CLIL BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

Multilingualism is essential in today’s society. We need multilingual citizens, not only as a labor necessity, but also as a factor indicating social integration, research and education (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009). In fact, it is in education “where answers have to be sought for how immigrant populations can be integrated into and served by their host societies, but also for how predominantly monolingual populations can be made fit for the demands of international interaction and cooperation” (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2007: 7). In this environment of multilingualism, FLs (foreign languages) teaching-learning processes are vital, namely, “the CLIL scheme has grown stronger as a solution” (Lorenzo 2007) in this context to become commonplace due to its effectiveness to improve students’ FL skills (Lasagabaster 2008). Rooted in immersion programs in Canada and content-based language teaching like sheltered instruction (Dutro and Moran 2003) and bilingual education in the USA (Pérez Vidal 2007; Dalton-Puffer 2007; and Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit 2010), CLIL “refers to situations where subjects (...) are taught through a foreign language with dual-focused aims, namely the learning of content and the simultaneous learning of a foreign language” (Marsh 1999, as cited in Pavlovic and Markovic 2012). Hence, CLIL establishes a balance between content and language learning (Pavlovic and Markovic 2012). Proficiency is supposed to be reciprocally achieved in both the subject matter and the FL (Dalton-Puffer 2007; Coyle et al. 2010; Llinares and Morton 2010; Lasagabaster 2011; Jaímez and López Morillas 2011).

2. Why CLIL?

The implementation of CLIL programs aims at fulfilling socio-economic, socio-cultural, linguistic and educational objectives (Eurydice 2006a: 22). Offering students better job prospects and values of cultural tolerance, enabling them to use the FL in real contexts and to acquire content knowledge are basic factors which CLIL is covering. Bearing these objectives in mind, in order to assemble different features of CLIL pedagogies, Coyle (2007) and Coyle et al. (2010) suggest a “4Cs” approach to CLIL. This conceptual outline can highlight CLIL as a mode of instruction (Morton...
2010: 97) because it caters for an equilibrium between content (subject matter), communication (language), cognition (learning and thinking) and culture (social acceptance of the self and others) (Pérez Vidal 2007; Morton 2010; Lasagabaster 2011; Spratt 2012; Pavlovic and Markovic 2012). An association between cognition and bilingualism is evident in The Threshold Theory by Cummins (1976) and Skutnabb-Khangas (1979), which says that “the closer the students are to being bilingual, the greater the chance of obtaining cognitive advantages” (Madrid and Hughes 2011: 24).

The language needed for learning in a CLIL context is thoroughly presented in The Language Triptych which Coyle (2007, 2011) and Coyle et al. (2010) suggest. CLIL learners can highly benefit from this threefold role of language: language of learning (conceptual language), language for learning (metacognitive skills) and language through learning (language learned through cognitive development, language needed for BICS and CALP) (Coyle 2007, 2011; Coyle et al. 2010; Spratt 2012). This representation promotes language using as language ‘for knowledge construction’ (Dalton-Puffer, 2007: 65) since “using language to learn is as important as learning to use language –both are requirements” (Coyle et al. 2010: 35) for a systematic CLIL progression. Consequently, a combination of language learning and language using, i.e., “teaching English, not just teaching ‘in’ English or simply providing opportunities for students to interact with each other in English” (Dutro and Moran 2003: 3), lets CLIL teachers bring together “what is good practice in first language content classrooms and second or other language learning classrooms” (Coyle 2011: 60).

Based on the belief that children are better at acquiring a language implicitly, CLIL encourages the use of language in natural contexts (Dafton-Puffer and Nikula 2006; Dalton-Puffer 2007; Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2007; Lasagabaster 2008), which takes us to the idea of a communicative approach to language teaching (Lasagabaster 2008). Dalton-Puffer (2007) posits that CLIL learners acquire “concepts, topics and meanings which can become the object of ‘real communication’ where natural use of the target language is possible” (p. 3). Unlike in traditional EFL contexts, CLIL promotes learning the language of the street in a formal context, thus creating a “language bath” (Dalton-Puffer 2007).
It is “in real communicative situations” that “language learning takes place in a more meaningful and efficient way” (Lasagabaster 2008: 32). CLIL is then linked to experiential views of SLA by merging meaningful activities and meaningful academic content, therefore bringing about authenticity (Lorenzo 2007). Likewise, “the implementation of a CLIL approach augments the presence of the foreign language in the curriculum without increasing students’ time commitment” (Lasagabaster 2008), consequently saving time (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2007), and time is precious in any educational context.

