Hadrian Lankiewicz
Uniwersytet Gdański

EAP AND ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: MEDIATING ELABORATED CODE IN A CLIL TYPE TEACHER EDUCATION

EAP and academic discourse: mediating elaborated code in a CLIL type teacher education

The aim of this paper is to relate the concept of ESP to the idea of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) to work out a platform for the conceptualization of academic language as a context-reduced means of communication (Bernstein, 1971; 1999). Subsequently, the concept of talk-types (Moate, 2011) will be presented as a way of counteracting language de-contextualization and engendering restructuring of knowledge and the language itself. Theoretical considerations will be supported with the presentation of research on classroom interaction. It is aimed at highlighting how expert language is mediated in content learning with types of classroom talk and how the process of languaging (Swain, 2006a) facilitates both "taming" (Lankiewicz, 2013b) of the elaborated code and acquisition of expert knowledge.

Keywords: EAP, ESP, academic language, CLIL, ecological approach, languaging, teacher education

Słowa kluczowe: język akademicki, język specjalistyczny, CLIL, podejście ekologiczne, *languaging*, edukacja nauczycieli

1. Introduction

The theoretical underpinnings of the paper rest firmly on the ecological approach to language, its learning and teaching. I mostly capitalize on the ecological metaphor in language acquisition (Kramsch, 2002) and the principles

of the ecological and semiotic perspective in the field of educational linguistics (van Lier, 2004). The concept of academic discourse identified by Bernstein (1971, 1999) as an elaborated code is construed as a macro category for any English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course.

Postulating the holistic approach to language, I suggest that EAP courses necessitate an application of Content and Language Integrated Language (CLIL) methodology, if they are to result in a substantiated, professional voice of the learner in an L2.[1] The application of CLIL methodology is expected to counteract the possible drawback of separating the form and content of more traditional approaches to EAP courses, in which the stakeholders (the teacher and the learner) suffer from some sort of "schizophrenia". The former is more interested in the language form, while the latter in communicating the meaning, and both are experts in different fields trying to designate meaning to concepts.

CLIL, accentuating the attention to both, the form and content, guarantees the development of an authentic professional voice in an L2 (cf. Eco, 2000: 100). The compartmentalization of EAP/ESP is also argued on the ground that any English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course cannot be dissected into an emotion-free professional set of terminology and discursive specificities to be acquired intellectually. Language development requires a process of negotiation with reference to the restricted code, which in the ensuing research is manifested with the use of different talk-types to mediate the professional jargon. Lastly, my claim is supported with the notion of languaging, which, on the one hand, maintains the existence of undivided, human-specific ability of meaning making (Jørgensen & Juffermans, 2011), and on the other, the mediating function of language in the development of higher mental processes (Swain, 2006a). Consequently, academic language, to be substantiated (knowledge-laden), needs to be frequently mediated by all types of "talkscape" (Moate, 2011), which CLIL methodology takes for granted.

2. Literature review

English for Academic Purposes represents a subdivision in the plethora of acronyms of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (Harding, 2007: 6). The historical review of ESP taxonomies implies that the classification of EAP has posed problems to maintain its comprehensive and disjoint nature. Carter (1983: 131) or Kennedy and Bolitho's (1990) postulated the centrality of EAP

---

[1] Being aware of the difference between a FL and an L2, I decided to refer to both contexts of language learning as an L2.

and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) in ESP but they were unable to disjoin the two domains effectively. Taking employment as the end-objective of the course, they claim that "people can work and study simultaneously; it is also likely in many cases that language learnt for immediate use in a study environment will be used later when the student takes up, or returns to, a job" (Hutchison & Waters, 1992: 16). Apparently, this problem is dealt with by Robinson (1991: 4), whose taxonomy of ESP aims to account for the fact that both EOP and EAP might pertain to situations in which students who have just begun working or studying and those who are on their way to becoming experts, or have done so. Hence they are at the pre- in-, or post-stage. Nonetheless, this taxonomy "by experience" contains a logical problem of whether pre-service students of EOP are not the subject of education. Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998: 6), in their classification by professional area, differentiate EAP from EOP by separating non-academic purposes from purely occupational ones. Thus English for Academic Medical Purposes is supposed to be different from English for Medical Purposes of practicing doctors (ibid., 7). The seminal problem of considering education as a part of professional life has been unresolved.

