

International Conference/Conférence internationale Bruxelles, 7-8 novembre 2016

Multilingualism and alternative language learning methodologies: New complementary tools for foreign language teaching/ Multilinguisme et méthodes alternatives d'apprentissage des langues : Les nouveaux dispositifs d'accompagnement pour l'enseignement des langues étrangères

Laurent Gajo, Université de Genève: *Didactique des langues et didactique du plurilinguisme : continuités, complémentarités, ruptures.*

La prise en compte du plurilinguisme peut s'exercer de différentes manières en didactique. Depuis une quinzaine d'année, on voit émerger en Europe une didactique du plurilinguisme, qui regroupe différentes approches travaillant avec/sur/vers la diversité linguistique : on pensera par exemple à la didactique des langues voisines (intercompréhension) et à l'enseignement bilingue. Ces différentes approches peuvent et doivent se combiner avec l'enseignement plus « classique » des langues étrangères, où chaque langue constitue une discipline scolaire particulière. Des zones de contact se développent d'ailleurs entre ce dernier et les approches plurilingues. On évoquera notamment l'enseignement de la langue orienté vers le contenu et la perspective actionnelle.

Dans cet exposé, nous montrerons, d'une part, en quoi consistent les apports originaux de la didactique du plurilinguisme et, d'autre part, en quoi ils nouent des liens intéressants avec la didactique des langues et ses récentes évolutions.

Laurent Gajo est professeur ordinaire au Département de linguistique de l'Université de Genève, où il dirige l'Ecole de langue et de civilisation françaises. Linguiste de formation, il s'est spécialisé dans l'analyse de l'interaction en classe bilingue, la didactique du plurilinguisme, la politique linguistique et le plurilinguisme dans la science. Auteur d'une centaine de publications, il a conduit de nombreuses recherches en Suisse et à l'étranger dans le domaine de l'enseignement bilingue.

Rick de Graaff, Universiteit Utrecht, *CLIL-squared: What language and subject teachers can learn from the role of content and language in education.*

In the last few decades, the focus on language in communicative language education has shifted from object to means. Language is, in the first place, a means of communication. However, the content of communication seems to be reduced to a secondary role in language teaching; content is irrelevant to the pedagogy. But what do we want learners to be able to communicate about, related to language, literature, culture, society?

In CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) or bilingual education, a language focus contributes to the development of content knowledge in other subjects. This allows for space for language use and development within the curriculum. How can we create and use this space in foreign language education as well?

In this presentation, I will first investigate the shared roles of language and content in education. Second, I will discuss the ways language teachers can strengthen their teaching by adopting a content-focused approach, based on lessons learned from subject teachers who reinforce their teaching by a focus on language. I will draw parallels not only with CLIL in bilingual education, but also in language-focused subject teaching in L1. All in all, the aim of language education is to promote the development of students into communicative members of a multilingual society, who know both *how* and *what* to communicate.

Rick de Graaff is Professor of Foreign Language Education and Bilingual Education at Utrecht University. His research focuses on pedagogy and learning outcomes in foreign languages and in content and language integrated learning, and on professional development of language teachers. Rick de Graaff teaches language pedagogy and curriculum development in the Graduate School of Teaching. For more information: <http://www.uu.nl/staff/HcJdeGraaff/0>

Tim Lewis, The Open University (UK), *The Changing Face of Tandem Language Learning*.

Tandem language learning draws on a tradition of peer learning and teaching which has its origins in the Madras Military Orphans Asylum of the late C18th. Its key principles are autonomy and reciprocity. It continues to evolve in ways that repeatedly enable new kinds of learners to benefit from working in partnership. Tandem learning was first – and still is - practised on a wide scale in face-to-face Franco-German exchanges organized by the Deutsch-Französisches Jugendwerk/Office Franco-Allemand pour la Jeunesse in the years after WW2. Here it assumed an intercultural dimension, since it brought together in a spirit of reconciliation young people from two former enemies. An intercultural focus is also evident in the Tandem exchanges organized in the 1970s between German social workers and members of the Turkish Gastarbeiter community. Tandem Learning went online in the early 1990s with the EU-funded International Email Tandem Network, led by Helmut Brammerts of Ruhr Universität Bochum. More recently it has been reinvented as Teletandem by Joao Telles in Sao Paulo Brazil, where online videoconferencing provides a platform for exchanges. In Europe, its latest incarnation is in the L3Task project, led by Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena. Here Teletandem exchanges are used as a means of enabling partners to learn and maintain third languages. This paper examines successive applications of Tandem learning and considers how it has proved so versatile and explores how effectively its core principles and practices - including 50/50 dual language use and error correction by partners - have been operationalized in its successive incarnations.

