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Abstract
The study aims to investigate how a framework that develops tasks on a continuum from less to more demanding ones applies in the Greek primary school CLIL programme for the subject of Geography in English. A class of 19 6th-grade learners participated in the study. The framework was based on Cummins’ CLIL Matrix (1984); tasks of different cognitive and linguistic demands were performed by the target learners. Their performance was measured; classroom observations were carried out; questionnaires were delivered to the learners to examine their reactions and difficulties concerning the specific tasks. The results showed that the proposed framework can be successful within the particular CLIL context. Further research is required, however, to draw safer conclusions.
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1. Introduction
Since 1990s, CLIL, i.e., Content and Language Integrated Learning, has been increasingly adopted as an educational approach in primary, secondary and tertiary settings all over Europe for the simultaneous learning of both content and foreign languages. However, there is a lack of published teaching materials solely for CLIL purposes (Navés 2009; Tomlinson 2012); this fact makes the process of designing appropriate CLIL materials from scratch very time-consuming for the CLIL teachers. Thus, the development of a theoretical framework that would aid CLIL teachers in this process should be considered of the utmost importance.

The present small-scale study is an initial attempt towards that direction. That is, the aim of the study is to propose a framework for designing tasks that progress from less to more cognitively- and linguistically-demanding ones, and to investigate how this framework applies in the Greek primary CLIL classroom; in particular, the study examines how the proposed framework works with a class of Greek CLIL 6th-grade learners for the subject of Geography in English. The rationale is to examine how task
difficulty and complexity influences primary CLIL learners’ performance and reactions to certain types of Geography tasks (e.g., brainstorming, info-gap, problem-solving, opinion-exchange tasks) that vary in terms of their cognitive and linguistic demands. It is necessary to point out that this is a pilot study, and thus, its findings cannot be generalised.

2. Background

2.1 What is CLIL?

Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010: 1) define CLIL as “a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language”. By “additional”, they mean either a foreign language, or a second language, or the community language of the speaker (ibid.). In CLIL pedagogy, subject matter and language are of equal importance, as the aim is to promote not only content learning but also language learning. It is this unique integration of language and content that differentiates CLIL from other educational approaches: learners are expected to learn content through an additional language, and to learn an additional language through content.

CLIL has its origins in Canadian immersion in the 1960s, which sought to promote second (i.e. French) language acquisition (e.g., Cummins 1995, 2001; Swain and Johnson 1997 as cited in Jäppinen 2005), but in Europe it has been particularly influential since the early 1990s (Dalton-Puffer 2007). As there is a great diversity of languages and cultures across Europe, CLIL European programmes vary widely depending on the sociolinguistic context in which they are adopted (Hartiala 2000; Marsh and Hartiala 2001 as cited in Jäppinen 2005). In addition, CLIL is encountered in different levels of education, from primary to tertiary educational settings; it can also be applied to one or more subjects, or even cover the whole curriculum depending on the school’s policies.

Despite their diversities, the majority of CLIL programmes in Europe share some common features. Most importantly, CLIL learners are extensively exposed to the target language, which is most of the times a foreign language that is not used outside the classroom (Dalton-Puffer 2011; Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2007); CLIL learners use the target language meaningfully and naturally (ibid.), in order to learn new content; they also have to think in the target language and to create and negotiate meaning, as they use it for different functions in class, which are specified by the subject matter
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(e.g., Geography, History, etc.); last but not least, the CLIL approach in Europe is basically a content-driven approach to learning, as:

CLIL lessons are usually timetabled as content lessons (e.g. biology, music …), while the target language normally continues as a subject in its own right in the shape of foreign language lessons taught by language specialists (Dalton-Puffer 2011: 184).

Thus, subject matter is, therefore, the driving force behind regular CLIL programmes in European contexts.