Yet, Robinson's classification (1991) seems to be an interesting one for my further considerations since he treats English for Educational Purposes (EEP) on a par with EAP; thus English can be taught "for study in a specific discipline" or "as a school subject" (integrated or independent). In this way, EAP receives two understandings: as a language specific to the academic/scientific realm of a particular scientific discipline, and language of educational institutions in general (school language of a subject taught in an L2). This second sense of EAP pertains to institutionalized discourse as derived from Bernstein's sociocultural studies (1971, 1999) or an elaborated code used at schools and a restricted one, characteristic of natural, contextualized conversational exchanges. The ambiguity of conceptualizing EAP is evident also in defining it as "courses and materials designed specially to help people who want to use English in academic contexts" (Harmer, 2007: 19).

Satisfying students' linguistic interests is among general characteristics of ESP courses, which focus on the language itself, its syntax, lexis, discourse (Strevens, 1988) and the genre (Harmer, 2007: 327). Nonetheless, "all ESP teaching should reflect the methodology of the disciplines and professions it serves; and in more specific ESP teaching the nature of the interaction between the teacher and the learner may be very different from that in a General English class" (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998: 3-4).

In the past, the implementation of EAP in the institutional milieu was achieved by substituting General English courses with discipline related ones

so that students would be familiarized with the language of a particular field mostly with the use of the reading method developing comprehension (Maleki, 2008). With the onset of the communicative approach, the goal has been extended to developing listening (if a course book was furnished with a CD set) and conversation skills characteristic of the academic world. Nonetheless, my own research indicates (Lankiewicz, forthcoming a) that EAP courses do not pay much attention to developing writing skills. It needs to be accentuated here that the Polish Qualifications Framework (KRK 2011) requires that linguistic education at the tertiary level should be major specific. In fact, most of General English courses at the university level have been adapted to this recommendation.

Considering the ambiguity in conceptualizing EAP, evident in its classification within "the tree of ELT" (Hutchison & Waters, 1992: 17) and the general recommendation for any ESP course to represent methodology of a particular discipline, I came to a conclusion that drawing on the achievements of the ecological approach in language learning (van Lier, 2004; Kramsch, 2002), a natural alternative for teaching EAP courses might be CLIL methodology.

The global village of the present world with easy access to resources, conferences and opportunities for publications requires the development of all skills. Whether EAP denotes a narrowly understood course for prospective academics, or simply educational discourse, it is economically inefficient to expect to teach English twice (General English and ESP or EAP separately). Any language course necessitates proper needs analysis in the light of learner-centred methodology and the autonomization of the learning process. Additionally, the general tendency promoting content-oriented education and agency on the part of the learner, as assumed by the ecological approach, requires a more wholesome approach to the understanding of language itself and language education in particular (van Lier, 2004). Certainly, such a stance presents challenges to English teachers. Nowadays, it is not enough to be a language expert, because the teacher, particularly in the field of ESP, needs to possess subject-matter knowledge, if he/ she is to incorporate the methodology of a particular discipline. In the narrow meaning of EAP, this boils down to the problem of value and quality of education, e.g. teaching academic writing if one is not an active academic contributor himself/ herself (cf. Lankiewicz, 2013a). Furthermore, teaching EAP or EEP separately may be a sign of inefficiency of institutional language teaching as such.

Taking into account the taxonomical ambiguities, I assume that in academic, institutionalized education it is difficult to tell the difference between EAP/EEP and EOP. How can the teacher presume at this level that the student is interested only in the occupational aspect of the English course?

Excluding possibilities of academic ambitions would be contradictory to the character of academic schooling. Thus, it is suggested here that the solution to the dilemma can be the application of CLIL methodology.

3. CLIL, EAP and teacher education

The concept of CLIL is derived from Canadian and American achievements of bilingual education of the 1960s and 80s respectively, which became to be referred to as immersion programs. Basically, they were conceptualized as a method of teaching a second language through subject-matter courses, among others, to minority students or immigrants. Their aim was to reintroduce or reinforce the target language; thus Canadian French immersion stood for revitalization of this language in Canadian educational system so that it would not possess a lower social status compared with English. American immersion programs, in turn, were addressed at immigrant minorities to facilitate the process of linguistic assimilation. They were intended as a remedy to the shortcomings of submerging them to the mainstream education as accounted for by Bernstein (1972). Other terms related to the concept of teaching a subject through the means of a foreign language are content-based learning, sheltered classes (cf. Lankiewicz, 1997; 1998), or a *Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)* (Genzuk, 2011). CLIL represents a European initiative supported by the European Commission promoting multilingualism.