Dr Tim Lewis is Director of Postgraduate Studies in the Centre for Research in Education and Educational Technology at the Open University, UK, where he has worked since 2002. From 1992 to 2001 Tim was Director of the Modern Languages Teaching Centre at the University of Sheffield, where he introduced Tandem Learning to the languages curriculum and led the Centre's participation in the EU-funded International Email Tandem Network and successor projects (1994-1999). Tim's research interests include telecollaboration, intercultural learning and learner autonomy. In February 2011, Tim co-edited a special issue of *Language Learning and Technology*, on 'Multilateral Online Exchanges for Language and Culture Learning' and his publications include *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem* (Sheffield: Academy Electronic Press, 2003), *Language Learning Strategies in Independent Settings* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008) and *Online Intercultural Exchange: Policy, Pedagogy, Practice* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

Katherine Anderton, Radboud Universiteit, NL: *Using social media to promote the creation of communities of practice and engage adult learners with their learning*

MOTIVATION

As for life in general, technology is making its presence felt in education; either through the deliberate application of technologies to traditional learning pedagogies or the emergence of a more rhizomatic pedagogy as technology increasingly leads to the blending of the virtual learning environments of institutes and the personal learning environments of learners.

Building on ideas first encountered in Wenger's *Communities of Practice*, over the last three years I have endeavoured to promote a learning community that extends beyond my classroom through the use of social media. This has been done through the re-design of the course, *Advanced Speaking Skills*, that promotes a rhizomatic learning pedagogy, as well as facilitating student autonomy over their learning. This course is one of continuous review and modification, as it moves towards a point where: *the community is the curriculum, students define what they learn*, (Cormier, 2010) and where the teacher can move from the traditional role of 'sage on the stage' to 'the guide on the side'.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Working with adult learners has its own limitations. Unlike students in further or higher education, adult learners may only communicate during the class itself, while homework is often prioritised lower than the daily requirements of work and family life. Furthermore, learners are often reluctant or slow to make connections within the class due to the limited contact hours or length of time between classes.

In addition, adult learners often have higher expectations of the teacher and assume learning must come from the teacher, rather than other class members

Finally, adult courses are often short in duration and unlikely to be followed by another course (at least for some period of time). This leads to the problem of how to get students to take responsibility for their learning so that it continues after the course is over.

APPROACH

Initial work into the problem of promoting collaboration was as part of an Open University Master's programme: Online & Distance Education. In this case the end-of-module assessment for H852: The use of Facebook to promote student community and collaboration in adult language learning (with limited contact hours).

The problem was approached via a re-design of a common exercise conducted with students as part of their preparation for the Cambridge Advanced English Exam. The outcome of this redesign was analysed in combination with prevailing theories of communities of practice and scaffolded learning, surveys of participating students, and an analysis of the Facebook posts produced. The results of this study were applied to a more open-curriculum course *Advanced Speaking Skills*. (A speaking skills course designed for high level (C1-C2) English-learning professional)

RESULTS

The original requirements of the assessment required a critical reflection of the designed task. However, the study also brought to light several other issues that can arise through using social media as part of the learning experience. Thus this is not presented as a completed study but rather as the first phase on an ongoing study into the use of social media as a legitimate and accepted learning tool.

What emerged from the original study was that incorporating social media into a classroom can lead to rhizomatic practices emerging as students engage with the platform, take responsibility for their own learning and begin to define their own curriculum. With learner autonomy and the importance of learning communities as a new goal for learning achievement, *Advanced Speaking Skills* was first reconceptualised to adhere to the elements of Connectivism as defined by Siemens (2005). The course has been further developed to embrace the rhizomatic learning practices, defined by Cormier (2010). This course will begin in August and results will be collated by the end of October 2016.

CONCLUSIONS

One of the difficulties of designing courses for adults, is that starting levels are often different, while needs and wants can vary wildly from student to student.

