



Piet Van de Craen

Evy Ceuleers

Jill Surmont

Eva Mignom

Laure Allain

1. Introduction

The main task of this group was to show, first, in what way political aspects do influence the implementation of multilingual education recommended by Europe and, second, in what way multilingual education has an added-value vis-à-vis the learners in secondary education. We approached these questions from the Belgian angle and, more specifically, from the Flemish angle since, in Wallonia since 1998 (revised in 2007) a decree stipulates in what way multilingual education should be organized. Since Flanders is one of the few regions in Europe where multilingual education is not officially allowed this region cannot but be boosted by our efforts.

When we refer to multilingual education we refer to content and language integrated learning (CLIL), which is a generic term indicating that a - preferably but not necessarily - native speaker of the target language teaches subject matter in a second - or foreign language - for a number of hours per week. This approach is accompanied by a number of pedagogical accompanying measures. Consequently, it is apt to be used in primary and secondary schools much less so in a university context. The following results are divided in two parts. First the political aspects are discussed and, second, the pedagogical activities and results.

2. Political aspects

Flanders is part of the near federal state of Belgium that became independent in 1830. From 1840 onwards the Flemish Movement has been striving for an independent Flanders. Today, their heirs can be found in right wing and ultra right wing nationalist parties. As elsewhere in Europe – The Netherlands, Hungary and Finland come to mind but also Italy, France and Denmark can be mentioned - in Flanders these parties advocating a populist programme enjoy some momentum at the onset of the 21st century. One of them has won the 2010 elections and is responsible for a crisis of the federal government that at

the time of writing – spring 2011 – already lasts ten months.

Since 2004 the ministers of education have been members of the socialist party. The first one, who held the post until 2009, developed a very antagonistic discourse with respect to multilingual education. Its examination revealed ideas inspired by the classical arguments of the Flemish Movement as well as those taken from the nationalist parties. It is characterized by a monolingual view of education and even some anti-European ideas with respect to European legislation. His successor and current minister is less radical in this respect but at the time of writing he has not made any official statements regarding multilingual education in Flanders. The only official initiative that was taken was the implementation of CLIL in nine experimental secondary schools spread over Flanders but Brussels and its periphery excluded, lasting from 2008 to 2010. The official report has not been made public at the time of writing although we know that it is positive. In view of all this we undertook a study examining which factors are significant in countries' view on multilingualism. Six countries were singled out, the four countries neighbouring Belgium, plus Estonia and Spain because these countries have recently been particularly active in implementing CLIL. Table 1 summarizes our findings according to five parameters

Country/ Parameter	Dutch- speak- ing Belgium	France	The Netherlands	Luxembourg	Germany	Spain	Estonia
Standardization	Late	Early	Early	Late	Late	Early	Late
Perceived language threat	Big	Awareness	Small	Big	Small	Awareness	Big
Language dominance	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Language Legislation	Heavy	Reasonably heavy	Light	Changing towards heavy	Light	Heavy before, much lighter now	Heavy
Acceptance of multilingual education	Very reluctantly	Very reluctantly	Wholeheartedly	Very reluctantly	Wholeheartedly	Before, very reluctantly, now wholeheartedly	Very reluctantly

Table 1: Parameters influencing acceptance of multilingual education in one region and six countries in Europe

From the above some interesting inferences can be made. It seems that European policies have a fertile ground when the language (1) had early standardization, (2) with no language treats (3) dominant and (4) has light legislation. On the contrary, when the language (1) has late standardization, (2) perceives language threats, (3) is or feels dominated and (4) lives under heavy legislation multilingual education encounters resistance to implementation.

3. Pedagogical aspects and results

Despite the previous we have been implementing multilingual education since 2001. Since 2008 we have been following two secondary schools from the experimental programme just mentioned, one vocational and one elite school. Our findings suggest that the following aspects improve with CLIL pupils as compared to traditional education. (1) Better knowledge of the target language (French and English), (2) increased knowledge of the mother tongue, (3) increased knowledge of subject matter judged by their marks, (4) increased positive awareness of their own attitudes vis-à-vis languages, (5) increased cognitive activities judged by their general school performance. In short, we were able to show that no matter whether or not a vocational or an elite school was examined in both cases pupils profited from the added-value of CLIL as mentioned in the literature.

4. Conclusion

To study the influence of policy on multilingual education and the impact of multilingual education on practices was our main task. As far as the first aspect is concerned we showed that language policies might indeed have serious impact on implementation of multilingual education. We also showed the most important parameters that influence European countries in general. As far as practice is concerned we were able to show the added value of CLIL in a vocational as well as in an elite school with respect to five parameters.

© 2011 DYLAN Project

For more information please visit www.dylan-project.org