Another advantage for CLIL students is how this content-based instruction enhances motivation (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2007; Coyle 2007; Coyle et al. 2010; Spratt 2012), self-esteem and confidence (Llinares and Dafouz 2010); partly because “the higher proficiency level achieved (…) may have a positive effect on their desire to learn and develop their language competence” (Marsh 2000, as cited in Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009; Lasagabaster 2008).

Also, the development of CLIL programs is to a certain extent derived from cooperative learning (Ting 2011) for this method encourages the progress of higher order thinking skills (Brewster 2009, Llinares and Dafouz 2010) and makes available more opportunities to share different opinions by means of social interaction with peers (Pistorio 2010).

For implicit learning to occur, “massive amounts of input are needed” (Lasagabaster 2008: 32). Studying different content subjects through a FL clearly provides more exposure to the language (Dalton-Puffer 2007, 2008), improving thus the linguistic competence of CLIL students (Agustín Llach 2009; Ojeda Alba 2009). However, this improvement is more obvious in receptive skills (listening and reading), vocabulary and morphology than in productive skills (speaking and writing) and syntax (Dalton-Puffer 2007, 2008; Lasagabaster 2008; Llinares and Dafouz 2010). In the case of vocabulary, repeated exposure to new lexicon provokes an increase in the knowledge of words. In Nation’s (1990) view, “learners need to be involved in five to 16 repetitions in order to learn the new word” (in Ting 2011: 136), a frequency possible when studying subjects in a FL as a consequence of this greater exposure.

Also, it has been claimed that “learners studying in a CLIL context will show fewer instances of L1 transfer than other learners receiving traditional instruction in the
foreign language” (Agustín Llach 2009: 114). This is based on the strong relationship between L1 (first language) and L2 (second language), as stated by Vygotsky (1934, 1986) and Cummins (1978) through the linguistic interdependence hypothesis, which asserts that “becoming functionally bilingual is influenced by the level of competency in the first language” (Vartuki 2010: 68). Thus, there exists a necessity for CLIL students to have a good mastery of the L1 before starting studying in the L2.

3. CLIL and EFL

When comparing CLIL and EFL, the positive effects of content-based teaching can be indicated.

Attributable to the implicit learning exclusively provided in FL naturalistic contexts (Lasagabaster 2008), CLIL learners show a better development of communicative competence than traditional EFL students (Dalton-Puffer and Nikula 2006).

Based on a greater exposure to the FL and more meaningful and authentic tasks through CLIL rather than ELT (English Language Teaching), the content-based approach appeals to more positive attitudes towards the FL on behalf of CLIL learners (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009; Lasagabaster 2008; Spratt 2012).

CLIL and ELT require different syllabuses, language use and teaching methodologies. In the same way, the learning contexts they entail are different. While CLIL classes are organized around the content to be learned, ELT focuses on grammar, vocabulary, and skills (Spratt 2012).

Finally, we can go as far as saying that “even if the traditional teaching of the foreign language is of very high quality, optimal goals cannot be achieved due to lack of time, as ‘in foreign language settings input is, by definition, limited and it is usually distributed in very small doses’” (Muñoz 2008: 590, in Lasagabaster 2008). In this sense, CLIL is much more beneficial due to the greater amount of exposure hours to the language.

