

A Review of the Traditional and Current Language Teaching Methods

María Luisa Renau Renau

Department of English Studies, Universitat Jaume I, Castellón, Spain

Abstract – Nowadays, there is a need to fit into a world increasingly globalized, in which communication and foreign languages have more importance than some years ago. The English language is, nowadays, the language of international communication. Taking this into account, foreign language lessons acquire, nowadays, more significance than in the past. For that reason, English teaching should not be limited to the study of its structure, but to the use of the language in different contexts in order to be adapted to this new reality. (Díaz Merino, 2010). These days, we can observe how English language lessons try to fulfill the students’ needs for communication using different strategies and methodologies such as team teaching in the CLIL approach. This paper provides some theoretical background about the methodologies used in Spain in the past and the way in which we can adapt them to the current English lessons in order to help students raise their English language level as well as their academic results.

Keywords – CLIL Approach, Language Teaching in Spain, News Trends in Methodology.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Teaching Methods

The term *Teaching method* (teach.com) refers to the general principles, pedagogy and management strategies used for classroom instruction. Your choice of teaching method depends on what fits you — your educational philosophy, classroom demographic, subject area(s) and school mission statement. Teaching theories primarily fall into two categories or “approaches” — teacher-centered and student-centered.



Fig. 1. Teaching Methods (teach.com)

1.1. Teaching Styles

Grasha (1996) explains the three main teaching styles in educational pedagogy: direct instruction, inquiry-based learning and cooperative learning. She states that when applying these methods, teachers and instructors improve their students’ understanding considerably, manage better the classroom and get better connection with their students. We can observe in figs. 2, 3 and 4 these teaching styles:

1.1.1. Direct Instruction

Direct instruction is made through master classes, lectures and teacher-led demonstrations. Here, teachers and professors are the providers of knowledge and information.

Formal Authority	Expert	Personal Model
Formal Authority teachers are in a position of power and authority because of their exemplary knowledge and status over their students. Classroom management styles are traditional and focus on rules and expectations.	Expert teachers are in possession of all knowledge and expertise within the classroom. Their primary role is to guide and direct learners through the learning process. Student are viewed solely as the receptors of knowledge and information (“empty vessels.”)	Teachers who operate under the “Personal Model” style are those who lead by example, demonstrating to students how to access and comprehend information. In this teaching model, students learn through observing and copying the teacher’s process.

Fig. 2. Direct Instruction (teach.com)

1.1.2. Inquiry-Based Learning

Inquiry-based learning focuses on student research. The teacher is a facilitator; he/she provides guidance and support for students through the learning process getting students involved in the learning process as they play an active and participatory role.

Facilitator	Personal Model	Delegator
Facilitators place a strong emphasis on the teacher-student relationship. Operating under an open classroom model, there is a de-emphasis on teacher instruction, and both student and educator undergo the learning process together. Student learning loosely guided by the teacher, and is focused on fostering independence, hands-on learning, and exploration	Teachers who operate under the “Personal Model” style are those who lead by example, demonstrating to students how to access and comprehend information. In this teaching model, students learn through observing and copying the teacher’s process.	Teachers act as a “resource” to students, answering questions and reviewing their progress as needed. Teachers play a passive role in student’s learning; students are active and engaged participants in their learning. The main goal of a Delegator is to foster a sense of autonomy in the learning process.

Fig. 3. Inquiry-based learning (teach.com)

1.1.3. Cooperative Learning

Cooperative Learning stresses group work. This model fosters students’ academic and social growth. This type of learning is student-centered approach as learners are the only responsible of their of their learning and improvement.

Facilitator	Delegator
Facilitators place a strong emphasis on the teacher-student relationship. Operating under an open classroom model, there is a de-emphasis on teacher instruction, and both student and educator undergo the learning process together. Student learning loosely guided by the teacher, and is focused on fostering independence, hands-on learning, and exploration	Teachers act as a “resource” to students, answering questions and reviewing their progress as needed. Teachers play a passive role in student’s learning; students are active and engaged participants in their learning. The main goal of a Delegator is to foster a sense of autonomy in the learning process.