CLIL as such functions as an umbrella term for a variety of approaches using language as a medium of instruction. The proponents of CLIL recognize its transatlantic similarity, yet they accentuate its originality. David Marsh's (1994: 11) definition of CLIL as pertaining "to situations where subjects, or part of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with dual-focused aims, namely the learning of content, and the simultaneous learning of a foreign language" would be also true for any immersion program. However, Kiely (2011: 154) claims, CLIL is to be "conceptualized as broader and more integrated than bilingual education or immersion programs". Consequently, it receives more theoretical underpinning pertaining to 4C (culture, content, cognition, communication) (ibid.), or more recently rephrased as CULTIX, ENTIX, LANTIX, CONTIX, LEARNTIX (culture, environment, language, content, learning) (CLIL compendium) to meet the European goals. Nonetheless, the realization of CLIL allows for its hard and soft module consisting in exploring "a topic which is a part of a content based ELT curriculum" (Zajączkowska, 2013: 136).

Significant for my considerations is the explication of the success of CLIL methodology. Apart from the above mentioned characteristics, CLIL

incorporates Cummins' (1979, 1980) concepts of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), meaning the skill of using academic language and Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), standing for the use of conversational discourse. By integrating subject-matter, it supplies opportunities for students' language and intellectual development and necessitates a change in methodology use. Markedly, CLIL also entails re-structuring of language to support the assimilation of academic content. The features are no way exhaustive in considering the assets of the application of CLIL methodology for EAP, but arguably they facilitate elaboration of a more genuine voice related to an academic discipline based on learner agency in constructing both language and knowledge.

The assumption that EAP should be realized through CLIL courses is compatible with a general tendency in teaching languages all around the world, e.g. Council Resolution (CR 2008) in promoting development of multilingualism to devote "particular attention to the further training of language teachers and to enhancing the language competences of teachers in general, in order to promote the teaching of non-linguistic subjects in foreign languages (CLIL — Content and Language Integrated Learning)". Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe promotes "language in other subject" as an alternative to "language as a subject policy" (LPD 2009). This may also resemble new theoretical trends in approaching language such as dialectal linguistics or ecological linguistics (cf. Steffensen, 2007; van Lier, 2004; Kramsch and Whiteside, 2008) accentuating contextualization, learner agency in meaning making, or critical language awareness.

L2 teacher education in Poland is an example of incorporating pedagogical language, academic discourse and BICS, and aims at both language development and professional expertise. It remains disputable whether L2 teacher education in Poland applies the typical CLIL methodology, but undoubtedly it represents immersion education due to the fact that it deals with limited-English-proficient students, employs teachers being basically non-native speakers and assumes the goal of linguistic improvement (Lankiewicz, 2013b: 125). Without much hesitation it can be classified as the soft module pertaining only to teaching language-related subjects. Nonetheless, EEP/EAP or any ESP course might draw on its achievements. Interestingly, prospective language teachers of ESP courses are educated within these frames. I can see a potential for expanding CLIL teacher education to other disciplines (biology, chemistry, physics, etc.) as an alternative for investing in ESP linguistic education. In the context of ESP courses operated by the private sector, Harmer duly points out: "[i]f CLIL becomes a standard model in secondary schools, for example, the demand for private 'top-up' learning may diminish" (2007: 23).

Despite the fact that L2 teacher training institutions in Poland incorporate academic language as an integrated element of education, it quite often offers extra courses of academic writing as a supplement to the seminar. Unfortunately, they do not seem to be very successful (cf. Lankiewicz, 2013a). There are numerous reasons for this, one of them being the dominant "oracy" of the postmodern education (Fairclough, 1992: 33) typical of developed countries and resulting from this limited attention to editorial skills. Another one may be the fact that the courses are instructed by teachers who do not necessary have experience in academic writing themselves, they teach school essay format rather than article writing. Yet another one may be a gap between students' direct experiences and sudden excessive demands. All in all, successful in other respects, students have serious problems with academic writing and reading professional literature if it is not properly mediated with recourse to different talk types (Moate, 2011).

The mastery of academic language is seen as a form of empowering (Lankiewicz, 2013a: 129), yet it cannot be learned theoretically (by delivering guidelines) without due amount of practice, proper expertise on the part of the teacher, and interactional treatment of academic discourse in a stepwise fashion as a form of "taming" it (ibid.). Reflection from the achievements and shortcomings of the soft version of CLIL in Polish L2 teacher education might be insightful for teaching any ESP course, particularly the one pertaining to EAP.