4. CLIL in Europe

The European Commission’s White Paper on Education and Training (1995) suggested incorporating methods which promoted plurilingualism into national curricula. Many countries promptly started implementing bilingual programs (Casal and Moore 2009: 38) as “a European solution to a European need” (Marsh 2002: 5, in
Lorenzo 2007: 27). Principles like mobility, economic cohesion, and maintenance of cultural diversity were necessary to implant and/or augment (Lorenzo 2007). Today, the range of CLIL programs under plurilingual European contexts is reasonably extensive: Germany, Italy, Ireland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Austria, Finland, Spain or Wales (Marsh 2002, in Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009: 7); and their use of the FL “is mainly confined to the classroom” (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2010; Whittaker, Llinares and McCabe 2011).

Concerning Spain and Italy, CLIL instruction was seen as urgent from an early age owing to the facts that more than 50% of their inhabitants are monolingual, and that “the percentage of Spanish (17%) and Italians (16%) who can hold a conversation in two other languages is among the lowest among the European member states” (Lasagabaster 2008: 31).

Dalton-Puffer (2007, in Lasagabaster 2008) boosted the linguistic benefits of CLIL after looking at some research in German speaking countries, whose results showed a higher language competence by CLIL students compared to non-CLIL learners. Dalton-Puffer reached the conclusion that those CLIL learners who were generally good at FLs would also have a good performance in traditional EFL classes, and that it would be the average students who would benefit more from a CLIL program.

In another study, in Swedish secondary schools, Sylvén (2004, 2006) states that CLIL learners acquired a wider vocabulary due to a greater exposure to the FL (in Jiménez Catalán and Ruiz de Zarobe (2009).

4.1. CLIL in Spain

The spread of CLIL programs across Spain has been very fast; first, due to the Spaniards’ growing awareness of the necessity to learn FLs (Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster 2010a), and, second, to incorporate the co-official languages (Catalan, Basque or Galician) in education (Cenoz 2009; Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster 2010a). In the case of foreign languages, it is English, the international language, the predominant FL in CLIL programs in Spain. According to Cenoz (2009), “using English as an additional language of instruction can provide the opportunity for more exposure to English in a context in which contact with English outside the classroom is very limited” (p. 145), as unfortunately happens in Spain.
Spain presents two different settings for the implantation of CLIL: bilingual and monolingual regions. Bilingual areas like Catalonia, the Basque Country or Galicia, through CLIL, aim “to maintain already existing bilingual communities”. Specifically, the Basque Country has been implementing a Plurilingual Experience “to prove the educational importance and the efficiency of this program in a bilingual community with two already integrated languages, Spanish and Basque” (Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster 2010b: 30). On the other hand, monolingual regions like Madrid, Andalusia, La Rioja or Extremadura, intend to foster foreign languages, mainly English, apart from L1 (Road, Madrid and Sanz 2011: 107-8).

In Catalonia, some CLIL programs have been implanted in primary and secondary education, but there exists a lack of continuity from one level to the other. Nonetheless, the research carried out so far has proved the positive outcomes of CLIL. Namely, Catalan students have shown a good command of both Catalan and Spanish at the end of secondary education, which seems to be good evidence for CLIL in other languages (Ruiz de Zarobe and Lasagabaster 2010b: 30). In fact, Navés and Victori (2010) mention the better results in language proficiency by CLIL learners than EFL students. However, we must still be doubtful about this connection as the presence of FLs outside school is much more limited than the use of Catalan or Spanish. That is to say that the degree of bilingualism in other languages would be somehow more difficult to attain than in Spanish-Catalan.

The Basque Country offers a widespread implementation of CLIL programs. Lasagabaster (2008), in a study conducted in this region, observed how CLIL learners in grade 4 of secondary education outperformed non-CLIL students in the same or even higher grades in all the linguistic measures analyzed. Thus, CLIL did not only foster receptive skills as pointed out by Dalton-Puffer (2007), but also writing and pronunciation. Also, it was demonstrated that “students benefited from the CLIL approach irrespective of their sociocultural status”, probably due to the meaningful language use created in CLIL classes (Lasagabaster 2008: 40).

In another bilingual setting, Galicia, a study (San Isidro 2010) in 10 secondary schools, both in urban and rural areas, proved the educational benefits of CLIL as regards English language proficiency. Contrary to the traditional view that girls are better at languages, no gender differences were found in this CLIL context. However,
CLIL urban learners outperformed their rural counterparts in oral skills, probably due to technologically less well provided schools in rural areas.

