T(w)o and fro: using the L1 as a language teaching tool in the CLIL classroom

Fiona Gallagher and Gerry Colohan

This article describes a small in-class study which sought to explore the effectiveness (or not) of using the emerging bilingual skills of the students as a teaching and learning tool in a Geography through English CLIL classroom in Northern Italy. In particular, the study sought to examine whether and to what extent the use of codeswitching / translanguaging between the native language and the language of instruction during content-related tasks might prove a useful technique for highlighting particular grammatical points in the CLIL vehicular language. Findings support the view that there is a place for the focused, planned and targeted use of the L1 during meaning-focused lessons in the language immersion classroom and that bilingual instructional techniques, such as the 'twisted dictation' used in the study, can be an effective means of both drawing students' attention to particular linguistic forms and of developing an enriched bilingual vocabulary. The authors suggest that the use of the L1 as a language teaching and learning tool is not limited to the CLIL or immersion classroom, but could be adapted for use in other language learning contexts.

Background

Re-thinking the monolingual principle

In recent years, the 'monolingual principle' (Howatt 1984: 135) in language teaching has been challenged (Cenoz and Gorter 2013; Cummins 2007, 2009a; Cook 2001). This is the belief that the target language should be used exclusively in the language classroom and all references to and use of the L1 should be prohibited during L2[1] lessons. Even in two-way bilingual educational contexts, the notion of what Cummins (2005: 588) has termed 'the two solitudes', whereby each language is dealt with separately and at different times, is well established. Creese and Blackledge refer to this compartmentalisation of languages in immersion contexts as 'separate bilingualism' (2010:105). Despite the lack of clear evidence to support the belief that monolingual instructional strategies are always preferable and that the target language should be used exclusively in the language classroom, the monolingual principle has been highly influential in language teaching pedagogy and has come to be considered as a basic principle (Auerbach 1993; Cook 2001; Cummins 2007, 2009a).

There are many reasons why this assumption has begun to be challenged. Firstly, the key role played by the L1 in the acquisition of the L2 among learners from a migrant background, particularly in relation to the academic language of school, has been identified. The cross-linguistic transfer of skills from one language to the other, particularly in relation to phonological awareness (Grosjean 2010; Shatz And Wilkinson 2010) print awareness (Lindholm-Leary and Howard 2008; Riches and Genesee 2006) and metacognitive and metalinguistic strategies (Bialystok and Peets 2010; Conboy 2010; Cummins 2001) has been

established. This cross-language transfer of linguistic knowledge, skills and abilities from the L1 to the L2 has been referred to as an 'underlying language proficiency' (Cummins 2007: 23). Although the phonology, morphology, syntax and lexis in each language may differ, learners can draw on the cognitive base underpinning their knowledge of language use and practices, what Riches and Genesee (2006: 80) view as their 'bilingual reservoir of literacy abilities and strategies', and can apply this cross-linguistic proficiency to any language, even linguistically distant languages (Cummins 2009b, García 2009; Riches and Genesee 2006). This clearly has implications for second language learning in general. '(L)earning efficiencies can be achieved if teachers explicitly draw students' attention to similarities and differences between their languages' (Cummins 2007: 233).

Secondly, the question has been posed as to whether the focus in relation to L2 acquisition should be on how monolinguals acquire their L1 or on how bilinguals acquire their language(s) (Butzkamm 2003; Cook 2001). Separate languages are not compartmentalised in the minds of bilingual speakers, but can interact in highly complex ways (Conboy 2010 ; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Grosjean 2010; Hornberger and Link 2012). Neurolinguistic studies have shown how both languages remain active, even when only one is being used by a bilingual speaker and both can be easily accessed (García 2009; Hoshino and Thierry 2011; Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012). Codeswitching[1], long considered to represent language deficit and to be a messy, lazy type of language use is now understood to be not only a normal, everyday discourse practice, but also a highly sophisticated use of language by fluent bilingual speakers, framed by a deep awareness and mastery of both languages in use (García 2009; Grosjean 2010; Hughes et al. 2006; Lin and Li 2012). It is common from a very early stage and used in increasingly sophisticated ways as bilinguals become more proficient in both languages. Shifting between languages is what bilinguals do − it is an integral part of their bi/multiligual discourse practices (Deuchar, Muysken and Wang 2007; Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012; Reyes & Ervin-Tripp 2010).

Finally, despite the ban on the use of the L1 in classroom contexts, it has been long acknowledged that the reality is that many highly skilled and effective language teachers (and their students) do in fact often use the L1 for varying and various reasons, even when discouraged to do so by educationalists, policy makers, and administrators (Baker 2011; Duff and Polio 1990; Lin and Li 2012). They do this often with feelings of guilt, unprofessionalism and subterfuge (Butzkamm 2003; Canagarajah 2011; Copland and Neokleous 2011). Cook (2001: 410) argues that it is important to give teachers 'absolution

for using the L1', encouraging methods which make positive use of the L1 in the language classroom, rather than seeing it as a regrettable fact of life which must be endured.

