from an English-only approach to an approach that takes into account students' linguistic heterogeneity. The authors suggest developing seminars for faculty and students, based on translanguaging dispositions, in which they can work together during a process of learning across languages.

The following chapter by Van de Poel and van Dyk goes back to challenges faced by university students in their first year. The authors claim that "academic acculturation is the key to academic success" (164) and suggest that academic culture may be difficult for students due to the fact that it is not always explicit. Based on semi-structured interviews carried out at two South African universities with subject experts and academic literacy experts on different support approaches for student academic acculturation, Van de Poel and van Dyk state that academic discourse can be learned both in the context of an academic discipline and as taught by language experts. The authors further analyze the strengths and weaknesses of four potential teaching approaches to academic literacy, namely a generic approach (without specific content requirements), an academic literacy approach (in which subject-specific content is taught by academic literacy experts), a subject-specific approach (in which academic literacy is taught by disciplinary experts) and a collaborative approach (whereby academic literacy experts and disciplinary experts teach in collaboration). Van de Poel and van Dyk explain that these four approaches may take place in different order at different stages in students' learning trajectory. However, they suggest that first-year students may benefit from general instruction that has to be later applied to specific disciplines (174).

From a different perspective, Elisabeth Wielander contributes to research on ICL in UK universities. More specifically, she sets out to investigate the degree to which German is used for teaching subject-specific content in UK undergraduate German programs and she discusses the institutional parameters that may have an impact on the integration of content and language. She concludes that there is a wider range of content instruction through German than previously thought, though the actual volume of German-taught content depends on the type of university.

Finally, Weinberg et al. close Section 3 with a chapter on the challenges faced in implementing the largest university French immersion program in Canadian Universities at the University of Ottawa. This last chapter is particularly enriching since it provides invaluable guidelines for successful immersion practice at

university level from different angles, ranging from second language acquisition enhancement to the role of institutional actors and the students' socio affective challenges.

Section 4, Integration, covers EMI practice from a content and language integration perspective. Anton Ledergerber focuses on business presentation skills, specifically on good practice for teaching presentations meant to help students learn how to produce more persuasive rather than just informative presentations. Ledergerber illustrates the means through which Coyle's 4Cs framework (Coyle et al. 2010) and Multimedia Learning (Mayer 2005) can be used for this purpose.

The chapter by Sherlaw, Czabanowska and Thompson tackles an EMI Master program on health sciences taught in France, specifically a course of "English for public health teaching" within this program. Drawing on Rowland et al.'s 'Knowledge Quartet' for Mathematics (2005, 2009), they designed a one-week course for teachers in the Master's. The authors conclude that

experience in training two groups suggest that the key to success is to create the conditions in which trainees feel safe to use their English while at the same time provide remedial language work within an overall interdisciplinary framework emphasizing opportunities for realistic language and team teaching practice. Such a course to be effective requires trainers to be well versed in both public health science and English language training (252).

The last chapter in this section by Dietmar Tatzl reports on support measures for EMI teaching practice developed by an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) professional in a Master's of Science in Engineering in Austria. The measures included on-demand collaboration sessions that provided support for specific needs of content lecturers, provision of teaching materials for EMI, regular information sharing between ESP and content lecturers through e-mail, joint research and publications and library orders with relevant publications both for students and for teachers. These measures were evaluated by five content lecturers in the field of aviation through a feedback form sent through e-mail. The results of the feedback form, as well as informal conversations with participants, revealed that overall, these lecturers preferred collaborative group sessions to individual support sessions. They also seemed to value teaching aids provided by an ESP professional.

Finally, Section 5, Competences, focuses on some of the competences required for and acquired through the integration of content and language at tertiary level. In this section, two of the chapters deal with pronunciation, both regarding students and lecturers. In her contribution to this book, Karin Richter provides an outline of a longitudinal case study on the effect of EMI on university students' pronunciation skills at the University of Applied Sciences Vienna. Her research comes from a bilingual German/English undergraduate degree in which up to 50% of the credits are taught in English. Based on research with an EMI group and an ESP control group, in which participants were assessed by seven lecturers of English pronunciation during reading aloud and quasi-spontaneous speech, Richter shows that EMI can be beneficial for students in terms of pronunciation gains. The author found statistically significant differences between the focus group and the control group in both tasks. Furthermore, the EMI group also showed more

willingness in spending a study abroad period, which in a way shows that EMI may have an impact on students' attitudes and approach to learning.