Fig. 4. Cooperative Learning (teach.com)

*Thanks to Research Group GRECA (project P1-1A2014-02)

II. LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS

We have already made a review of the different teaching methods. In the paper, we are going to examine the history of language teaching methods, as it will be very helpful to understand the nature of contemporary methods as well as to observe how modern method innovations are similar to the traditional ones. To finish with, we will do a critical review of the CLIL method.

These teaching methods are the following ones (Richards, J. and Rodgers, T., 1986):

- The Direct Method (the teaching is done entirely in the target language. The learner is not allowed to use his or her mother tongue. Grammar rules are avoided and there is emphasis on good pronunciation. Grammar-translation (learning is largely by translation to and from the target language. Grammar rules are to be memorized and long lists of vocabulary learned by heart)
- Audio-lingual (learning a language means acquiring habits. There is much practice of dialogues of every situations)
- The structural approach (language as a complex of grammatical rules, which are to be learned one at a time in a set order)
- Suggestopedia (a language can be acquired only when the learner is receptive and has no mental blocks)
- Total Physical Response (TPR) (learners respond to simple commands such as "Stand up", "Close your book", "Go to the window and open it." The method stresses the importance of aural comprehension)
- Communicative language teaching (CLT) (learners communicate effectively and appropriately in the various situations. The content of CLT courses are functions such as inviting, suggesting, complaining or notions such as the expression of time, quantity, location)
- The Silent Way (the aim of the teacher is to say as little as possible in order that the learner can be in control of what he wants to say. No use is made of the mother tongue)
- Community Language Learning (build strong personal links between the teacher and student so that there are no blocks to learning)
- Immersion (ESL students are immersed in the English language for the whole of the school day and expected to learn math, science, humanities etc. through the medium of the target language, English)
- Task-based language learning (completion of a task, which in itself is interesting to the learners. Learners use the language they already have to complete the task and there is little correction of errors)
- The Natural Approach (this approach stresses the similarities between learning the first and second languages. There is no correction of mistakes. Learning takes place by the students being exposed to language that is comprehensible or made comprehensible to them)
- The Lexical Syllabus (computer analysis of language, which identifies the most common words in the language and their various uses. The syllabus teaches these words in broadly the order of their frequency, and great emphasis is placed on the use of authentic materials)
- The Grammar- Translation Method (also known as the Classical Method, this is a traditional teaching technique that was used to teach Latin and Greek and was particularly in vogue during the 16th Century. The focus at this time was on the translation of texts, grammar, and rote learning of vocabulary. There was no emphasis on speaking and listening comprehension

because Latin and Greek were taught more as academic subjects rather than a means of oral communication)

- The Reform Movement (Dissatisfaction with the practice of teaching modern languages by such text-based methods came to a head in the *Reform Movement* of the 1880s-90s, among scholars and teachers in Germany, Scandinavia, France, and Britain who were interested in the practical possibilities of a science of speech)

2.1 Language Teaching Methods

2.1.1. The Direct Method

Parallel to the Reform Movement ideas was an interest for developing principles in language teaching as the ones that are seen in first language acquisition. These were called *natural methods*, and finally during the nineteenth and the twentieth century this new method was called the Direct Method. The Direct Method was based in an instruction exclusively in the target language since the mother tongue was not permitted. The vocabulary was taught through demonstration. The oral skills were organized around questions- answers between the teacher and the students. In opposition to the Grammar-Translation Method, grammar was taught inductively and speech and listening comprehension were taught. By the 1920s, the use of this method declined. Despite this decline, by the 1930s, applied linguists systematized principles proposed in the Reform Movement to teaching English as a foreign language. This led to other methods like the Audiolingualism.

2.1.2. The Audio-lingual Method

The origin of this method was due to the increased attention given to foreign language teaching in the United States at the end of the 1950s. This method took some principles from the Direct Method but added some features from American linguists. The Audio-lingual Method lasted from late 1950s to the 1960s. In this method, the language was divided in the four skills used when learning a language, in the following order: listening, speaking, reading and finally writing. Audio-lingual lessons were based on dialogues and drills. Dialogues were used for repetition and memorization. The correction of pronunciation, stress, rhythm and intonation were emphasized.