The L1 in the language classroom?

For reasons such as the above, many researchers have begun to question the notion of the monolingual principle and have begun to investigate ways in which the L1 could be used as a teaching and learning tool in the language classroom (Cook 2001; de la Colina and del Pilar García Mayo 2009; Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012). Baker (2011: 291) contends that the strict application of the monolingual principle in language learning contexts belongs to the 20th century, 'while the 21st century will see the deliberate and systematic use of both languages in the classroom'. García (2009: 53) advocates the development of language skills which promote 'dynamic bilingualism' to reflect and prepare students for the multiple language practices of the globalised world of the 21st century, involving skills such as interpreting, translating and bilingual information design. This is not to say that scholars have begun to advocate the extensive use of the L1 and a return to grammar translation pedagogic practices in class. The predominant and extensive use of the L2 in class to maximise meaningful input and communicative interaction and practice in the target language remains a central tenet of effective modern language teaching (Crichton 2009; Cummins 2007; Ellis 2005; Turnbull 2001). However, many language educationalists have begun to see the absolute ban on any use of the L1 in the language class as a squandering of resources and a missed opportunity to use all the intellectual, cognitive and linguistic resources available to the teacher and student (Butzkamm 2003; Canagarajah 2011; Hornberger and Link 2012). New approaches to the use of the L1 in the language classroom involve using the L1, not in a random way, but in a targeted, focused and systematic way for teaching and learning purposes (Butzkamm 2003; Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; Cummins 2007; García 2009).

Translanguaging

This strategic and judicious use of the L1 during lessons in language learning contexts is often referred to as translanguaging, defined by Baker (2011: 288) as 'the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, understandings and knowledge through the use of two languages'. The term, originally coined in the Welsh bilingual education context as a pedagogic technique involving the deliberate alternation between languages for input and output purposes (Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012), has been expanded to include the '*multiple*

discourse practices in which bilinguals engage in order to *make sense of their bilingual worlds*' (García 2009: 45 [italics in original]). It includes codeswitching and translation but is not limited to these (García and Sylvan 2011). García (2009: 298) advocates an approach in bilingual settings which involves 'flexible multiplicity' practices which include: responsible codeswitching both ways; preview/view/review; translanguaging; co-languaging; and cross-linguistic contrastive analysis. Others have also identified ways in which this shifting between languages, so typical of the discourses of bilinguals, can be done in both the language and the language immersion classroom (Butzkamm 2003; Cook 2001; Cummins 2007; Lucas & Katz 1994).

'Noticing' and Focus-on-Form in immersion contexts

Translanguaging and other bilingual instructional techniques are thought to have the potential to be a very effective way to facilitate conscious 'noticing' (Schmidt 2001: 17) of language on the part of the learner (Cummins 2007, 2009b; García 2009; Reyes and Ervin-Tripp 2010). The need for a clear and explicit focus on grammatical forms within a meaning-oriented approach in order to promote accurate use of the L2 has been identified as a key area for language immersion education (Doughty 2003; Lyster and Mori 2008; Met 2008; Snow, Met and Genesee 1989), including CLIL (Content-Language Integrated Learning), (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; de Graaff et al. 2007; Mearns 2012). It has been often acknowledged that while comprehension skills and fluency on the part of the learners are often highly developed in many language immersion contexts because of the exposure to high levels of meaningful content and enhanced opportunities for communicative interaction, achieving high levels of grammatical accuracy in the target language is not always as successfully realised (Fortune,Tedick and Walker 2008; Nassaji and Fotos 2011; Robinson 2003; Swain 1998).

The approach known as FonF (Focus on Form) and first proposed by Long (1991) may be particularly useful in this regard. This approach involves providing students with overt opportunities 'to notice' formal aspects of language in meaningful, communicative contexts where the main attention of the students has been primarily on meaning (Doughty 2001, 2003; Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen 2002; Robinson 2003; Schmidt 2001). The importance of consciousness-raising tasks which draw students' attention to particular linguistic features of the L2 and facilitate a conscious 'noticing' of language on the part of the learner has been emphasised in this regard (Doughty 2003; Robinson 2003; Schmidt 2001; Swain 1998). Nassaji and Fotos (2011) suggest that these consciousness-raising tasks can focus either

explicitly or implicitly on a linguistic point and can be preceded or followed by formal instruction:

> [I]t is now recognised that it is essential to make the target language structure obvious to the learner, whether through formal instruction or through manipulation of communicative input, in ways that call attention to target forms and allow learners to process them, or a combination of these methods (Nassaji and Fotos 2011: 88).

