

A good CLIL practice among European educational institutions

Elena Kovacikova*, Faculty of Education, Constantine the Philosopher University, Drazovska 4, 949 01 Nitra, Slovakia.

Jana Luprichova, Faculty of Education, Constantine the Philosopher University, Drazovska 4, 949 01 Nitra, Slovakia.

Suggested Citation:

Kovacikova, E. & Luprichova, J. (2018). A good CLIL practice among European educational institutions. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*. 10(1), 50-60.

Received August 27, 2017 revised October 21, 2017; accepted January 10, 2018.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Hafize Keser, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

© 2018 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has been recognised in the educational platforms in many European countries. It provides a unique chance to combine foreign language competences and knowledge with the content of other subjects such as geography, arts, history, maths and many others. Despite the fact that professional and scientific papers provide a high number of evidence on a positive impact of CLIL lessons, the truth is that the less experienced countries face problems with CLIL implementation at their institutions due to many problems. This paper interprets the findings from the project Erasmus+ comprising primary and secondary schools, and their experience gained within the CLIL implementation in Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden and Italy. It also focuses on interpretations of the data collected through document analyses and observations concerning the CLIL lessons carried out in the above-mentioned European countries.

Keywords: CLIL, education, good CLIL practice.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Elena, Kovacikova**, Faculty of Education, Constantine the Philosopher University, Drazovska 4, 949 01 Nitra, Slovakia. E-mail address: ekovacikova@ukf.sk; jluprichova@ukf.sk / Tel.: +421 37/640 81 11

1. Introduction

Investment in education and training of young generation teachers, in order to achieve better language skills development, is essential to boost their growth and competitiveness. The document *Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes* (Eur-Lex, 2017) highlights that in a world of international exchanges, the ability to speak foreign languages is a factor for competitiveness. Languages are more and more important to increase levels of employability and mobility of young people, and poor language skills are a major obstacle to free movement. Moreover, the recommendations outlined in *Rethinking Education* include new criteria of learning foreign languages that are based on a dual approach with the aim that 15-year olds should attain the level of the independent users of a first foreign language by the year 2020, and pupils in lower secondary education should study at least two foreign languages. Teaching and learning may be achieved with the help of innovative methods, including content and language integrated learning (CLIL) where non-language subjects are taught through the medium of a foreign language.

This paper seeks to demonstrate what a good CLIL practice is from the various contexts of countries involved in Erasmus+ project – namely from the historical, economic, national, educational and future perspectives. As one of the objective of this study is to compare and analyse the CLIL practices based on collecting research data through observation (qualitative research). This direction of the research aims at unification of a good CLIL model applicable for any educational institution in any European country. Our research problem – ‘What is a good CLIL practice?’ – is linked to the Eurydice report (2006) which declares that CLIL is still not consolidated enough from the theoretical point of view, and there is a need to create a conceptual framework that will be both coherent and applicable to different local conditions and contexts. Therefore, this paper explores how CLIL has been conceptualised and implemented in primary, lower secondary, and secondary schools of participating countries from different perspectives.

In Europe, CLIL has been embedded in primary, secondary or vocational schools either as a tool to acquire a foreign language (L2). For instance in Germany, it has been used to learn English language whereby some countries apply CLIL with ethnic minority languages (e.g., Basque in Spain). In accordance with the research carried out over the past two decades, CLIL proves that it is the right means of enhancing multilingualism, and at the same time, providing opportunities to deepen learners’ language skills. After the recommendation released by the European Parliament in March 2014, the British Council published general recommendations involving three basic sections that optimise the potential of CLIL for the 21st century competence-directed education. Section I presents some general recommendations upon which to articulate good CLIL practices. Section II considers the implementation of competence-based CLIL practices through the strands of curriculum, assessment and professional development. Section III includes additional recommendations on coordination, communication and dissemination (2017). The above-mentioned document also seeks case studies from a variety of contexts which could provide insights into conceptual experiences, and thus, provide data to guide essential decision-making process on implementation and resources.