The decline of Audiolingualism was in the late 1960s. The theoretical foundations of Audiolingualism were attacked due to the changes in the American linguistic theory in the sixties. Chomsky (1966:153) argued that: "*language is not a habit structure. Ordinary linguistic behaviour characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences and patterns in accordance with rules of great abstractness and intricacy*".

In Spain, with the General Law of Education of the year 1970, the language teaching was influenced by the Audio-lingual methodology, and it can be observed in the text books of the *Primary Education*. The main objective of this new law was the acquisition of the four skills but giving more importance to the oral skills.

2.1.3. The Structural Approach

In the words of Menon and Patel (1971): "The structural approach is based on the belief that in the learning of a

foreign language, mastery of structures is more important than the acquisition of vocabulary.” This approach employs techniques of the direct method of teaching but the use of translation is not wholly discarded. Teaching is done in the situation. Speeches urge giving stress but reading and writing are not neglected. This approach is essentially what the term implies—an approach and not a method as such. Bhandari (1961) remarked: “It is not proper and correct to call the structural approach method of teaching. It is not a method in approach. Any method can be used with it.”

Speech and oral work are the core of the structural approach. French (1966) observes that “Oral work is the basis and all the rest are built on it.” Through speech, students learn to make direct connection between the English words or phrases and the object, action or idea, it hears. He learns the habit of using words in the correct sentence patterns and he can learn this in no other way.

The aspects of structural approach: *Word order* (primary importance in learning English language. It is the order of words in a pattern that makes true meaning clear. *Presence of function words* (essential use of function words or “structural words.”). *Use of small number of inflections* (make use of the small number of inflections). *Forming language habits* (the learner should acquire the habits of arranging words in English in standard sentence patterns through language drills). *Importance of speech* (speech as more important than reading and writing). *Importance of pupil’s activity* (emphasis on pupil’s activity than on the teachers. The learner must be actively involved in the teaching-learning process)

2.1.4. Suggestopedia

Suggestopedia is a method developed by Georgi Lozanov (1978). The main characteristics of this method were the decoration, furniture, and arrangement of classroom, the use of music, and the authoritative behavior of the teacher (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 142). The music was essential in this method since the intonation and the rhythm are the basis of the learning process. The main objective of this method was to make students achieve advanced conversational proficiency by the use of lists of vocabulary pairs, however according to Lozanov (1978: 251): “the main aim of teaching is not memorization, but the understanding and creative solution of problems”.

2.1.5. Total Physical Response (TPR)

Total Physical Response was a language teaching method built around the coordination of speech and action; it attempted to teach language through physical activity (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 87). The main objective of this method was to teach communication since comprehension was the most important aspect when learning a foreign language. The ultimate aim was to teach basic speaking skills. The main objective of this method was accomplished by using imperative drills to which the students had to answer with a physical response.

2.1.6. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

The origins of this method are in the late 1960s. It appeared as a reaction to the approach used at that time: the Situational Language Teaching, in which language was taught by practicing basic language structures. The main

objective of this new method was to acquire communicative proficiency rather than master some linguistic structures.

The Communicative Language Teaching was expanded in the 1970s and the main goals of this new approach were:

- Make communicative competence the goal of language teaching
- Develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 66)

In Spain, the Communicative Language Teaching Method influenced the *Organic Law of General Order in the Educative System* in the year 1990 since one of the main objectives of this new law was to enhance the students’ communicative competence, moreover, the four language skills had to be integrated during the learning process.

2.1.7. The Silent Way

The Silent Way is the name of a method developed by Caleb Gattegno (1972) and it was based on the fact that the teacher should be in silence and the student is the one that had to produce as much language as possible. In this method, the learning process was seen as a problem-solving activity in which the learner was the center of the classroom. The Silent Way method was focused on structure rather than communicative competence and the main goal was to achieve a near-native fluency and pronunciation.