The Spanish monolingual setting where CLIL implantation has been more flourishing in the last two decades is Andalusia. Here, CLIL instruction is present in a great number of primary and secondary education schools, in which one group of learners per level (known as the bilingual section) is taught 30% to 50% of the curricula of two or more content subjects in a FL, primarily English. At a later stage, this CLIL exposure is increased through the learning of an L3 (Jaímez and López Morillas 2011: 79). Hence, the Andalusian context shows good results for the multilingualism Europe is seeking. Some research conducted in this region by Lorenzo, Casal and Moore (2009) showed that CLIL students performed better in English than monolingual peers. However, CLIL late starters obtained similar scores to their early start counterparts, which makes us speculate about the necessity of an early start in CLIL or not. In any case, according to some teachers, bilingual co-ordinations and language assistants involved in this Andalusian CLIL setting, the influence of CLIL goes beyond the L2 itself (Roa, Madrid and Sanz 2011) as it improves the learners’ cognitive development.

4.1.1. CLIL in Madrid

The Community of Madrid has introduced CLIL, particularly through English, as an unquestionably ambitious program. In fact, CLIL is different in Madrid due to “its large dimension” and “its fast implementation” (Llinares and Dafouz 2010: 110). The number of state schools incorporating CLIL programs has been consistently increasing in the last decade (Whittaker, Llinares and McCabe 2011). In the academic year 2015-16, there were 353 state primary education schools and 110 state secondary education schools, including IES Gómez-Moreno (Consejería de Educación de Madrid). At the end of this same school year, the first Madrid Bilingual Project students graduated and got their Bachillerato certificate, which might bring about a range of studies to analyze the benefits of CLIL after so much funding in its implementation.

Apart from its fast incorporation, CLIL in Madrid has been put into practice differently and in a more demanding way from other Spanish regions. Some of the requirements established by the regional government are the exclusion of teaching Math, and obviously Spanish and French, in a FL, the prerequisite for learners to attain a minimum level of English (A2) according to the European Framework of Languages.
to enter the program and the condition for teachers to have a C1 level to teach in CLIL programs. Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) support this last requirement at least for teachers in secondary and tertiary education. However, in other regions in Spain, Math is taught in English, there is no minimum entrance mark requirement and teachers are simply required to have a B2 level.

The CLIL program in state secondary education schools in Madrid (like IES Gómez-Moreno) encompasses one or more CLIL Bilingual Section groups in each level. The rest of the students are distributed in semi-CLIL Bilingual Program classes. The CLIL learners in the Bilingual Section are all taught Social Studies and Science in English and optionally other different content subjects. Additionally, they are given five hours per week of Advanced English (English language, literature and culture). In the Bilingual Programs, learners are offered five hours of traditional EFL, but semi-CLIL students are also taught some optional content subjects (Art, Technology, PE) in English depending on the school (at IES Gómez-Moreno they learn PE in English). We can then conclude that all learners in state bilingual schools gain a greater exposure to a FL as against those attending non-bilingual high schools in Madrid.

The effects of CLIL in Madrid are examined in a study conducted by Llinares and Whittaker (2010) in different state secondary schools to examine if CLIL learners’ difficulties with history genres were due to a poor English competency or if they also appeared in tasks developed in their mother tongue. The results suggest that the history genres are not negatively affected by CLIL tuition, supporting thus the idea that content-based education enhances the learning of a content subject instead of having a harmful effect on it (Spratt 2012).

Hence, CLIL instruction is present in state, semi-private and private schools all over Spain, which takes us to the constructive belief that this type of learning is not discriminatory. The only selective factor evident in some regions such as Madrid is the requirement for a minimum level to enroll in the CLIL program, which in Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe’s (2010) view should be avoided. The best way to implement CLIL programs is doing it equally across the country, not independently.
CLIL LESSON PLAN

Summary of Needs Description:

This CLIL Unit is aimed at a group of 1st or 2nd year of Secondary Education enrolled in a CLIL program in Spain. Their level of literacy in Spanish is upper-intermediate, and they have an A2 or B1 proficiency level of English.

