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INTRODUCTION

Life in the twenty-first century requires great complexity of knowledge and skills, which is reflected in modern learning approaches. The introduction of such modern learning approaches results in contents of individual subjects and disciplines to overlap and teaching rigidly separated subjects being considered rather obsolete. One of the main aims connected to language skills promoted by the European Union is the emphasis placed on the individuals’ knowledge of at least two additional languages to their mother tongue. CLIL method, one of the modern approaches to teaching, is a perfect solution to these two revolutionary phenomena.

The abbreviation CLIL stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning, meaning that within one class both, the language and content subject aims are desirable to be met. By saying this, the content subject offers a natural and authentic context for the language to be presented to students and the language itself then serves as a tool, which enables to render the content subject information to students in the most understandable and engaging way possible.

Due to this interconnection is CLIL seen as a modern, innovative method available to teachers of almost any subject ranging from biology, geography, history to art or music, who therefore intend to incorporate CLIL method in their classes. By doing so, teachers set a very natural learning environment, which is not always easy to be set in the language lessons.

My diploma thesis consists of two main parts, the theoretical and practical part based on a number of various academic sources. The theoretical
part includes a general definition of the term CLIL as it is understood by the Czech education system and its forms. This is followed by a comparison of CLIL to other teaching approaches, most importantly the bilingual education and CBI learning. A historical development of the method, outside and within the Czech Republic then concludes the first chapter. In the second chapter I elaborated on CLILs objectives, the aims of the implementation from the SEP (School Education Programme) and FEP (Frame Education Programme) point of view. The language used in CLIL, subjects in which CLIL can be implemented and its time allocation with the method’s benefits and challenges are stated here as well as the ways in which students attending CLIL lessons are being evaluated. In the third chapter the four main prerequisites of a successful implementation, which were chosen to be compared in this thesis, are described.

The second, practical part of the thesis deals mainly with the research which focuses on comparison of the CLIL method’s implementation at three randomly chosen Czech secondary schools. The implementation is compared in several areas starting with the teachers’ and students’ motivation in CLIL lessons, teachers’ and students’ language skills, materials being used in CLIL lessons and school management’s approach to the process of implementation. By taking various prerequisites of a successful implementation into consideration and highlighting both similar and different aspects of the implementation on each secondary school following research questions will be addressed.

1. What are the similarities and differences in implementation of CLIL approach at the sample schools?
2. What main challenges in CLILs implementation are being faced at sample schools from the perspective of students’ and teachers’ motivation, students’ and teachers’ language skills and teaching materials?

3. Is CLIL effective as a method of teaching English at the sample school?

4. Why has CLIL not really developed more as an approach?

The quantitative and qualitative research was carried out by the means of questionnaires being completed by teachers, students and school’s management of all three sample schools and interviews done with CLIL teachers teaching at these schools. Also data collected during CLIL lessons observation are used to underpin the research. The thesis is concluded by presenting the findings and stating final future recommendations, which are drawn from the findings.
Theoretical part

1 CLIL

In the first chapter the term CLIL is introduced from four key perspectives. The definition of CLIL used in the Czech Republic is stated at the very beginning, thereafter the historical development both within and outside the Czech Republic is described together with various forms of CLIL such as hard and soft CLIL. In the conclusion of the initial chapter CLIL is contrasted to the other teaching approaches in which a foreign language is used, the bilingual education and CBI.

1.1 What is CLIL

A considerably new term in the ELT field CLIL (Content Language Integrated Learning) has been defined by a number of specialists involved in foreign language teaching. Although their individual definitions differ to some extent, they still share the main idea, which Coyle, Hood, & Marsh (2010) state in one of pivotal publications related to this topic, CLIL (Content Language Integrated Learning). He defines CLIL to be:

"A dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. That is, in the teaching and learning process, there is a focus not only on content, and not only on language. Each is interwoven, even if the emphasis is greater on one or the other at a given time." (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 1)
An example of CLIL demonstrated in practice could be a class of Czech students learning about European history in English or a class of English students learning geography in Spanish.

The combination of languages and students’ nationalities has no limits, however given the language demand within and outside the EU, the “additional language”, throughout this diploma thesis identified as L2, in many cases occurs to be English or other frequently spoken language such as German, Spanish or French.

Coyle’s complex understanding of CLIL includes a crucial principle for this method, the duality of aims, which is inferred from the integration of a language and content. The integration of these two components is also aptly described in Baladová and Sladkovská (2009), the language being in CLIL seen as a means of teaching the educational content, which is then the source for language learning. (Baladová and Sladkovská, 2009) Looking back on the imaginary class of Czech students, English would be the “means” of teaching the European history, which would be the “source” or context for English language learning. This interconnection implies the fact that both English language and history of Europe are equally important and the learning aims of both components are met within a lesson following CLIL approach.

Other interesting definitions of isolated terms hidden in the abbreviation CLIL are offered by Tejkalová (2011) in the conference proceedings Integrated teaching of foreign language and content subject – CLIL. In short, Tejkalová (2011) said that CLIL method is a blend of specialized lesson’s Content, a Language, which in majority of cases is English as the world’s “lingua franca”,
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very often questionably balanced Integration of the content and language and finally a complex Learning process.

Since the position of CLIL among other ELT approaches is still not entirely clear, a conception of CLIL as an umbrella term is being promoted increasingly. This conception is also supported by Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) stating that “CLIL is an umbrella term covering a dozen or more educational approaches (e.g., immersion, bilingual education, multilingual education, language showers and enriched language programmes).” However, many foreign as well as Czech scholars adhere to the conviction that CLIL is very unique and therefore different to other ELT approaches such as bilingual education or CBI approach. These three and other educational approaches will be contrasted in more detail in chapter 2.3.

1.2 Types of CLIL

CLIL can be approached by teachers in various manners given its versatile use. In general, academic scholars and professionals tend to differentiate the types of CLIL either according to the intensity of exposure to learning and teaching through the foreign language or the aim, which this approach is focusing on more in the particular lesson. The first of above stated perspectives on CLIL is outlined by Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009, p.13) in the Figure 1 below.
Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009, p. 13-18) describes some of the distinct CLIL-style activities, which are reflected in the research part of this thesis, such as *language showers*, during which students use exclusively the L2 and receive between 30 minutes to one hour of exposure per day. Other type is *the total immersion programmes*, during which the teacher usually speaks only in the L2, the immersion language, and the students also address their teacher in this language. Gradually through years of the programme the curriculum becomes to be delivered in the immersion language at least from 50%. A similar view on CLIL types is offered by Coyle, Hood, & Marsh (2010) by describing various intensity in which the learners are exposed to learning in the L2, namely *

*Extensive instruction through the vehicular language* (meant L2), in which the vehicular language is used almost exclusively to introduce, summarize and revise topics, with very limited switches into the first language and in some
cases 50% or more of the curriculum may be taught in this way. (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p.15) and *Partial instruction through the vehicular language (L2)*, in which only less than 5% of the curriculum is taught through CLIL and therefore a project-based approach is often used in this case of CLIL. Both above described CLIL types vary in the intensity of the exposure to L2 however, they share a clear triple focus on content, language and cognition, which are in many cases realized by the cooperation of language and content teachers.

This brings us to other CLIL forms, namely *Soft CLIL* and *Hard CLIL*, in which despite the duality of aims being maintained, the emphasis is placed on either the language or content in the lessons where CLIL is used. Such division is, among others, supported by Czech academic scholars interested in CLIL, Šmídová, Tejkalová, & Vojtková (2012) according to whom *hard CLIL* is of a content-driven character, primarily implemented by content subject teachers in contrast to the *soft CLIL*, which is primarily implemented by language teachers, who select subject topics subordinate to the language aims. Benešová and Vallin (2015) also incline towards this definition since they find the division of CLIL types according to the intensity of CLIL implementation in lessons rather elusive. Referring to the example of a class of Czech students learning about European history in English mentioned earlier in the introduction, *hard CLIL* lesson could involve a history teacher teaching a topic of II. World War in English, unlike *soft CLIL* lesson which would be realized by an English teacher, who would include topics from English history in his or her English lessons.
The research part of this thesis deals with the hard and soft CLIL as well as language showers\(^1\) and immersion programmes extensive or partial instruction through the L2 since they correspond with the forms of CLIL which are being implemented at the secondary schools participating in the research.

**1.3 CLIL among other language teaching approaches**

CLIL, bilingual education and CBI share one, probably most crucial goal. They all aim to enhance the learner’s second language knowledge up to the level of a native speaker within a context of some specialized or content subject, which sets a stimulating environment to learners. However there are a number of characteristics, by which these educational approaches, in which second language is incorporated, can be unambiguously distinguished. Some of these differences are explained subsequently.

When the aims of the approaches are taken into consideration, CLIL teaching is quite often misinterpreted as teaching of non-linguistic subject in a foreign language or as language teaching based on specialized/subject topics, which is described as interdisciplinary relations. In the first case, it is a bilingual, respectively foreign-language teaching of a non-linguistic subject, in which the knowledge of a foreign language is an essential prerequisite in pupils. The aim of such lesson is not to primarily acquire new knowledge of the foreign language, but primarily gain knowledge of the non-linguistic subject through

\[\text{________________________} \]

\(^1\) Regular, short, continual exposure to a CLIL subject delivered in the target language for about 15 or 30 minutes several times a week. Language showers are more common in primary CLIL and usually involve one subject area such as art or maths. (Cambridge English, TKT, CLIL Glossary, 2015)
the foreign language. (Baladová, Sladkovská, 2009) In the latter case, Baladová and Sladkovská (2009) continue by describing that it is an example of interdisciplinary relations, where the teacher uses the pupils’ knowledge from the non-linguistic subject for teaching vocabulary, grammar and lexical phenomena of a foreign language. In this case, the lesson is not intended to expand the pupils’ knowledge of a non-linguistic subject.

Above stated supports the Coyle’s definition of CLIL, in which the duality of language and content subject aims is the crucial contrast between CLIL and other educational approaches to foreign language teaching. Bilingual education clearly prioritizes the content subject knowledge to be learnt and uses the L2 only as a tool to do so. Similarly to interdisciplinary relations mentioned by Baladová a Sladkovská (2009), an opposite goal is set also by the Content Based Instruction learning (CBI), since this approach aims to set ideal conditions for acquiring practical skills in the foreign language by exposing the learners to the L2 within a meaningful context of a non-linguistic subject. This crucial goal is also highlighted in CLIL. During the non-linguistic subject teaching the four language skills – reading, listening, speaking, writing are the tools used to learn new information and demonstration of understanding. It is the skill to act in a foreign language in different situations which is considered the greatest benefit of CLIL, especially for the future occupation of pupils. Pupils do not learn language skills that they may use later, but knowledge that they apply immediately. Baladová and Sladkovská (2009) This characteristic is, in fact, in line with the principle of modern approach to education that places the importance on practical learning instead of learning theory by heart.
Further on, unlike CLIL, which does not require a proficient knowledge of the L2 neither in students nor in teachers, bilingual education is rather demanding in the matter of additional language skills. Both the students and teachers need to prove a sufficient L2 knowledge, which is the most important prerequisite for the bilingual education implementation. As it is confirmed in Vojtková (2012) in majority of cases, students are deliberately linguistically prepared and selected according to the results of the entrance examinations at schools offering bilingual programs. Vojtková (2012)

As Benešová and Vallin (2015) state, in some cases bilingual education can even take place in settings where students are exposed to two additional languages. For example a child of Czech parents attends a bilingual programme including the combination of French and English at a French lyceum. Schools where bilingual education takes place are characterized by a significant proportion of native speakers among teachers and due to this, bilingual education is reserved only for a small percentage of children and does not aspire to be promoted in a state-funded education system in a long-term. In the Czech Republic bilingual education is mainly offered by private schools, they add. (Benešová, Vallin 2015)

A very similar approach to bilingual education, which also intensively exposes the learners to the foreign language, is the immersive approach. The immersive programmes can vary according to the amount of time the learners are being taught in foreign language, the lessons are taught either entirely in the L2, which is known as total immersion or only partially in the L2, which is known as partial immersion. CLIL is usually implemented partly in a foreign
language and partly in the mother tongue, emphasizing the use of a foreign language. In addition, in contrary to bilingual teaching, which focuses exclusively on receptive skills (reading and listening comprehension), CLIL focuses on both the receptive and productive skills such as speaking and writing. (Šmídová, 2012)

