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Theoretical Framework

1. Integration of Content and Language Learning/Teaching (Gajo 2007; Mohan 1985; Dalton-Puffer 2007, Pujol 2003)

Gajo (2007):
Theoretical Framework

Gajo (2007):
the idea of integration

- excludes clear-cut distinctions between content and language

- leads to question the language to be taught in the light of the knowledge paradigm of every subject
Theoretical Framework

2. Teacher Education on the CLIL Approach

Snow, Met & Genesse (1989)
Escobar (2008)
Theoretical Framework

Snow, Met & Genesse (1989):

- The content teacher and the L2 teacher need to collaborate to establish a list of
  - language that is essential or obligatory for talking about the subject matter (content-obligatory language)
  - language deriving from the L2 curriculum that is compatible with teaching/learning the subject matter (content-compatible)
Theoretical Framework

Escobar (2008):

- Teachers from different areas of expertise find it difficult to reach agreements about what to teach and how to do so when preparing CLIL pedagogical sequences.

- Cross-curricular dialogue is a procedure to obtain information about what makes it difficult for teachers to reach agreements.
Research Objective

- To explore what an expert in the pedagogy of History tells to an expert in the pedagogy of EFL about
  - what to teach at pre-university courses (age 17-18)
  - what is the role of language in the pedagogy of History.
Methodology

- Qualitative data.
- Authentic and natural data.
  The Interview between the two kinds of experts would have taken place because it was aimed to provide feedback for an EFL student-teacher creating a pedagogical sequence of History in English.
- Informants are volunteers.
- Descriptive, non-judgemental research.
- Emic perspective.
Informants

- Leon
  - Expert in the pedagogy of History

- Interviewer
  - Expert in the pedagogy of English as a Foreign Language
  - Absolute novice in the pedagogy of History
Multimodal Data

- Conversational data: audio recorded interview
- Student-teacher’s pedagogical sequence about History in English for pre-university students (age: 17-18).
  - Element semi-structuring the interview.
- Interviewer’s field notes.
- Leon’s working documents
  - Notes on the student-teacher’s materials
  - Written explanations for the interviewer (written after the interview)
Method of Analysis

- Conversational Analysis
- Content Analysis

- Interview triangled with the auxiliary the data
- Audio recorder treated as a participant affecting interaction (Unamuno & Nussbaum 2004)
Analysis (1)

- The student-teacher’s sequence and the interviewer model simple historical explanations.
  Example: ‘Columbus discovered America’ (Leon, turn 86)

- History teacher models complex historical explanations → ongoing creation of his model during the interview.
Complex Historical Explanation:

1. Concepts (-ism), eg: Fascism (Leon, turn 130)
2. Historical characters, eg: Columbus (Leon, t 86)
3. Quasi-characters, eg: the Church (Leon, t 88)
4. Multiple causes linked to quasi-characters’ purposes
5. Consequences
6. Language to articulate all this in discourse
Analysis (1)

History teacher’s **ultimate goal**: 
Leon (t 154): en historia enseñamos a que la gente aprenda a explicar | el pasado\ y/ aprenda a comprenderlo\| pero explicar se hace lingüísticamente\| Si no sabe explicarlo lingüísticamente /habrá que enseñar a escribir sobre el pasado\ no/ _ in history we teach people to learn to explain | the past\ and/ to learn to understand it\| but explaining is done in a linguistic way\| if he can’t explain it linguistically/ one must teach to write about the past\ musn’t one/ _
Analysis (1)

Leon (t 100): […] Fíjate\ un proceso de expansión europea\ concepto\ concepto\ […] Notice this\ an European expansionist process\ concept\ concept\_

Inter (t 101): {P: sí\||}  
                           {P: yes\||}
Leon (t 102):_ que incidió en que muchas monarquías/ portuguesa y española/ concepto/ concepto/ cuasipersonaje/ cuasipersonaje\ invirtieran mucho dinero/ por- debido a que habían rutas e: en el Medio Oriente que estaban cerradas porque los turcos habían invadido/ concepto/ concepto/ concepto\ Por tanto/ muchos navegantes/ como Enrique el Navegante\ Portugal\ descubrió nananananá/ y dentro este contexto/ Colón descubrió América\ [...]