These learners’ greatest area of need is more linguistic and strategic than content-based. They call for mainly improving their communicative skills in the L2, but also their academic writing, which “fosters thinking” (Chamot and O’Malley, 1994). In addition, they need to become aware of their own learning process. Thus, the acquisition of learning strategies, like doing self-assessment or developing critical thinking, is essential.

Hence, with the purpose of satisfying these students’ needs, this unit plan is thematically based. All the activities will be connected somehow to the main topic, “All that glitters is not gold”. Based on this, the content areas to be covered are Language Arts and Social Studies.

In order to engage these students, the methodology will be highly interactive. They will be able to learn language through content in a natural context. The whole learning process will follow a cooperative learning approach, and the utilization of visuals and the Internet will provoke motivation.

Summary of Materials Review:

“All that glitters is not gold” will be built up using these three materials, among others: a printed version of Little Red Riding Hood from a webpage, Little Red Riding Hood and the Wolf poem by Roald Dahl, and Roald Dahl’s webpage itself.

These three materials will be useful to exploit vocabulary (as pre-reading), and text structure of the different genres. Also, the students will have to develop metacognitive learning (prior knowledge, selective attention, organizational planning, self-assessment), cognitive learning (inferences, critical thinking, visuals, Internet), and affective learning (interaction).

Concerning content, these materials will cover Literature (genres, plots, characters, poetry features) and Social Studies (comparing past and modern moral values).

The authenticity of the materials promotes meaningful activities and motivation in the CLIL classroom. Moreover, they are easy to adapt to different students’ levels, and simple to expand.

Instructional Objectives:

Language:

The students will be able to listen to, speak, read and write about subject matter information. They will also have to analyze, synthesize and infer from information, as well as hypothesize and predict.
As to listening goals, the learners are supposed to listen to poems for rhyme and intonation, and pay attention to oral presentations. As regards writing, they must develop their academic writing. In relation to speaking, they should establish pair/group discussions regarding the basic theme.

**Content:**
By the end of the unit, the students will be able to identify two different genres: narrative (a fairy tale) and poetry. They are supposed to analyze the plot of a clearly structured fairy tale, and recognize the main theme in a poem. Also, they must distinguish in a narrative / poem the motives for the characters’ actions. They will have to order the different parts of the story, as well as compare and contrast, which “stimulates cognitive development” (Dutro & Moran, 2003). Moreover, they must interpret the moral of a fairy tale. Concerning form, they should identify some basic features in poetry (rhyme, symbolism and metaphors).

**Learning strategies:**
Throughout this CLIL unit the learning strategies will be taught explicitly (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994). First, the students must use some metacognitive strategies in order to be aware of their learning process. They will need to use selective attention and organizational planning, as well as self-monitoring and self-assessment.

With reference to cognitive strategies, the students must deal with literature relating it to prior knowledge, which is seen as “a critical influence on the acquisition of new information” (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994). In the course of the unit, they will be asked to develop critical thinking regarding the main theme. Making inferences about the meaning of words and expressions is another fundamental cognitive strategy. Likewise, the students will need to summarize information for comparing and contrasting ideas.

Finally, the learners must also develop affective strategies over interaction with classmates and teachers. Through cooperative learning, the students will carry out pair and group tasks.