To conclude, let me introduce the contrasting legislation related to the implementation of CLIL and bilingual education at schools. The implementation of CLIL teaching into the School Education Program of a school of any educational level – primary, secondary or even pre-school level is not bound by any regulations or legislative documents. Having said so, the decision whether this method is taught at the given school depends solely on the consideration of the school’s director, who should complexly consider the predispositions of the teachers and the overall facilities of his or her school and then decide on the most convenient type of CLIL approach being implemented into the School Education Program. On the contrary, bilingual education is subject to the instruction of the Minister of Education on the procedure for authorizing the teaching of certain subjects in a foreign language, dated July 15, 2008 (Ref.527 / 2008-23)². In order to receive this permission, among other conditions the school needs to prove that the teachers who are in charge of bilingual education have the language proficiency at the level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.³

³ https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf
The above mentioned contrasting features are briefly summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
<th>Bilingual education</th>
<th>CBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on</strong></td>
<td>Duality of aims, interwoven focus on both the content subject and L2 learning</td>
<td>Subject, the most important is the knowledge of the non-linguistic subject gained through the foreign language.</td>
<td>Language, the most important is the practice of L2 through the knowledge of a non-linguistic subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language and content subject knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Accepts L2 limitations in students and teacher</td>
<td>Previous knowledge of L2 is a necessary prerequisite</td>
<td>Previous knowledge of content subject is an essential prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquired skills</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on both receptive and productive skills</td>
<td>Focuses mainly on receptive skills</td>
<td>Focuses on both receptive and productive skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation regulations</strong></td>
<td>The Head teacher of the school considers the situation</td>
<td>The Minister of Education grants a permit</td>
<td>The Minister of Education grants a permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Contrasts between CLIL, Bilingual education and CBI

From the table above we can infer a clear conclusion that CLIL in comparison to other language teaching approaches focuses on the learning aims and skills in much more complex way, it is flexible and tolerant to language knowledge input and its implementation process is also easier from the legislation point of view.
1.4 Historical Development of CLIL

A phenomenon when people were forced to learn an additional, or second language by social, demographical or other life circumstances is described by Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009, p. 9) on an example from 5000 years ago when Sumerian was used by Akkadians, who conquered the Sumerian territory, to learn subjects such as theology, zoology and botany. With the same purpose the Roman families were educating their children in Greek to ensure them a more accessible social and professional life in the Greek speaking environment. (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010) Although many years ago and yet not bearing the term CLIL, both these examples are true forerunners of CLIL method since in both cases the people aimed to learn both the language and content subject information of the same importance.

Such situations can be witnessed even in more recent history, when the generation of our parents was forced to learn Russian or German due to the demographic situation during the II. World War. According to Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) a breakthrough year was probably the year of 1965, in which many multilingual programs were created as a result of geographical, demographic or social needs. Even though not applicable in the European environment, a good example of such programme, is the Canadian experiment of immersive teaching during which Canadian children were educated in French. This experiment was a significant impetus for further experimental activity in this field. (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009)

The beginnings of content and linguistically integrated teaching fall into the 1970s and are associated with the emergence of communicative methods.
The development of teaching non-linguistic subjects in foreign language gave birth to a number of terms LAC - Language Across Curriculum, TBLL - Task-based Language Learning, CBI - Content-based Teaching, which practically described a similar way of teaching. The abbreviation CLIL was first introduced by David Marsh in 1994 and two years later this term was employed at the University of Finnish Jyväskylä within the European Education Program in the Netherlands. (Šmídová, 2012)

*Teaching and Learning Towards the Learning Society*, with plurilingualism as its main aim, is an example of a pivotal document concerning CLIL in Europe. This programme document concerning education was issued and accepted by European Council in 1996. Its main aim was that every person living in European Union (Europe) should master at least three languages spoken in the European Union. The necessity of the L2 knowledge is even more topical with the increasing globalization and mobility of people in the world of 21st century and therefore the expansion of English as „lingua franca“ during the last decade goes hand in hand with the growing demand of CLIL approach.

The first decade (1994 – 2004) of CLIL´s existence was the time of the crucial development of this approach and many international declarations and events took place together with key publications being published. After the 2004, the attention moved on to the improvement of teachers´ competencies, materials´ quality and establishing the school frameworks.

In this age, the education process in a modern, globalized and integrated society cannot offer its learners a better approach than an integrated learning. Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) claims that even the Generation Y (people
born between 1982 and 2001) approached the learning process through the immediacy, well concluded by a statement “learn as you use, use as you learn”. The Cyber Generation born after 2001 seeks even more often for the personal experience of newly acquired abilities or information. With learners of this kind, CLIL is one innovative methodology that has emerged to cater to this age. (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009)

1.5 CLIL in the Czech Republic

Given the less favourable conditions for CLIL implementation in the Czech Republic due to the fact that neither of languages most frequently used for CLIL method is widely spoken in the Czech Republic, CLIL as a prominent educational initiative was introduced in the Czech Republic later than in other EU countries. In Šmídová et al. (2012, p. 8) it is explained that CLIL entered the Czech education system by the means of the EU document Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006. This Action Plan was based on the assumption that the content and language integrated learning will be a part of the EU’s language learning objectives, above all by allowing the pupils immediately verify newly acquired language skills and thus enhance his or her self-esteem for further language learning. (Šmídoví et al., 2012, p. 8) In 2006, CLIL was mentioned in the Czech National Plan for Foreign Language Teaching. Three years later, at the beginning of the year 2009, a key and so far the only document concerning the CLIL implementation at Czech schools, Content and Language Integrated Learning v
ČR\textsuperscript{4} was elaborated by the Pedagogical Research Institute and issued by the Ministry of Education.

The initiatives of educational authorities together with the teachers´ readiness to incorporate CLIL into their lessons are the building pillars for a successful expansion of this new method into the educational system, therefore it is important to mention some of the significant projects, which took place since the CLIL implementations in Czech secondary educational system starting point. In the years 2010 – 2011 a project entitled *Obsahově a jazykově integrované vyučování na 2. stupni základních škol a nižším stupni víceletých gymnázií* was implemented by the National Institute for Further Education (NIDV) together with partners of the project by the Research Institute for Education in Prague (REP) and the Association of English Methodologists (AMATE) with the objectives of raising teachers´ awareness of the CLIL methodology approach and to methodologically support teachers in the implementation and use of CLIL in teaching.\textsuperscript{5}. Under the leadership of one of the most significant personalities of CLIL in the Czech Republic, PhDr. Jitka Kazelleová, a project called *CLIL do škol* (2009 - 2012) took place within the Pedagogical Faculty of Masaryk University in Brno. A regional project, entitled *Výuka angličtiny napříč předměty na ZŠ, G a SOŠ kraje Vysočina* ran in years 2009 – 2012 aimed at increasing the skills of CLIL methodology of teachers in Vysočina Region.

\textsuperscript{4} http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/zakladni-vzdelavani/content-and-language-integrated-learning-v-cr?highlightWords=Content+and+Language+Integrated+Learning+%C4%8CR

\textsuperscript{5} http://clil.nuv.cz/uvod-do-clil/4-projekty-clil-v-cr/4-1-narodni-projekt-clil.html
Despite CLIL being one of the every year targets of the major educational authorities, National Institute for Education (NUV) and the National Institute for Further Education (NIDV), since its introduction in the Czech educational system, the expected widespread use of this innovative method has not yet been met. As evidenced by the data obtained from one of the few studies aimed at introducing CLIL into the Czech education conducted by Kubů et al. (2011), CLIL method was applied in 30% of both elementary and secondary schools and in majority of cases only in a less intensive form of language showers. Only 19% of the schools included CLIL in their School Education Programmes. The research also discovers the challenges that CLIL method places to its participants, Kubů et al. (2011, p. 7) mainly highlights the low number of teachers methodologically trained for CLIL lessons, low proficiency of the additional language in content subject teachers, shortage of teaching materials, demanding preparation for teachers and lack of time in lessons where CLIL is being applied. All these aspects mentioned in the above research are closely reflected in the practical part of this thesis.
2 IMPLEMENTATION OF CLIL AT CZECH SECONDARY SCHOOLS

This chapter deals with a general situation of CLIL´s implementation at Czech secondary schools namely the CLIL´s objectives, CLIL´s position within the FEP and SEP, advantages and disadvantages of CLIL´s implementation, subjects in which CLIL is typically applied, languages which are used as the L2 in CLIL lessons, time allocation CLIL approach has to its disposal within the ŠVP and in the end are described some of the challenges teachers face when evaluating their students in CLIL lessons.

2.1 Aims of implementation of CLIL at Czech secondary schools

The school curriculums following modern educational approach are in line with the idea of interconnecting the educational disciplines and the subjects. More precisely the modern time literally asks for the integration of languages and non-linguistic subjects since the knowledge of a foreign language, mostly English, is not an added value any more. These days especially the knowledge of English is a necessity. What is more, implementation of CLIL does not only support learning a content subject through the L2, but it also, as Šmídová et al. (2012) claims "brings new procedures that stimulate a much more active role of the pupil in the educational process." Šmídová et al. (2012) therefore highly recommends the implementation of this approach into schools SEP.
2.1.1 CLILs objectives

As specified in Šmídová et al. (2012), the National Institute of Education in the Czech Republic currently defines two main objectives in line with the methodology of CLIL’s integrated teaching method: 1) content and 2) linguistic. The third, complementary goal is to define which skills and strategies will be developed and how. Šmídová et al. (2012, p. 8) Given the fact that CLIL approach as a whole is to a large extent inspired by a number of theoretical concepts and second language acquisition theories, the practical execution of especially the third goal mentioned above is from a vast majority based on the principles of these theories. Resulting objectives of CLIL are presented here together with a brief description of the objectives of the influential theories one by one.

The first and probably crucial objective of CLIL is students’ active development of language skills by the interaction with other students within a natural context. This objective follows the principles of social constructivism according to which the students should take the leading role in an interactive learning process in order to activate their thinking and creativity. The learning process is embedded in a stimulating environment provided by the teacher who is in a role of a guide or advisor with students being actively the designers of their knowledge (Benešová and Vallin (2015, p. 61).

As another objective equally common to CLIL, the social constructivism highlights the importance of building the newly acquired information on the grounds of the previously learnt knowledge. CLIL’s objective is similarly to build on the knowledge that students already have either in the content subject
or language. This helps to reduce the challenge posed by learning entirely new information through the L2. Together with this objective the importance of meaningful communication for both CLIL and social constructivism is summarized in Šmídová et al. (2012) claiming that it is also necessary to build on the students’ language skills and skills that have been learned so far. Gradual integration into the system is the basis for a real mastering of the concepts and avoiding thoughtless imitation in a foreign language. Šmídová et al. (2012, p.23) However, as stated in chapter 2.3, CLIL approach in contrast to bilingual learning does not demand previous knowledge of L2 as one of its conditions.