2.1.8. Community Language Learning (CLL)

Community Language Learning (CLL) is an example of a method developed by Charles A. Curran (1972). In this method the teacher is seen as a counselor that gives advice and assistance in case of need, and the learners are seen as the clients who determine what is to be learned. In this method, the class atmosphere and the peer support were essentials in the process of learning. According to Maley (2013) “in the basic form of CLL, students (8 to 12 maximum) sit in a circle. There is a small portable tape recorder inside the circle. The teacher (who is termed the ‘Knower’) stands outside the circle. When a student has decided on something they want to say in the foreign language, they call the Knower over and whisper what they want to say, in their mother tongue. The teacher, also in a whisper, then offers the equivalent utterance in English and the student attempts to repeat the utterance”.

2.1.9. Immersion

According to Baker (1993), language immersion, or simply immersion, is a method of teaching a second language in which the learners’ second language (L2) is the medium of classroom instruction. Through this method, learners study school subjects, such as math, science, and social studies, in their L2. The objective is to foster bilingualism; this language learning method is meant to develop learners’ communicative competence or language proficiency in their L2 in addition to their first or native language (L1). Immersion programs vary from one country or region to another because of language conflict, historical antecedents, language policy or public opinion. Moreover, immersion programs take on different formats based on: class time spent in L2, participation by native

speaking (L1) students, learner age, school subjects taught in L2, and even the L2 itself as an additional and separate subject

2.1.10. *Task-based Language Learning*

Task-based learning (Willis 2007) offers an alternative for language teachers. In a task-based lesson, the lesson is based around the completion of a central task and the language studied is determined by what happens as the students complete it. The lesson follows certain stages.

Pre-task: The teacher introduces the topic and gives the students clear instructions on what they will have to do at the task stage and might help the students to recall some language that may be useful for the task. The pre-task stage can also often include playing a recording of people doing the task. This gives the students a clear model of what will be expected of them. The students can take notes and spend time preparing for the task.

Task: The students complete a task in pairs or groups using the language resources that they have as the teacher monitors and offers encouragement.

Planning: Students prepare a short oral or written report to tell the class what happened during their task. They then practice what they are going to say in their groups. Meanwhile the teacher is available for the students to ask for advice to clear up any language questions they may have.

Report: Students then report back to the class orally or read the written report. The teacher chooses the order of when students will present their reports and may give the students some quick feedback on the content. At this stage the teacher may also play a recording of others doing the same task for the students to compare.

Analysis: The teacher then highlights relevant parts from the text of the recording for the students to analyze. They may ask students to notice interesting features within this text. The teacher can also highlight the language that the students used during the report phase for analysis.

Practice: Finally, the teacher selects language areas to practice based upon the needs of the students and what emerged from the task and report phases. The students then do practice activities to increase their confidence and make a note of useful language.

2.1.11. *The Natural Approach*

The natural approach developed by Tracy Terrell and supported by Stephen Krashen, is a language teaching approach which claims that language learning is a reproduction of the way humans naturally acquire their native language. The approach adheres to a communicative approach to language teaching and rejects earlier methods. The situational language teaching approach which Krashen and Terrell (1983) believe is not based on "actual theories of language acquisition but theories of the structure of language". Krashen and Terrell view communication as the primary function of language, and adhere to a communicative approach to language teaching, focusing on teaching communicative abilities rather than sterile language structures. What really distinguishes the Natural approach from other methods and approaches are its premises concerning the use of language and the importance of vocabulary: Language is

viewed as a vehicle for communicating meaning and messages. Vocabulary is of paramount importance as language is essentially its lexicon.

2.1.12. *The Lexical Syllabus*

The lexical approach is a method of teaching foreign languages described by Michael Lewis (1993). The idea of this approach is that an important part of learning a language consists of being able to understand and produce lexical phrases as chunks. Students are thought to be able to perceive patterns of language (grammar) as well as have meaningful set uses of words at their disposal when they are taught in this way. In the lexical approach, instruction focuses on fixed expressions that occur frequently in dialogues, which Lewis claims make up a larger part of discourse than unique phrases and sentences. Vocabulary is prized over grammar *per se* in this approach.