2.2 The theoretical framework for the study
Before describing the theoretical framework of the study, it is important first to present the most influential theory that underlies most CLIL programmes; the framework is based on this theory. It is the theory of BICS (i.e., Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (i.e., Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency), which was developed by Cummins (1984; 1992). It has been empirically found that, as in L1, BICS develops much earlier than CALP in a second or a foreign language (L2) as well (ibid.). BICS is conversational proficiency that is necessary for everyday face-to-face communication, and develops within approximately two years of L2 instruction; CALP, on the other hand, refers to deeper-level language proficiency that is necessary for dealing with more abstract, academic situations, it involves the development of literacy skills, and can develop within five to seven years or even more of L2 instruction (Cummins 1984; 1992). So, learners first learn to communicate effectively in real-life oral communication, and then they become competent readers and writers in the target language (L1 or L2).

To conceptualize language proficiency more clearly, Cummins proposed a framework comprising two continua: The cognitively-demanding/cognitively undemanding continuum, and the context-embedded/context-reduced continuum (Figure 1). Below, a brief description of the framework follows.
On the left-end of the horizontal continuum, context-embedded communication means that:

the participants can actively negotiate meaning (e.g. by providing feedback that the message has not been understood) and the language is supported by a wide range of meaningful paralinguistic and situational cues” (Cummins 1992: 18).

That is to say, in face-to-face interactions learners can use non-linguistic cues, like body gestures and facial expressions, or ask for clarification, if they feel that there is some kind of misunderstanding, or if they are short of linguistic resources. Consequently, thanks to these cues and the correct use of compensation strategies, communication can take place successfully, even if the participants do not have full mastery of the language itself. On the right-end of the continuum, however, context-reduced communication “depends heavily on the knowledge of the language itself” (ibid.), and involves tasks like reading a passage with no visual cues to facilitate comprehension, or writing an essay on a topic or a letter to a friend, where obviously one has to rely on their literacy skills and their mastery of the linguistic code.

On the vertical continuum, cognitively-undemanding communicative activities “have become largely automatized (mastered) and thus require little active cognitive involvement for appropriate performance” (ibid.). For instance, copying sentences from the board is on this extreme end of the continuum. On the other end, though, learners have to use their higher-order thinking skills to carry out tasks successfully;
putting jumbled paragraphs in the correct order to get a coherent reading passage (jigsaw task), or expressing one’s opinion on a particular topic and discussing it with classmates are examples of activities that belong to the cognitively-demanding end of the continuum. Taking into account the two continua, it has been found that BICS mostly lies within Quadrant A, whereas CALP within Quadrant D (Baker 2001). It becomes evident, therefore, that BICS develops much earlier than CALP and this is the case in both L1 and L2.

The framework has been widely applied for L2 instructional purposes across the globe, and this has had important implications for L2 pedagogy and instruction. It has been argued that “[t]he more context-embedded the initial L2 input, the more comprehensible it is likely to be, and paradoxically, the more successful in ultimately developing L2 skills in context-reduced situations” (Cummins 1992: 21). CLIL approaches seem to provide this initial ‘context-embeddedness’ that is necessary for successful L2 learning to occur, as learners do not acquire language ‘for the sake’ of language, but through purposeful and meaningful activities that primarily deal with a particular subject matter (e.g., Geography). As Grabe and Stoller (1997) put it, “the language of CALP is the language of academic content areas” (ibid: 8) and CLIL provides the best opportunities for simultaneous content and foreign language development within a shorter period of time than any other instructional setting. Thus, CLIL approaches can lay the foundations for CALP to develop.

The framework adopted for the purposes of the present study was based on the theory of BICS and CALP presented above. It was also based on the five-task framework proposed by Richards (2001) and on Martyn’s differentiation of tasks according to their cognitive complexity (2001 as cited in Nunan 2004). The CLIL Matrix has finally been revisited and is presented in Figure 2 below. To be more specific, Richards (2001) proposes five task types for curricula development: Jigsaw, information-gap/exchange, problem-solving, decision-making, and opinion-exchange tasks. Based on empirical evidence, Martyn (2001 as cited in Nunan 2004) suggests that jigsaw tasks are the least cognitively demanding for learners, opinion-exchange tasks are the most cognitively demanding, while the rest lie in between along the continua of “cognitive complexity” and “density of negotiation of meaning” (ibid.: 90-91). The framework proposed in the study (Figure 2) places the above task types on a continuum starting from low to high cognitively- and linguistically-demanding tasks. It is described in more detail below.
The brainstorming tasks in the framework above help learners activate their background knowledge on a specific topic, they familiarize them with the topic, they make them feel confident with the L2, they promote fluency, and consequently, BICS, that is conversational proficiency (Cummins 1984). Lower-order thinking skills (e.g., remembering, understanding, classifying) are promoted at the same time (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001 as cited in Coyle et al. 2010).