**Activities:**

**Lesson 1: Apperances can be deceptive (LRRH)**
**Lesson 2: Social values have changed (The LRRH and the Wolf by Roald Dahl)**
**Lesson 3: Roald Dahl as a writer (webpage and books)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Why? / How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Ss will use prior knowledge.</td>
<td>Brainstorming (The Smurfs)</td>
<td>-To promote motivation / higher-order thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ss will be able to predict the unit theme from pictures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-By brainstorming information through pictures of 3 Smurfs and connecting it to deceptive appearances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ss will hypothesize and synthesize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ss will be able to speak about subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ss will use critical thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ss will learn through authentic material/visuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Expected Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening (Don’t Judge the Book by its Cover poem)</td>
<td>For rhyme and intonation. By listening to a poem related to the main theme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRH warm-up</td>
<td>-To foster prior knowledge. -By predicting from 3 pictures (a wolf, a basket, a forest) to guess the fairy tale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In groups, ordering parts of fairy tale + listening for checking</td>
<td>-To promote reading strategies / cooperative learning / self-assessment. -By making Ss order LRRH tale in groups + listen to the story on the website for checking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening (LRRH and the Wolf by Roald Dahl)</td>
<td>-To compare LRRH different versions / to foster listening skills / to analyze poetry features / to promote motivation. -By listening to a poem related to the theme read by the actual poet / by analyzing rhyme and figurative language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baskets graphic organizer</td>
<td>-To compare and contrast endings / to improve writing skills. -By completing graphic organizer for using critical thinking / writing new ending.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRH Mafalda comic</td>
<td>-To compare how social values in LRRH have changed. -By drawing new ending for the comic making use of critical thinking and cooperative learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research using Roald Dahl’s webpage</td>
<td>-To encourage reading. -By researching on 1 of Dahl’s book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: synopsis of</td>
<td>-To foster academic writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Ss will identify different parts of synopsis (plot, characters, setting).
- Ss will use organizational planning.
- By writing a synopsis of one of Dahl’s book.


- Ss will compare and contrast books.
- Ss will learn by interaction.
- Ss will do self-assessment.
- Ss will compare and contrast books.
- To compare synopses of books.
- Ss will listen to peers for information.
- By working cooperatively.

- Ss will complete a chart on books.

- Ss will be able to analyze a motto poem.
- Ss will make inferences about meaning.
- Ss will use critical thinking.
- To analyze authentic material.

- Ss will write a short motto poem.
- Ss will use rhyme.
- Ss will improve writing skills.
- By writing a motto poem using rhyme.

- Ss will read for organization of information.
- Ss will identify different parts of formal letter.
- Ss will use selective attention.
- Ss will make inferences.
- Ss will learn through authentic material.
- To analyze a formal letter / to use authentic material.

- Ss will be able to develop academic writing.
- Ss will use discourse.
- To improve academic writing.

Assessment:

Assessment procedures will be based on authentic reflections of meaningful opportunities (O’Malley & Valdez Pierre, 1996). Two different types of authentic assessment will be carried out: formal and informal.

Regarding formal assessment, the Ss will be evaluated on their projects (graphic organizers, oral presentations and writing samples). The T will assess the Ss’ academic writing by means of a rubric with the following categories: vocabulary, syntax and discourse. The students will be also evaluated on their reading through the following rubric:

**Literature Circle - Listening and Sharing : LRRH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Student seems to understand entire fairy tale</td>
<td>Student seems to understand most of the story</td>
<td>Student understands some parts of the story</td>
<td>Student does not understand most parts of the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinks about Characters</strong></td>
<td>Student describes how a character might have felt at some point in the story</td>
<td>Student describes how a character might have felt at some point in the story</td>
<td>Student describes how a character might have felt, but does NOT provide good</td>
<td>Student cannot describe how a character might have felt at a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As to informal assessment, the learners will be evaluated throughout the whole teaching process. First, the T will observe the Ss’ performance in the classroom (student attention, response to instructional material, interaction). Also, the T will assess Ss by asking questions to elicit information about the subject matter based on their prior knowledge. Furthermore, the learners will have to do self-assessment as part of their learning process. They will write reading and writing journal entries, which will be kept in their portfolios, for the teacher to give them feedback. Also, they will assess themselves by checklists on reading, writing and group discussion.

**LESSON PLAN (LITERATURE) - Student’s handouts -**

**Lesson 1: Judging the Book by its Cover**

**Stage 1:Appearances can be deceptive**

1. Can you think of some adjectives to describe the Smurfs’ personalities?


   You may be wrong. Actually, Smurfette is not as frivolous as she looks; she has a great heart deep inside. Brainy does not take things so seriously, in
fact, he loves partying with friends. Lazy Smurf works!!! And Farmer Smurf likes the city and fashion!!!