The following chapter, by Patrick Studer, looks at the linguistic competence of two lecturers from an EMI undergraduate science degree as seen through the eyes of their students. The chapter reports on a pilot study that analyzed the perception of the students through stimulated recall focus group discussions. Studer's study indicates that, although students seemed to perceive the failure of a teaching practice as the result of a lack of lecturers' formal language skills, the actual problem stood in the lack of lecturers' communicative-didactic competence.

Another contribution to this section concerned with competences in an EMI context is the chapter by Symon and Weinberg. In their study, the researchers focused on the effect of EMI on students' English proficiency, as well as on the challenges regarding EMI implementation in Israel. Based on survey and panel discussions with students and lecturers from EMI pilot-courses, their study indicates that the benefits of EMI on students' English proficiency are limited if students are not provided with the required language support. The authors further call for the need of careful planning and infrastructure prior to the actual implementation of EMI programs. Symon and Weinberg also encourage increased collaboration between content and EFL teachers as one of the key elements for the integration of content and language.

In the closing chapter of Section 5, entitled "A comparative study on the use of pronunciation strategies for highlighting information in university lectures", Valke and Pavón deal with the relationship between lecturers' pronunciation and intelligibility, as observed through comparative research conducted at the Universities of Brussels and Córdoba. The authors claim that training lecturers into an effective use of pronunciation skills, especially on the tonic stress to highlight relevant information, is of paramount importance in making their lectures intelligible to their students.

To sum up, the edited volume by Wilkinson and Walsh is a noteworthy contribution to the research in the field of the integration of content and language in higher education (Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra 2013, Fortanet-Gómez 2013, Smit and Dafouz 2012; Wilkinson and Zegers 2007, 2008). Given that, as noted by Pérez-Cañado (2012: 7) and Smit and Dafouz (2012: 2), most of the research on the integration of content and language is carried out in primary and secondary education contexts, the present volume is an extremely valuable resource for readers interested in the tertiary level. The book encompasses research on the implementation of ICLHE throughout the world, at both the macro (institutional level) and the micro level (classroom practice) which allows the reader to obtain a broad picture on the complexities of this approach. Moreover, as reflected in the title, the volume covers both theoretical issues and practice in different contexts, therefore providing stakeholders involved in EMI practice with exceptionally useful guidelines that can be applied to their own context. Another way in which this volume adds to previous research in the field of ICLHE is that, as a distinctive feature, some of the chapters focus on languages other than English. In addition, the present volume draws on the perspective of both content and language experts.

Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: From Theory to Practice. Selected papers from the 2013 ICLHE Conference is a reader-friendly

volume, clearly organized into sections with chapters that complement each other. This allows the reader to decide whether to treat the chapters individually or follow the order of the book. Nevertheless, although there is a brief description of the sections in the Introduction of the book, the volume would have benefited from an introduction at the beginning of each section that could have made the link between the different studies in the section more explicit. Despite this minor caveat, the book is an invaluable piece of research in the field, thought-provoking and inspiring for researchers willing to further contribute to this area of study.

References

- Coyle, Do, Philip Hood and David Marsh (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doiz, Aintzane; David Lasagabaster and Juan Manuel Sierra, eds. (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities. Global challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Eraut, Michael (2000). Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 70: 113-136.
- Fortanet-Gómez, Inmaculada (2013). *CLIL in Higher Education. Towards a Multilingual Language Policy*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mayer, Richard, ed. (2005). *The Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pérez-Cañado, María Luisa (2012). CLIL Research in Europe: past, present and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15.3: 315-341.
- Rowland, Tim; Fay Turner, Anne Thwaites and Peter Huckstep (2009). *Developing primary mathematics teaching: Reflecting on practice with the knowledge quartet*. London: Sage Rowland.
- Smit, Ute and Emma Dafouz (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. In U. Smit and E. Dafouz, eds., *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: Gaining Insights into English-Medium Instruction at European Universities*, *AILA Review* 25: 1-12.
- Wächter, Bernd and Friedhelm Maiworm (2014). *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The State of Play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens. <http://www.aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/images/members/ACA-2015_English-Taught_01.pdf> (Accessed November 30 2016).
- Wilkinson, Robert and Vera Zegers, eds. (2007). *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenges of a multilingual higher education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- Wilkinson, Robert and Vera, eds. (2008). *Integrating content and language: Realizing content and language integration in higher education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University. <<http://digitalarchive.maastrichtuniversity.nl/fedora/get/guid:7a48d841-788b-44b1-add7-c0878081ffd7/ASSET1>> (Accessed November 30 2016).

Raluca Catalina Lazarescu
Universidad Complutense de Madrid/Universidad Europea de Madrid
rc.lazarescu@ucm.es