Jigsaw and info-gap/exchange tasks aim to develop mostly higher-order thinking skills, such as analyzing (ibid.), and new content knowledge. They are not very demanding in linguistic terms, though, because learners do not have to give explicitly the reasons for their answers using the L2 (Martyn 2001 as cited in Nunan 2004); their L2 production is, therefore, controlled in these tasks, which do not require long, elaborate responses, but short utterances and a lot of interaction among learners.

Problem-solving tasks, however, are more cognitively- and linguistically-demanding, as they require reasoning on the part of the learners (ibid.), but also semi-controlled language use. This is because these tasks are not strictly closed, but semi-closed, in the sense that learners are only partly restricted to their use of the L2 in order to find the resolution to the problem. More abstract L2 concepts are encountered in these tasks, and higher-order thinking (e.g., evaluating, creating something new) is
promoted (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001 as cited in Coyle et al. 2010) along with new content learning.

Last but not least, decision-making and opinion-exchange tasks aim to gradually cultivate CALP (Cummins 1984), and for this reason, learners’ literacy skills (i.e., reading and writing) are involved to a great extent. In these tasks, learners have to rely heavily on their knowledge of the L2 itself to do them successfully, as they are context-reduced or remote (Martyn 2001 as cited in Nunan 2004). Learners can actually use the L2 freely to convey their message. Apart from that, they have to use their critical thinking and creative thinking more in these types of tasks, as more abstract learning is promoted.

The rationale behind this pilot study is to examine how the proposed framework works in practice in the CLIL primary classroom; more specifically, learners’ performance on and reactions to the different types of tasks for the subject of Geography in English are analyzed. It is expected that brainstorming and info-gap tasks would be performed better by the target learners in the particular CLIL classroom, while more demanding tasks, such as the problem-solving and the opinion-exchange tasks, would be more difficult for them. What is more, it is hypothesized that they would be more positive towards the former types of tasks than towards the latter types.

3. Research methodology of the study

3.1 Research questions

The paper addresses the following research questions:

1) How do CLIL learners perform in the various task types?

2) How do CLIL learners feel about these types of tasks?

By answering the questions above, one could find out whether or not the proposed framework can be successfully applied to the particular CLIL context for the particular 6th-grade learners.

3.2 Participants

The teaching context where the study was conducted was the 3rd Primary Model Experimental School of English in Evosmos, Thessaloniki, Greece – where CLIL has been implemented for the last three years for the teaching and learning of different subjects, such as Geography, Religious Education, History, etc. through the English
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A class of 19 6th-grade learners (11-12-year-olds) participated in the study. Their average L2 level was A2, with a small minority being A1 level (i.e., only 3 out 19 learners). At the time when the study was carried out, these learners had been already exposed to the CLIL methodology for one school year, as 5th-graders; actually, the subject of Geography was taught to them through CLIL in the 5th grade and continued to be taught through this approach in the 6th grade as well. So, it can be claimed that CLIL was not an entirely new approach to the target learners, as they were quite familiar with it.

3.3 Procedure, methods of data collection and analysis

During the design stage, it was necessary to pilot the tasks in order to make sure that they meet learners’ needs both in terms of content and language (i.e., the L2). For that purpose, their L2 level was taken into account while designing the tasks of the study. Additionally, the Greek Geography Coursebook, which is proposed by the Pedagogic Institute for the 6th grade, was taken into consideration; that is, the topics/units of the Coursebook that the target learners were currently dealing with in their CLIL Geography course at the time of the study were actually the topics of the present tasks. Finally, it is important to point out that the CLIL Geography teacher provided constant feedback to the researcher throughout the process of designing the tasks.