2.1.13. *The Grammar- Translation Method*

Grammar Translation dominated European and foreign language teaching from 1840s to the 1940s and in modified form it continues to be widely used in some parts of the world today (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 4). This method was based on the approach used to teach classical languages, such as Latin. It was teacher-centered and the main objective was to learn grammar rules and lists of vocabulary. This method was focused on reading and writing skills since the communicative aspect was not considered important.

2.1.14. *The Reform Movement*

Toward the mid nineteenth century, the industrialization and the immigration increased the opportunities for communication among Europeans that created a demand for oral proficiency in foreign languages. Phonetics, the analysis and description of the sound systems of language, was established. Linguists emphasized that speech, rather than the written skill, was the primary form of language. The International Phonetic Association was founded in 1886 and its International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). The main ideas of the reformers were:

Spoken language is primary and should be reflected in oral-based methodologies

- The findings of phonetics should be applied to teaching
- Learners should hear the language first
- Grammar rules should be taught inductively
- Translation should be avoided (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 8)

Although this new methodology was accepted favorably in Europe, in Spain it was not applied until the beginning of the 1950s, this was due to the fact that the Spanish education had always preferred the deductive method.

III. THE CURRENT EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

As we have commented before, nowadays, the current education law is the *Organic Law of Education 2/2006*, on 3rd May. The main contribution of this new law was it introduced some competences highlighting, for example, the competence in linguistic communication. With this, we can observe how it points to the importance of developing the students' communicative competence as it occurred

during the 1960s and 1970s with the implementation of the Communicative Language Teaching Method, and as the European Union recommended during 1990s.

The current educational system is based on this law, and consequently, the main objective of nowadays foreign language lessons is to help students acquire a communicative competence through the four language skills. Nowadays, lessons do not follow only one of the methods previously presented, but they follow the eclectic approach, that is, they choose activities and strategies from different language teaching approaches and methods in order to suit for their own teaching purposes; but this idea is not a new one. The Eclectic Approach or Eclecticism was proposed as a reaction to the profusion of teaching methods in the 1970s and the 1980s, and nowadays it can be observed in almost all foreign language lessons since language teachers choose different strategies from all the methods explained when teaching. According to Nunan (1989; 1991: 228):

“It has been realized that there never was and probably never will be a method for all, and the focus in recent years has been on the development of classroom tasks and activities which are consonant with what we know about second language acquisition, and which are also in keeping with the dynamics of the classroom itself”

IV. CLIL APPROACH

The main purpose of using English as a foreign language is to make students develop a critical thinking in order to adopt a different vision of the English language. According to San Isidro (2010:55), our gradually more globalized present-day world, a world in which new political, economic, technological and social realities have merged, has created an evident need for new educational policies. In this world, the study of a foreign language should be adapted to this new reality. For this reason, the English language has become a universal language and it is used as a communicative tool in any current context. Taking into account all the things commented in the previous paragraph, it is necessary to adopt an approach to develop the use of the English language outside the English language classrooms. This approach is called CLIL. The CLIL Approach emerged during the 70s and also during the 80s, but the term CLIL was coined by David Marsh in 1994. The origin of this project was due to immersion programs in Canada and in the United States and to the language programs for specific purposes. It is important to notice that CLIL differs from language immersion programs because linguistic immersion programs are performed when the student is within the context of the foreign language, and therefore, all the subjects are in the foreign language, however, CLIL programs are performed in the context of the L1 and there are only some subjects that are developed in the foreign language (Casal, 2009). CLIL stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning, and it can be defined as a program that involves teaching a curricular subject such as Math, History or Science through an additional language, a foreign language or a second

language. Moreover, Marsh (2000:2, 2010) defined CLIL as:

“This approach involves learning subjects such as History, Geography or others, through an additional language. It can be very successful in enhancing the learning of languages and other subjects, and developing in the youngsters a positive “can do” attitude towards themselves as language learners.”