Following the example of Cormier's MOOC courses with unstructured course planning, social interaction and community building, it is hoped this will provide more insight into how communities begin, work and can flourish in adult education, whilst also giving students the freedom to define what they learn and create learning opportunities that are relevant to their English use, allowing the "community to be the curriculum" (Cormier 2010).

KEY PHRASES: COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE; RHIZOMATIC PEDAGOGY; SCAFFOLDED LEARNING; LEARNER AUTONOMY; CONNECTIVISM.

REFERENCES

- Cormier, D. (2010)** 'Community as curriculum and open learning', *Dave's Educational Blog*, 17 Jun [online]. Available at <http://davecormier.com/edblog/2010/06/17/community-as-curriculum-and-open-learning/> (last accessed 16 November 2015)
- Cormier, D. (2012)** *Embracing Uncertainty – Rhizomatic Learning in Formal Education* (2012) YouTube video, added by Dave Cormier [online]. Available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VJIWyiLyBpQ> (last accessed 16 November 2015).
- Siemens, S. (2005)** 'Connectivism: a learning theory for the digital age', *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, vol. 2, no. 1 [online]. Available at http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm (last accessed 16 November 2015).
- Wenger, E., (1998)**. *Communities of practice*, Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1994 [1978])** Interaction between learning and development in Stierer, B. and Maybin, J., (eds) *Language, Literacy and Learning in Educational Practice*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters Limited.

Lenka Ludvikova, University of Masaryk, *The Non-language Impact of Autonomy Support in ELT*.

Learner's autonomy is usually suppressed at schools and that is why the students who come to university often do not know how to be autonomous. All this despite the fact that before the institutionalized education it is natural for us to accept the responsibility for our learning and to be in charge of the learning process. The English Autonomously course (EA) gives the students a scaffolding that helps them rediscover the autonomous way of learning.

The students learn English not from the textbooks and regular seminars led by the teachers but from their exposure to lots of stimuli. These enhance their learning of English as a foreign language as well as other skills that develop via English that becomes a tool for reflecting and developing the students in various aspects.

This presentation aims to introduce the framework of EA and its theoretical background as well as illustrate the impact of autonomy support that the students reflect on most frequently. Their progress is significantly reported, apart from the language skills, in the area of soft skills, metacognition and attitudes. Thanks to instant reflective practice from the beginning of the course and thanks to individualised content that the students choose themselves, they are more engaged and motivated to work harder. The data presented in the paper were collected in the EA course and show a wide range of students' reflections and two inventories that cover the use of language learning strategies and metacognition awareness before and after the course in which the students foster autonomy. The self-evaluation and self-reflection that the students do in order to identify their needs and plan their studies are not only instruments for research but also tools for students' learning.

Even though students come to the seminars to learn a foreign language, they eventually discover changes in their attitudes, shifts in their mindsets and increased self-awareness. In this sense, we are enriching the whole student.

Key words:

learner's autonomy, self-reflection, metacognition, informal learning, counselling

Selected sources:

BENSON, Phil. *Teaching and Researching Autonomy*. Pearson Education Limited, 2nd edition, 2011.

KARLSSON, Leena, KJISIK, Felicity, NORLUND, Joan. From Here to Autonomy. Helsinki University Press, 1997.

LITTLE, David. Learner Autonomy 1: Definitions, Issues and Problems. Dublin, Authentik, 1991.

OXFORD, Rebecca L.: Development and psychometric testing of the strategy inventory for language learning. U.S. Army Research Institute, 1986.

Nicolas Roland, Marjorie Castermans, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgique, *L'enseignement des langues par les cours en ligne ouverts et massifs : de la conception pédagogique aux pratiques d'apprentissage.*

Les pratiques d'enseignement et d'apprentissage des langues à l'université évoluent par le biais du numérique. Celles-ci s'inscrivent désormais dans des espaces multiples – changements de lieux – et s'étendent tout au long de la vie – changement de temporalité (Charlier, 2013). Dans ce contexte, les Massive Open Online Courses – ou MOOC – retiennent l'attention du monde universitaire tout autant que du grand public. De nombreuses universités de renom, à l'échelle internationale, se sont rapidement engagées dans la diffusion de MOOC. Les chiffres annoncés à la mi-octobre 2015 par Coursera sur son site permettent de mesurer l'ampleur de l'effort MOOC actuellement déployé : Coursera offre un catalogue de 1465 MOOC, pilotés par 133 institutions partenaires et suivis par 15.700.000 apprenants. Dans ce cadre, l'objectif de la présente contribution est de proposer un retour d'expérience de la conception et des deux premières sessions du MOOC « Spice up Your English » développé à l'Université libre de Bruxelles.