The resulting tasks (one task per task type) were finally performed by the target learners in class within a period of two months to examine how successful they could be in practice (see Appendix for samples of tasks)\(^1\). The following methods of data collection were used:

- Learners’ performance on the tasks was measured, to examine whether they were successful or not depending on the task-types. That is to say, it was examined whether learners performed better in the more closed tasks (such as the info-gap tasks) than in open tasks (such as the opinion-exchange tasks).

- Four classroom observations were carried out while learners were performing the tasks, to examine their reactions and their overall participation in the tasks; the data were qualitatively analyzed in order to find out how learners reacted towards the different types of tasks (the same observation sheet was used during all observations to make comparisons easier).

\(^{1}\) For full versions of the tasks, contact the researcher at ggramatikopoulou@gmail.com.
- A semi-structured questionnaire was given to the target learners every time they completed a type of task, in order that they record their views, feelings and difficulties regarding the particular task type. SPSS Statistics 20.0 was used to analyze the data of the questionnaire; more particularly, paired-sample T-tests were carried out in order to compare the mean scores and find out whether there were any statistically significant differences between the different types of tasks. This procedure was repeated four times, that is, after the completion of each different type of task.

4. Results and discussion

The key findings of the study are presented and discussed below.

4.1 Learners’ performance on the tasks

Table 1 below shows the number of learners who completed the tasks successfully in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task type</th>
<th>Number of learners that completed the task(s) successfully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming task</td>
<td>18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info-gap/exchange task</td>
<td>19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving task</td>
<td>15/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion-exchange task</td>
<td>15/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Learners’ performance on the tasks*

It becomes obvious that learners performed better in the less cognitively- and linguistically-demanding tasks (i.e., the brainstorming and info-gap/exchange tasks) than in the more cognitively- and linguistically-demanding tasks (i.e., the problem-solving and opinion-exchange tasks). In fact, they had no difficulty whatsoever in carrying out the info-gap task, as they were all correct. In the brainstorming task, only one learner wrongly put the Moon on the list of planets, excluding Pluto, which was categorized as a natural satellite. Overall, learners performed exceptionally well in these two types of tasks, which indicates that they can cope really well with tasks that promote BICS (Cummins 1984) and lower-order thinking skills (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001 as cited in Coyle et al. 2010).
As for the more demanding tasks, the majority completed them correctly, which means that they can also handle effectively these types of tasks, which aim to promote CALP (Cummins 1984) and higher-order thinking skills (Anderson and Krathwohl 2001 as cited in Coyle et al. 2010). However, for a group of 4 learners, the problem-solving task caused some difficulties, which may be attributed to the fact that they had to use their reasoning skills, or draw a route on the world map based on specific information, which is more cognitively demanding than the previously-mentioned tasks. Last but not least, another group of 4 learners did not manage to complete the opinion-exchange task successfully, as they provided inadequate written responses to the question: *Why are the Olympic rings joined together?*, without using any cues from the given reading passage. Their answer – which was the same, as they worked in the same group for this task – is presented in the example below:

(1a) Because they are the five continents of the Earth.

In terms of content, the above response does not fully answer the question. Concerning the correct responses, learners’ ideas basically revolved around the concepts of *unity, love* and *peace*, as the examples below show:

(1b) The rings are joined together because all the continents are in one world and all people have to be together without war.

(1c) Because it symbolised that all the continents have to live peaceful and don’t fight each other.

(1d) Because all these countries is love, peace.

(1e) People are together in Olympic Games. We are one.

Regarding the language used in the above examples, it should be pointed out that in (1b) and (1c) there is a wider variety of vocabulary and more elaborated responses, while in (1d) and (1e) the language is simpler. The former examples were A2-level learners’ answers, while the latter were A1-level learners’ answers. This means that this opinion-exchange task was quite challenging and posed more difficulties for low-L2 achievers in the class. The task was actually the most demanding of all the other tasks, because learners had to rely heavily on the L2 itself to do it successfully, they were involved in free language use, and finally, many abstract concepts were included.