Finally, the last definition about this approach came from the hands of the European Commission of Languages (2013): *“Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) involves teaching a curricular subject through the medium of a language other than that normally used.”*

According to Coyle (1999) a well-planned CLIL lesson should combine the 4Cs of the curriculum, these are the following ones:

- **Content:** enabling progress in the knowledge, skills and understanding of the specific issues of a particular curriculum.
- **Communication:** using language to learn while learning to use language itself.
- **Cognition:** developing thinking skills which link concept formation, knowledge and language.
- **Culture:** allowing exposure to diverse perspectives and shared knowledge that make us more aware of the others and oneself.

In Europe, the practice of the CLIL Approach is being spread quickly. In that situation, Spain is one of the European leaders using this method (Lasagabaster et al. 2010: viii). □ Although the application of this method has increased in Spain in the last few years, we have some differences in the characteristics of implementation depending on the autonomous region we select (Navés and Muñoz, 1999). That is to say, we can divide Spain's autonomous regions in two types: the monolingual communities and the bilingual communities (Lasagabaster et al. (2010).

Following the search for effective CLIL programmes, Navés (2009) establishes a set of parameters and conditions that should be followed so as to develop adequate CLIL policies. Firstly, the learners' culture and L1 need to be respected, since they represent a significant influence in the foreign language learning. Secondly, teachers in charge of the CLIL instruction are required to be bilingual or multilingual and completely trained, and it is convenient that they hold a stable position within the educational institution. Thirdly, the target language should be integrated and contextualised within the classroom. Additionally, students' parents need not only to be implicated and support the CLIL implementation, but also to collaborate with teachers. Finally, assessment and materials utilised when dealing with CLIL contexts have to be planned carefully. Furthermore, Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols (2008) also suggest that this focus on students' teaching-learning centred approach increases motivation, being fun and challenging.

Another decisive aspect that needs to be taken into account when implementing CLIL programmes successfully lies in the fact that teachers are required to be teachers of both language and content simultaneously

(Cummins 1994). Since this condition is hardly viable, maybe team teaching is the more appropriate methodology to be adopted.

Team teaching can be defined as a collaborative and 'pedagogical method in which teachers of the same or of different subject areas co-operate in the planning, realisation and further development of an educational course, programme, etc.' (Kaseva et al. 2006: 6). Hence, it involves mutual support and learning from and with each other, especially from the language teacher towards the content teacher, in the form of development of content terminology and materials, and advising on how the linguistic issues should be assessed (Pavón-Vázquez & Ellison 2013). This is an extremely usual situation that occurs when imparting CLIL lessons, since content teachers are neither native speakers nor experts in the foreign language.

V. CONCLUSION

The main objective of this study comes from: one hand, the social changes, and the new typology of students in the high-schools and on the other hand, the importance that communication and the foreign languages have in our everyday life, as well as the importance that ICT and Internet have nowadays. For these reasons, it is fully justified to implement new projects and programmes in the classrooms. According to the current law of education, *Spanish Law of Education LOE 2/2006*, on 3rd May, the main objective of nowadays foreign language lessons is to help students acquire a communicative competence through the four language skills.