Assuming after Vygotsky (1978, 1997) that knowledge is constructed in an interactional way in the zone of proximal development, it is unreasonable to expect that academic language can be taught in isolation from the discipline. A lack of professional expertise in the subject-matter renders ESP teachers detached interpreters without their authoritative voice during the class. Similarly, students exposed to ESP courses, not substantiated with a professional background, acquire language devoid of authenticity and practicality. An ESP teacher not being a practitioner may have little access to the so-called "occluded" discourses "traditionally kept hidden form non-members" (Nesi, 2013: 18). This results in teaching, e.g. business correspondence the way it is depicted in the books, not the way it is actually practiced.

Regarding the suggested use of the ecological perspective in language learning, Järvinen (2009: 167) makes a comparison between cognitive and ecological approaches with regard to the perception of context, interaction and learning. She accentuates remarkable discrepancies between the two and as she points out the ESP (content-specific discourses) teaching is placed in the cognitive tradition "content-specific language (concepts) … necessary for content learning (CALP, Cummins, 1991)" with "scaffolding (Bruner, 1990) … used to add support (context) to conceptual, context-free objects of learn-

ing" (ibid.). Quite differently, in the ecological approach learning of scientific concepts is realized through affordances (making sense of the meaning potential dreaming in signs) while operating in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) as a starting point and "then these internalized concepts are used to form new ZPDs at a practical level" (ibid.). "In CLIL contexts, an important source of affordances is provided by the subject matter itself. Content-specific affordances, such as subject-specific thinking and related thinking skills, subject-specific genres and registers, offer unique opportunities for fostering learning." (ibid., 169). Interaction within the ZPD results in internalization equated with learning. Finally, she offers the hypothesis that CLIL constitutes a perfect environment for ecological learning. I would extend it to the conceptual learning characteristic for ESP, including academic language, as contrasted with traditional structural or cognitive approaches.

The conceptualization, I propose, seems to reflect the stages of ESP development (Kennedy & Bolitho, 1990: 7). The fifth, developed stage, perceives ESP courses as a means of learning (ibid.). Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 14) call this phase the learning-centered approach and investigate the concept in their numerous works. The fact that a learner knows how a language functions does not mean that he/she is actually able to learn it. Therefore, a necessary component of education is an interaction characteristic of dynamic subsystems (Järvinen, ibid.). Hence, the essential element of learning is languaging (Swain, 2006a) or the "reshaping of cognition by the means of language" (Järvinen, ibid.). Drawing on Vygotskyan concept of mediating higher mental process by language (speech), Swain decides to replace the "conduit metaphor" of output (language conveying thoughts) with the one of languaging, "which involves mediating cognition, that is, articulating and transforming thinking into an artifactual form" (Jarvinen, 2009: 168), perceiving learner as "an agent in the making of meaning" (Swain, 2006a: 96), or an "agent-operating-with-mediational means (Wertsch, 1998: 26, after Swain, 2006a: 101). The concept of languaging finds various elaborations in pedagogical applications (cf. Lankiewicz and Wąsikiewicz-Firlej, forthcoming).

4. Research

4.1. The aim of the study

The general objective of the study is to demonstrate that academic language requires the process of negotiation and activation of agency on the part of the learner in the process of constructing concepts (content-specific language).

This allows to substantiate them with meaning. It is argued that the cognitive attitude characteristic of ESP methodology (Järvinen, 2009: 167) as adding support "to conceptual, context-free objects of learning" might be less productive than ecological constructionism[2] in the form of languaging. This claim may be of particular importance if we take into account the fact that the majority of ESP teachers are autodidact. Professional literature also indicates that sectors of ELT may not always provide ESP teachers with language purposefulness and immediacy (Harding, 2007: 6). Thus relying on theoretical assumptions of CLIL and the concept of languaging – comprehended as "talking-it-through" (Swain & Lapkin, 2002), "coming-to-know-while-speaking" (Swain, 2006b) and "talkscape" (Moate, 2011) – I undertake interaction analysis to identify the moments of constructing meaning for academic terminology. This is accomplished through languaging and the use of different talk-types.

The research hypothesis is built around the conviction based on personal observation enriched by contacts with other subject-matter teachers that students have problems with comprehending academic language. I believe partial responsibility might be put on the teachers, who do not pay proper attention to the properties of academic language (cf. Lankiewicz, 2013a). Consequently, I hypothesize that the application of CLIL methodology, particularly that part pertaining to interaction might help "tame" the elaborated code of academic language substantiating it with meaning of relevance to the students. Since academic language is a component of EEP or EAP, as indicated by ESP taxonomies, I additionally posit that any CLIL methodology and ecological "talkscape" may be insightful for ESP courses.