« Spice up Your English » est un cours d'anglais langue étrangère – passage du niveau A2 à B1 – à destination du public interne de l'institution – étudiants et personnel – ainsi qu'à un public externe ; sa première diffusion a réuni 27.500 personnes en mars 2015 et sa seconde 31.000 personnes en octobre 2015. Proposant dix modules subdivisés en quatre catégories de chapitres – grammaire, prononciation, vocabulaire et compétence –, le MOOC alterne des contenus audiovisuels, textuels, des activités, des phases d'interaction et une évaluation finale. Tout au long de sa diffusion, les apprenants sont conviés à découvrir une série de ressources en ligne suggérées par l'enseignante. Chaque semaine, les apprenants reçoivent également un notebook électronique – à imprimer – permettant de s'entraîner à la prise de notes – compétence complexe développée – et d'avoir accès au vocabulaire essentiel à la compréhension des vidéos. Les phases d'interactions enseignante-apprenants se déroulent sur le forum ; les phases d'interaction apprenants-apprenants peuvent avoir lieu sur le forum – grâce à des sections créées spécifiquement pour des échanges sur des thèmes précis – ou via le wiki du cours – espace d'échange de ressources et de conseils. Les activités sont principalement proposées en ligne, directement sur la plateforme d'hébergement (exercices de glisser-déposer, quizz) ou par le biais d'une ressource en ligne proposée mais également en version papier en recourant aux espaces prévus à cet effet dans le notebook. Enfin, au terme des 10 semaines, les apprenants peuvent participer à une activité d'évaluation par les pairs afin de pratiquer et d'évaluer leurs compétences rédactionnelles.

Notre communication sera structurée en trois temps. Dans un premier temps, nous dresserons, à partir d'une revue de la littérature des MOOC d'apprentissage des langues, un bilan des principales expériences en la matière. Dans un deuxième temps, nous viserons à décrire le processus de conception de ce dispositif particulier sous l'angle des médiatisations et des médiations (Peraya, 2014) opérées par les différents acteurs : les enseignants, la conseillère pédagogique ainsi que le technicien audiovisuel scénariste. Dans un troisième temps, nous nous intéresserons à l'appropriation par les apprenants des différents médias mis à leur disposition dans le cours en ligne : par l'intermédiaire de questionnaires – 1200 répondants lors de la première session et 5310 lors de la seconde session – ainsi que d'entretiens compréhensifs (Kauffman, 2007) – 23 menés lors de la première session –, nous saisirons les processus d'instrumentation et d'instrumentalisation (Rabardel, 1995) des différents artefacts en examinant la manière dont les apprenants modifient leurs schèmes d'utilisation, les adaptent à ces outils ou créent de nouvelles fonctions. Le croisement de ces analyses de données permettra d'établir des liens entre les pratiques à l'œuvre lors de la production des médias du MOOC, les produits finis et l'appropriation de ces instruments par les apprenants dans le cadre dudit cours en ligne ouvert et massif.

Bibliographie

Charlier, B. (2013). Apprendre au-delà des frontières : entre nomadismes et mobilités. *Savoirs*. 32(2), 61-79.

Kauffman, J.-C. (2007). *L'entretien compréhensif*. Paris : Armand Colin.

Peraya, D. (2014). Regards sur l'évolution des formes de médiatisation de la formation et de l'apprentissage. *Synergies. Pays germanophones*, 7. 19-32. Disponible en ligne à l'adresse : <http://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:45054>

Rabardel, P. (1995). *Les Hommes et les technologies une approche cognitive des instruments contemporains*. Paris : Université de Paris 8.

Marjorie Castermans, Laura Calabrese, Université Libre de Bruxelles *Learning Opportunities with a CLIL Approach: Assessing New Pedagogical Practices at the ULB*.

