

CLIL in the General Education Classes in the University of the Philippines: Establishing the Reading-Writing Connection

by Lalaine F. Yanilla Aquino

University of the Philippines (Manila, Philippines)

Introduction

General Education (GE) English courses in the University of the Philippines lend themselves to the CLIL approach. Drawing inspiration and guidance from Rosenblatt's Transactional Theory of Reading and Writing, this paper illustrates how the establishment of the reading-writing connection facilitates the teaching and learning of both language and content in the GE classes and how all five elements of CLIL (content, cognition, communication, community, and competence) are made real and more contextualized through this reading-writing connection.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is said to be a predominantly European movement (Costa & Coleman, 2010) and is defined simply as "a dual-focused approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language with the objective of promoting both content and language mastery to pre-defined levels" (Maljers et al. as cited in Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, & Frigols-Martín, 2010, p. 11). CLIL has also become an "umbrella term for a myriad of bi/multilingual educational settings" (Smit & Dafouz, 2012, p. 1) and such educational settings usually combine five elements: content, cognition, competence, community, and communication (Marsh, 2014). Though a survey of online articles and studies on CLIL and a survey of studies (theses and dissertations) on language and literacy development in the last two decades in the University of the Philippines (UP) both did not yield anything on CLIL in the Philippine context, this article aims to show how CLIL is used as an approach in UP GE classrooms. To better contextualize the use of CLIL in GE English courses in UP, it is important to briefly provide a short background on the use of English as the medium of instruction (MOI) in the Philippines and the kinds of GE English courses offered in UP.

English as MOI in the Philippines: A Short Background

The Philippines is a country of more than 150 languages (based on the Census of Population and Housing of 2000) (Albert, 2013), but it has only two official languages: Filipino (the national language) and English. Though not a primary language for most Filipinos, English has been used as the MOI in Philippine schools for more than 100 years now. Thus, generations of Filipinos (from preschool to post graduate levels) have actually learned and mastered content (e.g., subject matter in mathematics, science, social sciences, literature, etc.) in English.

For several decades before the Second World War, English was the sole MOI in the Philippines. It was only in 1957 that the Board of National Education (BNE) decided that the MOI in the first two grades of the elementary school would be the local vernacular (Espiritu, 2001). Then in 1974, after the ratification of the Philippine Constitution, the BNE introduced a bilingual approach to teaching: Pilipino (the term *Filipino* to refer to the national language was not yet used at that time) was used as the MOI for subjects in disciplines like the social sciences, practical arts, and physical education, while English was retained as the MOI for mathematics and the sciences. There was also the Bilingual Education Policy (BEP) of 1987 which kept most of the important provisions of the 1974 BEP and which was in effect until 2012, when the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented the Mother Tongue-Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) in all public schools, specifically in kindergarten and grades 1, 2, and 3 as part of the K to 12 Basic Education Program. In the MTB-MLE scheme, the mother tongue, Filipino, and English are taught as subjects starting in grade 1, with a focus on oral fluency; from grades 4 to 6, Filipino and English are gradually introduced as the MOI and become primary MOI in junior and senior high school (Department of Education, n.d.).

GE English Courses in the UP

The UP Department of English and Comparative Literature (DECL) offers six General Education (GE) English courses and these can be classified into two: (1) the reading and writing courses (English 1, English 10, English 30, and Creative Writing 10) and (2) the literature courses (English 11 and English 12). Among these, English 10 (College English), English 30 (English for the Professions), English 11 (Literature and Society), and English 12 (World Literatures) more readily lend themselves to the CLIL approach.

In English 10, the students learn how to do research and how to effectively write four academic papers: the report, the reaction paper, the concept paper, and the position paper. Before the writing process (writing the thesis statement, writing an outline, writing a draft, revising the draft, etc.) begins, the students are given a set of readings to help them learn various concepts and skills such as identifying the writer's purpose for writing, evaluating a thesis statement, using different techniques of definition, detecting fallacies, etc. They learn through English as they also engage in various activities like finding both primary and secondary sources that can support their assertions, synthesizing what individual group members have found out about a topic to come up with a comprehensive oral and written report, and sharing with a small group and with the class their responses to a book read (e.g., *The Graveyard Book*, *Hunger Games*) in preparation for writing a reaction paper.