Lyster and Mori (2008: 134) advocate a 'counterbalanced' approach in the immersion classroom, whereby the focus of an activity shifts to either form or meaning and is made explicit to the students. According to their counterbalance hypothesis, this shift in attentional focus requires increased effort on the part of the learners and is a particularly effective means of dealing with persistent interlanguage errors.

Deep learning: the bilingual lexicon

The dual processing and reprocessing of content knowledge in two languages can deepen and enhance learning (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; Cummins 2009a; Dalton-Puffer 2011). Translanguaging has been identified as a means of providing opportunities for deep learning of concepts in immersion education contexts (Baker 2011; Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012; Maillat and Serra 2009). Students have to fully understand and have fully digested content before they can discuss it in one language and write about it in another for example. Translanguaging techniques may also be a useful means of promoting the development of an enriched bilingual vocabulary in language immersion contexts (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012). Bilinguals operate within a single conceptual system with two lexicons. Each lexicon may have different words and meanings in it depending on individual experiences (Conboy 2010). According to Bedore, Peňa and Boerger (2010) and Cummins (2009 b), bilingual students need exposure to words in both languages in order to develop strategies that allow them to acquire multiple words for the same concepts and to be able to transfer this knowledge across languages., The lexicon of each system is informed and enriched by knowledge of the other, leading to greater depth and breadth of word knowledge and concept mapping resources (Bedore, Peňa and Boerger 2010; Conboy 2010, Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010) .

CLIL (Content-Language-Integrated Learning)

CLIL has been defined as 'language sensitive content teaching' (Wolff 2012: 108) and as 'an educational approach where curricular content is taught through the medium of a foreign language, typically to students participating in some form of mainstream education at the primary, secondary or tertiary level' (Dalton-Puffer 2011: 183). The 'CLIL vehicular language' (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010: 1) is both the medium and the object of learning. According to Coyle (2009), CLIL goes beyond task-based and topic-based approaches to language teaching in that it does not involve the re-teaching of already learned concepts in a different language and because of the high level of authenticity of purpose achieved through CLIL practices. It has been described as 'a foreign language enrichment measure packaged into content teaching' (Dalton-Puffer 2011: 184). Although there is no one CLIL model, CLIL techniques and approaches have become very influential in relation to language learning and teaching, particularly in the European context (Coyle 2009; Dalton-Puffer 2011; Ruiz de Zarobe 2013). Similarly to other immersion contexts, the need to focus on form and the possibility of using bilingual instructional strategies in the classroom have been identified as relevant in CLIL contexts also (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; Deller and Price 2007; Ricci Garotti 2007).

The study

Many scholars have called for further research on the flexible use of languages and bilingual practices in the immersion classroom (Canagarajah 2011; Creese and Blackledge 2010; García 2009; Lewis, Jones and Baker 2012) and for form-focussed experimental research in CLIL lessons (Dalton-Puffer 2011). Lin and Li (2012) point out that most research on the use of the L1 in relation to L2 learning has been done by sociolinguists or discourse analysts and they advocate the need for teachers themselves to become involved in this research.

The project described below seeks to make a small contribution to addressing this gap in our knowledge. It involved a small-scale in-class experiment which sought to explore the reactions of students to codeswitching during classroom tasks and the effectiveness (or not) of using the emerging bilingual skills of the students as a language teaching and learning tool in the CLIL classroom. In particular, it sought to examine whether and to what extent the use of codeswitching/translanguaging between the native language and the language of instruction during content-related tasks might prove a useful technique for drawing students' attention to particular grammatical points in the CLIL vehicular language.

The study took place in May 2012 in a large secondary school (Liceo Linguistico) in a small town in Northern Italy (student population:1070). This school has a strong CLIL tradition and a variety of CLIL options are available to the students, including Geography and Maths through English, History through Spanish or French, and Art History through German. The students involved in the study had chosen to follow a 3-year bilingual stream offered as an option in the school to students with a level of English equivalent to A2 or higher. The bilingual stream includes a Geography through English programme from Year 1 with further CLIL subject options in Year 2 and 3. The study involved two parallel Geography through English classes towards the end of Year 1 of the programme. The students were of mixed ability, mixed gender and were aged 14 to 15 years. Ethical approval was granted from the**[name of university deleted to maintain the integrity of the review process]** Research Ethics Committee and informed consent gained from the principal, parents, and students involved in the study. For the purposes of the study, one of the groups was used as a treatment and the other as a control group. The treatment group was labelled 'Group G' and consisted of 30 students and the control group was labelled 'Group F' and had 29 students. Comparisons were then made between the responses of the two cohorts of students following an in-class intervention described below. Individual students in each group were assigned a number to ensure their anonymity (e.g. G2, G22; F5; F20 etc.).