For decades now, English has been used as the language of international professional life in virtually all fields; however, only recently has it become the most widespread instructional language in higher education (Wilkinson 2004). The rapid implementation of English-medium instruction programs across Europe responds to universities' pressing need to attract international students, foster teacher and student mobility and adapt Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the new demands of the labor market. More recently, in their book entitled *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The State of Play in 2014*, Bernd Wächter and Friedhelm Maiworm provide a comprehensive view of European higher education institutions offering bachelor and master degrees in English; since 2002, an increase of 1000% of programs offered in English has been recorded in higher education institutions in non-English-speaking European countries. Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands are the leaders in terms of EMI – English Medium Instruction. In the specific case of the ULB, faculties are gradually incorporating English as the vehicular language mainly in Master's programs, with some Master's programs being taught fully in English, and one case of a multilingual program in French, Spanish and English. In developing English-taught programs, the ULB has invested in training its teaching staff both pedagogically and linguistically in order to improve the language proficiency required for teaching academic disciplines through the medium of English as well as to develop the methodological competence needed in a CLIL approach.

Content and Language Integrating Learning (CLIL) differs from English-Medium Instruction (EMI) in that it aims at developing competence in the content, as well as in the language. CLIL is "a dual-focused approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of content and language with the objective of promoting both content and language mastery to predefined levels" (Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010). The principles underlying CLIL expound that language is used to learn and communicate and thus plays an essential role in content learning. This basic assumption impacts the teaching methodology adopted in the classroom since the objective is not solely to teach in another language, but also to draw attention to the language itself. In order to implement this new perspective on content and language learning, methodological changes must be operated. These new pedagogical practices consist mainly in a communicative approach to teaching and learning, offering students every opportunity to practice and improve their language skills. This approach should therefore favor student-centered and task-based approaches as well as group work in order to allow learners to be actively engaged in learning.

The present paper will describe two concrete examples of pedagogical practices highlighting this methodological adaptation: on the one hand, within the framework of a course aimed at economics students in bachelor degree entitled *Analysis of Contemporary Economic Issues* and on the other hand, within a course aimed at students studying for a master degree in multilingual communication entitled *Multicultural Discourses*. Both courses have implemented changes in the way they envisage teaching in a foreign language. The former has attempted to support students in writing answers to exam questions. Writing is indeed a key resource when it comes to assessment. This productive competence is nonetheless not easy to comprehend and certainly not easy to master since, unlike oral expression, it has to be taught systematically. In CLIL, writing is an important challenge for learners and most in need of development (Dalton-Puffer, 2007). It is therefore essential to offer writing workshops that respond to students' specific needs and provide them with immediate corrective feedback. The use of a collaborative online platform has proven extremely useful in improving writing skills as students work in groups with the supervision of a content and a language teacher. This provides a unique opportunity for students to integrate, in writing, the dual focus of both content and language. Through satisfaction questionnaires distributed to the target

audience, it is possible to measure the impact of such pedagogical initiative and determine what kind of improvements could be implemented in order to make the workshop even more efficient.

The second course, Multicultural Discourses, has been completely redesigned in terms of structure and content so as to promote a CLIL approach. Each chapter has been supplemented with activities or tasks requiring active student participation such as oral presentations, participant-led discussions, class debates, and argumentative essays. All these activities contribute to the learning of higher order thinking skills (HOTS) which are typically requested in an academic context. HOTS are cognitive skills as diverse as developing reasoning, inquiry and discussion, as well as creative thinking, evaluating the work of oneself and others and hypothesizing about what could happen. They represent a real challenge for students and even more so in a second language. In this respect, focus groups are a useful tool to assess how the students concerned have made use of these new practices and to which extent they have been actually supported in their learning.

Key words: learning opportunity, CLIL, student-centered approach, task-based teaching, active learning

References

- Coyle, D., P. Hood & D. Marsh 2010. CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. 2007. 'Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): current research from Europe.' *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Wilkinson, R. (ed.) 2004. *Integrating Content and Language. Meeting the Challenge of Multilingual Education*. Netherlands: Universitaire Pers Maastricht).

Caroline Staquet, Université Libre de Bruxelles, *Uncovering the political and economic agendas behind CLIL. A discourse-analysis of some key terms surrounding the concept*.