In English 30, the students learn how to write various business correspondences (e.g., letter of application, letter of complaint, memorandum), how to prepare an effective Power Point presentation, how to write a research/project proposal, and how to ace a job interview, among other things.

As for the literature classes, English 11 (Literature and Society) focuses on the study of various literary genres as a dynamic interaction between the individuals and social and cultural forces, while English 12 (World Literatures) focuses on the study of representative/landmark texts from the literatures of the world. This paper will focus on how the CLIL approach is used in these classes and how all five elements (content, cognition, communication, community, and competence) are made real and more contextualized through the reading-writing connection.

The CLIL Approach to Teaching GE English Courses

As mentioned earlier, a survey of studies done in UP on language and literacy development in the last two decades did not yield a single study involving CLIL. Yet, the teaching of both language and content which is characteristic of CLIL is not a new idea and there have been studies (e.g., Europa, 1995; Bumanglag, 2001; Gabriel, 2002; Muñoz, 2003; Go, 2007; Manuel, 2007; Ramos, 2007; Casipit, 2008; Cablinan, 2010; Ayoso, 2012) that focus on this. Some studies focus on content-based language instruction (CBLI) and how it enhances language and thinking skills; the others focus on how the teaching of academic language

functions in the content area are able to improve students' academic achievement in subjects like algebra and biology. Marsh (n.d.), in an interview, asserted that CLIL is different from CBLI, that "content drives CLIL" and it is the blend between content and language that matters. Thus, though the studies apparently focus on the teaching of both language and content, these two are not "blended" enough for the approaches to be considered CLIL.

The seamless blending of language and content is achieved in GE English classes. If the key issue in CLIL is "enabling students to learn how to learn and enabling students to learn as they use and use as they learn" (Marsh, 2013), then teaching GE English classes addresses this issue. Moreover, the teaching of reading, writing, and literature (and other contents) in GE English classes easily integrates the five building blocks of CLIL: content, cognition, communication, community, and competence. Such blending and integration are more effectively done through the establishment of the reading-writing connection.

Content

The teaching of GE English classes requires the teaching of both knowledge (conceptual and procedural) and skills. In terms of conceptual knowledge students learn, for instance, what literature means, what literary genres there are, what the difference between an internal and an external conflict is, what plot structure is, what lyric poetry is, what the Greek definition of tragedy is, what a concept paper is, what a fallacy is, what a project proposal is, what the difference between a letter and a memorandum is. In terms of procedural knowledge, students learn how to delineate a character, how to analyze a short story, how to evaluate poetry, how to differentiate tragedy from comedy, how to compare and contrast Indian drama and Greek drama, how to write a paper on the comparative analysis of two Asian novels, how to write a rhetorically sound thesis statement, how to write a concept paper using different techniques of defining, how to write a balanced review of a book read, how to write an effective letter of application, how to organize a position paper, and how to prepare an effective PowerPoint presentation. In terms of skills, the students are able to enhance all four macro skills—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—as they work on tasks individually, in pairs, in small groups, and as a class. Likewise, they get to develop their higher order thinking skills as they are challenged to analyze information, synthesize data, evaluate sources, and apply theories. Lessons always begin with what the students already know and gradually progress to the

target concept/knowledge/skill. It is the content that drives the progression of the discussions and activities.

In the reading and writing courses, the content of the readings and the discussions can include Philippine and world history, anthropology, law, cultural studies, psychology, literary criticism, business, architecture, statistics, and engineering. In the literature courses, content can include the different literary genres, Philippine literature, Greek and Roman literature, medieval and renaissance literature, Asian literature, Russian novels, and Latin American magic realism.

Cognition

The discussion of readings and content usually entails a progression from the literal questions to the interpretative, evaluative, and creative ones. It requires a range of questions from the text-based to the student-based. This ensures that the students are made to think and develop their higher order thinking skills by having them keep in touch not only with their feeling and thinking selves, but also with their thinking and feeling classmates—thus, there is enhancement not only of the intrapersonal intelligence but also of the interpersonal intelligence. The invitation to “think and feel,” however, is done not only during the class discussion; it is also done through other tasks and strategies such as the think-pair-share, the writing of the reflection paper, the performance examination (for the literature classes) which requires the students to apply what they have learned about literature in writing their own 15-minute skit and acting this out, and the oral presentation of findings (for the research and writing classes).