Procedure

The study consisted of two parts: a 'twisted dictation' task followed by feedback from students. Both groups were taught a unit of work 'Climates of the World' by the same teacher and using the same materials. This unit of work focused on the climate of two geographical areas: the hot desert and tropical rainforest regions of the world. The language of instruction was English, which was not the first language for any of the students. The study itself involved a review of this unit of work through a chart completion dictation exercise. After studying this unit of work for several weeks, the students were given a blank chart to complete. This chart contained two columns, one with the heading 'Tropical Rainforests' and the other with the heading 'Hot Deserts'. The teacher dictated a range of sentences to the students.

The sentences all contained adverbs of frequency and/or place because the position of these had been identified by both the Geography [through English] and English language teachers in the school as a problematic language area for many Italian students of English. The position of adverbials of frequency and place similar in meaning to, for example,

"sometimes" / "usually" and "in this region" / "in these areas" would typically be quite different in Italian sentences. The vocabulary in the sentences was taken from the course material used by the students during the study of this unit of work. The following are examples of the sentences:

It rarely rains.

It is always hot and humid.

Sunlight rarely reaches the ground because of the dense vegetation.

Plants are usually low-growing in order to avoid water loss by strong winds.

There are sometimes sudden downpours although it is usually dry.

Animals in this region sometimes store water in their body for several days, allowing them to travel long distances.

There are usually different layers of vegetation in this region.

There are always sub-tropical high pressure systems in these areas.

Before and during the dictation, the teacher made no attempt to review or draw students' attention to English word order or to the position of adverbial phrases in English sentences. The teacher dictated the sentences in English, which was the language of instruction for the unit of work. The sentences were dictated at random and were not in any particular order. The sentences were dictated at normal speaking speed and were repeated twice. The students first decided which geographical location each sentence related to and then wrote the sentences in the correct column. The students in Group F (the control group) completed the chart in English. The students in Group G (the treatment group) translated the sentences and completed the chart in Italian (the L1 for all of the students in the group). We refer to this exercise as a 'twisted dictation'.

Following the dictation exercise, both groups of students were given the completed chart in English by way of feedback. Feedback related to topic content and not to the linguistic features of the sentences.

The following day, both groups of students were asked to complete a feedback sheet in class based on their reactions to the previous day's dictation task. The feedback sheet consisted of a short questionnaire with closed and open-ended questions followed by a free writing exercise in response to a number of given headings. The students were free to complete the feedback sheet in either Italian or in English. The questionnaire comprised a number of questions which focused on whether the students had liked / disliked the task;

whether they had found it easy / difficult to do; and on whether they found it useful / not useful for [1] Geography content learning and [2] their English language development. The students were also asked to identify what they liked about the task and what they didn't like about the task.   Students completed this part of the feedback sheet first.

     For the second part of the feedback, the students were given a few minutes to think about a number of headings which were written on the board and briefly explained to the students. Students were then given an opportunity to write freely in response to these headings. Both groups were given the following headings:

- useful/difficult/fun etc.? What did you think about the task?
- words/ideas you didn't understand in the dictation ? What did you do?
- Did you notice anything about the English language (e.g. English grammar; pronunciation; words) ?

 [As before, no particular language point was mentioned by the teacher when setting up this part of the exercise]

Group G (the treatment group who had translated the sentences into Italian) were given an additional heading:

- How did you feel about translating the sentences in the dictation − was this useful / difficult etc.

Students' writing in response to these headings varied in length (average length was 60 to 80 words). Students wrote in English, Italian or a combination of both languages. It is worth repeating that the students were 14 to15 year-old secondary school students and their comments should be seen in this context.   Researchers then conducted a close reading of the feedback in order to group similar responses and to identify recurrent themes.

Results

Student reactions to the translation task

     Fifteen of the thirty students in Group G (the Translation Group) wrote that they enjoyed the on-the-spot translation element of the task. One student (G24) wrote: "It was my first job as an interpreter". Half the students in this group mentioned that they found translating the sentences in this way difficult and/or challenging to do. Of these 15 students, 12 added a further comment that although difficult, the task was worthwhile.

What students noticed about the language : Group G (translation group)

Of the 30 students in Group G, 18 students commented on noticing aspects to the language. Nine students said they noticed the pronunciation of the words (e.g. the difference between the words 'roof' and 'root' and the words 'really' and 'rarely').   Nine different students said they had noticed aspects to the word order and organisation of words in English as compared to Italian.

As mentioned earlier, the position of adverbials in English and Italian sentences can be very different. For example in sentences such as the following:

- Ground frost can **sometimes** occur **at night.**
- Animals **in this region usually** live in the main canopy where there is most light.
- There are **usually** different layers of vegetation **in this region**
- There are **always** sub-tropical high pressure systems **in these areas,**

the position of adverbials similar in meaning to the ones in bold would typically be quite different in Italian. A review of the translated sentences which the students in this group had written as part of the 'twisted dictation' task demonstrated that, in general, the students had not changed the position of these adverbials when they had translated the sentences. This was probably due to the fact that the students had been asked to translate on the spot and were not given time to re-write or perfect their sentences. The sentences they wrote, therefore, contained Italian adverbials (e.g. '*sempre*' and '*a volte*') which, while not incorrect, did not follow normal Italian syntax.