4.2. Participants

The context of the study is a methodology class at a private institution in the northern part of Poland educating prospective teachers. It takes place at the end of the fourth semester (out of 6 necessary for the completion of the undergraduate course). The participants had been exposed to 12 hours of lectures on methodology of teaching English as a foreign language accompanied by 24 hours of tutorials and 24 hours of language acquisition theories taught by me before the research. The majority of curriculum subjects is covered in English taught both by native and non-native speakers. Proficiency level of English oscillates around B1 and B1+ (a subjective judgment consulted with several teachers). They are expected to achieve C1 in exactly a

---

[2] Social constructionism is contrasted with purely cognitive constructivism (cf. van Lier, 2001: 254).

year's time. On the day of the research the class consisted of 19 students (11 females and 8 males) and since the study was carried out as a regular lesson, they might have been rather unaware of the study.

4.3. Design and procedure

A week before the class I had made sure that students were not very much familiar with the concept of noticing (Schmidt, 1990) to use it during research. My intention was to demonstrate that new academic concepts need thorough reconceptualization and mediation before they are taken in. The session, whose fragments are analyzed in this paper, lasted 1 hour and 12 minutes and was video recorded. It needs to be admitted here that the study has a follow-up presented in a separate report (Lankiewicz, forthcoming b).

The research presented here was carried out in five steps. In step one a written text of academic language substituted expert talk. Students (19) were asked to read a page (39 lines) on the theory of noticing from the textbook (Harmer, 2007) to see how much of the idea would be grasped. The decision to use silent reading was dictated by the need to start my research from the contact with "raw", unmediated academic discourse to demonstrate that incomprehension is not that much resultant from the level of proficiency (however, this eventuality might be considered) but more from the particularities of academic discourse. This part constituted the foundation for further action. In the steps to follow I tried to engaged students in the navigation through the "talkscape" character of CLIL methodology (Moate, 2011). I consequently engaged students into exploratory talk based on the comprehension of the passage (stage two), exploratory talk pertaining to searching for commonsensical personal meaning of professional terminology facilitated by pair-work or group-work with the use of available resources (step three), exploratory and pedagogical talk carried out with the whole class (step four – the central part of the research), and finally expert talk was elicited as the result of individual reading and classroom interaction to round the lesson off.

4.4. Results and discussion

Since the present research is of a qualitative type, being exploratory by nature, it requires that the results are construed in a hermeneutic or, what Kramsch (2002: xiii) calls, "interpretation of contexts which needs to be matched by an interdiscursivity of research methodologies and approaches to data". For the clarity of considerations, I present research findings and possible interpretations in a common section.

Having read the material, students were invited in the construction of its meaning. Thus in step two – elicitation (comprehension check in the form of exploratory talk) – I asked questions such as *How do you understand the concept? What is the novelty of the concept?* to check the results of unmediated learning. Out of 19 answers, only some (4) may count as acceptable, the big majority consisted in citing exact words without comprehending content-specific words. Conceptualization of context-free objects of learning was ineffective due to the lack of proper scaffolding (Järvinen, 2009: 167), or alternately thinking skills did not relate with language. Due to the space limitations, I only offer an example of total incomprehension.

> *S: Awareness of language could help students create sentences.*[3]
> *T: In what way?*
> *S: Noticing is different than other language acquisitions. It depends on not teaching an item of language but to get students to notice it when it occurs (.) so that it sinks into the brain where it is processed [exact quote].*
> *T: So noticing is different from other theories (.) explanations of language acquisition. OK, but what does the teacher have to do to help students notice language?*
> *S: A moment [looking for phrase in the photocopy], to make students aware of language as an alternative to teaching it [quote].*
> *T: Aware of what?*
> *S: Language*
> *T: Like what? Sentences and information, knowledge?*
> *(…)*

In step three – exploratory talk – students worked in pairs or groups of three to explain the meaning of some words from the text. The objective was to focus their attention on constitutive elements of the text and elicit their commonsensical understanding. I selected several nodal points (Laclau and Mouffe's 1985: 12) in the passage to help students construct some understanding of the concept of noticing. Students worked for 5 minutes consulting others, books, the internet – since lots of them bring notebooks or almost everybody has a smartphone. It was intended to help them comprehend intertextual references typical of academic texts. Among the nodal points were the notions of "graded language", "consciousness raising, "language processing", "Krashen's theory", etc. – proper conceptualization of which was essential to the understanding of rest of the text. At this stage,

---

[3] Conversational exchanges are not annotated for incorrectness.

students are expected to use all possible resources but most of all they are supposed to negotiate subjective meanings between each other.