With regard to research question 1, the above findings showed that the majority of learners in the particular CLIL classroom performed very well in all types of tasks,
which means that the proposed framework can be successful with the particular learners. The hypothesis that learners would be better at low-demanding tasks than high-demanding ones was confirmed, as learners did better at the former than the latter.

To get a better picture of how the framework applied in the particular CLIL classroom, it is also necessary to examine learner’s reactions, feelings, difficulties and participation during the tasks. Research question 2 addresses these issues. To answer research question 2, classroom observations were carried out while learners performed the tasks, and, immediately after the completion of the tasks, learners were asked to report their views, likes and dislikes concerning these task types with the use of a questionnaire. Below the main findings of these two methods are presented and discussed and research question 2 is answered.

4.2 Classroom observations
The findings from the observations showed that learners participated willingly in the different types of tasks and completed the tasks in the expected time; however, it was observed that learners were less enthusiastic with the opinion-exchange task, while they showed more enthusiasm in closed and less cognitively-demanding tasks, such as the brainstorming and the info-gap tasks, where language was more controlled. The latter tasks were more straightforward than the problem-solving and the opinion-exchange tasks, which caused some confusion among the different group of learners, which was expected to happen, as these types of tasks are more demanding and, therefore, more complicated, both linguistically and cognitively.

To answer research question 2, it is necessary to take into consideration the above results in conjunction with the learners’ self-reports on the questionnaire.

4.3 Learners’ self-reports on the questionnaire
Learners’ feelings and attitudes towards the particular task types were mostly positive, as these were recorded in the questionnaire immediately after the completion of each task. But the paired-sample T-tests yielded some statistically significant differences between the task types, which are presented below.

Regarding the brainstorming tasks, learners reported that they were statistically significantly more interesting than the opinion-exchange task, as Chart 1 illustrates (p < .05).
This finding is supported by SLA research, which has shown that closed tasks are preferred to open ones by learners who have not developed yet a good mastery of the L2 (e.g., Ellis 2003), which is necessary for dealing with more context-reduced tasks (e.g., the opinion-exchange task).

Learners also found the brainstorming tasks a little more difficult than the info-gap, problem-solving and opinion-exchange tasks (p < .05); in the former, a wider spread of scores was observed (st. deviation = 0.74536) than in the rest of the tasks (Chart 2 below). This indicates that their responses as to how difficult the tasks were for them varied more for the brainstorming tasks, compared to the info-gap, problem-solving and opinion-exchange tasks. As Chart 2 shows below, learners actually reported that they had very few difficulties with the tasks overall, with the brainstorming tasks being statistically significantly the most difficult of all.
These is a quite surprising result, as brainstorming tasks aim to activate background knowledge and are not very demanding (Ur 1981); therefore, it was not expected that they would be found more difficult than the other tasks, which involve learners in higher-order thinking and more in-depth learning. If, on the other hand, one considers the fact that these tasks introduce new content to the learners, while all the other tasks provide further practice on an already familiar topic, then the above finding may be explained.

The opinion-exchange task was found to be the second-most difficult type of task, according to learners’ reports, as Chart 2 above indicates. Learners, therefore, had difficulty handling the demands of the opinion-exchange task, which promoted their critical thinking skills, their reasoning skills and their L2 writing skills more than any other task type in the framework. This result was expected, since the target learners are very young and are not so competent L2 users so as to cope with abstract, open-ended tasks.

So, taking into account the findings from the observations and the learners’ questionnaires, we can answer research question 2: overall, learners had positive attitudes and liked all types of tasks. However, they tend to be more positive towards closed tasks than open-ended ones, which confirmed what was initially expected. This may be due to the fact that learners’ L2 level is still quite low and they may feel frustrated if they are asked to perform tasks that require abstract thinking and free L2 use (e.g., opinion-exchange task).

All in all, the framework proposed in the study can be applied successfully in the particular Greek CLIL programme for the 6th graders for the subject of Geography in English. This is because the target learners performed very well in all task types of the framework, and their reactions towards these tasks were mostly positive, with only very few difficulties with the more cognitively- and linguistically-demanding tasks, as it was expected.