2. Document analysis

When CLIL was presented for the first time by Marsh (1994), the Council of Europe and the European Commission picked it up and presented it as an innovative approach in order to develop plurilingual competence among all European citizens (1995). Since that time, the European Union has been actively encouraging its citizens to learn other European languages in order to understand and communicate in more than one language. Moreover, many researchers have published in their papers, a rapid growth of CLIL implementation in European primary and later also in secondary schools (Coonan, 2005; Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010; Dalton-Puffer & Nikula, 2006). The CLIL boom has resulted in involvement of this new innovative approach into the mainstream education throughout Europe (Coyle, 2009).

Regarding the above mentioned, the consortium of five countries has prepared and submitted a project proposal focusing on implementation of CLIL methodology. The project entitled 'Transnational exchange of good CLIL practice among European educational institutions', approved by the Slovak National Agency in July 2015 with a participation of five European countries – Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Sweden and Italy. The following objectives were stated:

- Setting up essential components of good CLIL practice in the classroom by face-to-face observations,
- Preparing a modular e-training course for European CLIL teachers,
- Providing countries with none or less CLIL experience with the essential training and learning opportunities so that they can commence implementing this approach in their schools,
- Training teachers from the project partner countries on CLIL,
- Setting up an open database of class recordings and other teaching and methodological materials for CLIL teachers,
- Collecting research data and conducting a comparative analysis of CLIL practice.

The following document analysis shows the process of implementing CLIL in the project partners' countries, advantages and obstacles during its implementation. The analysis focuses on the following areas:

- CLIL as a part of national curriculum,
- Compulsory or selective teaching and learning through CLIL methodology,
- Economic or other financial advantages concerning CLIL implementation at schools,
- Willingness of stakeholders, teachers, learners and parents to educate or be educated through CLIL,
- Future visions of CLIL methodology in respective countries.

2.1. Italy

The evolution of CLIL in Italy is dated back to the early 1990s when it appeared for the first time in international or European schools, mainly situated in the northern part of Italy, because multilingualism has been a part of their cultural background (Cinganotto, 2016). Later on, the Italian *Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca* (MIUR), presented and introduced a larger reform of the second cycle of education in 2010. It issued the national guidelines (MIUR, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d) describing specific learning objectives for each type of upper secondary schools, including the students' educational, cultural and professional profiles. A part of this reform has been the introduction of CLIL into the Italian school system as mandatory in *licei* and *istituti tecnici*, according to the following instructions (Cinganotto, 2016, p. 383):

- teaching of a content subject in a foreign language is to be offered in the final (fifth) year at *licei*; any curricular subject can be chosen;
- the teaching of a subject in a foreign language is to be offered in the final (fifth) year at technical schools; the subject must belong to 'specialisation' area;
- the teaching of two subjects in two foreign languages is to be offered in the final three years at *licei linguistici*.

The same year, in 2010, MIUR also specified the parameters of CLIL courses for teachers who were willing to learn more about CLIL methodology (MIUR, 2010b). Unfortunately, these specifications appeared to be quite limiting because only teachers whose competences in a foreign language were at least C1 (according to the Common European Framework of Reference) could enrol to these courses. Secondly, the teachers who passed the course could achieve a certificate confirming their ability to teach non-linguistic subjects in a foreign language (Leone, 2015). Except for the language dimension, the CLIL course parameters also specified teachers' subject and methodological dimensions in order to be fully qualified to apply for CLIL.

As of 2013, CLIL was started to be taught in the fifth year of all lyceums and technical institutes. Moreover, MIUR put forward specifications for students in both lyceums and technical institutes, where CLIL has been embed – foreign language competences at minimum of B2 level (according to CEFR), and secondly, they had to fully master Italian language in all skills at the advanced level (Leone, 2015). Even though the MIUR has specified quite detailed criteria for the CLIL methodology, the curricula are quite different from school to school. Subjects which can be taught through the CLIL methodology in the fifth year of all lyceums and technical schools are the following ones: history, geography, philosophy, math, physics, natural sciences, art history, physical education and religion.

