Chapter 2

Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on CLIL by first examining its history. It then discusses the theoretical background of present-day CLIL research. It then discusses the growth of CLIL in the Western world and Asia, focusing on the growth of CLIL in India. Finally, it discusses the relationship between CLIL and other close approaches in language teaching.

2.2 Historical background of CLIL

According to Mehisto et al., (2008) and Hamaluba et al., (2023) , the term CLIL was first coined in Europe in 1994. CLIL has a long history, dating back to the Akkadians (about 5000 years ago in modern-day Iraq) when the conquerors first practised CLIL exercises. The Akkadians who subjugated the Sumerians employed Sumerian, the local language, to teach various subjects, including theology, botany, and zoology.

Adrián (2011) shared how similar instances of using CLIL and the activities have been practised with the Latin language, where Latin was the language of instruction in European universities for centuries. Latin became the primary language of law, medicine, theology, Science and philosophy. The immersion programmes in Canada, the content-based language teaching in the US, and bilingual education are good examples of using CLIL activities to teach language and content.

Adrián (2011) shared how "the immersion programmes in Quebec were devoted to English-speaking children who needed to learn French, the official language in Quebec" (p.94).

Brinton et al., (1989) and Snow et al., (1989) had shared that Content-based language instruction was also used in language teaching classes in the United States during the 1980s. The goal was to provide alternatives to classroom approaches employed with immigrant students.

Coyle et al. (2010) shared how content was always the forerunner when compared with language and how there was a curiosity and need to find an approach or a method to teach language and content together to build familiarity with a language. The approach or method had to improve the language skills and abilities of the learners.

'Bilingual education' became popular in the United States and Europe during the 1980s and 1990s. Grenfell (2004) mentioned how all EU member states approved a resolution aimed at improving the quality and variety of language teaching/learning across the EU. According to Adrián (2011) and Martínez & Gutiérrez (2015) CLIL originated in the 1990s as an umbrella word for several types of learning methodologies in which language plays a vital role in addition to studying any specific subject or material. Several European scholars and agencies have used this phrase as a generic term for such projects.

Coyle et al. (2010) shared how language cognisance gained importance in the later part of the 1990s and how language learning became prominent. This change of view in academic understanding led to the rise and strengthening of CLIL. The growth of CLIL was further exalted, with CLIL being viewed as a time-saving approach. CLIL facilitates teaching content and language together, which helps manage the hours assigned in the curriculum to teach language and content in a given course.

According to Mehisto et al., (2008) teaching content in the non-native language without weakening the command of the mother tongue spread all over Canada, the United States and the rest of the world.

From the 1960s to around 1998, about 300,000 "Canadian children participated yearly in such a programme" (Marsh, 2002, p.56).

In 2005, "there were 317 dual immersion programs in US elementary schools, providing instruction in 10 languages" (Potowski, 2007, p. 2).

As noted by Marsh et al., (2001) and Kovács (2014) David Marsh coined the acronym CLIL in 1994 when he was a team member at the Finnish University of Jyväskylä. Marsh (2012) states that "the European launch of CLIL during 1994 was both political and educational. The political driver was based on a vision that mobility across the EU required higher levels of language competence in designated languages than was found to be the case at that time. The educational driver, influenced by other

major bilingual initiatives such as in Canada, was to design and otherwise adapt existing language teaching approaches so as to provide a wide range of students with higher levels of competence" (p. 1).

Kovács (2014) reported that the 2000s witnessed the expansion of CLIL to other countries. Marsh proposed CLIL in 2005 as a general 'umbrella' term to refer to numerous techniques that lead to dual-focussed education where attention is given to both the topic and the language of instruction. Eurydice (2006) reported on the rapid expansion and spread of CLIL in 2006. Coyle et al. (2010) described how CLIL merged language and content, making it accessible to all segments of society.

Marsh (2012) had mentioned that CLIL research has grown over the previous decade, although it has focused on the linguistic rather than the non-linguistic aspects of CLIL. According to Coyle et al., (2010) and Mehisto et al., (2008) multidisciplinary CLIL research has increasingly focused on students' learning techniques and thinking skills.

The CLIL approach is no longer European but has spread far and wide to countries such as Germany, Argentina, Poland, Spain, Thailand, Malaysia, and India, to name a few.

2.3 Theoretical Underpinnings

In this section, the researcher shares the theories of language and learning that helped in the theoretical foundation of this research and are a part of the theoretical framework of the CLIL approach.