More specifically, to answer research question 1, it was found that learners performed well in all tasks, but they did better at brainstorming and info-gap tasks than at problem-solving and opinion-exchange ones. These findings agree with other studies in the field that show that SLA learners of low L2 level are better at closed or semi-closed, less cognitively-demanding tasks than at open-ended and more

To answer research question 2, the results of the study showed that the 6th-grade learners of the particular primary school had more positive feelings towards closed tasks, such as the brainstorming and info-gap tasks, than towards open-ended tasks, such as the opinion-exchange tasks. The latter are less favored tasks by low L2 proficiency learners according to current SLA research (Bygate 2010; Ellis 2003). To be more specific, Bygate (2010) suggests that open tasks are preferred by advanced L2 speakers who have developed a good mastery of the L2 and can therefore use the L2 more freely and more eloquently.

Thus, it can be suggested that, in the particular CLIL context, closed or BICS-type tasks should be used before open or CALP-type tasks for the subject of Geography in English; this gradual progression from closed to open tasks is widely supported by the current SLA research on materials development and the recent pedagogy of Communicative Language Teaching (Crookes and Chaudron 2001; Richards 2006).

5. Limitations, recommendations for further research and conclusions
This is a small-scale, pilot study and its scope is limited due to time constraints. The framework presented in the paper has worked well so far with 6th-grade learners for the particular Greek primary school CLIL programme, which seems to pave the way for more systematic research in the future. No generalisations can be made, however. To draw safer conclusions, longitudinal studies are required. Further research should be conducted, for example, to find out how the proposed framework works with a greater number of CLIL participants, or with the same participants for a longer period of time (e.g., throughout the school year). More tasks of the particular types could also be designed and piloted to add to the reliability of the findings.

To conclude, the present pilot study showed that both closed tasks (e.g., brainstorming, info-gap/exchange) and open tasks (e.g., opinion-exchange) can work well with the Greek CLIL 6th-graders for the subject of Geography in English in the school where the study was conducted. Closed ones, however, should be prioritized, as target learners’ L2 level is still quite low; this is because they first need more controlled practice with the new content through the L2, and only after internalizing it, can they cope with more cognitively- and linguistically- demanding tasks, where the L2 is used more freely.
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APPENDIX: SAMPLES OF TASKS

**BRAINSTORMING TASK**

CLASSIFYING OBJECTS (PAIR WORK)

Put the astronomical objects in the right list below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Saturn} & \quad \text{Sun} & \quad \text{Neptune} & \quad \text{Venus} & \quad \text{Pluto} & \quad \text{Uranus} & \quad \text{Earth} \\
\text{Moon} & \quad \text{Jupiter} & \quad \text{Deimos} & \quad \text{Mercury} & \quad \text{Mars} & \quad \text{Phobos}
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANETS</th>
<th>NATURAL SATELLITES</th>
<th>STAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you know anything about them? Discuss with your classmates and your teacher.

Which of the planets is known as the “dwarf planet”? Can you guess why?
INFO-GAP/EXCHANGE TASK

Some information about the planets is missing. Ask each other in pairs (Student A and B) and complete the table.

**Student A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>How many satellites?</th>
<th>What is it made of?</th>
<th>What colour is it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth</td>
<td></td>
<td>rock</td>
<td>blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td></td>
<td>orange, red, brown and white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow and brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>gas, rock and ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td></td>
<td>gas, ice and dust</td>
<td>dark blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM-SOLVING TASK

Do the task in groups.

Islo the E.T. has come to Earth from outer space! He has landed somewhere in North Canada (look at the map). He wants to visit at least 3 continents and fly over at least 2 oceans before he goes back home. Discuss in groups and draw his route on the map to help him, giving reasons. Then, discuss with the rest of the class.
OPINION-EXCHANGE TASK

(Based on a short reading passage about the Olympic rings and their symbolism, learners were asked to do the following task)

Why are the Olympic rings **joined together**? Discuss in groups and write down your ideas. Then, discuss with the rest of the class.