Recent studies carried out in Italy show the discrepancy in terms of applying CLIL methodology (Leona, 2015). One study (Grandinetti, Langellotti & Ting, 2013) points to the insufficient proficiency of foreign language knowledge of teachers willing to apply CLIL, as well as the limited knowledge of the foreign language of their students. Therefore, it is natural that both language and content teachers are present to teach a non-linguistic subject in a foreign language. Moreover, teachers encounter organisational problems while applying CLIL, and they are overloaded with considerable extra work when preparing CLIL lessons. All the above mentioned issues may lead to a lack of cooperation among teachers, and thus, further destabilisation of CLIL. In spite of these obstacles, teachers highlight the positive impact of CLIL on a development of students' language competences. Moreover, a decision of policy makers to adopt CLIL for teaching non-linguistic disciplines through a foreign language in upper secondary schools in Italy will lead to improving the quality of learning foreign languages, and thus, they will meet the earlier mentioned European Commission recommendations (Cinganotto, 2016).

The project, mentioned in the beginning of this paper, involved a partner from Italy, particularly from Caserta, close to Napoli, and the partners are teachers from the upper secondary school *Liceo Statale Alessandro Manzoni Caserta*. They teach through CLIL in French or English in the following non-linguistic subjects – history, physics, drama, literature, civics, arts and economics. All observed CLIL teachers are fully competent to teach their subjects in foreign languages, because they are both content and language teachers.

2.2. Sweden

English language in Sweden is literally everywhere – it is accessible in media (almost all foreign films are provided with subtitles), on the radio, on the computer, at the cinema, etc., so it is very often a necessary part of Swedes everyday life and work. According to one study provided in 2006 (Kristiansen & Vikor, 2006), 29% of Swedes actively use English at least four times in a week. Thus, the proficiency in English is highly valued in the society as well as within the school system in Sweden, because it is mandatory from primary schools throughout to upper secondary schools (Skolverket, 2014). Swedes do not only use it as a social language but they come into a contact with English in academic texts, because a large number of university courses are provided in English language; and also, a relevant literature for these purposes is provided in English (Olsson & Sylven, 2015).

In spite of the fact that CLIL is not directly endorsed in Swedish curriculum, according to Swedish National Agency for Education, it provides a solid base for its implementation (Skolverket, 2014). All CLIL pilot projects in Swedish schools are a consequence of local initiative, mainly of teachers, supported by their school management and municipal authorities, sometimes supported by an initiative of parents. Almost any subject may be taught through CLIL methodology. Commonly involved subjects are the social sciences, aesthetic subjects and sports. Admission criteria for access to CLIL programmes in schools providing compulsory education are not required. For teachers applying CLIL, there are also no special legal qualification requirements. The only CLIL course in pre-service training is offered at the Stockholm Institute of Education, which includes theory of CLIL methodology, language proficiency, development of teaching materials and lesson plans (Eurydice, 2006).

CLIL has been offered to Swedish schools, mainly to upper secondary, since 1977, but only a few of them joined the CLIL consortium. As of 1992, after formulating national objectives and general

guidelines in the new school law, many upper secondary schools and later compulsory education schools have offered CLIL programmes for their students. The CLIL boom finished by 1999 in secondary and upper secondary schools, but it is still widespread within the schools in the years 2010–2012 with a variety of forms (Dentler, 2007) because the main aim is to increase learners' motivation for studying foreign languages; and thus, promote their good command of communicative competences for future work and study abroad.

Currently, CLIL is offered as an option at approximately 27% of all upper secondary schools in Sweden (Olsson & Sylven, 2015), and students can choose if they want to follow regular programmes or CLIL ones. There is still a doubt whether CLIL should be implemented in schools in purpose to increase foreign language skills of students in Sweden because recent studies carried out in Sweden show that teenagers are exposed to English outside of school a lot when comparing with students in other countries, and moreover, English is introduced as the first foreign language in schools already in grade 1 (Sylven, 2015). According to the national curriculum, students are guaranteed 480 hours of instruction in English as a subject during their compulsory schools years (Skolverket, 2011).