Context

Since its emergence in the early 1990's, CLIL has frequently been described as a response to the EU impetus for multilingualism. As a result, research in the field has widely benefited from institutional support (Bruton: 2013; Van de Craen, Mondt, Allain, & Gao: 2007).

In this context, CLIL has been enthusiastically labelled by some researchers as an innovation, 'education for modern times' (Coyle, Hood, Marsh: 2010), a new form of 'bilingual education at a time when teaching through one single language is seen as second rate education' (Bergillos: 2007). Arguing that the concept could not be separated from the contexts in which it grows, some academics therefore linked it to non-educational concepts such as the 'Knowledge Age', and human capital (Coyle, Hood, Marsh: 2010). Its dual approach would allow for an 'integrated learning' in an 'integrated world' (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols: 2008). Last but not least, CLIL would be a tool to cultivate 'a cosmopolitan identity' (Coyle, Hood and Marsh: 2010).

Such claims were moderated or even dismissed by other scholars, who feared the concept had become 'a brand-name' (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit: 2010) and therefore made a plea that CLIL remain an academic term for an area of research based on theoretical and empirical foundations. Some recently urged to move from 'celebration' to a more critical study of CLIL (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter : 2013). Bruton (Bruton: 2013 ; Bruton: 2011) repeatedly expressed strong scepticism against the methodology and the 'pro-CLIL' discourse, his main claim being that CLIL would be discriminatory.

Goals

Such a polemic echoes past conflicting visions about what education should be and which type of individuals it ought to prepare. It reminds us of the sensitive relation between languages, languages in the curriculum, nation and identity (Beck: 2002). We believe a thorough discourse-analysis could help one determine how far CLIL's methodology, research and the expectations around it are ideologically driven, especially as there is no clear consensus on CLIL's objectives.

Methodology

To fulfil this purpose, we have selected a corpus of academic texts about CLIL's methodology (see 'Selected corpus'). In this corpus, we have selected five key terms – i.e. 'knowledge society', 'integration', 'convergence', 'cosmopolitan identity' and 'best practices' –, which, we believe, encompass an economic and/or political dimension. The first part of our study will address the interdiscourse of these terms. In a second part, we will discuss our results with the antagonistic views often expressed towards CLIL.

Key words

Discourse analysis - CLIL - multilingual ideology - EU language policy– knowledge society – cosmopolitan identity

Selected corpus

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

Marsh, D., Wolff, D. (Eds.). (2007). Diverse Contexts-Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). Uncovering CLIL. China: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Selected bibliography & references

Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, culture & society*, 19(1-2), 17-44.

Bergillos, F. J. L. (2007). The Sociolinguistics of CLIL: Language Planning and Language Change in 21st Century Europe. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada*, (1), 27-38.

Bruton, A. (2011). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? Re-evaluating some of the research. *System*, 39(4), 523-532.

Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some of the reasons why... and why not. *System*, 41(3), 587-597. Cenoz, J.,

Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, amt011, 1-21.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (Eds.). (2010). Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms (Vol. 7). John Benjamins Publishing. European Commission (1995). White Paper on Education and Training. Teaching and Learning : Towards the Learning Society. Brussels : European Commission.

Eurydice Network (2006). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe. Brussels : Eurydice Network.

Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2014). CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning): The bigger picture. A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: Some of the reasons why... and why not. *System* 41 (2013): 587–597. *System*, 44, 160-167.

OECD (2007). Human Capital : How What You Know Shapes Your Life. Paris : OECD. OECD (2000). Knowledge Management in the Learning Society. Paris : OECD.

Sylvén, L. K. (2013). CLIL in Sweden–why does it not work? A metaperspective on CLIL across contexts in Europe. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 301-320.

Van de Craen, P., Mondt, K., Allain, L., & Gao, Y. (2007). Why and how CLIL works: An outline for a CLIL theory. *Views*, 16(3), 70-78.