Interactional Model:

Rivers (1987) described the interactive approach in language learning as pupils becoming proficient in a language when their focused energy is directed towards sending and receiving real messages.

Richards and Rodgers (2016, p. 24) shared that the interactional model "sees language as a vehicle for the realisation of interpersonal relations and for the performance of social transactions between individuals." In this model of language education, language is a tool used to create and maintain social relations. Moreover, since the 1980s, 'interaction' has been central to second language learning theories.

These 'interactions' and 'negotiation of meanings', central to the interactive language education model, are also a significant part of the CLIL approach. In CLIL, language is also viewed as the vehicle for learning content. In CLIL, "Language is text and discourse- based. Learning how language is used in disciplinary - based genres is central to CBI (Content- Based Instruction) and CLIL" Richards and Rodgers (2016, 120- 121). For the CLIL approach, interaction is necessary for learning. The CLIL method has benefited from the interactional model due to its emphasis on the importance of peer and teacher-student interactions in the classroom, which are critical to the CLIL approach's effective implementation.

Sociocultural model:

Dale and Tanner (2012) stated that sociocultural theory integrates with language learning, culture, and cognition. Social interaction is the core force of this theory, which views "language as a communicative activity in which the social context is central" (Richards & Rodgers, 2016, p. 24).

The CLIL technique relies heavily on language comprehension to convey material. Thus, as shared by Lyster (2011) the purpose of teachers in any form of content-based programme is to help students understand the curriculum delivered in the second language.

Williams and Burden (1997) shared that sociocultural theory views education as a strategic improvement in learning and skill development, building on the individual learning experience and development.

The sociocultural model has greatly improved the CLIL approach by highlighting the vital roles that social contact, cultural context, and collaborative learning play in language acquisition. Through meaningful communication in the target language with peers and teachers, this method enables students to acquire a better appreciation of their subject matter while developing intercultural competency.

Genre Model:

The genre-based approach is a functional language model in which language is "a resource for making meaning". This resource is said to "consist of a set of interrelated systems," and language users "draw and create" understanding and meaning when they

use language. This approach's text is "shaped by the social context" by the people and the context of use and usage (Richards and Rodgers, 2016, p.25; Feez, 1998, p.5).

Genre is an area of human functioning and learning, and learning to use language in a disciplinary-based genre is at the core of the CLIL approach.

Llinares et al., (2012) shared, "Students need to understand and participate in the activities that build up the disciplines they study, activities that to a large extent are carried out through language" (p. 109).

The CLIL approach has benefited immensely from the genre model's provision of an organized framework. The learners' comprehension and production of content-related language in the target language have improved their understanding of the linguistic features and conventions required to communicate within each subject.

Lexical Model:

The Lexical Model of language "prioritises the role of lexis and lexical chunks or phrases in language and highlights the interrelatedness of grammar and vocabulary" (Richards & Rodgers, 2016, p. 25).

Llinares et al. (2012) shared, "One special feature of learning a second language in CLIL contexts is that the vocabulary needed to represent content in the instructional register is often technical and abstract, in contrast with the type of vocabulary necessary to communicate in foreign language classes" (p.191).

As CLIL integrates language and content, specialised vocabulary registers are essential for understanding and conveying meaning. Subject-specific vocabulary is crucial in the CLIL classroom.

The CLIL approach has greatly benefited from the lexical model's emphasis on vocabulary learning. The reason for this is that it makes it possible for students to successfully access and understand subject-specific content in the target language, which is crucial for learning in a CLIL setting.

Social Constructivism:

Cummins (2005) describes the Social Constructivism theory of learning, which highlights the primacy of student experience and the significance of supporting active student learning over passive knowledge intake.

This paradigm emphasises "interactive, mediated, and student-led learning" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 28).

According to this theory as mentioned by Richards & Rodgers (2016) learning occurs in a specific social setting (e.g., a classroom), in which people (teachers and students) interact with objects (texts, books, images) and culturally organised activities and events (instructional acts and sequences).

Dale and Tanner (2012) stated that this theory confirms that learning should be viewed as a social exercise that progresses through interactions. Leeds (2009) shared that social constructivism is a theory of society and communication that accesses a learner's growth based on their understanding of people and situations.