Another important objective of CLIL approach is to set a corresponding cognitive and language level of the students. This implies that the use of mother tongue and the foreign language for CLIL tasks should correspond with the cognitive level of the individual activity. At the beginning the L2 can be integrated into the tasks of lower cognitive demand and for tasks of higher cognitive demand the use of mother tongue can be maintained. Benešová and Vallin (2015) In order to correctly determine the cognitive level of the tasks and interconnect it with an appropriate language level it is more than advisable to consult the Bloom’s taxonomy. Particularly the updated version of the Bloom’s taxonomy, which was revised by psychologists Anderson and Kratwohl in 2001. As it is explained in Šmídová et al. (2012), each of the categories not only represents the cognitive level, but also a particular lexical or grammar area which the student needs to master in order to fulfill the aims of the category. Šmídová et al. (2012, p.23) The following table retrieved and translated from
CLIL ve výuce (Šmídová et al., 2012, p. 28) serves as a practical guide to teachers in meeting the above mentioned objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target category (level of mastery)</th>
<th>Typical verbs determining the objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Remember</strong> terms and data - its classification and categorization</td>
<td>define, identify, make a list, name, repeat, remember, detect, note, match, revise, underline, highlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Understand</strong> translation from one language into the other, transfer from one communication into the other, simple interpretation, explanation</td>
<td>choose, give example, demonstrate, describe, determine, distinguish, explain, explain in one’s own words, choose, reformulate, communicate, translate, simulate, calculate, check, measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Apply</strong> use of abstract thinking and generalisation (theories, principles, laws, rules, methods, techniques, procedures, general ideas in specific situations)</td>
<td>apply, demonstrate, interpret data, draft, generalise, state relations between, plan, use, prove, register, solve, examine, distinguish, prepare, note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Analyse</strong> analysis of complex information (system, procedure) into elements and parts, establishment of element’s hierarchy, principle of its organization, relations and interaction between the elements</td>
<td>analyse, do an analysis, find relation, compare, summarise, put into context, classify into logical sequences, identify causes and consequences, categorise, discuss, classify, combine, estimate, imply, question, solve, diagnose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Evaluate</strong> assessment of materials, background, methods and techniques from the perspective of its purpose in line with the established criteria or which the pupil establishes itself</td>
<td>criticise, evaluate, vindicate, assess, support the arguments, oppose, prove, compare with the standard, choose, state benefits and drawbacks, justify, valorise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Create</strong> composition of elements and its parts into previously non-existent unit</td>
<td>adjust, organise, formulate, reorganise, formulate, suggest, supervise, manage, build up a system, reconstruct, forecast, propose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: CLIL objective categories
The Cummin’s concept of BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicational Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency)\(^6\) also offers background for balancing the cognitive level of the content and the language used in CLIL approach. If the content is of higher cognitive demand, students need to be provided with contextual language support for example in a form of scaffolding\(^7\). (Benešová and Vallin, 2015, p. 69)

Subsequently Benešová and Vallin (2015, p. 65) depict the importance of CLIL approach providing students with various types of activities, which would respect the different needs and learning preferences of students. This conviction is supported by the theory of multiple intelligences developed by Gardner\(^8\), who came to the conclusion that there are eight different types of intelligence; questioning the theory that intelligence is limited exclusively to logical reasoning (Gardner, 1999). Also bearing in mind another language teaching theory concerned with the three types of students’ learning styles (visual, auditory and kinaesthetic) should lead teachers to incorporate a wide range of activities in their CLIL lessons. This objective may be for teachers one of many challenges when developing materials.

Although CLIL’s objectives may be reflected in a number of language teaching and learning approaches, probably the most complex view on CLIL’s components may be illustrated by Coyle’s 4Cs Framework which, based on the idea of content being related to learning and thinking (cognition), shares most

---

\(^6\) [http://esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/cummin.htm](http://esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/cummin.htm)

\(^7\) [http://educanet2.ch/pec/pec_gen/54/Scaffolding.pdf](http://educanet2.ch/pec/pec_gen/54/Scaffolding.pdf)

\(^8\) [http://www.tecweb.org/styles/gardner.html](http://www.tecweb.org/styles/gardner.html)
of the principles described above. Coyle, Hood, & Marsh (2010) share the view of Benešová and Vallin (2015, p. 61) stating that "Content matter is not only about acquiring knowledge and skills; it is about the learner creating their own knowledge and understanding and developing skills." Further on, Coyle et al. agree with the Cummin’s concept of cognitive and language demands being in a balance: "Thinking processes (cognition) need to be analysed for their linguistic demands." (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 42) The following Figure 2 summarizes The 4Cs Framework according to Coyle.

![Figure 2: The 4Cs Framework (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2012, p. 41)](image)

The model of 4Cs Framework clearly demonstrates a close integration of four areas – content (subject matter), communication (language learning and using), cognition (learning and thinking processes) and culture (developing intercultural understanding and global citizenship) within one common context. (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 41) Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) also specify their model of 4C elements crucial for successful CLIL; however their model differs distinctly in two areas. Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) focus in their model more on the interpersonal relationships than on the cultural ones, therefore they include community instead of culture. What is more, based on
the belief that cognition is superior to the other elements in reaching a good CLIL practice, it has a superior position in the model too. (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009, p.31) Mehisto´s model of 4 Cs is illustrated in the following Figure 3.

![4Cs Model](image)

Figure 3: 4Cs Model, (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009, p. 31)

All the above mentioned CLIL objectives are concisely and clearly summarized into 6 categories by Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009, p. 29 - 30) in his list of *Core Features of CLIL Methodology*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>Multiple focus</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ supporting language learning in content classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ supporting content learning in language classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ integrating several subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ organizing learning through cross-curricular themes and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ supporting reflection on the learning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. <strong>Safe and enriching learning environment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ using routine activities and discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ displaying language and content throughout the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ building student confidence to experiment with language and content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ using classroom learning centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ guiding access to authentic learning materials and environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ increasing student language awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. <strong>Authenticity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ letting the students ask for the language help they need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ maximizing the accommodation of student interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ making a regular connection between learning and the students’ lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ connecting with other speakers of the CLIL language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ using current materials from the media and other sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Active learning**
- students communicating more than the teacher
- students help set content, language and learning skills outcomes
- students evaluate progress in achieving learning outcomes
- favoursing peer co-operative work
- negotiating the meaning of language and content with students
- teachers acting as facilitators

5. **Scaffolding**
- building on a student’s existing knowledge, skills, interests and experience
- repackaging information in user-friendly ways
- responding to different learning styles
- fostering creative and critical thinking
- challenging students to take another step forward and not just coast in comfort

6. **Co-operation**
- planning lessons/themes in co-operation with CLIL and non-CLIL teachers
- involving parents in learning about CLIL and how to support students
- involving the local community, authorities and employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Core features of CLIL methodology (Mehisto et al., 2008, p. 29-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Apart from the CLIL principles which were already stated in this chapter, Mehisto et al. highlights the importance of a safe and enriching learning environment achieved with the help of routine activities, language being displayed in the classroom and students’ open experimenting with the L2. In relation to another feature, the authenticity of CLIL lessons, Mehisto et al. claims that the newly acquired knowledge should be regularly connected to the students’ lives. Co-operation is also assigned a considerable value since not only the co-operation of content and language teachers, but also the inclusion of parents and a local community is important part of CLIL methodology.

Later in the practical part of this thesis some of the relevant features of CLIL methodology listed in this chapter are reflected in the criteria the classroom observation sheet was constructed on.
2.1.2 CLIL within the FEP

Given its complexity the Coyle’s 4Cs Framework is a building block for the Frame Education Programme of both secondary and grammar schools, therefore a further demonstration of how the 4 elements are projected in the FEP is offered in the following chapter.

Caused by the fact that individual subjects and disciplines blend and enrich each other at almost every education level, the individual disciplines overlap and connections are nowadays a part of any modern curricula. This phenomena is well-reflected by CLIL, which intends among other objectives, to develop the critical thinking, creativity and a number of other learning strategies, so it can be claimed that CLIL is perfectly in agreement with some of the objectives of the FEP at secondary, namely grammar schools. Šmídová, Sladkovská, Vojtková (2012) describe relevance between the principles of Coyle’s 4Cs Framework and the main objective of the FEP at elementary schools. After reviewing the FEP for grammar schools published by NÚV in August 2016 it is obvious that there happen to be many similarities with the 4Cs Framework too. According to Šmídová, Sladkovská, Vojtková (2012) the 4C elements are represented within the FEP by: the communication based on the educational content of a foreign language and the communicative competence, the content is based on educational content of a non-lingual subject, the cognition is represented by the expected outcomes and involvement of key

_______________

competencies and the cultural dimension is based on the educational content of cross-cutting themes.

2.1.3 CLIL within the SEP

Based on the recommendation of the NÚV there are two most common scenarios for CLIL implementation at Czech schools – in the form of soft or hard CLIL. In the case of soft CLIL, language elements are occasionally incorporated into a non-linguistic subject’s lesson, which is recommendable especially for schools which do not have profound experience with CLIL. According to Šmídová et al., (2012), such step can be a good starting point for future implementation of hard CLIL at the school. For hard CLIL to become a part of teaching there is a need of an experienced teacher who is preferably qualified in both the content and language subject and is able to teach the content subject through the L2. In relation to this topic it is added in Šmídová et al. (2012) that CLIL can be described in other ways which reflect its organizational form, staffing and conceptual anchoring at school, such as the thematic, modular and project CLIL variants.

In general there are many ways in which CLIL can be implemented in teaching at schools; however recommendations elaborated precisely for implementation of CLIL in the SEP at secondary schools are described on the websites of MŠMT (2009)\textsuperscript{10}. The first example is more suitable for lower secondary schools since in the majority of the lessons the teacher uses the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{10} http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/zakladni-vzdelavani/content-and-language-integrated-learning-v-cr
\end{footnotesize}
students’ mother tongue and L2 is exclusively used for giving instructions and in the CLIL materials students use it as a source of information needed for the task accomplishment. The second example is very similar to the form of hard CLIL, in which the content subject is being taught through the L2 and students learn the terms relevant to the content subject not only in their mother tongue, but also in the L2.

The extent in which CLIL is anchored in the lessons depends on many variables such as the language skills of students and teachers or the willingness of teachers to apply CLIL in their lessons. Therefore it is not possible to determine which of these ranges is sufficient or insufficient or differently put right or wrong. The best conclusion is probably to believe that any step towards introducing the integrated language teaching and learning is a positive step. Šmídová et al. (2012) elaborates this statement by highlighting that the introduction of any form of CLIL into the school’s SEP brings an interesting work to teachers and gives the school credit for making advantage of modern teaching which is naturally intertwined with foreign languages.

However the reality of CLIL implementation is not very positive. As already written above, Kubů et al. (2011, p. 7) reveal in their research rather disappointing results in relation to the extent of CLIL being introduced into teaching at Czech secondary schools in year 2008 with only 30% percent of schools using CLIL in a form of “language showers” and only 19% of schools having CLIL approach as a part of their School Education Programmes (SEP). Hopefully this situation has changed in the last ten years; unfortunately there is no research from more recent time to confirm that.
2.2 Benefits and challenges of CLIL

Very often and not only in teaching and learning do modern innovative approaches bring with themselves both benefits and inevitable pitfalls. CLIL approach is by no means an exception. Chapter 3.2 describes the main profits of CLIL implementation into lessons followed by frequent risks, both being reflected further on in the research part of this thesis.

2.2.1 Benefits

A number of academic pieces of research reflecting CLIL’s outcomes carried out by the NÚV suggest better communicative competencies in CLIL students in comparison to those attending standard language learning. Therefore the development of language skills and competencies within a natural, student-centred context may be considered to be the major asset CLIL method brings to its students. Czech academics specializing in language learning and CLIL method in particular, Hanušová and Vojtková (2011) together with Baladová and Sladkovská (2009), state that L2 within CLIL method is used in a meaningful context and more natural situations in contrary to artificially constructed communicative situations in ordinary language lessons, with this claim agrees Coyle (2006), adding that L2 is not perceived as a learning objective of the lesson, but as a means of acquiring new knowledge, which induces natural learning of the language. Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) contribute by explaining that “CLIL students are not learning a language simply for the sake of language learning and future use, but are putting just-learnt language to immediate use while learning and manipulating content that is

CLIL enhances not only the development of communicative competencies, but also the development of higher cognitive processes, since these are demanded in CLIL lessons unlike in standard language lessons. (Šmídová, 2012) and Novotná with Hofmannová (2003) focused on the cognitive aspects of CLIL teaching in their research and discovered differences in the cognitive processes of students attending CLIL and standard language lessons caused by a different way of manipulating symbols, which ultimately leads to the development of students' cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Tejkalová, 2011, p. 12-14). Novotná (2011, p. 10) believes that code-switching of students in CLIL lessons, which is an alternate use of the mother tongue and L2 and corresponds to the inner speech necessarily indicates a positive influence on their cognitive development. Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) see the proof of CLIL students’ metalinguistic awareness development in the fact that CLIL students not only often outperform their peers in the content subjects, but also in comparing the languages and rendering their messages. Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009, p.20)

Taking into consideration the overall students’ motivation for learning and in particular for learning languages, it can be said that the natural context
of real situations increases the appetite for knowledge and communication as such. Lasagabaster and Sierra (as cited in Benešová and Vallin, 2015, p.25) say that “CLIL offers a more meaningful opportunity to use a foreign language, which is positively reflected in building attitudes to learning foreign languages as such.” Further, Benešová and Vallin (2015, p. 25) add that pieces of research focused on CLIL’s outcomes suggest that students taking part in CLIL programmes consider foreign languages to be more necessary, important and useful than their peers who learn foreign language in regular language lessons.