The comments of the students in Group G reflect this:

G1: The exercise helped me to reflect on the fact that translating some sentences into Italian I wasn't writing some words in the right place because in English sentence maybe they were at the beginning of the sentence while in Italian they wouldn't be there

G5: I found […] quite confusing because the structure of English is different from one in Italian and we had to rearrange it on the spot

G18: I was doubtful as to how to lay out certain sentences in Italian because they had different word order in English [translated from Italian]

G21: … isn't easy to translate from english into italian [sic], because the grammar between these two languages isn't the same (for example where I have put "sometimes", "always" and other …)

What students noticed about language: Group F (non-translation group)

The comments of the 29 students in Group F were quite different in focus. Eleven students commented on noticing the pronunciation of the words during the dictation (e.g. 'camel' 'desert' 'nocturnal'). One student wrote that the dictation exercise had helped with learning the spelling of 'canopy' which she had noticed when she checked her answer afterwards. Three students commented that the exercise helped them with English grammar/structure. However, unlike many of the comments from Group G, the comments in relation to this tended to be quite vague: one student mentioned that it had helped with word order without giving examples and the other two students did not specify how the exercise had helped with English grammar beyond saying that it had. Seven students in this group pointed out that they did not think about language/grammar when doing the task. The following comments illustrate this:

F 9: I had thinked in English without ask myself "What is it's grammar?" "What does it mean?" I had thinked in English, not in Italian so I didn't thinked to the question like that [sic]
F 20: I wrote and that's all. I didn't think about how to say it. It would have just distracted me and I would have written things that didn't make sense [translated from Italian]
F 14: the teacher was saying about the tropical forest but I thinked nothing about the grammatical structure [sic]

Words they didn't know in the L1

Many students from both groups wrote that there were words they had not understood in the dictation. Students in Group G (the Translation Group) were particularly conscious of words/concepts which they had learned in English but could not translate to their L1. 23 of the 30 students in this group commented that there were words that they knew in English (the L2) but were not able to translate into Italian (the L1). The most frequent words which students mentioned in relation to this were the Geography specific English words *canopy; ground frost; sudden downpours*. The following comments give an insight into how the students experienced this:

G16: there are English words that I don't know how to translate except in a roundabout way. For example, 'canopy' means the upper part of the forest but how do you say it in Italian? [translated from Italian]

G 3: some words were clear to me in English but when I had to translate them weren't so clear in Italian so I had to leave a blank space or put in a word with a similar meaning

G12: I don't know a lot of words in Italian that I know in English because I learned them in English so I don't know the word in Italian – but I know the meaning of this word

G20: there are some words that I know in English but in reality can't translate into Italian like canopy, groundfrost, downpours. Maybe because there isn't a corresponding word. This confused me a bit but it made me want to check the meaning in a dictionary. That's why I think it was useful.[translated from Italian].

The above comment also describes a re-processing of meaning as the student translated the words. Examples of what other students wrote in relation to this are:

G22: In my opinion, translating is useful because it helps you to know what you really understand.

G16: I like the idea of this type of test because it's also a way to test yourself

G18: The exercise was useful because it allowed us to determine our level of Geography [translated from Italian]

G7: I think it is usefull [sic] to translate the words from english to Italian [sic] because it help me to remember the meanings of words.

Students in the non-translation group did not refer to not knowing the word in Italian for concepts they had learned in the L1.

Summary of results:

The results of the study can be summarised as follows. Firstly, the students in Group G, the translation group, tended to find the task more challenging and more difficult to do than students in Group F because of the translation element, although a significant number of these students went on to say that they had also found the task worthwhile and motivating. Secondly, many students in Group G seemed to have a very positive awareness of themselves as bilinguals while they were doing this task. Thirdly, most students in Group G seemed to be very conscious of Geography terminology that they were familiar with in English (the L2) but not in Italian (the L1). Students in Group F did not refer to words they understood in English but not in Italian. Fourthly, both groups seemed to be very conscious of the pronunciation of words in English while completing the dictation. Finally, Group G seem to have been more conscious of language structure as they translated. In particular, they

commented on the differences between English and Italian syntax and word order; students in Group F, on the other hand, tended not to think consciously about the grammar/structure of English during the task and focused on the content of the sentences only.

Discussion of results.

Cummins states emphatically that re-thinking the 2 solitudes approach is 'not intended to encourage regression to predominant use of translation nor to dilute the centrality of promoting L2 communicative interaction in both oral and written modes in L2 classrooms.' (Cummins 2007:237). He advocates a *judicious* use of L1 as a cognitive tool in a targeted and systematic way *within* a meaning-focused, task-based approach with extensive exposure to and meaningful practice in the target language. The conclusions reached and discussed below are intended to be seen very much within this approach.