Because writing is thinking, the reading and writing classes also challenge the students to think critically and creatively as they discuss issues pertinent to a particular topic, pursue a research problem, analyze their data, synthesize information from their primary and secondary sources, and draw conclusions based on the results of their data analysis. In the literature courses, the students are engaged in critical and creative reading of the texts as they infer the meaning of a character’s dialogue, explain the relevance of the text in the context of the culture that produced it, use the concept of intertextuality in interpreting some passages, and apply various critical approaches in responding to what they have read.

Communication

To teach and learn reading, writing, research, and literature is to negotiate meaning, to express what a text means to oneself, to paraphrase or write a precis of somebody else's ideas, to tell why something that was written in a different era and a different culture can still be meaningful and relatable to the present readers, and to reflect on how art can well represent a people's values and aspirations. All these entail communication—the expression of ideas and feelings either orally or in writing. As the students negotiate meaning and express themselves, they learn the precise use of language at the word, sentence, and discourse levels. As the lessons progress and the students are gradually equipped with enough vocabulary and literary terminology, they use what they learn and learn what they use, particularly as they read literary texts, talk about what they have read, listen to others talk about what they think and feel, and write about their own reflection on and reaction to more specific issues or literary topics.

Community

Doing research allows a student to discover a community of learners or several discourse communities as well as researchers who are also interested in the problems and issues that s/he is interested in. Reflecting on what a text says and negotiating meaning with a pair, a small group, and a class is to gradually discover a community of learners with whom one shares things in common and paradoxically, also with whom one discovers one's uniqueness. The study and discussion of a text often helps a student discover what s/he is like, what s/he wants in life, and what s/he values most—all these because s/he learns what the other students in class are like and what they value most. The teaching and learning of writing and research involves evaluating the soundness of somebody else's ideas and writing techniques while the study of literature sometimes involves developing empathy with fictional characters or with the persona in poetry, inferring the motives of various characters, and evaluating the effectiveness of decisions made by both protagonists and antagonists. Such things also allow the students to be more aware of themselves and of others.

Competence

CLIL is not about teaching *in* English, but teaching *through* English (Marsh, 2014). To help the students become competent in English, they have to be taught through English. For them to be truly competent in this language, they have to possess both the receptive and productive

language skills—they should be able to listen and read English with understanding and likewise speak and write it effectively and meaningfully. As they learn the different concepts and skills in the study of writing, research, and literature, as they develop their thinking and feeling selves, as they realize that they belong to a community of learners who have both unique and shared characteristics, and as they use English to communicate their ideas and feelings and negotiate meaning orally and in written form—they then become competent in the language.

Establishing the Reading-Writing Connection in CLIL

To establish the reading-writing connection in GE English classes is to draw inspiration and guidance from Rosenblatt's (1994) Transactional Theory of Reading and Writing. According to Rosenblatt, Vygotsky postulated "the existence of a dynamic system of meaning, in which the affective and the intellectual unite" (p. 1060) while Bates provided "the useful metaphor of an iceberg for the total sense of a word to its user: the visible tip represents the public aspect of meaning, resting on the submerged base of private meaning" (p. 1061). Vygotsky's and Bates's ideas of *meaning*, together with Rosenblatt's concept of a *linguistic-experiential reservoir* are useful in describing how the establishment of the reading-writing connection facilitates the blending and integration of content and language in a literature class.

English 11: Literature and Society

To illustrate how the reading-writing connection is actually done, a sample lesson is useful. One of the stories discussed in English 11 (Literature and Society) is Gilda Cordero Fernando's "Hunger." It is a story of a British girl living in Singapore. Her playmates gossip about how this girl is always hungry though she belongs to a wealthy family. The limited omniscient point of view allows the reader to learn that the girl, who is an only child, is neglected by both her parents; thus, her hunger for food stems from a deeper emotional and psychological hunger. Because Singapore is a melting pot of different cultures, the setting also highlights the contrast between the girl's western family (i.e., British) and the other families in the community—most of whom are Asian (i.e., Filipino, Indian, Chinese). CLIL which also makes use of constructivist strategies often starts the lesson with what the students know and helps them relate what they already know with the new topic or subject matter. Thus, even before the students are assigned to read the story "Hunger," they are already asked in class, "What things do you hunger for?" and are then tasked to write a one-page

reflection paper on this, with the additional task of relating their answer to what happened to the story's main character. Here is an example of what a student has written in his reflection paper:

I wish I could take back all the times I yelled at my grandfather. I regret having ignored him at times in the past. Now I am returning him the favor. I drove him to the hospital when he had a stroke attack. Those classes that I missed can never compare to what he is to me. I took care of him. Even though he has recovered now, he can no longer do the things he had done in the past. I realized that time really does fly fast and that we should never take others for granted and enjoy every moment we spend with our loved ones because we never know what will happen in the future. This is what I hunger for.

Prior to this paragraph, the student has written that “hunger can also be associated with something one direly needs or something one hasn’t experienced in a very long time.” Though the paragraph that the student wrote is not a perfect example in terms of adherence to the principles of good writing, it is a good example of how a student draws from her/his linguistic-experiential reservoir as s/he tries to transact with the text and negotiate meaning. The affective (e.g., feeling of regret) and the cognitive (e.g., realization/insights gained from a sad experience) are both present in this transaction and negotiation. Though the referent of the pronoun *this* in the last sentence of the paragraph is not clear, the sentence that somewhat defines hunger in the previous paragraph gives the reader an idea about what the student actually hungers for, e.g., spending more quality time with a loved one, being able to show a loved one how much he cares. When the student is asked to read this reflection paper in class, those who listen to his reading also transact with the text they hear and most probably draw from their own linguistic-experiential reservoir and their own understanding of the story “Hunger” to be able to “get” what their classmate is trying to say. As the community of learners listen to each other talk about their own hungers, they are also getting ready to discuss the story. “Hunger” is often used in teaching two major elements of the narrative: theme and character. In having the students write a reflection paper on what things they hunger for, they are in effect being tasked to focus on these elements; likewise, they are being made to use that “dynamic system of meaning in which the affective and the intellectual unite”

because to be able to fulfil the objective of the writing task, they need to be in touch with their feeling and thinking selves.

In class, one of two activities is done—(1) students are either called upon to read aloud in front of the class their one-page reflection paper or (2) the students form groups of four or five members and share with the group the highlights of their reflection paper by reading these aloud. During the sharing session, the students who have already seen the “tip of the iceberg” when they tried to address the prompt given in the writing assignment, also get a glimpse of the base of the iceberg (the private meaning) as they listen to the different meanings that their classmates have given to the word “hunger.” Either way, what the students have read aloud/shared becomes the springboard for discussing the short story. Even this early in the class session, the students, in order to understand and make sense of the things that their classmates shared, have already drawn from their linguistic-experiential reservoir which, according to Rosenblatt, embodies “funded assumptions, attitudes, and expectations about language and about the world” (p. 1061). In order, for instance, to make sense of the “new” meaning of *hunger* which does not pertain to physical hunger for food, the students have to “transact” with the literary text and then with each other “to make new meanings by applying, reorganizing, revising, or extending public and private elements” (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 1061) from their linguistic-experiential reservoir.

After the sharing session, the specific definitions of hunger that the students gave in their reflection papers are used as springboard for discussing the story in-depth, usually with more focus on the theme and the characterization. When the students read the story for the first time to prepare for the writing assignment (the reflection paper) and the class discussion, they transacted with the text. Based on Rosenblatt’s theory, each reading event is a transaction involving the reader, the text, and the context. If there were twenty students in class, there were twenty unique transactions that happened even before the story was discussed in class. As students transacted with the text, they learned how language was used by the author to highlight certain elements of the narrative and to convey meaning. When the students were tasked to write a reflection paper on the things they hungered for, it was their turn to use language to highlight whatever definition or experience they wanted to emphasize and to convey their feelings and ideas. According to Rosenblatt (1994), the writing event, just like the reading event, is also a transaction:

Writing is always an event in time, occurring at a particular moment in the writer's biography, in particular circumstances, under particular external as well as internal pressures. In short, the writer is always transacting with a personal, social, and cultural environment. Thus, the writing process must be seen as always embodying both personal and social, or individual and environmental, factors. (p. 1072)

At the heart of every transaction (be it reading or writing) is language. In reading a literary text, the students learn not just the word but also the world—that is, both language and content (which is at the heart of CLIL). In writing about a literary text, the students are given an opportunity to apply what they have learned about the word and the world. When they share with a small group of classmates or with the whole class what they have written, the learning of the word and the world is enhanced and the other two macro skills—listening and speaking—are likewise developed. Moreover, students become more aware of a community of learners and a discourse community in which ideas, feelings, and values are shared and made more distinct. In this context, the teacher is not the only source of knowledge in the classroom—teaching and learning become transactions in themselves, with the teacher and the students acting as co-authors and co-creators of meaning, individually constructing their own understanding of the content through language and discovering together the varied ways of expressing such understanding.