Šmídová (2012) contributes with some other advantages of CLIL, namely the increase in students’ opportunities on the Czech and foreign job market as well as in further studies. Šmídová (2012) then agrees with Hanušová (2012) who includes wider development of cultural and multilingual interests and attitudes to be one of the positives of CLIL method. Another advantage is a higher stress tolerance witnessed in CLIL students. (Van de Craen as cited in Benešová and Vallin, 2009, p. 26)

Moving the focus on assets the CLIL method brings to teachers, Ball (2011) together with other academics on Onestopenglish web portal state that CLIL, by linking language and non-linguistic teaching, can be used as a time-saving method. Of course, we can make full use of the learning space only under condition that the level of knowledge achieved in the non-linguistic subjects taught in L2 is not reduced. Another positive aspect is that teachers are encouraged to not only reform their way of teaching and include the activation methods aimed at students at the expense of frontal teaching
approach (Valin and Benešová, 2015, p. 31), but also they are motivated to increase their qualifications. (Šmídová, 2012)

2.2.2 Challenges

Although CLIL method has provably high added value to the modern language teaching, the number of challenges it represents mainly, but not exclusively to CLIL teachers is still quite high. Kubů et al. (2011) in her research aimed at the implementation of CLIL in the Czech Republic highlights the high demands placed on teachers omitted in the document issued by the Ministry of education Content and Language Learning v ČR. Kubů et al. (2011, p.9) specifies among other demands, the high requirements on the L2 level, a necessity to change teaching methods and techniques as well as adjust systematically the development of learning strategies in students. From the organizational point of view, she brings up the need of effective cooperation in pedagogical team, which is very rare especially at Czech schools, and the crucial role of support of school´s management in CLIL training. Another obstacle relevant to the research of this thesis, Kubů et al. (2011, p.9) underpins the absence of CLIL materials that are very difficult to access.

Elaborating on the question of the teachers´ and students´ language skills requirements stated by Kubů et al (2011), the research focusing on classroom communication by Dalton-Puffer (as cited in Benešová and Vallin, 2015, p. 27) points out the low interaction among learners in L2, largely in the form of single-word responses of students and questions of lower cognitive difficulty from the side of teachers, where the main role is represented by a
teacher not a student. (Dalton-Puffer as cited in Benešová and Vallin, 2015, p. 27) This claim is supported also by Šmídová (2015) who views the students’ insufficient language competence to use a foreign language in a content subject something that is confronted in the CLIL courses. (Benešová and Vallin, 2015, p. 31) However, Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) refute this allegation based on the academic results saying that “CLIL is suitable for students of varying levels of ability, it is suggested that entry to the programme be granted on a first come, first served basis.” (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009, p. 23) Said this, he refuses the fact that CLIL courses should be accessible only for students of a certain language level. Similarly in the case of teachers, Ting (as cited in Benešová and Vallin (2015, p.28) highlights that teachers’ high level language skills are not the key prerequisites for successful CLIL implementation in lessons. More importantly she sees the teachers’ availability of materials, which would back or supplement teachers’ language skills. (Benešová and Vallin (2015, p.28)

Nevertheless, a great problem with the shortage of high quality CLIL materials not only does not serve as a solution for teachers’ insufficient language level, but as Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) explain introduces other problems. "Since off-the-shelf CLIL materials are in short supply, teachers often spend considerable time developing and/or adapting existing learning resources." (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009, p. 22) Šmídová (2012) also recognized the lack of relevant learning materials as well as evaluation tools for CLIL as one of problems in CLIL implementation at schools. What is more, she emphasizes the fact that the school managements are not properly informed on
the topic of CLIL method which causes unsystematic implementation of CLIL at schools. (Šmídová, 2012) She also agrees with Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) on the fact that the number of teachers with a desirable level of language as well as the qualification both in CLIL method and the content subject is very limited.

In conclusion, given the above stated obstacles which teachers face in the process of CLIL implementation, we can only agree with the fact that the CLIL preparation and lessons themselves may result in being a rather frustrating and stressful experience for teachers as well as students. Therefore it is not surprising that Šmídová (2012) claims the unwillingness and low motivation in teachers to incorporate CLIL into their lessons to be one of the problematic facts.

The table on the following page provides us with a review of the benefits and challenges CLIL method offers. As previously stated, some of them are reflected in the research part, namely the topic of motivation of students to work in CLIL lessons and in language learning, motivation of teachers to use CLIL method in their lessons, the L2 skills requirements for teacher and students, a shortage of CLIL materials and time requirements for preparation of CLIL lessons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of language skills and competencies within a natural, student-centred context</td>
<td>High L2 level requirements of teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as a means of learning, students ´ active implementation of newly learnt knowledge in practice</td>
<td>Necessity to change teaching methods and techniques of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of metacognitive processes and strategies</td>
<td>Need of effective cooperation in pedagogical team, and support of school ´s management in CLIL training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in motivation for learning in general and language learning as such</td>
<td>Shortage of high quality CLIL materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized importance and necessity of L2</td>
<td>Time demanding preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in students ´ professional opportunities</td>
<td>Low motivation of teachers to use CLIL in lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider cultural and multilingual interests and attitudes</td>
<td>Low motivation of students in CLIL lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher stress tolerance</td>
<td>Limited number of qualified teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-saving method</td>
<td>Low support of school ´s management and unsystematic CLIL implementation at schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for teachers to increase their qualification and adjust their teaching method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: CLILs Benefits and Challenges


2.3 Language

According to the data released in the document *Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe* (Eurydice, 2012) the most widely used foreign languages are English, French and German as well as Spanish and Italian. These languages are also the most frequently taught foreign languages at schools in Europe. (Eurydice, 2012, p. 40) In the years 2009/10 the situation in the Czech Republic was following: at lower secondary schools 100% of students learnt English, 22.6% German, 3.7% Russian and 3% French. Differing numbers were present at higher secondary schools and specialized schools where 84, 6% students learnt English, 47, 7% German, 7, 5% French and 5, 3% Russian. (Eurydice, 2012, p. 73)

The same document describes the situation of learning foreign languages in the Czech Republic: "For all pupils it is compulsory to start learning the first foreign language at the age of 8. Later at the age of 13 or 14 (depending of the type of school), all pupils can start with learning the second foreign language as it is compulsory at all schools to offer their students a choice of an optional second language. In general education this second language becomes compulsory for all pupils aged 15 in general education. The obligation to learn two languages lasts until the pupils are 19 years old."

(Eurydice, 2012) However, there is no regulation in regards to the minimal provision of language education, therefore the schools can choose the form in which they include language teaching in their school education programme. Given this flexibility it depends on each school whether they put the emphasis on foreign languages teaching or not.
The general situation of language teaching at secondary schools is closely connected with the languages used as L2s or “additional languages” within the CLIL lessons. The following Figure 4 demonstrates the status of the target languages in which CLIL was being implemented at primary, but also at grammar schools in the school year 2010/11. In the Czech Republic, CLIL lessons included the official language, in this case the Czech language in combination with a foreign language or a regional, minority or non-territorial language.

Figure 4: Status of languages used to teach CLIL at primary and grammar schools in years 2010/11 (Eurydice, 2012)

---

The language traditionally used in certain parts of the territory of a given state by citizens of that state, which form a group less numerous than the rest of the population of that country and not the language of the country in that country. (*European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Council of Europe, 1992*)

The language spoken by citizens of a particular country, which is not identical to the language or languages used by the rest of the population of a given country. Although traditionally used in the territory of a given country it cannot be unequivocally assigned to a particular area within that territory, it is for example Romani. (*European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Council of Europe, 1992*)
The situation of CLIL implementation with respect to languages used at primary and secondary schools from the year 2009/10 is illustrated in more detail in the Figure 5 on the following page. In the right part of the table the schools are differentiated according to the ISCED levels\textsuperscript{13}. For this thesis are relevant number 2 representing lower secondary education or second stage of basic education and 3 representing upper secondary education. It is clearly visible that in majority of cases CLIL is being implemented at both lower and upper level of the secondary schools. The most common foreign languages according to \textit{Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe} are in majority of implementation cases used in CLIL lessons in combination with the official language. 6 secondary school implement combination of official language with English and French, 5 schools as L2 German, 4 schools use Spanish, Polish is represented by 3 schools and Italian is in CLIL present at 2 schools.

\textsuperscript{13} https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Standard_Classification_of_Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language status</th>
<th>Language names</th>
<th>ISCED level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 + 2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2 + 1</th>
<th>1 + 2 + 3</th>
<th>Reference year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 state language + 1 foreign language</td>
<td>Czech - English</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech - German</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech - French</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech - Italian</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech - Spanish</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 state language + 1 minority/regional language with a status of official language</td>
<td>Czech - Polish</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Languages used for CLIL at primary and grammar schools in the Czech Republic in 2009/2010 (Eurydice, 2012)
2.4 Subjects and time allocation

CLIL approach can be developed in its full potential in a vast variety of subjects starting with humanities including geography, history or civics, followed by sciences such as mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics and less possibly in artistic subjects like music, art, physical education.

Interesting results were received from the research conducted by Kubů et al. (2011): From the perspective of a content subject in which a foreign language is used Czech language and literature (35%) together with mathematics (29%) are the most frequently used subjects. Then, also quite frequently (relative to other subjects), foreign languages are used in artistic subjects (music and art), history, and natural sciences, but minimally in biology. It also appears that the use of the foreign language is relatively widespread in the lessons of second foreign language, which, due to the number of teachers qualified in two foreign languages, points to CLIL method being generally widespread among language teachers.

In respect to the time allocation of subjects where CLIL approach is included, in majority of cases time allocation in practice usually depends exclusively on the teacher’s and his/her time availability. (Kubů et al., 2011, p. 17)
2.5 Evaluation

The integration of content subject and a foreign language, which is the main idea of CLIL, clearly implies the need of two areas to be assessed during the lessons where CLIL is used. For many CLIL teachers an appropriate way of students´ assessment may be one of significant challenges they face when using CLIL in their lessons. There are usually two dilemmas which arise at the point of assessment. Firstly it is the question whether to assess students´ performance in language, knowledge of content subject or some mixture of both. In addition, another dilemma, which teachers very often deal with in the CLIL´s practice, is how to assess students´ work and how to approach students´ errors caused by insufficient language skills not the content subject knowledge.