Three key conclusions were drawn from the results of this experiment. The discussion of these is framed within the limitations of this small-scale study involving one school and two CLIL Geography lessons and should be interpreted in that context.

Firstly, the study found that the use of codeswitching or translanguaging, when done in a targeted way can be a very useful language teaching and learning tool, particularly as a technique to develop a way of 'noticing' and raising awareness of certain features of the language of instruction. In the case of the study described above, the sentences used in the 'twisted dictation' were designed to highlight the position of adverbials of frequency and place in English sentences. While translating, many students became acutely aware of the differences between Italian and English in relation to this. They began to consciously compare the word order of the two languages. It is significant that so many of the adolescent students in the translation group were able to articulate this raised awareness, whereas no student in the non-translation group described this. As discussed earlier, this noticing is a very important first step in a Focus on Form (FonF) approach, and could be followed by a more explicit focus on a particular linguistic form. This study did not involve a follow-on exercise which might have involved an explicit focus on the position of adverbials. Further research which would include such a follow- on language focus could potentially yield further insights into the effectiveness of this type of tranlanguaging task. Furthermore, other linguistic features of the target language could also be highlighted through codeswitching exercises such as the one described above.

Secondly, in general students appear to have very positive feelings about using their bilingual skills in the classroom. They seem to see this on-the-spot translation as reflecting a

real-life skill of interpreting. They found this difficult and challenging to do, but overall they also found it useful and motivating. This may relate to the novelty factor involved in doing something in class which they perceived as new or different, but it is worth considering codeswitching during tasks as a way of furthering a positive self-image of language students as bilingual beings and promoting bilingualism as a goal in itself. This could be particularly useful for contexts where there are students from migrant backgrounds in the classroom and where subtractive bilingualism can occur (Banks 2009; Cummins 2009b; Freeman 2004; Nieto 2004).

The third finding relates to the technical-type words from the Geography syllabus which students knew in English (the language of instruction) but appeared not to know in their first language. These were words which relate to Geographic concepts such as *a canopy of trees* or *ground frost* which students had learnt in their CLIL class. They were not always familiar with words to describe these concepts in their L1.   Such translanguaging tasks as the one described above could be used as a way of developing an enriched dual language lexicon for concepts learned in one language, promoting a deeper processing of meaning through the re-processing of content from one language to another.

Conclusion

These findings support the view outlined by many researchers (Baker 2011; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Cummins 2007; García 2009) that there is a place for the focused, planned and targeted use of the L1 through bilingual instructional techniques such as translanguaging and codeswitching in the immersion classroom, particularly as a means of both drawing students' attention to particular linguistic forms and of developing an enriched bilingual vocabulary.

Given our increasingly multilingual classrooms, the link between various models of language immersion (Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter 2013; Fortune and Tedick 2008; Gallagher and Leahy 2014; Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester 2003) and other language learning contexts (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; Dalton-Puffer 2011; García and Sylvan 2011) has been highlighted more and more frequently. Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010: 159) state: 'It is now becoming clear that there is commonality of teaching approaches, strategies and tasks which emphasise scaffolded learning and in particular language as a *learning tool* across first, second, new and other language contexts' [italics in original]. The use of the L1 as a language teaching tool may be one such approach. The 'twisted dictation' technique

described in this study is by no means limited to the CLIL or even the immersion classroom, but could be adapted for use in other language learning contexts.

[1]The expression L2 is used throughout to denote any language that is not the first language of learners. It is acknowledged that for some learners this might be a third, fourth, etc. language.

[2]The term 'codeswitching' is used here as an umbrella term to describe switching between languages in the same stretch of discourse. 'Code-switching is the alternate use of two languages, that is, the speaker makes a complete shift to another language for a word, phrase, or sentence and then reverts back to the base language' (Grosjean 2010: 51/52); García and Sylvan (2011: 389) define codeswitching as 'shift between two languages in context'.

References:

Auerbach, E. R. 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27, no. 1:

9-32. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.remote.library.dcu.ie/stable/3586949

Baker, C. 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multingual

Matters

Banks, J. A. 2009. Multicultural education: dimensions and paradigms. In *The Routledge*

International Companion to Multicultural Education, ed. J. A. Banks, 9-33. New York:

Routledge.

Bedore, L. M., Peña, E. D. and Boerger, K. 2010. Way with words: learning a second-language

vocabulary. In *The Education of English Language Learners: Research to Practice*, eds. M.

Shatz, and L. C. Wilkinson, 87-108. New York NY: The Guildford Press.

Bialystok, E., and Peets, K. F. 2010. Bilingualism and cognitive linkages: Learning to read in

different languages. In *The Education of English Language Learners: Research to Practice*, eds.