Stefanie Blom, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, CLIL at tertiary level: a case study of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Brussels, Belgium)

This case study will examine the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at the faculty of Economics and Social Sciences (ES), which offers a Masters' program Management as an English-taught equivalent of the Dutch Masters' program Bedrijfskunde. The fact that these courses are being taught in English does not, however, guarantee that they are in fact CLIL courses (see Wilkinson & Zegers, 2008). Recently, the application of the term CLIL for programs which are not representative of CLIL practice has led to criticism with regards to the efficacy of CLIL as a pedagogical practice. The lack of consensus regarding a definition of CLIL only adds to the point at issue / problem (see Mehisto, Frigols & Marsh, 2008; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Gierlinger, 2012; Dafouz & Smit, 2014). The purpose of this research, therefore, is two-fold: first, a clear definition of CLIL will be provided in order to assess the Masters' program

Management. Secondly, the study will focus on the influence of instruction in English on student performance and has a specific interest in the linguistic proficiency of learners and their development throughout the CLIL program. A quantitative method will be used to acquire whole-group results, whilst several students will be chosen for further qualitative research based on the initial language test outcomes. These results will be further complemented by a quantitative analysis of learners' academic outcomes in order to investigate whether foreign language teaching affects student content knowledge. If possible, further recommendations for future improved implementation will be provided.

Key words

CLIL, higher education, learners' outcomes, case study, English-taught programs, foreign language learning

Bibliography

Dafouz, E. & Smit, U. (2014). Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English- Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings. *Applied Linguistics* 2014., 1-20. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Foreword. In: Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., Sierra, J. & Gallardo del Puerto, F. Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts. Bern: Peter Lang., pp. 9-10.
Gierlinger, E. (2012). T. "CLIL Models" <https://clilingmesoftly.wordpress.com>. Accessed on 14/11/2014.
Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. & Frigols, M.J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL*. Oxford: MacMillan. Wilkinson, R. & Zegers, V. (2008). Introduction. In: Wilkinson, R. & Zegers, V. (eds.). *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht., pp. 1-9.

Julie Luyckx, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Le Projet Voltaire au sein d'un environnement de *blended learning*.

Le potentiel de développement du *blended learning* a considérablement été élargi grâce à l'émergence et la disponibilité des nouvelles technologies. Les technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC) jouent un grand rôle dans cette méthode alternative d'apprentissage qu'on peut définir simplement comme une combinaison d'un apprentissage face-à-face et d'un apprentissage en ligne. Le *blended learning* gagne de plus en plus en popularité dans les écoles supérieures qui souhaitent utiliser les TIC et l'Internet pour appuyer l'apprentissage autonome (Beazar, e.a. 2013).

L'objectif de cette contribution est de présenter l'exploitation d'un environnement de *blended learning* dans un cours de FOS (français sur objectifs spécifiques) en deuxième bachelier de droit à la Vrije Universiteit Brussel et d'en analyser son impact sur la maîtrise langagière, plus particulièrement sur la précision de l'orthographe des mots, et la motivation des apprenants. Dans cet environnement, la précision de l'orthographe des mots est vue de manière individuelle par le biais de la plateforme en ligne « Projet Voltaire » qui propose une remise à niveau en orthographe grâce à un service personnalisé pour chacun de ses utilisateurs. Ce cours sera suivi par environ 100 étudiants au premier semestre de l'année académique 2016-2017. La moitié sera amenée à utiliser la plateforme (groupe Projet Voltaire) et leurs progressions et leurs motivations seront ensuite comparées avec les progressions et les motivations de l'autre moitié des étudiants faisant un tandem VUB-ULB (groupe Tandem).

La présentation donnera tout d'abord un aperçu de la littérature traitant du *blended learning*. Puis, le fonctionnement de la plateforme en ligne « Projet Voltaire » sera expliqué. Les trois grands thèmes de la recherche seront ensuite éclairés: (1) la progression de la précision de l'orthographe des mots, (2) l'influence de l'utilisation de la plateforme et (3) l'influence de la motivation de l'utilisation de la L2 et de la motivation de l'utilisation de la plateforme dans un environnement de *blended learning*. Enfin, plusieurs hypothèses seront données afin de proposer des réponses à mes questions de recherche.

Mots clefs : *blended learning*, *self-paced learning*, enseignement universitaire, Projet Voltaire, français sur objectifs spécifiques (FOS)

Bibliographie sélective

Beazar, G., Duval, E., d'Ydewalle, G., Fastré, A., Achten, M., Op de Beeck, I., Questier, F., Van Campenhout, J., Vandeput, L., Van der Perre, G., Van Hoecke, T., Van Landeghem, H., Van Mingroot, H., Van Overschée, W., & Willems, J. (2013). *Van Blended naar Open Learning? Internet en ICT in het Vlaams Hoger Onderwijs. Klasse Technische Wetenschappen. Standpunten*, 19. Brussels, Belgium: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten.