Scaffolding is integral to the social constructivist classroom, as it helps in classroom interactions. According to Gibbons (2002), scaffolding is the temporary assistance provided by a teacher to a learner in order for the learner to be able to do a similar job on their own.

According to Richards & Rodgers (2016) and Swain et al., (2010) scaffolding in the classroom is the process of interaction between two or more persons while carrying out a classroom task in which one person (for example, the trainer or fellow learner) has more advanced knowledge than the other. CLIL and a few other approaches attribute and acknowledge the importance of scaffolding in learning. "In CLIL contexts, teachers' scaffolding is even more necessary as students need to process and express complex ideas in a foreign language" (Llinares et al., 2012, p. 91).

The CLIL approach has benefited immensely from social constructivism's emphasis on collaborative learning, where students actively acquire knowledge via interaction and discussion. With this method, students can improve their language proficiency and

comprehension of the material, making the learning process more engaging and significant.

Collaborative Learning:

Kagan (1994) described collaborative learning as a group activity for sharing information. Olsen & Kagan (1992) described Cooperative Language Learning or Collaborative Learning is a group learning activity in which learners are held accountable for their own learning and motivated to improve the learning of others.

Collaborative Learning (CL) has influenced the present study as it aids in fostering critical thinking, cooperation, and the development of "communicative competence through socially structured interaction activities" (Richards & Rodgers, 2016, p. 248). The group-based procedure used in CL fosters positive interdependence, individual accountability, and social skills, motivating learners and making them accountable for their learning. The role of materials in CL is not only limited to information sharing but also helps bring variation to the class and is purpose-driven.

Collaborative learning has been extremely beneficial to the CLIL approach by giving students a natural environment to practice and enhance their language abilities through conversation, greater comprehension, active engagement, and allowing students to support one another.

Aside from the theories, the individual factors play a significant role. Richards & Rodgers (2016) state that "Individual learners' characteristics can have a significant impact on learning, and teaching approaches frequently attempt to account for these characteristics. These include learning style preferences (such as whether a learner likes to learn in groups or prefers learning alone); affective factors such as shyness, anxiety, enthusiasm, and other emotions that language learning may elicit and that may influence the learner's willingness to communicate; motivation, which refers to the learners' attitude, desire, interest in, and willingness to invest effort in learning a second language; learning strategies- the ways in which learners plan, manage, and evaluate their own learning- for example, monitoring their language development over time and identifying area that need additional effort and improvement." (p. 28)

The CLIL approach addresses individual learning factors and matches teaching strategies to learning styles.

2.4 Expansion of CLIL

According to Marsh et al.,(2001) the term CLIL was adopted in 1994. "CLIL is an educational approach in which various language-supportive methodologies are used which lead to a dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given both to language and the content" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 3).

A few reasons for the expansion of the CLIL approach are:

- Accepting and applying Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles applied in real-world classroom scenarios. Richards & Rogers (2016) had mentioned that a describing element of CLT is that educational institutions should focus on real communication and information exchange: the ideal scenario for second language learning would be one in which the subject area of language teaching was content rather than grammatical structures or functions or an alternate language-based unit of organisation, i.e. subject matter that transcends the domain of language.

- CLIL promotes bilingualism. The European Commission's policy increased CLIL-based programmes in Europe. The white paper 'Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society of the European Commission' in 1995 reflected that "a stated objective was the '1 +2 policy', that is, for EU citizens to have competence in their mother tongue plus two Community foreign languages" (Llinares et al., 2012, p.1). Coyle et al. (2010, p.8) cited "four reasons" for the spread of CLIL in Europe, which can be summed as competence in at least one foreign language expected by families, language education improvement pushed by governments, the foundation of economic strength and far-reaching inclusion promoted by the European Commission, and lastly the potential for languages education integration with various subjects.

- CLIL promotes convergence. CLIL is a hybrid strategy that combines language and subject learning and is tied to the convergence process. Convergence includes the merging of previously fragmented pieces, such as curriculum subjects. In this area, CLIL pioneers new ground (Coyle et al., 2010; Pérez, 2019).

- Coyle et al., (2010) and Korbek & Wolf (2020) stated that the CLIL approach helps to pool knowledge and skills to promote interconnected innovation in learning. Globalisation affected trade and commerce during the 1990s and pushed educational insight to reach higher degrees. Thus, this impact of globalisation increased the search for better language and communication approaches, which would yield outcomes. CLIL is not just a convenient reaction to the issues provided by fast globalisation; alternatively, it is a contemporary solution, in accordance with greater social perspectives, and has proven beneficial.