M. Shatz, and L. C. Wilkinson, 133-152. New York: The Guildford Press.

Butzkamm, W. 2003. We only learn language once: the role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *The Language Learning Journal,* 28, no:1: 29-39. doi:10.1080/09571730385200181

Canagarajah, S. 2011. Codemeshing in academic writing: identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, no: 3: 401-417. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. 2013. Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly* 47 no: 3: 591-599. doi:10.1002/tesq.121

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F. and Gorter, D. 2013. Critical analysis of CLIL: taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics [first published online July 2013]*, doi:10.1093/applin/amt011

Conboy, B. T. 2010. The brain and language acquisition: variation in language knowledge and readiness for education. In *The Education of English Language Learners: Research to Practice,* eds. M. Shatz, and L. C. Wilkinson, 25-47. New York: The Guildford Press.

Cook, V. 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 57, no: 3: 402-423. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.remote.library.dcu.ie/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=4284018&site=ehost-live

Copland, F. and Neokleous, G. 2011. L1 to teach L2: complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal* 65, no: 3: 270-280. doi:10.1093/elt/ccq047

Coyle, D. 2009. Language pedagogies revisited: alternative approaches for integrating language learning, language using and intercultural understanding. In *Culturally and Linguistically*

Diverse Classrooms: New Dilemmas for Teachers, eds. J. Miller, A. Kostogriz and M. Gearon, 172-196. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. and Marsh, D. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A., and Blackledge, A. 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94, no: 1:103-115. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

Crichton, H. 2009. 'Value added' modern languages teaching in the classroom: an investigation into how teachers' use of classroom target language can aid pupils' communication skills. *The Language Learning Journal* 37, no: 1: 19-34. doi:10.1080/09571730902717562

Cummins, J. 2001. *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Californian Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. 2005. A proposal for action: strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 89, no: 4: 585-592.

Cummins, J. 2007. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10, no:2: 221-240. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.remote.library.dcu.ie/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=27982695&site=ehost-live

Cummins, J. 2009a. Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: pedagogical considerations. *TESOL Quarterly* 43, no: 2: 317-321.

Cummins, J. 2009b. Fundamental psycholinguistic and sociological principles underlying educational success for linguistic minority students. In *Social Justice through Multilingual Education,* eds. T.

Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty and M. Panda, 19-36. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dalton-Puffer, C. 2011. Content-and-language integrated learning: from practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 31: 182-204.

de Graaff, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. 2007. An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10, no: 5: 603-624. doi:10.2167/beb462.0

de la Colina, A. and del Pilar García Mayo, M. 2009. Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: the use of the L1 as a cognitive tool. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 47, no: 3: 325-345. doi:10.1515/iral.2009.014

Deller, S. and Price, C. 2007. *Teaching Other Subjects through English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Deuchar, M., Muysken, P. and Wang, S. 2007. Structured variation in codeswitching: towards an empirically based typology of bilingual speech patterns. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10, no: 3: 298-340. doi:- 10.2167/beb445.0

Doughty, C. 2001. Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In *Cognition and Second Language Learning,* ed. P. Robinson, 206-258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. J. 2003. Instructed SLA: constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition,* eds. C. J. Doughty and M. H. Long, 256-311. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Duff, P. A. and Polio, C. G. 1990. How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal* 74, no:2:154 - 166. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.remote.library.dcu.ie/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=7150821
&site=ehost-live

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. and Loewen, S. 2002. Doing focus-on-form. *System* 30, no: 4: 419-432. doi:http://dx.doi.org.remote.library.dcu.ie/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00047-7

Ellis, R. 2005. Principles of instructed language learning. *System* 33, no:2: 209-224.

Ellis, R. 2006. Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly* 40, no:1: 83-107. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.remote.library.dcu.ie/stable/40264512

Fortune, T. W. and Tedick, D. J. 2008. One-way, two-way and indigenous immersion: a call for cross-fertilization. In *Pathways to Multilingualism: Evolving Perspectives on Immersion Education,* eds. T. W. Fortune and D. J. Tedick, 3-22. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Fortune, T. W., Tedick, D. J., and Walker, C. L. 2008. Integrated language and content teaching: insights from the immersion classroom. In *Pathways to Multilingualism: Evolving Perspectives on Immersion Education,* eds. T. W. Fortune and D. J. Tedick, 71-97. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Freeman, R. 2004. Reviewing the research on language education programs. In *Bilingual Education: An Introductory Reader,* eds. O. García, & C. Baker, 3-18. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gallagher, F. and Leahy, A. 2014. The feel good factor: comparing immersion by design and immersion by default models. *Language. Culture and Curiculum*, 27, no: 1: 58 – 71. doi:10.1080/07908318.2013.877476

García, O. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O. and Sylvan, C. E. 2011. Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal* 95, no: 3: 385-400. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x