The partners in already mentioned project work at upper secondary school *Alstromergymnasiet* in Alingsås. They have never applied the CLIL methodology, even though a large number of teachers have a good command in English and most of the students' proficiency level is also high. In spite of the fact that they were quite sceptical in the beginning of running the project, in the end they have found it an effective method for teaching not only for their students with lower communication skills, but also refugees with the aim to make them familiar with the Swedish language. Currently, they have been attending the conferences in order to show the positive effect of CLIL with newcomers.

2.3. Latvia

Latvia, as a former country of the Soviet Union, may be considered a quite multilingual country – approximately 62% of all inhabitants are Latvian, 26% are Russian, followed by Polish, Byelorussian, Jewish, Lithuanian, Estonian, German, etc. The original language is so called *Latgalian* – a cultural heritage – but used only in some villages and families (offered as an optional language in some schools). Though the official state language is Latvian, a widely spread in the society is Russian language, available in Russian minority schools. The aim of all schools with the Russian language instruction is to provide everyone with the possibility to learn Latvian at a high level, and to be integrated into Latvian society. Polish is the language of instruction in few schools; it exists because the Poles are the third big national group in *Latgale*. Other languages which are used only in the families are Byelorussian, Jewish, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, etc. (Ustinova, 2017). Due to these facts, the concept of education in Latvia relates to the term *bilingvala izglitiba* (bilingual education) and is also used in a national terminology and public rhetoric. Moreover, the concepts of education development highlight the development of bilingual education in general education programmes, in purpose to decrease differences in access to high-quality education. Therefore, the bilingual education in Latvia is considered the suitable and effective means of achieving a good command in languages (Eurydice, 2006). Beginning of bilingual education in Latvia dates back to 1st November 1995, after the Latvian language agency presented the state programme of Latvian language acquisition (LAT2). Here is the chronological procedure of bilingual and CLIL education according to Ustinova (2017).

-Phase 1: 1996–1998 – the working out of Latvian bilingual education for minority schools methodology, the preparation of teacher-trainers, the development of future plans and the programme of sustainability.

-Phase 2: 1998–2000 – the improvement of teaching methodology including integration questions.

-Phase 3: 2001–2002 – the stabilisation of the Latvian language use in the society.

- Phase 4: 2003–2004 – methodological materials for all subjects in basic schools (students aged 7–16), publication and dissemination in all minority schools, the working out of methodological materials for secondary schools. Support to Minority Education Reform.
- Phase 5: 2005–2006 – strong support of institutions which realise LAT2 programme for all Latvian population (students, adults, different jobs, nationalities, etc.).
- Phase 6: since 2006 – based on European Commission Strategy (2005) – to develop practical skills in at least two foreign languages. Task: To develop the professional development programme for CLIL teacher-trainers, teachers and materials for students in cooperation with the British Council using the experience of bilingual education.
- The agency also supports the teachers' willingness to achieve CLIL methodology. The following programmes for teachers were offered in 2006–2017 (Ustinova, 2017):
 - Professional development programme with masterclasses – 36 hours
 - Professional development programme for teachers of history, biology, mathematics, economy and culture – 60 hours
 - CLIL methodology course – 36 hours
 - British Council course on CLIL methodology – 50 hours

The Latvian project partner has offered to a whole consortium of possibilities to observe several schools with CLIL classes. Schools in Latvia obviously provide two approaches to CLIL – traditional and non-traditional. The traditional one involves learning the subject content in a foreign language at the subject lesson. The second one focuses on non-traditional work forms, such as projects, creative workshops, surveys, experimental laboratories, etc. The content is given wider and deeper than it is defined by standards. It is organised as an optional lesson, after classes.

As for assessment, students do not get marks/grades in CLIL lessons. Their activity and interest are usually higher than at ordinary lessons, because young people are placed into a different learning environment and understand the necessity of gained knowledge and its importance in their future life, which is a special motivational effect.