APPEARANCES CAN BE DECEPTIVE

2. Listen to the poem and repeat the different stanzas for intonation.

Stage 2: (traditional version)

1. Predict what we are going to talk about. The pictures below will help you.

2. In groups of four, try to order the different parts of the LRRH the teacher will give you.

Lesson 2 (Roald Dahl 1)

Stage 1

1. Listen to by Roald Dahl. Which is the ending in this story? Do you like it?
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y3uVQ1hSYfY (VIDEO)
   https://ace.home.xs4all.nl/Literaria/Txt-Dahl.html (TEXT)
2. In your group, provide a different ending for the story. Compare with the other groups' endings and vote for the most original.

   Fast learners: Now, read the moral of the story in a little poem by Perault and answer the questions:

   Little girls, this seems to say,
   Never stop upon our way.
   Never trust a stranger friend;
   No one knows how it will end.
   As you're pretty, so be wise,
   Wolfs may lurk in every guise.
   They may be handsome, gay and kind,
   Or even charming, never mind!
   Now, as then, it's simple truth:
   Sweetest tongue has sharpest tooth!

   -What does the word mean?
   -Why do little girls have to be careful?
Is a sweet tongue one that likes sugar?

What do you think the wolf symbolizes in the story?

**Stage 2:**

1. Take a look at the comic, where the is deconstructed. In pairs, provide an ending for the comic!!
2. Take a look at the real ending and compare it to yours.
3. Now that you have seen different endings to the story, have values changed according to times? Why?

**Assignment:** Complete a chart comparing the 3 different versions (use the Baskets graphic organizer).

**Lesson 3 (Roald Dahl 2)**

**Stage 1**

1. In pairs, choose a book by Roald Dahl on [www.roalddahl.com](http://www.roalddahl.com) and write a synopsis (characters, description, plot …) at home.

2. Present your synopsis to the class.

**Stage 2**

Roald Dahl lived his life by this motto:

My candle burns at both ends
It will not last the night
But ah my foes and oh my friends
It gives a lovely light

What does this tell you about Roald Dahl? What did he mean by it?

Write a short motto (try to make it rhyme) to sum up the way you live.
**MY MOTTO FOR LIFE**

Stage 3

1. Read this letter by Roald Dahl to Mr. Heins regarding one of his books, Try to identify formal letter patterns.
GYPST HOUSE
GREAT MISSINDEN
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

5th October, 1972

Paul Heins Esq.,
The Horn Book,
585 Baylston Street,
Boston,
Mass. 02116,
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Heins,

Kaye Webb has told me that Eleanor Cameron dislikes "Charlie and the Chocolate Factory" intensely. She added that you weren't crazy about it either. Both of you are entitled to think what you like about it. Kaye also tells me that Eleanor Cameron is proposing to write something about this in one of your issues. She is entitled to do that too. But would you consider permitting me to see her piece and to reply to it in the same issue?

Yours sincerely,

Roald Dahl
There is a particular way to set out a formal letter:

The current way is to put everything, even your address, against the left hand. Your address might look like this:

My name
My house and street name
Town
County
Postcode

**The layout must include:**

Sender's name, address, telephone details

date

references - if used

recipient's name, address

salutation - dear ....

**A heading**

opening sentence - to make it clear why you are writing, refer to any letter you are replying to

body of the letter - in logical order. clear paragraphs, if many paragraphs use numbers or headings

closing sentence - summary and indication of what will happen next

complimentary close - yours ....

signature

name

**REFERENCES**


Internet Resources:

LRRH listening
http://www.dltk-teach.com/rhymes/littlered/1.htm

Baskets graphic organizer
http://www.edhelper.com
The Little Red Riding Hood and the Wolf by Roald Dahl
http://www.poetryarchive.org/poetryarchive/singlePoem.do?poemId=7428

Roald Dahl official webpage
www.roalddahl.com

Reading and Listening Comprehension Rubric
http://rubistar.4teachers.org/

The Smurfs homepage