As the literary text is discussed in-depth in class, students are not only asked questions, they are also encouraged to ask their own questions. When questions are asked by the instructor, these have to be of different types (e.g., requiring convergent or divergent answers, text-based or student-based) and have to cover a wide range of levels from the interpretative to the evaluative/creative, in order to develop the students' higher order thinking skills. Again, in this exchange of ideas, both language and content are learned. In the discussion of the story "Hunger," for instance, the students learn that there are words like *hunger* which are polysemous; that definitions can range from the concrete to the abstract; that there is such a thing as "cultural hunger"—some Filipinos, for example, still feel hungry no matter how much they eat, if the meal does not include rice; that one of the things that defines culture is food; that it is human nature to be hungry not just for food but also for love and attention; that sometimes the insatiable hunger for food is just a manifestation of a deeper emotional and

psychological hunger. This discussion, therefore, allows the teacher and the students to discuss content other than literature—because the discussion makes use of concepts in anthropology, sociology, psychology, and cultural studies to interpret what happens in the story. Moreover, the students also learn that the title of the story often serves as a clue as to its major theme (and when it is their turn to write, they realize how important it is to provide their essay/paper with a creative and interesting title), that the theme can be spoken explicitly by one of the characters or can be implicit in the narrative, that setting can either be just a backdrop or an integral part of the story, that character traits can be physical or psychological, and that in a well-written narrative, all the elements blend into an integrated whole. In order to learn all these, the students have to use all four macro skills—reading (and transacting with the text), writing (a reflection paper and drawing from their linguistic-experiential reservoir), speaking (and sharing their ideas and feelings with their classmates), and listening (to others share their own ideas and feelings)—and learn *through* English holistically. Yet, it is the establishment of the reading-writing connection that facilitates such learning and allows the integration of language and content.

English 12: World Literatures

Three of the masterpieces taken up in English 12 are Dante’s *Inferno*, Cervantes’s *Don Quixote*, and Dostoyevsky’s *Brothers Karamazov*. Because in CLIL, it is content that drives the class discussions and other activities, the students are tasked to focus more on discussing things like the historical context of each work, the motifs and themes reflected, and the relevance of the different elements of the narrative to contemporary issues and concerns. Such discussions often result in an interesting exchange of ideas in which students tackle topics like the Catholic definition of hell versus the definition of other religions, the operating principles that Dante apparently used in arranging the sins in hell from top to bottom and in assigning the corresponding punishments, why Don Quixote is saner than the people who are making fun of him or trying to “cure” him of his insanity, how the relationship between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza develops from master-servant to bosom buddies, how the four brothers Karamazov are all guilty of the murder of their father, how foolish people like Ivan and Katerina who choose pride over love are, etc.

Because there is always that reading-writing connection that facilitates the learning of language and content, writing reflection papers also allows students to express their opinions

and insights regarding the masterpieces. For instance, when they were tasked to write about whom they identify with the most among the four brothers Karamazov, some students came up with these answers:

(Student 1) Despite all his debaucheries, (Dmitri) has “human” conflicts that revolve around his moral core, discerning between right and wrong, and the ideal of Madonna and Sodom. He still acknowledges the presence of a higher being and questions and celebrates the existence of sensual lust. He is actually into poetry. Imagine a hunky military man reading Walt Whitman on his way to Saigon. His is a body powered by emotions—the greatest reason I identify myself with him. And yes, I do like poetry and getting drunk as well but I am no womanizer. Manizer, perhaps, yes.

(Student 2) While *The Brothers Karamazov* has a moving—both emotional and logical—story, I don’t like that it puts faith superior to logic. I don’t have anything against religion but logic can also define morality. The bible or the Quran or other holy scriptures are just guides. We have brains for a reason.