Latvian teachers also face some obstacles in providing CLIL lessons:

- Content language teachers' foreign language knowledge level is low in general.
- Universities do not prepare content teachers to teach in a foreign language (students' knowledge of foreign language is rather high).
- The Ministry of Education and Science offers only moral support. Therefore, it is very difficult to introduce CLIL at schools without the Ministry's support.
- No CLIL textbooks and other supplementary materials are published or available.

2.4. Lithuania

Bilingual education was initiated by the Ministry of Education and Science in 2001 as a part of the educational reform. Its main goal was to improve the Lithuanian language competencies of learners mainly from the Russian minority groups to be able to integrate into society. CLIL has been introduced to education system a year later after the Lithuanian Ministry of Education and Science declared this methodology as one of the most important priorities. The Ministry has also issued the *Guidelines project* aiming at encouraging a wider implementation of CLIL in the system of general education in Lithuania.

Since 2001, several projects in Lithuania have been carried out, co-founded by European Union, but the outcomes and findings revealed the lack of systematic approach towards the implementation of CLIL in Lithuania in the formal educational system (Targamadze & Kriauciuniene, 2016). Moreover, content teachers' foreign language competencies were not at an appropriate level, therefore, another CLIL-type project launched in 2002 in order to improve teachers' communication skills, mainly in English, German and French (Vilkanciene, 2007). British Council together with the Ministry of Education and Science organised teacher training events throughout the country in 2006 with a focus

on the development of teaching content through the medium of English. The main outcomes of all meetings included (Factworld, 2006):

- development of teaching resources,
- increase in methodology and content knowledge,
- development of schools' and teachers' network,
- gaining more experience in CLIL.

Nowadays, CLIL is offered in some Lithuanian schools due to the initiatives of local teachers. It is usually provided as an optional lesson, and it is taught in a tandem mode – both content and language teachers are available during the lessons. Vehicle languages are English, German and French within the subjects history, geography, ethics, cultural studies, arts and mathematics. All these subjects are led in a soft version of CLIL, just IT and Sciences are provided in a hard version.

The future plans of Ministry of Education are very clear – its ambition is to make a CLIL way of teaching a part of mainstream education. Moreover, CLIL has also been applied in bachelor's degree programmes at Siauliai University within study programmes education, social education, primary and preschool education – lectures have been prepared in cooperation with both language and content teachers.

The project partner was situated in Vilnius - *Vilnius Jonas Basanavicius progimnazija*. Their experience with CLIL was just at the starting line. Before joining the consortium, they have taught through CLIL just music lessons in French. It was provided in a hard version and pupils' discomfort was visible – not all of them were skilled enough in the French language. After training and support, situation got more acceptable mostly for pupils and they enjoyed the lessons.

3. Observation

A qualitative design of research was chosen for this study, as the aim of the research was to capture a holistic view on CLIL issue. The methods of document analyses and observation were employed.

With the aim to find out the good CLIL practice, we have stated the following research questions:

1. What are the historical, economical and national official requirements regarding CLIL in respective countries?
2. What is the practical implication of CLIL processes in educational institutions?

The first research question was followed by the document analyses with the aim to find out whether the context for CLIL implementation in European countries is the same or comparable. According to Flick (2009), documents are standardised artefacts and they are written for a purpose, such as notes, reports, statistics, policy documents, expert opinions, etc. Documents can be divided into private and official. For the purposes of our research, we aimed at comparison of similar categories found mainly in the documents of the countries participating in the project. The issues regarding CLIL in European countries chosen for comparison were as follows:

- CLIL as a part of national curriculum,
- Compulsory or selective teaching and learning through CLIL methodology,
- Economic or other financial advantages concerning CLIL implementation at schools,
- Willingness of stakeholders, teachers, learners and parents to educate or be educated through CLIL,
- Future visions of CLIL methodology in respective countries.

The method of document analysis is best used as a complementary strategy to other methods, such as interviews or observations (Cohen, Manion, Morrison, 2007, Flick 2009). Therefore, the observation as another complementary method was chosen to follow the research aims stated in the study. CLIL lessons in particular countries were observed by the project participants, that is, each lesson was observed by at least three to maximum seven people from several countries. Observations were

carried out in the period from February 2016 until February 2017. The observation sheets consisted of the open questions concerning the following:

- time,
- Language
- language,
- Scaffolding used for communication,
- Content CLIL language,
- CLIL activity techniques used for the content and language,
- Code switching (L1 versus CLIL language),
- Materials/resources used,
- Assessment.