A solution for the first dilemma offers Bentley (2010), who suggests that in case of soft CLIL, which means that a content subject is studied within a foreign language lesson the assessment is focused mainly on the L2. In contrast, in content subject lessons, where CLIL is developed in a form of hard CLIL so that the L2 is used as a tool to teach and learn the specialized subject, the assessment should be applied mainly on the content subject knowledge. (Benešová and Vallin, 2015)

The problematics of how to evaluate the students´ performance is described in Ball (2012). We distinguish between the summative (final) and the formative (regular) assessment, which is more time consuming, though the other one corresponds more to the specifics of CLIL teaching - it focuses on the learning processes and attitudes. (Ball, 2012) As a form of formative
assessment the teacher can continuously assess for example individuals’ communication skills in a group or pair work, presentation skills in the L2 or their performance in projects. Although this type of assessment is more demanding from the organisational point of view, it appears to be more complex and fair to those students who, because of lower L2 skills, may receive worse assessment in a summative test at the end of the midterm or the school year. As Ball (2012) confirms that the central principle of CLIL learning process assessment is the problematics of L2 requirements and risks. The CLIL language mustn’t be a factor which would prevent students from proving their knowledge and skills. (Ball, 2012)

The decision whether to test students in their mother tongue or CLIL language is even more important especially for teachers in the Czech Republic, because of the fact that for all students attending secondary education the final leaving exam is compulsory to be taken in Czech language. Therefore many secondary schools at which CLIL is implemented reduce the number of CLIL lessons in the final grade in order to prepare their students for the exam in their mother tongue.
3 Prerequisites of successful implementation

Although the implementation of CLIL at secondary as well as primary schools solely depends on the consideration of the school’s head teacher in the Czech Republic, there are several conditions which have to be met before the school decides to apply this approach in its teaching. These conditions are summarized in the document issued by MŠMT in 2009 as following:

1. The school has to introduce teaching by the CLIL method and bring this into the School Education Programme (ŠVP), which is fully within the director’s remit;
2. The school has to fulfil expected outcomes both in a foreign language and in a non-linguistic subject;
3. The school has to preserve minimal time allocations of foreign language and non-linguistic subject according to Frame Education Programme (RVP);
4. The school mustn´t exceed the weekly maximal time allowances defined in the FEP for each year;
5. The school has to recognize the qualifications of the teachers for teaching by the CLIL method, which is fully within the competence of the director; in the case of a shortage of qualified teachers, only one teacher, can teach the CLIL method, in all classes, in part-time teaching, in cooperation with teachers of non-linguistic subjects. (Content and Language Integrated Learning v ČR, MŠMT, 2009)
Despite meeting all the prerequisites stated by the Ministry of Education (MŠMT), the implementation of CLIL can become complicated without an active co-operation of teachers, support of school´s management and material background and therefore the school´s director needs to re-consider carefully the unique circumstances for CLIL implementation present at his or her school.

3.1 CLIL teachers

As previously described in chapter 3.2 a complex process of CLIL approach implementation is accompanied not only by benefits but also challenges, which most importantly the teachers who decide to include CLIL in their lessons need to deal with. There are a number of demands placed on CLIL teachers; above all it is a good knowledge of the content subject together with a certain foreign language level expectation. In addition, not less importantly, the adaptation of teaching techniques required by interconnecting of two distinct subjects is inevitable. The combination of these three conditions sufficiently demonstrates that highly qualified and flexible teachers are probably the best candidates for the CLIL methodology implementation at schools. Novotná and Hofmannová (2002) describe three basic models of potential CLIL teachers:

- Native speakers who are qualified in the content subject
- Teachers of content subjects with an active knowledge of the foreign language with no special language qualification
- Foreign language teachers with no qualification in the content subject
A situation when there are a language and a content teacher both present in the lesson is also one of possible solutions, but by all means financially rather inefficient they add. (Novotná and Hofmannová, 2002)

Although the best combination of qualifications may clearly be the first model, it happens only exceptionally that such teachers are found among CLIL teachers at secondary schools in the Czech Republic. Language teachers often include topics of content subject such as geography or history in their language lessons, but these few occasions can be described rather as interdisciplinary way of teaching than a form of CLIL approach. What is more, a language aim is usually is solely accomplished during these lessons. Within the Czech Republic CLIL teachers are most commonly represented by specialized subject teachers incorporating the foreign language into their lessons. This brings us to the question of a foreign language knowledge requirement explained by Benešová and Vallin (2015). Some countries require a specific language level in accordance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) from teachers who only have an academic qualification in the content subject and are not qualified in the foreign language. However majority of countries only recommend the teachers to have a certain foreign language level, which means that there is no official proof of foreign language level required from the CLIL teachers. This is also the case of Czech Republic, where a level B2 according to the CEFR is only recommended, but not required from

teachers who use CLIL approach as a part of their teaching. (Benešová and Vallin, 2015)

Benešová and Vallin (2015) suggest that the key aspect of a successful functioning of CLIL in praxis is the well-informed teacher and his or her motivation. Naturally, the more prepared the teachers are, the smoother the implementation experience is not only for them, but also for their students. Importance of CLIL teachers´ preparation is also reflected by a number of universities in the Czech Republic, who include modules focused on CLIL methodology in their curricula. CLIL is being taught as a separate, individual subject, among others, at pedagogical faculty of Charles University in Prague, Masaryk University in Brno or Palackého University in Olomouc. Also at some other universities future teachers are given an option to attend this module in which they can acquire the theory of CLIL methodology and in some cases even apply their newly learnt knowledge into practice as a part of practical workshops. Besides to the university modules, teachers in the Czech Republic interested in widening their knowledge of CLIL can participate in a number of workshops and projects dealing with this problematics, which are organised by educating institutions throughout the Czech Republic.

Even though a number and variety of supportive tools aiming to increase teachers´ awareness and readiness for CLIL application in the teaching process is increasing as well as their availability not only within the universities, there are still obstacles which make practising CLIL difficult to teachers. As discovered in the research conducted by Kubů. M. et al. (2011) the most frequently mentioned problems which teachers claim to encounter is the time demanding
preparation for CLIL lessons, insufficient time for CLIL activities in the content subjects and low level of the foreign language among students. Some of these and other problems are also considered in the practical part of this thesis.

3.2 Students

For all students the use of CLIL in lessons represents a great opportunity to be a part of a dynamic and motivating form of learning, in which they can naturally use foreign language as a means of communication. In this chapter we will focus on some of the main areas in relation to students as participants in CLIL learning, which are relevant to the research part of this thesis. Namely it is the foreign language skills, students’ qualification essential to successfully become a part of CLIL learning and the overall students’ motivation to learning during CLIL lessons.

As Benešová and Vallin (2015) confirm CLIL as a new teaching method is supported in a state-funded education system therefore it can be implemented at any school of any status and specialization. However they admit that it is the accessibility for all pupils without prior selection which is one of the most ambitious goals of CLIL. It is only a case of a small number of schools in European countries, the Czech Republic included, where the students have to meet some specific admission criteria individually set by the school. However, in majority of European countries there are neither official admission requirements nor recommendations for the students’ selection, they add. (Benešová and Vallin, 2015)
The above described ambitiousness of CLIL being universally available to any student is rather justified mainly when speaking about the language skills. This fact at the same time sets a not always easily achieved goal to CLIL teachers. Also the type of content subject in which CLIL is implemented influences the level of linguistic challenge the students face. The extent to which the content subjects are a challenge is clearly described by Hofmannová and Novotná (2002/2003) saying that we should mainly differentiate the subjects which rely on the verbal communication from those where other communication tools such as visual aids and other resources can complement the verbal communication. The first group can include for example history, philosophy and the second one mathematics, biology, geography or physical education. The first group demands in students advanced language skills; on the other hand the latter group is suitable also for younger students or students with lower language skills. (Hofmannová and Novotná, 2002/2003) Fortunately there are various possibilities of CLIL’s application into the lessons, starting with occasional games in the L2, language showers, vocabulary inputs up to the majority and even the whole lessons being taught in the L2. The teachers, based on a previous reconsideration, then can decide which form of CLIL corresponds the best with the current L2 level of his or her students. Apart from agreeing with the above claim, Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh (2009) claim that “The language learning, which is certainly not considered incidental by parents or teachers, in many ways is incidental to students. They are above all interested in the subject content, not the vocabulary and mechanics of the CLIL language. For students, language is a means to
their goal. Yet the teacher needs to be aware of language.” (Mehisto, Frigols, & Marsh, 2009)

The implication which can be understood from this statement is that the teachers in the role of guide, learning facilitator or tutor represent a much more important variable in the CLIL learning process than the students´ language skills. Either inner or outer motivation is a crucial component in any learning process, because it is the driving force which helps students in completing their tasks. Therefore motivation is an important general factor affecting the quality of learning and its final outcomes. As described by Grecmanová (1998) motivation is next to the level of intellectual development, development of abilities, and level of existing knowledge, volitional personality traits or approach to the learning content one of the most influential factors in the learning process. According to a number of academics from National Institute for Education (2007) the natural environment for learning and developing the L2 belongs to the indisputable advantages of CLIL, which causes that the students are much more motivated to learn and what is more, achieve better results than the students of lessons where content subject and foreign language are learnt separately. The problematics of students´ motivation is also reflected in the practical part.
3.3 Teaching materials for CLIL

CLIL teaching materials differ greatly to the materials used in content subjects and language lessons. To follow CLIL’s key principle of the duality of aims in the material preparation process, the balance to meet both the language and content subject goals of the lesson needs to be maintained. And there are even other areas which need to be taken into consideration, as Benešová and Vallin (2015) say, the development of thinking processes as well as interdisciplinary relations or cultural and social goals should be reflected in carefully chosen materials.

The main criterion for choosing the material is according to Bentley (as cited in Benešová and Vallin, 2015) the content of the lesson and then the language is customized to the lesson’s and students’ needs. Since meeting the language goal is for many teachers as well as students the most challenging part, the preparation of CLIL materials from the language goal perspective and methods for successful achievement of language goals is described in this chapter.

An often misconception about CLIL’s practise is that it is sufficient for students to be exposed to and learn the specialized vocabulary of the content language, however the language goals should not be limited only to the specialized vocabulary or grammar and should cover the complexity of language areas. Procházková (as cited in Šmídová, 2012) explains that meeting language goals need to be approached from all language areas. At first, it is the general language which students use for general communication with their classmates but also the teacher. Students use basic language if they need to borrow a pen
or if they need to understand the teacher’s instructions. Then it is the specialized vocabulary typical for the content subject, which can be in practice introduced by vocabulary lists or mind maps. And the last essential area is the academic language, which is the functional language that allows students to accomplish their tasks. The students use phrases to ask a question or express a cause and its consequences. (Procházková in Šmídová, 2012)

Given the fact that every class of students has its specific needs and language skills very often the teachers despite having access to either online sources or materials in library are need to adjust these materials to his or her students’ needs. This results in CLIL materials preparation process being very time and economically demanding since there are more than language and content subject goals which are desired to be met. The CLIL materials prepared or made by teachers should according to Procházková (as cited in Šmídová, 2012) meet following criteria and general principles. The materials should include the content that leads students to the lessons aim and at the same time a variety of activities, which would reflect different learning styles. As already mentioned the language should be appropriately graded. In addition, scaffolding tools should be provided to students especially during activities of higher cognitive level as well as enough space for students’ creativity, movement and time requirements should be secured. (Procházková as cited in Šmídová, 2012)
3.4 Support of institutions

The school’s management often represented by the head teacher is in charge of the initial decision whether to start with the CLILs implementation at his or her school or not. As already mentioned, when making this decision he or she needs to carefully consider the unique conditions of his or her school and if the current conditions are not very favourable, it should be his or her responsibility to undertake further steps in order to create such conditions that would support a successful CLIL implementation.

There appear to be two main ways how the head teacher can support his teachers in CLILs implementation. The teachers can be offered an initial training on CLIL method either at school or external training and they can be provided the necessary materials. In addition, they might be offered some language course in case they would not feel competent enough in the foreign language. The school can be a part of some EU, state or regional project which usually informs the teachers about the CLIL method in general, but also provides them with practical training and CLIL materials.

All above mentioned solutions for teachers’ support in the CLIL implementation are possible to be used, however they are usually time-demanding from the teachers’ perspective and economically demanding from the schools’ perspective, therefore it can be said that the implementation of CLIL is an easy step neither for the schools management nor for the teachers.
Practical part

4 Implementation of CLIL at Czech secondary schools – case study

4.1 Aims of the research

The first aim of the practical part of this diploma thesis is to compare the implementation of CLIL at three grammar schools, which took part in this research. There were a number of comparative criteria applied in the research in order to ensure the objectiveness of this comparison. The main comparative criteria relate to the start of CLIL implementation, forms of CLIL used, subjects in which CLIL is used, school’s management’s approach towards CLIL implementation at school, motivation to use CLIL both from the perspective of students and teachers, teachers’ and students’ language skills and materials used in lesson where CLIL approach is developed. Next goal is to discover the main challenges faced while the implementation of CLIL method at the sampled schools from the perspective of students’ and teachers’ motivation, students’ and teachers’ language skills and teaching materials. The last two goals are to explore the effectiveness of CLIL method in regards to English language learning and answer a question why CLIL has not developed more as an approach at the sampled schools.
4.2 Methods used in the research

Since my research focuses on comparison of CLIL implementation features observed at each sample school as well as on the overall CLIL implementation challenges seen from the motivation, language skills and quality of material perspective, I considered a multiple case study as described by Dörnyei (2007), to be the best approach to my research. Given only a limited number of individuals involved in CLIL at each of the three sample schools, every school was represented only by a small-size sample of participants in the research. Therefore, not only to increase the representativeness of the data collected, but also to gain a more objective and in depth insight into the situation at each institution, a mixture of methods was applied. Because subjective opinions and descriptions of individual experiences are crucial information in the research, mainly non-numerical data was collected by applying qualitative research tools such as interviews and observation forms. Qualitative data was complemented by quantitative data, which was provided by answers received in questionnaires.