(Student 3) According to JS Mill in his essay on utilitarianism, pleasure is about quality, not quantity. I’d like to add to that philosophy in saying that simply enjoying pleasure is not enough. You need to also have the intellect to realize the depth and breadth of the pleasure you’re receiving. I believe that I’m a man with sensual intellect, a man like Ivan, yet with distinct strokes of Dmitri’s personality in the tapestry.

In the establishment of the reading-writing connection, it is noticeable that students also learn to make connections not only between the text at hand and the things they write about, but also between the present text and other texts they have read like the Bible, the Quran, the poetry of Walt Whitman, and the philosophical writings of John Stuart Mill. Moreover, as they draw from their linguistic-experiential reservoir, they creatively come up with their own definition and description of what and who they are, like student 1 who calls himself “manizer” (because he is gay), student 2 who asserts that logic also defines morality, and student 3 who claims that he is “a man with sensual intellect.” These are concrete examples

of how they learn both language and content (e.g., philosophy) as they also realize things about themselves—through English.

English 10: College English

In English 10, the students are required to write a comparative analysis of two young adult (YA) novels—*The Hunger Games* and *The Graveyard Book*. Here are two examples of what the students have written:

(Student 1) From a humanist's point of view, both books present a major flaw in us human beings. That flaw is ignorance, whether on purpose or by accident. Ignorance of the suffering of the people around us, ignorance of all the pain in the world apart from the pain that we ourselves experience, and ignorance of the fact that we are, in fact, ignorant. *The Hunger Games'* characters, specifically the Capitol people, did not seem to bat an eyelid at every child death scene; in fact, they seemed to enjoy watching children suffer very much. In Chapter 5 of the *Hunger Games*, Katniss notes that for the Capitol people, *The Hunger Games* is a form of entertainment. She wonders about the life in the Capitol, "What must it be like, I wonder, to live in a world where food appears at the press of a button?" In the book, Katniss was saying this in a literal sense; the people in the Capitol did live a life where pressing a button would give them instant food. But if we relate this to the real world, we can see that this is very similar to the case of less fortunate people who still have to work hard all day in order to fill their hungry tummies, unlike the fewer, luckier people who can afford servants or household help to do all the work for them, without having a care in the world. The interesting thing here is that, while we have a faint notion that the suffering of the less fortunate is unjust, like the Capitol people, we are taught from a young age that that is just the way things are in our world. We are taught that unfairness, injustice, and misery are normal, and that we cannot do anything about these problems.

(Student 2) At the end of this brief discussion, two things are made clear. In the absence of freedom, children's rights are impeded and cannot be properly promoted. Rights to special protection for the holistic development of children,

adequate living arrangements, and protection against neglect and exploitation are only a part of the rights violated in a society devoid of freedom. In its presence, even if it is not absolute, freedom encourages the growth of children in all aspects. If freedom is stimulation, community is the main advocate of these rights. Most, if not all, of children's rights require an atmosphere of acceptance, unity, and positivity. Without this integral component, a huge risk of obstacles to these rights is immediately introduced.

Both student 1 and student 2 have drawn from their linguistic-experiential reservoir and have discussed the books not just as literary texts but also as representation of realities, issues, and concerns in their societies. Student 1 compares her generation to the people of the Capitol and realizes how their generation has been “trained” to think that injustice and misery in their own society are “normal” and things that they just have to accept because they cannot do anything to correct these (which implies that she realizes that she and her generation can indeed do something about these). Student 2 related the characters' (Katniss's and Bod's) lack of freedom in the novels to issues related to the implementation of children's rights (and he therefore realizes that freedom or the lack thereof has implications for children's enjoyment of their rights). The writing samples show how the reading-writing connection allows students to situate themselves not only in the text but also in their society. Prior to the students' writing of a comparative analysis of the two young adult novels, the texts were also discussed in class. In this reading-discussion-writing sequence, all five elements of CLIL are at work: content (the discussion and the students' writings touched on different content areas such as history, psychology, and law as two YA novels were tackled), cognition (students were challenged to think out of the box, analyze and evaluate the novels, and apply the things they had learned from the discussions in writing their paper), communication (the students did not only use all four macro skills—reading, listening, speaking, and writing—as they discussed their ideas orally and in writing, but they were also challenged to communicate their ideas clearly, coherently, logically, and emphatically), community (the students situated themselves not only as members of the class during the discussion but also as members of a discourse community as they shared their ideas orally and in writing), and competence (the students were able to effectively express their feelings and ideas orally and in writing).