The aim of the observation was to find out the practical implication of CLIL methodology as well as finding a good CLIL practice which could be recommended to the institutions. Further in the paper, the study focuses on particular observations in the countries taking part in the project.

3.1. Italy

In Italy, the observation was carried out at the upper secondary school *Liceo Statale Alessandro Manzoni Caserta* in May 2016. This school provides CLIL lessons in French or English in the following non-linguistic subjects – history, physics, drama, literature, civics, arts and economics. All observed CLIL teachers are fully competent to teach their subjects in foreign languages because they are both content and language teachers.

CLIL language for history lessons was in French, while other subjects were instructed in English and Italian. As for the time devoted to CLIL, the model of hard version of CLIL as a whole lesson was seen. Scaffolding techniques for content and language were visuals such as pictures, maps, miming and gestures. Code switching from French and English to Italian was used when explaining the details, discussing issues more in detail as well as the disciplinary problems. As from the observations, outcomes show that the materials used for CLIL lessons are published materials directly for CLIL either in French or English. Italy was the only country with such an advantage, where the CLIL materials are ready-made for the teachers and learners. The assessment was provided orally and no grades were given throughout the observed lessons. The Italian model of CLIL lessons was one teacher for the lesson, speaking mostly in the target language. Apart from the books, presentations, projects and discussions were used. Some negative comments were given to the teaching styles of the teachers. Teacher talking time prevailed in lots of cases and students may have been more actively involved and engaged during the lessons.

3.2. Sweden

Three observed lessons were carried out at the upper secondary school *Alstromergymnasiet* in Alingsås. This school had not applied the CLIL methodology before they were involved in the project. A large number of teachers have a good command in English and the most of students' proficiency level is also high. The observations were carried out at the three lessons – sociology, linguistics and health care. Regarding the time devoted to CLIL, the model was the whole lesson. The hard version of CLIL was preferred, that is, the lessons were almost all instructed in English as the CLIL language. Provided scaffolding techniques were mainly group discussions, pictures and videos used in the lessons. A pair or group works was the preferred forms of work in Sweden. The lessons were instructed with the help of internet and IT technologies. No printed textbooks or materials were used in the lessons. Comparing to Italian lessons, Swedish students were actively engaged, and student used computers for every given task. The critical thinking was supported through discussions, role plays and project works. As for the assessment, no grades were given during the lessons. The students were positively motivated through oral praise, support and encouragement. Each lesson was taught by two teachers.

One as a subject teacher and the second as a language teacher, however, they were both actively involved.

3.3. Latvia

The Latvian project partner *Daugavpils pilsetas Izglitibas parvalde in Daugavpils* has offered to us a wide range of primary, lower secondary and secondary schools with CLIL classes. Schools in Latvia obviously provide two approaches to CLIL – traditional and non-traditional. The traditional one involves learning the subject content in a foreign language at the subject lesson. The second one focuses on non-traditional work forms, such as projects, creative workshops, surveys, experimental laboratories, etc. The content is given wider and deeper than it is defined by standards. CLIL lessons are optional and mostly recommended to the best students. Out of 10 observations in biology, math, science, geography, civic education and history, the cooperation of two teachers preparing and leading the lessons prevailed. One teacher was a subject teacher responsible for the content, and an language teacher responsible for the linguistic issues in the lesson. Use of CLIL was in the whole lesson; mother tongue was used mainly for explanation, instructions and disciplinary issues. Scaffolding techniques ranged from visual aids, through stories, miming, discussions and debates. Materials used in the lessons were chosen by the teachers and mainly they used original outdated English textbooks which were provided to schools by different donations and charities. The lessons were not graded. Teachers gave smileys, verbal positive feedback and encouragement during the lessons. Language competence of content teachers was in some cases much lower than B2 level, therefore, the presence of an language teacher in the lesson was appropriate.