At the beginning of my research I observed 2 lessons where CLIL was implemented at each school. All together I observed 6 CLIL lessons of various content subjects. Besides taking general notes, during my observations I completed a classroom observation form which compiles of a number of criteria relevant to the specific aims of my research. Among other criteria CLIL types, duality of aims accomplishment, 4C´principles and some of other CLIL principles, which as described in chapter 3.1.1 are recommended by Mehisto to be developed in CLIL lessons, were included in the observation form. On the
observation form scale I marked either “observed” or “not observed” to note whether the specific principle was observed or was not observed during the lesson. Classroom observations provided me most importantly with a closer insight into the unique ways in which CLIL is practised at each sample schools.

With an aim of supplementary quantitative data collection, students, teachers and school´s management of each school were asked to complete questionnaires consisting of closed and open questions exploring the areas of student´s and teacher´s motivation and language skills and also the quality of materials. All together 129 students, 6 teachers and 3 representatives of school´s management submitted the questionnaires.

Just after the head teacher, who has the final word in the approval process of the CLIL implementation, teachers are the key elements in the implementation itself. As a matter of exploring their subjective opinions on the research areas I decided to back the quantitative data up by qualitative information collected by interviews with CLIL teachers teaching at the sample schools.

Both questionnaires and interviews were provided to the participants of the research in Czech language, their mother tongue, assuming various levels of English among the participants.
4.3 Participants in the research

Participants who voluntarily took part in the research were deliberately chosen individuals directly involved in the learning and teaching process with CLIL approach being included at secondary schools in the Czech Republic. Three secondary schools in Brno area together with their school’s management, 2 teachers actively applying CLIL in their lessons from each school, and all together 129 students attending lessons where CLIL is being actively used took part in the research.

In relation to the institutions chosen for this research there were two conditions desirable to be met. Firstly the institution needed to be a public or private secondary school in the Czech Republic. Secondly, CLIL approach in any form and of any frequency had to be actively used in the education process. Very similar conditions were set for the teachers, indifferently to what subject they taught, they needed to be teachers at the sampled secondary school in the Czech Republic actively using CLIL in any form and of any frequency in their lessons. Considering the students involved in the research, the only condition was that they were attending CLIL lessons at sampled secondary schools. There was no age or grade range limitation set. Lastly, a member of each school’s management, either the head teacher or deputy director was also included in the research. In conclusion it is important to highlight that anonymity of all participants involved in the research was respected throughout the whole research.
4.4 Analysis of data collected and comparison of findings

4.4.1 Classroom observation

Because of the limited number of lessons observed in my research I included as many easily observed principles of CLIL methodology as possible in the lesson observation form. By completing this form a complex view on the process of implementation in the lessons from the key CLIL features accomplishment perspective was obtained.

To note whether the relevant principle was observed or was not observed during the lessons I used symbols √ for “observed” and X for “not observed” which I complemented by numbers 2 or 1 to indicate in how many lessons this principle was or was not observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL METHODOLOGY PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>observed</th>
<th>not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of CLIL from the perspective of intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language showers</strong> (students and teacher use L2 partly)</td>
<td>2X</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total immersion</strong> (students and teacher use exclusively L2)</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of CLIL from the perspective of aim/focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soft CLIL</strong> (language-driven character, CLIL implemented by language teachers)</td>
<td>2X</td>
<td>2X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard CLIL</strong> (content-driven character, CLIL implemented by content subject teachers)</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple focus accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content subject-related goals accomplishment</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-related goals accomplishment</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting reflection on the learning process</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing learning through cross-curricular themes and projects</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL features according to 4Cs Coyle’s principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content subject matter learning opportunities</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language learning and use opportunities</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of learning and thinking processes</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of intercultural awareness within an intercultural context</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerance towards L2 limited knowledge and scaffolding techniques</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance to limitations in students’ language knowledge</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance to limitations in teachers’ language knowledge</td>
<td>2X</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on a student’s existing knowledge, skills, interests and experience</td>
<td>2√</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fostering creative and critical thinking
Responding to different learning styles

Safe and enriching learning environment establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2✓</th>
<th>2✗</th>
<th>2√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>using routine activities and discourse</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displaying language and content throughout the classroom</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building student confidence to experiment with language and content</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making a regular connection between learning and the students’ lives</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using current materials from the media and other sources</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guiding access to authentic learning materials and environments</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2✗</th>
<th>2✗</th>
<th>2✗</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>students communicating more than the teacher</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favouring peer co-operative work</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers acting as facilitators</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
<td>2✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2✓</th>
<th>2✓</th>
<th>2✗</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>planning lessons/themes in co-operation with CLIL and non-CLIL teachers</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✓</td>
<td>2✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: CLIL Methodology principles – Lesson observation sheet

- **Type of CLIL from the perspective of intensity, aim and focus**

  In both lessons observed at school 1 students communicating exclusively in the L2 with their teacher and even among themselves were totally immersed in CLIL language. In contrast, CLIL was used in a form of language showers at both school 2 and 3, where the teachers exposed students to the specialized vocabulary several times, asked them questions using the L2 or asked them to complete a short activity in L2. In case of all 6 lessons, 2 at each school, CLIL
was implemented by a content subject teacher in a content subject. At school 1
CLIL was used by a geography teacher, at school 2 by a history teacher and at
school 3 by an art teacher. All 6 lessons were with no doubt of a content-driven
character.

- **Multiple focus accomplishment**

  To my surprise, the principle of multiple focus accomplishment was
reflected in implementation of all three schools. In the lessons of school 1, the
main content subject-related goals focused on students being able to
distinguish and describe various types of people´s settlements and in the
second lesson they aimed to become familiar with typical features and
interrelations of countries of Eastern Europe. From the language-related goals
point of view, by the end of the lesson students were supposed to learn both
the specialized vocabulary related to the topic of settlement and countries´
characteristics as well as practice functional language by asking for clarification,
using the L2 in discussion and explaining the consequences of various facts.
At school 2, students´ content subject-related goals were to become familiar
with the topic of Civil war, the causes and consequences and in the second
lesson, to learn the British school system and being able to distinguish the
differences between British and Czech school systems. The language-related
goals were to acquire the specialized terms of both Civil war and School system
topics and be able to recognise the frequently misused false friends in English
and Czech such as grammar school and *gymnasium*. In the lessons of art
observed at school 3 students were guided to practise the 3D perspective
painting and use of water colours in both lessons. These goals were
complemented by learning body parts and names of spring flowers in the L2. In addition to this, the students used L2 terms for typical tools and activities used in the art lessons. In all the lessons students were supported to reflect their learning process as well as to learn through cross-curricular themes, geography topics blended with English language at school 1, history topics blended with English language at school 2 and art topics blended with English language at school 3.

- **CLIL features according to 4Cs Coyle’s principles**

  Since the lessons at all three schools were of a content-driven character, the students were given an opportunity to learn the content subject. However, at the same time they could learn and use the L2. In case of school 1, students were exposed to L2 with higher frequency, which inferred higher opportunity not only to learn the CLIL language, but also to use it. Development of learning and thinking processes was present in all 6 lessons either represented by implementation of interesting tasks, pair work or the open class discussion.

  Speaking about intercultural awareness, unlike in lessons at school 1 and 2, in neither of lessons at school 3 the teacher developed an intercultural context.

- **Tolerance towards L2 limited knowledge and scaffolding techniques**

  Because of the fact that there were no observed limitations in the L2 of the teacher at school 1, the tolerance towards potential limitations was not observed. However, there occurred moments when students had problems understanding or using certain L2 terms during the lessons. These situations were solved by teacher applying immediate scaffolding. In a very similar way as described in chapter 4.4, the teacher elicited the unknown terms from students.
By using different visual aids such as whiteboard, presentation or map in combination with varied activities, different learning styles were responded in both lessons. In many occasions teacher asked the students whether they remembered the information from the previous lesson or semester, which was a proof that their newly acquired knowledge was intended to be built on already learnt information. As well as in the case of school 2 and 3 the teacher asked the students questions aimed to develop their critical and creative thinking. At school 2 and 3 the tolerance towards not only the students’ L2 limitation, but also the teachers’ L2 limitation was reflected. Teacher at school 2 used a prepared list of specialized vocabulary, which he also handed out to the students and the teacher at school 3 wrote the L2 terms during a brainstorming activity on the blackboard. Also she prepared a matching of terms and pictures activity for the students as a means of vocabulary pre-teaching activity. When the students did not know some word or were not sure, they could ask their teachers who, at both schools, offered a translation to their students instead of eliciting the meaning of the unknown words.

- **Safe and enriching learning environment establishment**

  Great differences in application of principles related to safe and enriching learning environment establishment were observed. Neither of listed principles was observed in the lessons at school 2, on the other hand at school 1 and 3 all principles except the guidance to authentic learning materials and environments were present in the lessons. The teachers used routine activities such as greeting and introducing the topic in L2, which was displayed in the context of
content subject around the classroom. In the geography classroom there were maps in the L2 and in the art classroom the tools and different subjects were tagged with names in the L2. The content was very often related to the students’ lives. Teacher at school 1 applied the geographic topics on students experience with living in the city and knowledge about the Eastern European countries. Similarly art teacher at school 3 asked her students about the likes and dislikes of spring flowers. Both teachers used internet as a source of current materials for their lessons.

- **Active learning**

  During neither of the lessons the student talking time was observed to be higher than the teacher talking time. Again unlike at school 1 and 3 peer co-operative work was completely omitted in history lessons at school 2. In rather teacher-centred lessons the teacher presented the information using a Power point presentation to students, who were in majority of time passively listening to the teacher. The other two teachers included assigned pair work in their lessons as well as open class discussion during which they were in a role of facilitator.

- **Co-operation**

  Only teachers at school 1 and 2 confirmed co-operation with other teachers at their schools particularly in planning the topics of their lessons.
4.4.2 Analysis of questionnaires and interviews with teachers

Questions included in the questionnaires for teachers were designed to reflect the main aims of the research. Firstly it was the teachers’ motivation to apply CLIL in their lessons covered by following questions:

3. Would you be interested in attending training on CLIL method?

8. What do you like about this method? What is its contribution to your lessons?

9. What do you dislike about this method? What do you consider to be the most difficult about this method?

10. Do you consider CLIL method to be beneficial to the language development of your students?

Secondly it was the teachers’ experience with CLIL and teachers’ language skills explored in questions 1, 2, 4, and 5 and then the teaching materials used in CLIL lessons under questions 6 and 7.

1. For how long have you been using CLIL in your lessons?

2. In what way were you trained for teaching CLIL method?

4. I don’t have a problem with using English for teaching in my lessons.

5. Please complete the statement: The biggest challenge in CLIL lessons from the language skills perspective is/are..............................................................

6. What materials do you use in your lessons?

7. What is the most common source of CLIL materials you use?

The above stated questions were supplemented and expanded by 12 questions the teachers were asked during the interview. Teacher’s motivation
to apply CLIL in their lessons being covered by questions number 3, 4, 5, 10 and 11.

3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?

4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?

5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?

10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?

11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be highly financially rewarded?

Teachers’ experience with CLIL and teachers’ language skills were aimed at by questions number 1, 2, 8 and 9.

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?

2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?

9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?

And teachers’ opinion on teaching materials used in CLIL lessons was reflected in questions number 6 and 7.

6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
Question number 12 was included to provide the teacher with a possibility of further comments of his/her choice.

10. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Data collected in the questionnaires and interviews are clearly described in the following table and an additional commentary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial impetus to use CLIL</strong></td>
<td>Inner motivation Attractive and convenient method</td>
<td>Attractive and convenient method</td>
<td>Attractive and convenient method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of use</strong></td>
<td>Maximal frequency</td>
<td>Once – twice per week</td>
<td>Irregular use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form of CLIL</strong></td>
<td>Content-driven</td>
<td>Hand outs Documents</td>
<td>Vocabulary Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>Geography, physics</td>
<td>Geography, history</td>
<td>Art, history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience with CLIL</strong></td>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation for CLIL implementation</strong></td>
<td>Training at school External training Self-study</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
<td>External training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive attitude of teachers to CLIL training</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of English in lessons is not a challenge</strong></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Partly agree</td>
<td>Partly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits of CLIL implementation</strong></td>
<td>Enrichment of lessons and teachers’ and students’ English skills</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary approach to topics</td>
<td>Developments of specialized and general English vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges of</strong></td>
<td>Fulfilment of</td>
<td>Students’ English</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL implementation</strong></td>
<td>SEP goals in scheduled time, specialized terminology, materials preparation</td>
<td>skills, time possibilities, testing of acquired knowledge</td>
<td>vocabulary and language competency of teachers, preparation of CLIL lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL materials sources</strong></td>
<td>Internet Own production</td>
<td>Own production</td>
<td>Internet Own production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL materials challenges</strong></td>
<td>Time demanding preparation, meeting SEP goals, applicability on the Czech curricula, adjusting materials to students´ L2 level</td>
<td>Adjusting materials to students´ L2 level, scarce variety of materials available on the market</td>
<td>Specialized vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to use CLIL</strong></td>
<td>Extra financial reward, immediate results observed in students</td>
<td>Extra financial reward, availability of better CLIL materials together with the students´ L2 input level</td>
<td>Extra financial reward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Data collected from questionnaires and interviews with teachers
**Reason to start with CLIL, its form and frequency of use**

As the initial impetus to start with CLIL method in their lessons all the teachers stated the methods attractiveness and its convenience for either their students or the school. As one of the teachers at school 1 said: "*It was an attractive method. It was convenient for our school.*" (teacher 2, school 1) It can be said that the method is by the teachers at school 1 used in maximum number of lessons and is of a rather content-driven character. Teachers at school 3 use CLIL once or twice a week in a form of handouts or documents in L2. The least used CLIL is by teachers at school 2, who do not use CLIL regularly because of their time possibilities and also insufficient level of English in their students.

**Subjects and experience with CLIL**

The teachers at school 1 have three and more years of experience with using CLIL in their lessons. Precisely, they have been using CLIL in geography and physics lessons for approximately 5 years now. For CLIL approach implementation into their lesson they were prepared in various ways, in training at their school, in external training and by self-studying. The teachers at school 2 share the approximate length of experience with CLIL in their lessons with the teachers from school 1, but they prepared for CLIL’s implementation on their own, by a self-study. At school 3 the teachers were prepared by attending an external training and have been practising CLIL for up to 4 years.
• **Training**

Both teachers at school 1 have a positive attitude towards training in CLIL saying that if there was a possibility, they would attend one. Teachers at school 3 stated that they would not be interested in the training since they have already attended one. Only one teacher from school 2 would attend the training and only under a condition it would be at their school. However all teachers from school 2 and 3 consider the training focused on CLIL method to be useful for CLIL teachers in general.

• **The level of English with English being the CLIL language**

Both teachers at school 1 estimated their English to be at B2 level according to the CEFR, confirming that they do not have problem with using L2 in their lessons. They added that in their opinion English language (L2) course is not necessary once the teacher attains the B2 level of English. Speaking about their students’ L2 skills they both agreed that using English improves L2 knowledge of their students.

Teachers at schools 2 and 3 partly agreed with not having problems while using English in their lessons with two teachers from school 3 and one from school 2 assessing their English level to be intermediate. As one of the teachers at school 3 confirmed: “Perfect knowledge of English is not needed, but you need sufficient knowledge. Good pronunciation, with which I am also struggling, is also important.”(teacher 1, school 3) Teachers of both schools admitted that a possibility to attend an English cause would increase their motivation to use CLIL in their lessons. Similarly as teachers at school 1 they
agreed that use of CLIL in their lessons to some extent improves their students’ English.

- **Benefits of CLIL method**

  According to teachers at school 1 CLIL implementation into lessons overall enriches the lessons as well as the teachers’ and students’ L2 skills. Teachers at school 2 see the greatest benefit in the interdisciplinary approach to topics and the teachers at school 3 in developments of specialized and general English vocabulary.

- **Challenges and drawbacks**

  Teachers at school 1 agreed or partly agreed that they have no problems with leading lessons in English, however they described the fulfilment of the SEP goals in the scheduled time to be the biggest challenge for them. As other challenges they also mentioned the L2 knowledge, specialized terminology and preparation of materials. According to teachers at school 2 the main challenges are represented by L2 skills of their students, time possibilities and testing of the acquired knowledge. Besides using specialized vocabulary and language competency of teachers, a demanding preparation of CLIL lessons was stated by teachers at school 3 as main challenge of the method.

- **Materials**

  The main source of materials used by teachers at school 1 was claimed to be internet and their own production. Challenges related to CLIL materials are according to them the time demanding preparation, meeting SEP goals and applicability on the needs of Czech curricula. The challenge was also seen in adjusting the materials to the L2 level of the students. Both the teachers at
school 2 and 3 prepare the CLIL materials exclusively themselves with Internet being an additional source of materials for teachers at school 3. The teachers from school 2 mostly see the challenge in using materials, adjusting them to the L2 level of their students and also in scarce variety of materials available on the market. School 3 teachers name challenge in specialized vocabulary, which could be solved by developing a vocabulary bank or completing the database with additional materials.

- **Motivation for CLIL´s implementation and financial reward**

  Both school 1 teachers agreed with extra financial reward for CLIL teachers. Although one would include it only at the beginning of methods implementation they both stated the demanding and additional preparation to be the reason for the extra financial reward. With this agreed also the teachers of schools 2 and 3 however teachers at school 2 consider the extra financial reward to be impossible. To conclude what affects teacher´s motivation to use CLIL more often, in the case of school 1 it is the immediate results observed in students, in case of school 2 mainly the availability of better CLIL materials together with the students´ L2 input level and in case of school 3 an extra financial reward would motivate both teachers. As one of the teachers claimed:

  “*If you take into consideration how much energy they spend to get to a certain level how much time they spend preparing the materials and on analysing feedback and self-evaluating in order to provide some reasonable outcome I think that some financial reward is in place.*”

  (teacher 1, school 1)
4.4.3 Analysis of questionnaires for students

Data collected from questionnaires designed for students is described in this subchapter. Firstly, results gained from students’ questionnaires collected at each sample school are described and a summary of data collected from students’ questionnaires from all three sample schools follows. The stated percentage is counted from the number of total answers for each question, not from the total number of participants in the research.

**Question 1: I like using English in other subjects than English.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Don´t know</th>
<th>Don´t agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>all students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65% Totally agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% Partly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Don´t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Don´t agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 1: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 1**

As we can see in the table above, a vast majority of students attending school 1 and 3 totally or at least partly agree with a claim that they like using English in other content subjects. There is a great fall in a number of students
who totally agree with the statement, however at least a half of the students partly agree.

In total only 5% of all the students disagree with this statement, so it can be claimed that from an individual perspective of each school as well the overall students like using English in other subjects than English lessons.

**Question 2: Using English in other subjects is difficult for me.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Don´t know</th>
<th>Don´t agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 2

Unlike at school 2, where a half of students experiences problems with using English in other subjects, to majority of students at schools 1 and 2 this does not cause problems. Positively no student at neither school totally agree with English being too difficult for them.
Question 3: Using English in other subjects is necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Don’t agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 3

We can observe high level of motivation in students for using English in CLIL lessons especially at school 3 where all the students consider English to be necessary in other subjects than English language lessons. Lower percentage is seen at schools 1 and 2, but the proportion of students who agree in any extent with this statement does not fall under a half. In summary only 11% of all students refuse necessity of English in other subjects, which confirms high overall motivation among students.
Question 4: Materials which we use in other subjects in which also English is used are interesting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Don’t agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 4

77% of all students in the research would totally or partly describe the materials used in CLIL lessons as interesting. Interestingly, all the students at school 3 also totally or partly agree with this statement. Half of the students at school 2 are impartial.
Question 5: Materials which we use in other subjects in which also English is used could be improved in terms of...? (please tick maximum 3 options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Language content</th>
<th>Graphic design</th>
<th>Variability of teaching materials</th>
<th>Testing materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 5

As can be observed in the concluding graph, majority of all students who participated in the research would suggest an improvement of topics as well as variability of teaching materials in their CLIL lessons. However looking at the numbers separately, students from school 2 do not follow this trend and their answers were evenly distributed between the improvement of language content, variability of teaching materials and testing materials in CLIL lessons.
Question 6: Using English in other subjects improves my English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Don`t know</th>
<th>Don`t agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 6

In the graph above it is visible that more than a half of all students present in the research agree with using English in other subjects to be improving their knowledge of English. Again there is a significant difference in the perception of this claim among students from school 3. More than a half of the total number of school 3 students are either impartial or do not agree with this statement.
Question 7: In case you (partly/totally) agree with the previous statement in which areas does your English improve? (please tick maximum 3 options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample school</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school 1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school 3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 7

Graph 7: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 7

A similar trend in opinions of students from schools 1 and 2 can be observed since majority of students, who totally or partly agreed with the fact that using English in other subjects improves their English knowledge, claimed that they observe improvement mainly in their understanding and vocabulary. The answers were rather evenly distributed among improvement in vocabulary, pronunciation, communication and understanding. To conclude, similarly to opinions gather at schools 1 and 2, a greater half of all students chose either
improvement in understanding or vocabulary as their answer. In contrast, both individually at each school and among all students, very low number of students chose the improvement of grammar, reading or writing skills as their answer in the questionnaire.

**Question 8: Using English in other subjects motivates me to take an English exam (for example FCE, Maturity exam)**

![Table 14: Data collected from questionnaire for students – question 8]

The highest motivation for taking an English exam can be inferred from answers collected from students at school 1 since all together 74% of students partly or totally agreed with the claim that using English in other subjects motivates them to take an English exam. Lower percentage of students at school 3, all together 61% in some extent agreed with this claim, however a third of them stayed impartial. The lowest numbers were recorded among students at school 2, where 40% of students do not feel motivated to take exam in English and 20% are impartial. Positively, a greater half of all the
students are by using English in other subjects motivated to take an exam in English.

**4.4.4 Analysis of questionnaires for school’s management**

Further differences and similarities in implementation of CLIL at three sample schools are expressed by the data collected in questionnaires designated to school´s management and further described in the final findings. The nine questionnaire questions are followed by a comparison of answers collected from each school´s management.

1. **In which subjects is CLIL implemented at your school?**
2. **How many teachers teach CLIL method at your school?**
3. **In what way are CLIL teachers at your school prepared for using CLIL in their lessons?**
4. **Are the teachers willing to take part in the training?**
5. **CLIL lessons at our school are taught by:**
6. **CLIL teachers at our schools:**
7. **What is the time allocation of CLIL method at your school?**
8. **In what way are CLIL teachers motivated to use CLIL in their lessons at your school?**
9. **Do you think CLIL helps in students’ language development? If yes, in what way?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>History, geography, physics, chemistry, biology</td>
<td>History, geography, art</td>
<td>History, art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>More than 3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Training at school</td>
<td>As a part of project of Pedagogical faculty MU</td>
<td>External training (covered by teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes if the training is within the school</td>
<td>Yes if they feel their work is appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Qualified teachers in language and content subject or only in content subject</td>
<td>Qualified teachers in content subject</td>
<td>Qualified teachers in content subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Create materials on their own</td>
<td>Create materials on their own</td>
<td>Create materials on their own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1. grade class 7 lessons, 2. grade class 5 lessons, 3. grade class 4,5 lessons a week</td>
<td>According to the teacher´s abilities and possibilities</td>
<td>According to the teacher´s abilities and possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Teachers either agreed with using CLIL or it was a recruitment condition</td>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>Motivation component of teachers´s salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Yes, CLIL improves their vocabulary.</td>
<td>Yes, by interdisciplinary connection</td>
<td>Yes, CLIL improves their language, vocabulary and students loose restrain in communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Final findings and future recommendations

The main aim of this thesis was to address the research questions stated in the introduction of this thesis. The first research question referred to the similarities and differences in implementation of CLIL approach at the sampled schools. After analysing the data collected it can be claimed that many similarities as well as differences were found and therefore it was proved that CLIL method can be implemented in various ways.