According to Rosenblatt, reading and writing are not mirror images; instead, they can be viewed as parallels that involve similar processes such as the transaction that happens between the reader and the text, the writer and the text to be written. Because reading and writing are essentially different skills, “it cannot be assumed that the teaching of one activity automatically improves the students’ competence in the other” (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 1084). However, Rosenblatt asserts that the teaching of one skill can affect the students’ operations in the other:

1. Reading provides the writer with a sense of the potentialities of a language.
2. Writing deepens the reader’s understanding of the importance of paying attention to diction, syntactic positions, emphasis, imaging, and conventions of genre.
3. Cross-fertilization will result from reinforcement of linguistic habits and thinking patterns resulting from shared transactional processes of purposive selective attention and synthesis. (p. 1084)

Thus, it is good CLIL practice to establish the reading-writing connection and help students develop such “linguistic habits and thinking patterns” to allow them to learn better both language and content.

References

- Albert, J.R.G. (2013). Many voices, one nation: The Philippine languages and dialects in figures. Retrieved from http://www.nscb.gov.ph/sexystats/2013/SS20130830_dialects.asp
- Ayoso, J.P. (2012). Use of English and English-Hiligaynon as media of instruction in teaching secondary general science (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Bumanglag, J.C. (2001). Content-based instructional materials versus literary texts in developing critical thinking skills (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Cablinan, A.B.G. (2010). Content-based instruction and students' reading comprehension (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Casipit, A.B. (2008). Developing critical thinking skills through content-based instruction (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Costa, F. & Coleman, J. A. (2010). Integrating content and language in higher education in Italy: Ongoing research. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1, 19-29. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/13/article2.html>
- Darn, S. (2006). CLIL: A lesson framework. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/clil-a-lesson-framework>
- Department of Education. (n.d.). What is the k to 12 program?. *Official Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.ph/k-12/>
- Espiritu, C. (2001). Filipino Language in the curriculum. Retrieved from http://www.ncca.gov.ph/phil_culture/other_culturalinfo/language.html
- Europa, G. F. (1995). Second language proficiency and content mastery in a sheltered science learning environment (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Gabriel, J.P. (2002). Comprehensible input strategies and pedagogical moves using Filipino/English as medium of instruction in secondary mathematics (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Go, R.S. (2007). Developing an English proficiency program for science, mathematics, and English teachers (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.

- Manuel, J.B. (2007). Designing sustained content-based lessons for secondary students (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Marsh, D. (Interviewee) (n.d.). CLIL: An interview with Professor David Marsh (Interview transcript). Retrieved from *International House Journal of Education and Development* web site: <http://ihjournal.com/content-and-language-integrated-learning>
- Marsh, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D., & Frigols-Martin, M.J. (2010). European framework for CLIL Teacher Education. Retrieved from http://www.unifg.it/sites/default/files/allegatiparagrafo/20-01-2014/european_framework_for_clil_teacher_education.pdf
- Marsh, D. (2013). Why CLIL is education for the 21st century (YouTube). Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b4Y0vTzcAQg>
- Marsh, D. (2014). Why CLIL now with David Marsh (YouTube). Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OL5Cqi35dZk>
- Muñoz, A.M.S. (2003). Adjunct model of content-based instruction: Student attitude and achievement in science and English (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Ramos, A.C. (2007). Academic language functions and student achievement in biology and algebra. (unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1994). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. R. B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (4th Ed.) (1058-1084). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Smit, U. & Dafouz, E. (2012). Integrating content and language in higher education: An introduction to English-medium policies, conceptual issues and research practices across Europe. *AILA Review*, 25, 1-12.

About the author

Lalaine F. Yanilla Aquino is an associate professor at the University of the Philippines where she finished her doctorate in Reading Education and where she teaches undergraduate and graduate courses on English language studies, comparative literature, creative writing, and reading education. From 2010 to May 2012, she was the president of the Kuwentista ng mga Tsikiting (KUTING), an organization of writers for children.s