Leon (t 102): that caused that many monarchies/ the Portuguese and the Spanish ones/ concept/ concept/quasi-character/quasi-character\ invested a lot of money/ for- because there were routes in the Middle East that were closed because the Turks had invaded/ concept/ concept\ Therefore/ many sailors/ such as Enrique el Navegante/ Portugal\ discovered nanananananananana/ and within this context/ Columbus discovered America\ [...]

Analysis (1)

Leon (t 102): that caused that many monarchies/ the Portuguese and the Spanish ones/ concept/ concept/quasi-character/quasi-character\ invested a lot of money/ for- because there were routes in the Middle East that were closed because the Turks had invaded/ concept/ concept\ Therefore/ many sailors/ such as Enrique el Navegante/ Portugal\ discovered nanananananananana/ and within this context/ Columbus discovered America\ [...]

Analysis (1)
Leon (t 100): [...] Fíjate\ un proceso de expansión europea\ concepto\ concepto\ […] Notice this\ an European expansionist process\ concept\ concept\_

Inter (t 101): \{P: sí\} \{P: yes\}
Leon (t 102): que incidió en que muchas monarquías portuguesa y española/ concepto/ invirtieran mucho dinero/ por- debido a que habían rutas e: en el Medio Oriente que estaban cerradas porque los turcos habían invadido/ concepto/ Colón descubrió América\ | [...]

...
Leon (t 102):_ that caused that many monarchies/ the Portuguese and the Spanish ones/ concept/ concept/quasi-character/quasi-character\ invested a lot of money/ for- because there were routes in the Middle East that were closed because the Turks had invaded/ concept/ concept/ \Therefore/ many sailors/ such as Enrique el Navegante\ Portugal\ discovered nanananananananana/ and within this context/ Columbus discovered America\ [...]
Analysis (1)

The Discourse to be taught in the subject of History is

- subject-specific
- an inextricable part of the content
Leon shows concern about

1. an EFL teacher’s instructions for reading a historical text:

   ‘Ask students not to worry about the meaning of every word, but to concentrate in the general meaning of the text’ (student-teacher’s sequence, p 4)

**BECAUSE**

Some of the words the students do not know can do at the text with key meaning *because they are concepts* (‘*porque son conceptos*’, t 116)
Leon shows concern about

2. an EFL teacher’s vocabulary exercise

Manpower, rejected, cellar, prevent, assignment, to herd, hollow, set aside, corpse (student-teacher’s pedagogical sequence, p 5)

CLASSIFICATION:

EFL student-teacher: challenging vocabulary for pre-university students

Leon: ‘small vocabulary’ (t 148)
Analysis (2)

Small vocabulary ≠ concepts

Small vocabulary ≠ content-obligatory language
(Snow, Met & Genesse 1989)

Small vocabulary = ____?
Analysis (3)

History teacher’s ultimate goal:
Leon (t 154): en historia enseñamos a que la gente aprenda a explicar el pasado y aprender a comprenderlo pero explicar se hace lingüísticamente Si no sabe explicarlo lingüísticamente habrá que enseñar a escribir sobre el pasado no

in history we teach people to learn to explain the past and to learn to understand it but explaining is done in a linguistic way if he can’t explain it linguistically one must teach to write about the past musn’t one
Analysis

The traditional type of language taught in the subject of History is written discourse.

Further Evidence:
Analysis

Leon shows surprise at the EFL student-teacher’s expliciting of types of oral interaction (Leon, t 34; Interviewer’s notes)

Correct with whole class.

| Type of interaction: class ↔ T; T ↔ class | Time: 5 minutes |

Student-teacher’s sequence, p 8
Conclusion

Identification of points for discussion between an expert in the pedagogy of History and an expert in the pedagogy of L2 when they have to collaborate to create CLIL pedagogical sequences:

1) What’s *small vocabulary*? How to deal with it?

2) Learner-centered curriculum: how to incorporate oral discourse in the History class?
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