3.4. Lithuania

In February 2016 and a year after in February 2017, five lesson observations were carried out at *Vilnius Jonas Basanavicius progimnazija*. Before joining the programme, CLIL had been implemented in the music lessons in French. After that, CLIL was implemented with English in mathematics, biology and arts. All of these lessons were for the selected pupils, chosen mainly according to their language proficiency. As for the CLIL model, as in the previous countries, the whole lessons were instructed in English with the code switching to Lithuanian language in case of giving instructions, or disciplinary issues. Regarding the content and language scaffolding, unfortunately the pictures, videos, pictures and project work were used with very widely used translations. The materials provided in the lessons were mainly authentic materials from the Internet or English textbooks. As it was apparent in the Latvian project partner, the pupils in the extra CLIL lessons were selected according to their language proficiency; they were motivated, however, not graded. The pupils were supported and encouraged by the positive approach of enthusiastic teachers. However, the teaching style was rather teacher-centred and sometimes pupils could have been more actively engaged in the learning process by a pair or group work.

3.5. Observation Outcomes

The research aim of these observations was to study and compare the practical implications of CLIL in the project countries. The common features were that the CLIL methodology was perceived positively from the point of view of teachers, pupils, parents and institutions. Practically, all principles and models of CLIL were adjusted to the educational, institutional and personnel contexts of the particular countries. The positive sides were visible in enthusiastic and supportive approach of teachers, innovative model of language- and subject-teacher cooperation. The challenges were seen in the model of the whole CLIL lessons instead of shorter and more effective CLIL activities in some cases. The same applies to the content and language scaffolding techniques, where the collective forms of

pair and group work are applied with the project work, discussions and role plays engaging and activating the pupils aiming towards learner-centred approach. Regarding the teaching material, the only country with ready-made published CLIL textbooks was Italy. The rest of the project countries searched for the materials on the websites, Internet or authentic textbooks in the target language. None of the countries assessed the performance of the pupils with grades. Instead, positive oral or written feedback was used in order to motivate the learners. All in all, we can say that CLIL was adjusted to teachers' possibilities, educational background and learners' language proficiency.

4. Conclusion

The crucial question of this project 'What is a good CLIL practice?' has been answered as follows. Due to the diversity of historical, economic, national and educational contexts, there are several good CLIL practices. Through applied research methods, it has been proven that there is not just one good CLIL practice. The countries involved in the project were historically different. Latvia and Lithuania are post-Soviet countries with a very strong teacher-centred approach in education. Moreover, the language proficiency in these countries was poorer than in Sweden and Italy. When it comes to techniques and methods, Sweden widely uses modern technologies instead of textbooks with various learner-centred techniques such as project work, debates, role plays, etc. Italy, on the other hand, is supported by the state with published textbooks, workshops and training for the CLIL teachers. Moreover, each country which has not still included CLIL into their curricula needs paradigm shifts in the organisation of education and update it to serve the world of today and tomorrow. The whole process should start at teachers' training colleges, preparing student-teachers for their future profession. However, not only students at departments of foreign languages but also students of other study programmes, so-called content teachers. They also should achieve adequate foreign language skills, including a methodology of teaching foreign languages.

In our opinion, despite CLIL is still not unified as a model applicable for any educational institution in any European country, we may consider it as an advantage that it is not a rigid set of rules, but rather a holistic approach to education itself. With CLIL, teachers use current and authentic learning materials to inspire and motivate their learners to be active participants in their own mission for skills and knowledge. Moreover, students are forced, but in non-invasive form, to communicate about subject matters important to them, they learn to express themselves through a foreign language; they practice the problem solving skills, communication skills, cooperation skills and critical thinking, as well as they are scaffold with the aim to build their own frames of knowledge.