Graham, C.R. (2005). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In C.J. Bonk & C.R. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs* (pp. 3-21). San Francisco : Pfeiffer Publishing.

Johnson, C. (2014). *Increasing Students' Academic Involvement: Chilean Teacher Engagement with Learners in Blended English as a Foreign Language Courses*. Thèse de doctorat en éducation, Walden University, Washington.

Marsh, D. (2012). *Blended Learning: Creating Learning Opportunities for Language Learners*. New York : Cambridge University Press.

Picciano, A. G. (2008). Blending with purpose—The multimodal model. *Journal of the Research Center for Educational Technology*, 5(1), 4-14.

Sharpe, R., Benfield, G., Roberts, G., & Richard, F. (2006). *The undergraduate expérience of blended e-learning : a review of UK literature and practice*. The Higher Education Academy. En ligne https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/sharpe_benfield_roberts_francis_0.pdf, consulté le 13 mars 2016.

Laura Scarpa, Institut des Langues Vivantes, Université Catholique de Louvain Correction par les pairs dans un eTandem: opportunité ou limite?

Quelle place pour la correction par les pairs dans une expérience de télécollaboration ? Quels avantages présente-t-elle ? Et quels désavantages ou limites ? Dans quelles modalités est-elle réalisée par les étudiants ? Comment la gérer au mieux ? Nombreuses sont les questions qui se présentent quand nous commençons à pratiquer la correction par les pairs dans la télécollaboration. Tout en faisant référence aux principes énoncés dans la littérature courante sur la matière, et dans le but d'un tirer une leçon et des conseils utiles, nous allons analyser l'expérience de correction asynchrone par les pairs faite sur les cahiers de bord écrits par les étudiants dans le cadre d'un etandem italien-français entre l'Institut des Langues Vivantes de l'UCL en Belgique et l'Université de Padoue en Italie.

Résumé

La correction par les pairs est naturellement présente dans les échanges synchrones à distance dans des activités de télécollaboration, surtout quand il s'agit de préciser la signification pendant la communication. La correction par les pairs devient aussi de plus en plus une nécessité, surtout dans les projets de télécollaboration (mais aussi dans d'autres typologies de cours) qui impliquent à la fois un nombre élevés d'étudiants et une production écrite. Les professeurs, ne pouvant pas/plus de manière réaliste assumer la correction de toute la production écrite dans un court délai, demandent alors aux étudiants de s'en charger, en suivant des instructions plus ou moins détaillées, pour la réaliser. Bien sûr, cette démarche ne comporte pas uniquement un coté utilitariste, mais aussi un coté fortement pédagogique. Il s'agit en fait d'une manière d'impliquer encore plus l'étudiant dans le projet, d'en faire de plus en plus un protagoniste au lieu d'un simple utilisateur. Dans cette perspective, la correction par les pairs peut très bien s'inscrire dans la télécollaboration, qui se base sur des principes comme celui de l'autonomie (et donc de la responsabilité) et de la réciprocité dans l'apprentissage.

Mais concrètement quels sont les résultats d'une correction par les pairs, notamment dans le cadre d'un etandem à caractère linguistique, comme celui qui sera analysé ? Est-elle fiable, pour le professeur comme pour les étudiants ? Quelles sont ses caractéristiques principales et ses modalités? Doit-elle être intégrée

par d'autres modalités de correction ? Représente-t-elle un plus pour le projet d'échange ou plutôt une complication ? Est-elle appréciée par les étudiants ? Est-elle vraiment bénéfique ?

Dans un esprit de dialogue avec les participants, cette communication tentera de donner des possibles réponses à ces questions (ou d'un soulever d'autres), en mettant en relation les principes et les acquis de la recherche dans ce domaine avec les données et les observations tirés d'un corpus de textes écrits et corrigés par les étudiants dans le cadre d'un etandem linguistique italien-français pendant l'année académique 2015-2016.

Mots-clé : télécollaboration, etandem, correction par les pairs, correction asynchrone, apprentissage linguistique