- Integration has become the solidifying essence of education in today's world. The CLIL approach accommodates integrating language and content, cultural elements, and socio-economic attributions of its learners to champion its relevance in contemporary education. The global escalations of the CLIL approach "has surprised even its most ardent advocates" (Maljers et al., 2007, p. 7).

- "CLIL methodology, with its synthesis of content and communication, is based on the concept that these two are inseparable, and this synergy accounts for its success in the classrooms" (Lal & George, 2021, p. 31).

2.5 World-view

This section briefly shares the understanding of CLIL from countries where the CLIL approach is prevalent.

The CLIL approach has seen steady progress over the years. CLIL offers learners, regardless of their age, a natural language development situation that grows on other methods and ways of learning. This method of language development is seen to boost the motivation of learners and their inclination towards learning languages. Marsh & Langé (2000) shared that this naturalness appears to be one of the primary foundations for CLIL's importance and success in language and other academic areas.

2.5.1   The Western Context of CLIL

In Argentina, CLIL has expanded in a very encouraging manner with the help of the teachers. The teachers' content knowledge, integrated with language learning, is

beneficial for the learners. Banegas (2016) suggested that "teachers" played a vital role in creating lessons that integrated content and language (pp. 7-36).

Banegas (2015) shared that the CLIL approach was language-driven in the secondary and tertiary levels of education. Also, cognition was given importance along with language and content among CLIL practitioners in Argentina.

Research on CLIL in Spain has consistently highlighted the approach's benefits. In Spain, the European Union, in 1990, decided to promote languages using CLIL. Tsuchiya & Perez Murrilo (2015) were certain that "CLIL in Spain" was employed because language skills were necessary (pp. 23-25). Aguilar & Munoz (2013) shared how the "CLIL experience" was more advantageous for less proficient students, unlike the common perception (pp. 1-18). Tsuchiya & Perez Murillo (2015) shared how CLIL was employed in Spain as language skills were considered necessary to develop understanding in diverse communities and encourage citizens to be the people of the world. In Spain, CLIL is believed to help students with the process of globalisation.

Breidbach & Viebrock (2012) shared that CLIL was started in Germany after the Franco-German treaty in 1963 to encourage international relations. From being an elite approach to being promoted at all levels and the local government, CLIL in Germany broke the odds. A movement towards progress is the way the CLIL approach is used in Germany. Breidbach & Viebrock (2012) stated that CLIL research in Germany focused on content, learners, motivation, skills and linguistic differences among learners; moreover, the progress of CLIL in the country was on a positive path.

In Poland, CLIL is not just limited to English; Papaja shared how "German, Spanish, Italian, French, and English are used to teach CLIL" (Papaja, 2012, pp. 28-56). Poland has proudly housed several types of research on CLIL, which has helped in the growth of the approach. Papaja carried out a study to understand the advantages and disadvantages faced by the students of CLIL. The results suggested that the students found CLIL advantageous and satisfactory for future related opportunities and goals. The "CLIL students in Poland" are in a beneficial position and are happy with the approach (Papaja, 2012, pp. 28-56).

According to Pokrivčáková et al. (2015), "Finland was also among the first nations to respond to the challenge of CLIL, specifically inside its city of Jyväskylä. The ministry of education has recommended the expansion of CLIL since 1989. But the first experiences were collected during an experiment in 1990. Due to its positive results and new education legislation, this kind of teaching has continued. In 1992, Finland introduced Swedish immersion classes. In 1993, some schools offered French content-based classes, followed by German and Russian language classes a year later. In 1996 CLIL programmes had been launched in 251 Finnish schools (179 primary and 72 secondary schools). The legislation allows the schools to choose freely how they will apply CLIL" (p. 11).

Pokrivčáková et al. (2015) found that CLIL in the Czech Republic began in the 1990s with initiatives from the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, the National Institute for Education, and the National Institute for Further Education. In accordance with the EU Action Plan on Languages (2004-2006), the Czech national education plan contained an offer for every teacher to be educated in CLIL through pre-service training at universities or in-service training offered by ministerial institutions. The National Institute for Education supported CLIL by creating online content (Foreign languages across the primary curriculum), which was released in 2006.