Grosjean, F. 2010. *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hornberger, N. H. and Skilton-Sylvester, E. 2003. Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. In *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice in Multilingual Settings,* ed. N. H. Hornberger, 35-71. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. 2012. Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15, no: 3: 261-278. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.658016

Hoshino, N., & Thierry, G. 2011. Language selection in bilingual word production: electrophysiological evidence for cross-language competition. *Brain Research,* 1371: 100-109. doi:http://dx.doi.org.remote.library.dcu.ie/10.1016/j.brainres.2010.11.053

Howatt, A. P. R. 1984. *A history of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, C. E., Shaunessy, E. S., Brice, A. R., Ratliff, M. A. and McHatton, P. A. 2006. Code switching among bilingual and limited English proficient students: possible indicators of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 30, no: 1: 7-28. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.remote.library.dcu.ie/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=23074433&site=ehost-live

Lewis, G., Jones, B., and Baker, C. 2012. Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*, no: 7: 641-654. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

Lin, A. Y. M. and Li, D. C. S. 2012. Codeswitching. In, *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism,* eds. M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese, 470-481. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Lindholm-Leary, K. and Howard, E. R. 2008. Language development and academic achievement in two-way immersion programs. In *Pathways to Multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* eds. T. W. Fortune, & D. J. Tedick, 177-201. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. H. 1991. Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective,* eds. K. de Bot, R. B. Ginsberg and C. Kramsch, 39-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lucas, T. and Katz, A. 1994. Reframing the debate: the roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly* 28 no: 3 Special-Topic Issue: K-12: 537-561. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org.remote.library.dcu.ie/stable/3587307

Lyster, R. and Mori, H. 2008. Instructional counterbalance in immersion pedagogy. In *Pathways to Multilingualism: Evolving Perspectives on Immersion Education*, eds. T. W. Fortune and D. J. Tedick, 133-152. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Maillat, D. and Serra, C. 2009. Immersion education and cognitive strategies: can the obstacle be the advantage in a multilingual society? *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6, no: 2: 186-206. doi:10.1080/14790710902846731

Mearns, T. L. 2012. Using CLIL to enhance pupils' experience of learning and raise attainment in German and health education: a teacher research project. *The Language Learning Journal* 40, no: 2: 175-192.

Met, M. 2008. Paying attention to language: literacy, language and academic achievement. In *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving Perspectives on Immersion Education,* eds. T. W. Fortune and D. J. Tedick, 49-71. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms: Integrating Form-focused Instruction in Communicative Context*. New York: Routledge.

Nieto, S. 2004. *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multilingual Education* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Reyes, I. and Ervin-Tripp, S. 2010. Language choice and competence: code switching and issues of social identity in young bilingual children. In *The Education of English Language Learners: Research to Practice,* eds. M. Shatz, and L. C. Wilkinson, 67-87. New York: The Guildford Press.

Ricci Garotti, F. 2007. Five methodological research questions for CLIL. In *Diverse Contexts – Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*, eds. D. Marsh and D. Wolff, 131 – 145. Frankfurt: Peter Lang

Riches, C., and Genesee, F. 2006. Literacy: crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. In *Educating English Language Learners,* eds. F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. M. Saunders and D. Christian, 64-108. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. 2003. Attention and memory during SLA. In *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition,* eds. C. J. Doughty and M. H. Long, 631-679. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. 2013. CLIL implementation: from policy-makers to individual initiatives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16, no: 3: 231-243. doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.777383

Schmidt, R. 2001. Attention. In *Cognition and Second Language Instruction,* ed. P. Robinson, 3-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shatz, M., and Wilkinson, L. C. 2010. Introduction. In *The Education of English Language Learners: Research to Practice,* eds. M. Shatz, and L. C. Wilkinson, 1-25. New York: The Guildford Press.

Skehan, P. 1996. A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied*

    Linguistics 17, no: 1: 38-62. doi:10.1093/applin/17.1.38

Snow, M. A., Met, M. and Genesee, F. 1989. A conceptual framework for the integration of language

    and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly 23*, no: 2: 201-217.

    Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org.remote.library.dcu.ie/stable/3587333

Swain, M. 1998. Focus on form through conscious reflection, In *Focus on Form in Classroom*

    Second Language Acquisition, eds. C. Doughty and J. Williams, 64 – 83. Cambridge: Cambridge

    University Press

Turnbull, M. 2001. There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but

    ….., *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, no: 4: 531. Retrieved from

    http://search.ebscohost.com.remote.library.dcu.ie/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=4797031

    &site=ehost-live

Willis, J. 1996. *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.

Wolff, D. 2012. The European framework for CLIL teacher education. In *Synergies Italie: Nouvelles*

    Approches et Bonnes Practiques dans l'Enseignement Intercultural, ed. P. Kottelat, 105-117.

    Sylvains les Moulins, France: Gerflint.