In step four – exploratory talk, pedagogical talk – answers were elicited in a whole class discussion. My intention was not to take over and let students construct the meaning themselves, assuming that my understanding did not have to be the only possibility. The following fragment demonstrated that apparently simple phrase "graded language" needed re-contextualization (Bernstein, 1972) and a lot of languaging to imbue it with meaning.

The exchange demonstrates (see appendix) that something apparently very simple, like the phrase "graded language" turned out to be cognitively complex. The difficulty derived from the fact that it was used in the text in a metaphorical sense; nonetheless, its meaning was essential for the conceptualization of the term "noticing". Interactions, evoked experiences, visualization and reconceptualization helped them tame a piece of "academic rhetoric" and sell professional jargon as another restricted code by its deep contextualization (Atherton, 2011). The sign afforded itself to meaning making through the plane of *deixis*, it became imbued with *iconicity* and *symbolicity*, which the semiotic ecological perspective refers to as anchoring, "the tying of language to the world, the grasping of the word through language, and the tying of the self to the world, resulting in mind" (van Lier, 2004: 66). The predicational abstract chunk became substantiated with the indicational process to afford meaning. The interaction manifests that academic language needs to relate to all other types of language, an argument against compartmentalized perception of EAP courses. Furthermore, it shows how new meanings emerge at each additional reading and working in the interactional zone of the classroom (Kramsch, 2008).

In step five, expert talk was triggered by asking students to work out in pairs a summary pertaining to the concept of noticing and present it to the rest of the group. The elicitation of the task revealed idiosyncratic understanding of the concept. Students accentuated different points, construed concepts in alternative ways. Despite the fact that the majority of the presentations were to the point, they still exhibited general misconception and terminological instability. The presentations themselves were a good opportunity for the students to realize experientially that knowledge and language are constructed interactionally with others. The reflection session on the presentation will be the subject of another academic consideration. I enclose herewith three selected summaries.

> *Noticing is a new **way of teaching** English. We rather **show students mistakes** or **repeat some of grammar issues then try teach them all the grammar***

structures all over again. When we see new things and *someone gives us a simple answer about them it is easier* to understand them.

This theory modifies the theory of Krashen, not only the graded language is needed but also noticing of certain language structures. Teachers task is to make his students aware of the grammar structures in the language by emphasizing its main features. **To establish those features students should be tested on those structures**.

There is a significant difference between making students aware of a language than teaching it Teacher just shows the structure, does not explain it, students notice it. For students to notice a language structure teachers need to draw their attention i.e. by repeating some language grammar, changing the voice or simply putting it down on the blackboard, **because students not knowing the rules are not able to recognize that is correct.** *Students have to be on some language level to notice new structures. Teachers should not expect immediate application of the rules by students, it takes longer time.*

The highlighted phrases are, in a sense, indicative of incomprehension or, possibly, the result of a discrepancy between concepts and their articulation. The follow-up interaction referring to the content of the summaries was aimed to raise students' awareness of the constructionist character of language and knowledge. Due to space limitations and the need for additional theoretical references to build a new hypothesis, I decided to present my findings in a separate paper to maintain the clarity of my considerations.

5. Conclusion

This qualitative research described in this paper was intended to demonstrate that elaborated academic language cannot rely only on the development of Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency but it requires evocation of multiple timescales, "levels of reality and fiction" (Kramsch, 2008: 391). It need to be accentuated here that since "CALP is easier to acquire in an L1 than in an L2, it accounts, according to Cummins for the success of bilingual programs. If this is so, the issue of mastering academic language is not the problem of terminology but lies ironically in the sphere of BICS or the area of context reduction" (Lankiewicz, 2013b: 126). The activation of the "talkscape" seems to trigger learning "coming-to-know-while-speaking" phenomenon (Swain, 2006b) or languaging (Swain, 2006a). CLIL methodology with double-plannedness (language and content) offers affordances for the construction of meanings, which are so vital in meaningful language learning, and developing the voice in aca-

demic language. Thus, it is ultimately assumed that CLIL methodology presents a challenge for the Balkanized vision of the cognitive context support for context-reduced EAP courses (Järvinen, 2009: 167). With the application of the ecological and semiotic perceptive CLIL seeks to help students establish personal contexts by an extensive use of languaging.

BIBLIOGRAFIA

(CR, 2008), Council Resolution of 21 November 2008 on a European strategy for multilingualism, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C: 2008:320:0001:01:EN:HTML DW 23.11.2013.