CLIL had a positive effect on writing compared to non-CLIL pupils (Lasagabaster, 2008). In a literature review, Dalton-Puffer (2007) notes that CLIL learners enhance their speech and vocabulary, particularly jargon.

According to Lasagabaster (2008), CLIL is thought to help prepare students for international experiences, increase motivation to learn, improve intercultural communicative ability, provide possibilities for "implicit and incidental learning" (p. 32), facilitate progressed communication, and contribute to the development of all language skills and systems, particularly speaking.

According to Lasagabaster (2008), CLIL also helps with pronunciation. Lasagabaster (2011) identified that CLIL has a good impact on learner motivation, a critical aspect of learning. Lorenzo et al., (2010) shared inputs from CLIL research where the mother tongue is affected in a positive way by the application and teaching of CLIL.

2.5.2   *The Asian Context of CLIL*

In Asia, the countries of Thailand, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Japan have extensively contributed to the growth and research of CLIL as an approach.

The CLIL approach was introduced in Thailand in 2006 due to a partnership between the Thai Education Ministry and the British Council. Suwannoppharat and Chinokul (2015) stated that the success of CLIL resulted from the active learners and teachers and depended on a well-planned and prepared application. It was further stated how CLIL produced lifelong learners who are motivated, confident and can collaborate in real life. Research shared that CLIL helps learners improve their language skills, vocabulary and grammatical knowledge.

According to Yang & Gosling (2013) in Taiwan, the education ministry began marketing CLIL at the tertiary level in 2011. Research is quite active in Taiwan, which provides the impetus for the necessary changes. Research has shown that CLIL has successfully improved the language and content of the learners in terms of understanding and application.

According to Yasin et al., (2010) in Malaysia, the Ministry of Education framed the CLIL policy in 2003 to develop the students' proficiency in English and implemented it at the primary, secondary, and higher education levels. The education ministry has done all it can to ensure the success of CLIL, such as issuing resources and more, as highlighted by Yasin et al. (2010). Numerous research studies carried out in Malaysia have shown the positive impact CLIL has had on learners' language learning.

Tsuchiya & Perez Murillo (2015) had mentioned that in Japan, CLIL was said to have been introduced as a response to economic gains. Many prominent universities have accepted CLIL to teach subjects such as health sciences, environmental sciences, and English for Academic Purposes.

Research has also been quite active in Japan, which suggests the rise of CLIL at all academic levels. According to Tsagkari (2019), using CLIL can be a successful option for overcoming Japanese students' lack of enthusiasm, limited English input, and poor language performance. Parsons & Caldwell (2016) and Koike

(2018) shared how studies have found encouraging evidence of student engagement in the English language in CLIL teaching environments.

Koike (2018) completed a case study in which CLIL was used to teach English to students who were completing their major in Regional Development Studies. It was discovered that they were less reluctant to speak openly in the classroom at the end of the course. Parsons & Caldwell (2016) evaluated the introduction of CLIL at a Japanese university and observed that working in groups with peers increased students' motivation to study. Ohmori (2014) mentioned that the Saitama Medical University and Sophia University were the first Japanese universities to incorporate CLIL into their curricula. Tsagkari (2019) shared how implementing CLIL in English education in Japan encourages bilingual education, develops the student's intercultural communicative skills, broadens their minds, and encourages them to look at things from different perspectives.

2.5.2.1   CLIL in India. In India, the adoption of CLIL is in the growing stages, which is different from the greater acceptance and development in most of the developed world.

Vency and Ramganesh (2013) conducted a study at the secondary level in which English and Science were taught through CLIL. This study demonstrated that "language learning was possible by using Science and employing the CLIL approach" (pp. 31-47). Marbaniang (2016) conducted PhD research on CLIL among the Khasi tribe in Meghalaya. The research tested the approach and found significant improvements in the demonstrable outcomes of English Language education among the Khasis in Meghalaya. Lal and George suggested that the content and language teachers should add more depth to their existing knowledge for CLIL to be successful in India. They stated that the teachers should learn about other subjects, too, as it would help them as "CLIL teachers" (Lal & George, 2017, pp. 32-41). In her master's thesis, Makiranta (2014) highlights the lack of suitable CLIL materials in several countries. The problem looms even more in India as the CLIL approach is not practised widely. Sunil (2018) conducted PhD research on CLIL in at the school level. The research tested the CLIL approach in developing speaking skills among secondary-level learners. The research did bring to light how authentic CLIL materials can be used to help learners improve their speaking

skills and even shared the areas of improvement and research that the CLIL approach requires in India.