Acknowledgements

Strategic Partnerships (Key Action 2) - Project number: 2015-1-SK01-KA201-008937. *This publication was supported by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.*

References

- British Council. (2014, March 10–12). *CLIL policy and practice: Competence-based education for employability, mobility and growth*. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/clilrecommendations_august_14_pdf.pdf on 1 June 2017.
- Cinganotto, L. (2016). CLIL in Italy: A general overview. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 9(2), 374–400.

- Kovacicova, E. & Luprichova, J. (2018). A good CLIL practice among European educational institutions. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 50-60.
- Coonan, C. M. (2005). The natural learning of a foreign language: CLIL as a possible partial solution for the primary school. *Scuola e Lingue Moderne*, 4(5), 4-11.
- Coyle, D. (2009). Language pedagogies revisited: alternative approaches for integrating language learning, language using and intercultural understanding. In J. Miller, A. Kostogriz & M. Gearon (Eds.), *Culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms: New dilemmas for teachers* (pp. 172-195). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkmann (Eds.), *Future Perspectives for English language teaching* (pp. 139-157). Heidelberg, Germany: Carl Winter.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., & Nikula, T. (2006). Introduction. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 15(3), 4-7.
- Dentler, S. (2007). Sweden. In A. Maljers, D., & Marsh, D. Wolff (Eds.), *Windows on CLIL: content and language integrated learning in the European spotlight* (pp. 166-171). Graz, Austria: European Platform for Dutch Education.
- European Commission. (1995). White paper on education and training: Teaching and learning, towards the learning society. Retrieved from; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51995DC0590&qid=1488202961906&from=EN> on 1 June 2017.
- Factworld. (2006, April 22-29). *Lithuania – developing CLIL in Lithuania*. Retrieved from <https://www.factworld.info/en/Lithuania-Developing-CLIL-in-Lithuania> on 12 June 2017.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Grandinetti, M., Langellotti, M., & Ting, Y. L. T. (2013). How CLIL can provide a pragmatic means to renovate science education – even in a suboptimally bilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 354-374.
- Kristiansen, T., & Vikor, S. (2006). *Nordiske sprakhaldningar. Ei meiningsmaling*. Oslo, Norway: Novus Forlag.
- Leone, A. R. (2015). Outlooks in Italy: CLIL as language education policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 30(1), 43-63.
- MIUR. (2010a). *Decreto ministeriale 249/2010*. Retrieved from http://www.miur.it/Documenti/universita/Offerta_formativa/Formazione_iniziale_insegnanti_corsi_uni/DM_10_092010_n.249.pdf on 1 June 2017.
- MIUR. (2010b). *Indicazioni nazionali per i licei*. Retrieved from; http://nuovilicei.indire.it/content/index.php?action=lettura&id_m=7782&id_cnt=10497 on 1 June 2017.
- MIUR. (2010c). *Linee guida per gli istituti tecnici*. Retrieved from http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/nuovi_tecnici/INDIC/LINEE_GUIDA_TECNICI_.pdf on 1 June 2017.
- MIUR. (2010d). *Linee guida per gli istituti professionali*. Retrieved from; http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/nuovi_professionali/linee_guida/LINEE%20GUIDA%20ISTITUTI%20%20PROFESSIONALI_.pdf on 1 June 2017.
- Olsson, E., & Sylven, L. K. (2015). Extramural English and academic vocabulary: a longitudinal study of CLIL and non-CLIL students in Sweden. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(2), 77-103.
- Skolverket.se (2014). *Certification of teachers and preschool teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/andra-sprak-och-lattlast/in-english/teacher-certification> on 1 June 2017.
- Sylven, L. K. (2015). CLIL and non-CLIL students' beliefs about language. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(2), 251-272.
- Targamadze, V., & Kriauciuniene, R. (2016). Content and language integrated learning: Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints. *International Journal of Multilingual Education*, 8, 42-59.
- Ustinova, I. (2017). *The overview of CLIL development in Latvia: Sharing personal experience of CLIL practice in Daugavpils city*. Exchange of Language Education Practice among European Teachers. International Conference, Nitra, Slovakia.
- Vilkanciene, L. (2007). CLIL: Lithuanian context. *Kalba ir kontekstai*, 2, 415-424.