(LPD 2009). Language(s) of schooling. Language Policy Division, DG IV/ EDU/ LANG (2009)5. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/langeduc/boxc2-schooling_EN.a sp#s1 DW 23.11. 2013.

(KRK 2011). Rozporządzenie Ministra nauki i szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 2 listopada 2011 r. w sprawie Krajowych Ram Kwalifikacji dla Szkolnictwa Wyższego. http://isap.sejm.gov.pl/DetailsServlet?id=WDU20112531520 DW 23.11.2013.

Atherton, J. S. 2011. Doceo; Language codes [On-line: UK]. http://www.doceo.co.uk/ background/language_codes.htm DW 25.08.2013.

Bernstein, B. 1971. Class, codes and control (Volume 1). London: Routledge and Kegan.

Bernstein, B. 1999. "Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay" (w) British Journal of Sociology of Education 20, 2. Academic Research Library: 157-173.

Bruner, J. S. 1990. Acts of meaning. Harvard University Press, Cambridge: MA.

Carter, D. 1983. "Some propositions of ESP". The ESP Journal 2: 131-137.

CLIL compendium: http://www.clilcompendium.com/clilcontacts.htm DW 08.08.2013.

Cummins, J. 1979. "Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimal age question and some other matters". Working Papers on Bilingualism 19: 197-205.

Cummins, J. 1980. "The cross-lingual dimension of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue". TESOL Quarterly 14: 175-187.

Cummins, J. 1991. "Conversational and academic language proficiency in academic context". AILA Review 8: 75-89.

Dudley-Evans, T., St John, M.J. 1998. Developments in ESP: a multi-disciplinary approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eco, U. 2000. Kant and the platypus: Essays on language and cognition. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Fairclough, N. 1992. Critical language awareness. London and New York: Longman.

Genzuk, M. 2011. "Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) for language minority students". http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/CMMR/Digital Papers/SDAIE_Genzuk.pdf DW 24.08.2013.

Harding, K. 2007. English for specific purposes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. 2007. The practice of English language teaching. London: Longman

Hutchinson, T., Waters, A. 1992. English for specific purposes: a learning-centred approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Järvinen, H.-M. 2009. "What has ecology to do with CLIL? An ecological approach in content and language integrated learning" (w) CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field (red. D. Marsh and P. Mehisto; D. Wolff, R. Aliaga, T. Asikainen, M. J. Frigols-Martin, S. Hughes, G. Langé). CCN: University of Jyväskylä (Finland): 164-171.

Jørgensen, Normann, J. and Juffermans, Kasper 2011. Languaging. http://www.toolkit-online.eu/docs/languaging.html DW 10.08.2013.

Kennedy, C., Bolitho, R. 1990. English for specific purposes. London: Macmillan.

Kiely, R. 2011. "Understanding CLIL as an innovation". Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching 1: 153-171.

Kramsch, C. (2002). "Introduction: 'How can we tell the dancer from the dance?'" (w) Language Acquisition and language Socialization: Ecological Perspectives (red. C. Kramsch). London and New York: Continuum.

Kramsch, C. 2008. "Ecological perspectives on foreign language education". Language Teaching Vol. 41/3: 389-408.

Kramsch, C., Whiteside, A. 2008. "Language Ecology in Multilingual Settings. Towards a Theory of Symbolic Competence". Applied Linguistics 29/4: 645-671.

Laclau, E., Mouffe, C. 1985. Hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics. London: Verso.

Lankiewicz, H. 1997. „Alternatywa dla programy nauki języka angielskiego". Języki Obce w Szkole 1/202: 24-29.

Lankiewicz, H. 1998. „Propozycja lekcji 'modern studies' w LO". Języki Obce w Szkole 3/209: 244-249.

Lankiewicz, H. 2013a. „Filologiczna praca licencjacka a rozwój kompetencji naukowych studenta". Neofilolog 40/1: 111-125.

Lankiewicz, H. 2013b. "Taming academic language; Reflections of methodology teacher » (w) The creative potential of the word: from fiction to education (red. A. Szczepaniak-Kozak, H. Lankiewicz). Piła: Wydawnictwo PWSZ: 123-143.

Lankiewicz, H. "ESP or GE courses? English as academic language vs. content". (forthcoming a).

Lankiewicz, H. „Budowanie refleksji w oparciu o languaging jako alternatywy dla feedbacku: rozwój proceduralnej świadomości konstrukcjonistycznej natury wiedzy i języka". (forthcoming b).

Lankiewicz, H., Wąsikiewicz-Firlej, E. (red.). Languaging experiences: learning and teaching revisited. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing (forthcoming).