An important CLIL project named CLIL@INDIA was running in India from 2016 to 2018 and was co-funded by the Erasmus + Programme of the European Union. The project centre was at the Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka. The CLIL@INDIA project was a three-year project that aimed to introduce CLIL methodology and pedagogy to the Indian educational system, especially at the school level. The Project aimed to develop a new bilingual education model by adapting the CLIL approach to the Indian context. The Project started the study of CLIL adaptation by using pilot CLIL modules in primary schools- both in the public and private sectors. It also tried to disseminate knowledge to relevant stakeholders such as academia, non-profit education organisations, and policymakers. The Project began in 2016 and focused on six languages: English, Hindi, Kannada, Tamil, Marathi, and Punjabi. The team at CLIL@INDIA had on board ex-state level teachers as their associates, who were providing much-needed support for the lesson plans. Activities played a significant role in classroom teaching, and the research associates were assigned to create charts, presentations, and other enjoyable activities for all schools. The results from the intervention showcased that CLIL, as a new educational approach, can address multilingualism in a much better way and that, with the right impetus, it can be an alternative approach to the present education system in India.

India has witnessed a growth in CLIL research since 2010. According to George's (2019) research, the technique of the CLIL approach was helpful in improving language production skills among diploma students in English. The study focused on students pursuing their technical diploma in Kerala.

Kothuri's (2019) research findings revealed how contextual knowledge of word usage and vocabulary growth through the CLIL intervention helped learners enhance their language proficiency and overall performance.

In the research findings, Theporal (2018) noted how respondents benefited from the CLIL strategy, which linked speaking skills with content material.

2.6 The relation between CLIL and CBI

Content-based instruction (CBI) is an approach "in which teaching is organised around the content or subject matter that students will acquire, such as history or social studies, rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus" (Richards & Rodgers, 2016, p. 116).

The CBI and CLIL approaches have similarities but differ in focus, which may be confusing. Graddol (2006) mentioned how both approaches are part of the growing trend of advocating the English language as a medium for instruction.

The CLIL curriculum is based on language classes, where the content teacher uses a second or foreign language to teach the content and may also use content from language classes. However, in CBI, the learning process begins with the goals set for the content class in which the language and content teachers co-teach a course. CBI had organic growth and emerged as an approach, whereas CLIL was an approach proposed in the European Commission policy paper. Both approaches encourage multilingualism. However, CLIL also aims to ensure the freedom and wellness of native languages.

Richards and Rodgers (2016) stated, "People learn second language more successfully when they use the language as a means of understanding content, rather than as an end in itself. This principle distinguishes CBI and CLIL from conventional language courses where language syllabus is used as the basis for organisation and content is chosen according to how well it supports a linguistic syllabus" (p. 118).

While CBI focuses on developing academic skills in subject areas and improving existing English language skills, CLIL aims to develop "intercultural communication skills, oral communication skills, and target language competence" (Brinton et al.,1989, p. 32).

Thus, Lasagabaster (2008), Chansri & Wasanasomsithi (2016) shared that the most crucial difference between CBI and CLIL lies in the priority given to both language and content in the CLIL approach along with the integration of communication, cognition, culture and content in the classes.

2.7 Conclusion

The studies carried out in India and across Asia has strengthened the claim that the CLIL approach goes beyond teaching of content and language in isolation, but involves seeking to integrate them in harmony. This aspect of the CLIL approach makes it different from the other approaches like the immersion or content-based instruction techniques of language acquisition. The CLIL approach works towards harmonising language and content-based learning.

This approach is very clear about how a learner cannot improve their content knowledge without language. CLIL aids the learning and use of the target language effectively while gaining content knowledge. CLIL classes help learners achieve academic growth along with the development of intercultural understanding, critical thinking and social skills. This approach can be a means to introduce learners to the world around them by working on their confidence, motivation, and intercultural competence.

This chapter explained the theoretical underpinnings and expansion of CLIL worldwide. It started with a brief historical background of CLIL, moving towards the theoretical approaches used in this research and their relation with the CLIL approach. Next, the reasons behind the expansion of CLIL were shared briefly, followed by how CLIL is viewed around the world. Finally, it concluded with the relationship between CLIL and CBI. The next chapter discusses the research methodology of the study in detail.