CLIL is an innovative methodological approach that aims to foster the integrated learning of languages and other curricular contents. The multilingual condition of Europe and its members together with the current tendency of globalisation and mobility have originated an increasing development of CLIL in many countries. Besides, it has been proved that CLIL benefits and bolsters learners' foreign language skills as well as motivation and attention. Nonetheless, the correct implementation of CLIL implies reinforcement in areas such as teacher training, team teaching, education and assessment planning, and additional resources.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [2] Casal, S. (2009) *AICLE: Implicaciones Pedagógicas* <http://www.slideshare.net/hermes2g/aicle-implicaciones-pedagogicas> (accessed on 02/09/2013)
- [3] Chomsky, N. (1966). *Linguistic theory*. London: Oxford University Press
- [4] Coyle, D. (1999) "The next stage? Is there a Future for the Present? The legacy of the communicative approach." *Francophonie*, No 19, pp13-16
- [5] Curran, C. A. (1972) *Counseling-Learning: A Whole-Person Model for Education*. New York : Grune and Stratton
- [6] Cummins, Jim. 1994. Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as a second language. In Fred Genesse (ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*, 33-58. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Díaz Merino, L. (2010) "AICLE-CLIL-EMILE." <http://www.cprceuta.es/Asesorias/Idiomas/archivos/Pale/FOLLETOS%20Y%20TROS/FOLLETO%20ENFOQUE%20AICLE%20L.pdf> (accessed on 23/08/2013)
- [8] European Commission of Languages (2013) http://ec.europa.eu/languages/language-teaching/content-and-language-integrated-learning_en.htm (accessed on 02/09/2013)
- [9] French.F.G. (1966). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford University Press.
- [10] Gattegno, C. (1972) *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: The Silent Way*. (2nd edition) New York: Educational Solutions
- [11] Kaseva, Petra & Karen Schwartz (eds.). 2006. *Content and language integrated learning. Team teaching. CLIL-AXIS*. Helsinki: Prima Oy.
- [12] Krashen and Terrell (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press. 183pp.
- [13] Lewis, Michael (1993) *The Lexical Approach*.
- [14] Lozanov, G. (1978) *Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedya*. New York: Gordon and Breach
- [15] Marsh, D. (1994) *Bilingual Education & Content and Language Integrated Learning. International Association for Cross-cultural Communication, Language Teaching in the Member States of the European Union (Lingua)*. University of Sorbonne: Paris
- [16] Marsh, D. (2000) "Using languages to learn and learning to use languages" in Marsh, D. and Langé, D. (eds.) University of Jyväskylä: Finland [available at <http://www.tieclil.org/html/products/pdf/%201%20UK.pdf>] (accessed on 02/09/2013)
- [17] Marsh, D. (2002) "CLIL/EMILE- The European dimension. Action, trends and foresight potential." Contract DG/EAC: European Commission. University of Jyväskylä: Finland
- [18] Marsh, D. (2010) *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated: Feedback*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [19] Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. and Frigols, M. J. (2008) *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan Books for Teachers
- [20] Menon and Patel. (1971). *The Teaching of English As a Foreign Language (Structural Approach)*, Acharya Book Depot Baroda
- [21] Muñoz, C. and Navés, T. (2007) "Windows on CLIL: Spain" in Malijers, A., Marsh, D. and Wolff, D. (eds.) *Windows on CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in the European Spotlight*. The Hague, European Platform for Dutch Education.
- [22] Navés, T. and Victori, M. (2010) "CLIL in Catalonia: An Overview of Research Studies" in Lasagabaster, D. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.) *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- [23] Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [24] Nunan, D. (1991) *Language Teaching Methodology*. New York: Prentice Hall
- [25] Richards, J. C. and Rogers, T. (1986) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [26] Richards, J. C. and Rogers, T. (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd edition) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [27] Willis, D. and Willis, J. (2007). 'Doing Task-Based Teaching' by Dave and Jane Willis, OUP 2007. Also see www.willis-elt.co.uk
- [28] Pavón Vázquez, Víctor; Ellison, Maria (2013) - Examining teacher roles and competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) L I N G V A R V M A R E N A - VOL. 4 -- 65 - 78
- [29] Navés, T. and Muñoz, C. (1999) "Implementation of CLIL in Spain" in Marsh, D. and G. Langé (eds.) *Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning*. University of Jyväskylä: Finland.
- [30] Lasagabaster, D. and Ruiz de Zorbe, Y. (2010) *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

AUTHOR'S PROFILE



María Luisa Renau Renau was born in Castellón, Spain. She holds a degree in English and German philology since 1993 in the Valencian University, Spain. In 2004 she obtained her PhD with honour in the Universitat Jaume I, Castellón, Spain. She is a full-time professor in the English Studies Department at Universitat Jaume I in Castellón, Spain. She has been teaching ESP for 16 years, mainly Computer Engineering courses. Moreover, she supervises students' Final Degree Dissertations in the English Studies Degree and also, she is actively involved in the master from the English Department supervising Final Master Dissertations with the topic of ICTs (Innovation and Communication Technologies) and the CLIL approach. Her main research is in the ICTs, especially in the ESP courses and also connected to the CLIL approach. Furthermore, she has been an active member in the Cognitive Linguistics research group (GRESCA) for five years where she has several relevant publications in this field.