Maleki, A. 2008. "ESP Teaching: A Matter of Controversy" (w) ESP World, Issue 1 (17), Vol. 7. Retrieved from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_17/issue_17.htm DW 23.11.2013.

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) Paris: University of Sorbonne.

Moate, J. 2011. "Reconceptualising the role of talk in CLIL". Journal of Applied Language Studies Vol. 5/2: 17-35.

Nesi, H. 2013. "Uncovering occluded genres: a role for corpora in LSP". Presentation at the 12th conference at the European Association of Languages for Specific Purposes. Books of Abstracts.

Robinson, P. C. 1991. ESP today: a practitioner's guide. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Schmidt, R. 1990. "The role of noticing in second language learning". Applied Linguistics 11/2: 129-158.

Steffensen, S.V. 2007. "Language, ecology and society: An introduction to Dialectical Linguistics" (w) Language, Ecology and Society – a dialectical approach (red. J. C Bang. i J. Døør), London: Continuum, 3-31.

Strevens, P. 1988. "ESP after twenty years: A re-appraisal" (w) ESP state of the art (red. M. Tickoo). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Centre: 1-13.

Swain, M. 2006a. "Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency" (w) Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky (red. H. Byrnes). New York: Continuum: 95-108.

Swain, M. 2006b. "Verbal protocols: what does it mean for research to use speaking as a data collection?" (w) Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple research perspectives (red. M. Chalhoub-Deville, C. Chapelle, P. Duff). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 97-113.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S. 2002. "Talking-it-through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation". International Journal of Educational Research (Special issue on the role of interaction in instructed language learning Vol. 37: 285-304.

Van Lier, L. 2001. "From input to affordances: Sociocultural-interactive learning form the ecological perspective" (w) Sociocultural theory and second language learning (red. J. P. Lantolf). Oxford: Oxford University Press: 245-285.

Van Lier, L. 2004. The ecology and semiotics of language learning. A sociocultural perspective. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. Mind and society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1997. Educational psychology. Boca Raton: St. Lucie Press.

Wertsch, J. V. 1998. Mind as action. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zajączkowska, B. 2013. "Content and language Integrated Learning" (w) From classroom to workplace: Advances in Applied Linguistics (red. E. Wąsikiewicz-Firlej, H. Lankiewicz). Piła: Wydawnictwo PWSZ: 135-144.

Appendix

An excerpt from classroom interaction pertaining to stage four of the research.
T: So, what do you think graded language is?
S1: Simplified version
T: Like what? Any examples? [reference to pedagogical talk]
S1: Graded readers, books for students, are good example.
T: So, this is what you found in your dictionary, right?

Ss: [Laughter as confirmation]…

T: So in what way are the books graded?

S2: The versions of books [still citing a definition form the dictionary].

T: Has anybody seen a grated reader book?

Ss: [silence…]

T: You have never seen versions of books for children marked A up to 600 words, B up to 1200 words, C, D, etc.?

Ss: … [some of them exhibit familiarity with graded readers, some of them seem to be surprised…]

S3: Yes, I have got some at home, they are not mine, but I have seen them.

T: So, in what way is language graded there? [I make focus on the meaning of the word because students do not seem to know it].

S2: Maybe, less words, less grammar.

T: OK, fewer words, less complicated grammar. So, what is the meaning of graded?

S4: Simplified.

S5: Yes, I think, everything is less complicated than in an original book for a native speaker.

T: Yes, of a lower grade, sometimes called abridged version, form 'to abridge' meaning 'to reduce'.

T: See, in a sense, I am activating noticing for you right now, would you notice it without my help?, Anyway, the concept of noticing refers more to formal, grammar aspects of language, we will come back to it [meta talk, pedagogical talk].

T: What is, then, the function of graded language in the process of language acquisition?

S1: Hmm, Isn't it something like comprehensible input?

T: Perfect, can you give me an example of how it works? [pedagogical talk].

… [the student delivers a satisfying example].

T: In what way noticing is different form Krashen's theory?

S: I am not sure, but perhaps Krashen believed that grammatically graded language is enough to understand and remember, and (.) (looking for the name), Schmidt claims, you need first to notice a new grammar structure to (.) process it, remember and use.

T: Exactly, you hit the nail on the head [Here, I explain the meaning of the idiomatic expression, which I rashly use – opportunistic leaning. Then, I initiate critical talk and pedagogic talk asking the following questions: Do you think, noticing supplements or complements Krashen's theory? In what way is it different? Discussion on other items follows suit].