Firstly the main similarities shared by all three schools are described. To the main similarities discovered in research belonged, English happened to be used as CLIL language, CLIL was applied in a form of hard CLIL, since all the lessons where CLIL was used were originally lessons of content subjects and CLIL was applied by content teachers. However the subjects where CLIL was applied varied from history, geography, physics to arts. At all three schools the multiple focus as well as 4C principles described by Coyle were fully accomplished in CLIL lessons. In addition, various techniques of scaffolding, especially to reduce the students’ limitations in L2, could be observed. To conclude the differences observed during the lesson observations, at neither of the schools students’ talking time was higher than teachers’ talking time.

Further on, similarities in the implementation of CLIL at the sample schools from the perspective of teachers, students and schools management are described. The data collected in questionnaires to teachers and interviews indicate that all the teachers are mainly professionals qualified in some content subject with teaching experience ranging from 10 – 20 years. From the perspective of teachers’ motivation and L2 skills, it can be claimed that all the
teachers were motivated to possibly participate in CLIL training and to prepare
the CLIL materials on their own with use of internet sources. All the teachers
would be motivated to use CLIL more often under condition of extra financial
reward. Regarding main similarities that all CLIL students shared it can be
claimed that both students within the individual schools and also overall like
using English in other subjects and to some extent consider English to be
necessary. They see the CLIL materials to be interesting, however they suggest
an improvement in the area of topics and variability of teaching materials. To
conclude the question of similarities it can be said that school managements of
all three schools share the impression that their teachers are motivated to
participate in training focused on CLIL as well as they know that their teachers
prepare the materials themselves.

Moving onto the differences discovered in the research, among those
observed in the lessons’ observations the different intensity of L2 used in
lessons can be mentioned at the first place. Unlike at school 1 where total
immersion was observed, at school 2 and 3 CLIL was present only in a form of
language showers. Another significant difference was discovered in the area of
establishment of safe and enriching learning environment in which the students
would participate by active learning. This principle was not observed at school
2, however at both schools 1 and 3 the majority of activities observed were
leading to this principle. Comparing the CLIL teachers at sample schools, their
L2 level differed as the teachers at school 1 claimed to have upper-intermediate
(B2) level in contrast to the teachers at school 2 and 3 whose level was claimed
to be intermediate (B1), according to their rather advanced level of English (L2)
they all either agreed or partly agreed to not having problems with using L2 in their lessons. With the L2 level can be connected the motivation to use CLIL in the lessons, since teachers at school 1 claimed to use CLIL at maximal frequency in comparison to teachers at school 2 and 3 who said to be using CLIL several time a week or irregularly. Different approach was also observed in co-operation of CLIL teachers with their colleagues at their school. Only teachers at school 1 and 2 confirmed co-operation with other teachers when planning topics of their lessons. From the students’ point of view, majority of students at schools 1 and 3 appeared to be motivated to attend lessons where English is used claiming that English is not an obstacle for learning a content subject. In addition, they considered English knowledge to be essential. Opposite opinions were observed among students from school 2, where half of the students is experiencing problems with using English in content subjects and only a half consider English to be necessary. Students from school 2 also suggested that CLIL materials would be improved in more than above mentioned areas, adding to the topics, variability also the language content and testing materials. In conclusion, from the data collected in questionnaires designated to schools’ management it can be said that types of time allocation for CLIL lessons differs since the school 1 has rigidly given time allocation in their lessons whereas schools 2 and 3 apply CLIL according to the teachers’ time possibilities.

The second research question addressed the main challenges connected with CLIL implementation. Main challenges described by teachers were the time demanding preparation of CLIL materials, students’ L2 skills and the specialized
terminology in L2 used in the lessons. Also problems with meeting SEP goals and the possibility to apply the CLIL materials in the lessons were highlighted. Surprisingly only a half of the students at school 2 claimed to have problems with English in the CLIL lessons, in many cases due to the specialization of vocabulary or impossibility to express themselves.

The third research question referred to CLIL being an effective as a method of teaching English. According to the opinions of school management’s representatives as well as teachers use of CLIL in content subjects helps the students’ language development mainly by expanding vocabulary and lowering students’ communicational restraints. Data collected from students release that in general more than a half of students participating in the research think that using English in other subjects helps to improve their English skills, more specifically they observe improvement in vocabulary and understanding. In conclusion, it can be claimed that collected data reveal the fact that a greater part of all students present in the research feel motivated to take an exam in English.

The forth and the last question deals with a hypothesis that CLIL has not developed more as an approach. Data collected in the research part of this thesis reveal that from the perspective of CLIL teachers there seems to be a scarce variety of CLIL materials with certain limitations, which are difficult to be applied on the individual needs of students. Second obstacle in CLIL approach, which is closely connected to the first one, is that teachers experience problems with time demanding preparation of CLIL lessons and receive no extra financial reward, which may result in teachers being demotivated to do the extra work.
connected with CLIL implementation. The last possible problem in CLIL incorporation into lessons may be the language proficiency of not only the CLIL teachers, but also the students.

To conclude this chapter, several future recommendations which result from the facts revealed in the research part of this thesis are stated. In order to increase teachers’ motivation to include CLIL in their lessons the schools may reward them adequately to the extra work connected with CLIL lessons’ preparation. In order to improve the preparation skills, teachers could attend a training focused on CLIL materials preparation in order to get more skilful and decrease the preparation time of the CLIL materials. With an aim of increasing students motivation to learn the teachers could establish a safe and enriching environment that would be pleasant and favourable to students’ active learning. This conclusion may be implied from high level of motivation in students at school 1 and 3 whose CLIL lessons happen in such environment. It may also be suggestable to incorporate a rigid time allocation for CLIL lessons as it is at school 1 in order to ensure a regularity of CLIL lessons by which students’ motivation and L2 skills may be improved.

Despite the findings described above it may be important to highlight that as every research has its limitation, this research is not an exception, therefore further research on the topic of CLIL implementation is inevitable in order to explore and study conditions and opinions of other participants of CLIL teaching process.
6 Conclusion

CLIL being one of the innovative teaching approaches of these times is fortunately available to any secondary school in the Czech Republic, whose head teacher together with his or her teachers are interested in making use of this great teaching method. However as with any other newly introduced method or technique, not only in teaching, there are many variables which influence its realistic application into practise. Therefore a number of research questions arose when considering CLILs application into everyday schedule of three sample secondary schools: What are the similarities and differences in implementation of CLIL approach at the sampled schools? What main challenges in CLILs implementation are being faced at sampled schools from the perspective of students´ and teachers´ motivation, students´ and teachers´ language skills and teaching materials? Is CLIL effective as a method of teaching English at the sampled school? Why has not CLIL developed more as an approach? The key objective of this thesis was to find the answers to these research questions as well as to suggest possible steps of further research in this area.

In the thesis theoretical part the key term CLIL has been described. The explanation of CLILs role in and outside the Czech education system and among other teaching approaches together with the historical development has been introduced. In the second chapter the CLILs objectives and implementation aims from different perspectives were described as well as the benefits and challenges that are represented by CLIL to teachers and students in their lessons. Further on important points such as CLIL language, CLIL subjects, CLIL
time allocation and evaluation in CLIL lessons are introduced in conclusion of the third chapter.

Four key prerequisites of a successful CLIL implementation are stated in the third chapter.

At the beginning of the research part the aims of the research, applied research methods and the participants involved in the research were introduced. The data collected in the CLIL classroom observations, in questionnaires designated to students and teachers who were an active part of CLIL lessons as well as in the interviews with these teachers were analysed and compared. By this comparison mainly the first and second research questions were addressed and concluded. Said so the most outstanding differences and similarities between the CLIL implementation at the three sample schools collected by applying the research methods were summarized together with the main challenges connected with CLIL implementation. In conclusion of the thesis all four research questions were dealt with and possible future recommendations were suggested.
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8 Summary

This thesis deals with the implementation of CLIL approach at three sample secondary schools. Together with many ways CLIL approach can be implemented into content subject or language lessons there are also many challenges which participants of CLIL, a modern teaching approach, need to face. Therefore the main objective of this thesis has been to describe similarities and differences in practise of CLIL at three randomly selected secondary schools, depict the challenges CLIL participants at these secondary schools deal with and prove or disprove a hypothesis whether CLIL approach helps students’ development of English, being the CLIL language and why CLIL has not developed more as an approach.

In the theoretical part CLIL approach together with aims and prerequisites of CLIL implementation at Czech secondary schools are described. In the practical part 6 CLIL lessons were observed, 129 students, 6 teachers and 3 representatives of school’s management filled in a questionnaire and in case of teachers, additional questions were asked in interviews. The data collected in the research tools have been analysed and results presented: A number of similarities and differences in the implementation of CLIL were observed at sample secondary schools mostly in CLIL types and forms, CLIL language skills and motivation in teachers and students. Main challenges the participants had to face were the time demanding preparation of CLIL materials, students’ L2 skills and the specialized terminology in L2 used in the lessons together with problematic application of CLIL in lessons. The hypothesis
about CLILs influence on L2 development was proved since most participants confirmed that CLIL improves their L2 skills in various ways. The second hypothesis related to the reason for no further development of CLIL was proved by high demands on teachers in respect to the CLIL lessons preparation, use of materials and language skills of students as well as inadequate financial reward for the extra work connected with CLIL implementation. Discovered facts offer suggestions for further research.
9 Shrnutí

Tato práce se zabývá implementací metody CLIL na třech středních školách v České republice. Společně s mnoha možnými formami, kterými je možno CLIL do hodin obsahových předmětů a jazykových hodin začlenit existuje také mnoho výzev, kterým účastníci CLILu, jakožto moderního přístupu ve výuce musí čelit. Proto si tato práce klade za cíl popsat podobnosti a rozdíly v praktickém využití CLILu na třech náhodně vybraných středních školách, vyzařovávat hlavní výzvy s kterými se účastníci CLILu na těchto středních školách potýkají a potvrdit či vyvrátit jak hypotézu zda CLIL napomáhá rozvoji cizího jazyka tak co zapříčinilo malý rozvoj CLILu jako výukové metody.

V teoretické části je popsán CLIL společně s cíli a předpoklady CLIL implementace na českých středních školách. V praktické části bylo provedeno 6 náslechů CLIL hodin, 129 žáků, 6 učitelů a 3 představitelé vedení školy vyplnili dotazníky a v případě učitelů doplňující otázky byly zodpovězeny v rámci rozhovorů.

Údaje shromážděné pomocí výzkumných prostředků byly analyzovány a poté byly prezentovány výsledky: Na středních školách byla pozorována celá řada podobností a rozdílů v implementaci CLILu, nejvíce však v družích a formách CLILu, jazykových dovedností a motivaci učitelů a studentů. Hlavní výzvy, s kterými se účastníci CLILu museli potýkat byla časově náročná příprava CLIL materiálů, jazykové dovednosti studentů, odborná terminologie v cizím jazyce v hodinách CLILu společně s problémy spojenými s aplikací CLILu v hodinách. Hypotéza ohledně vlivu CLILu na rozvoj cizího jazyka byla
potvrzena jelikož většina účastníků potvrdila, že CLIL napomáhá rozvoji jazykových dovedností hned několika způsoby. Druhá hypotéza ohledně důvodu malého rozvoje CLILu jako výukového přístupu byla také potvrzena a to vysokými požadavky na CLIL učitele spojenými s přípravou CLIL hodin, použitím materiálů, jazykovými dovednostmi studentů a také nepřiměřené finanční ohodnocení za práci navíc vyplývající z implementace CLILu. Objevené skutečnosti otevírají možnosti pro další výzkum.
10 Appendices

10.1 Questionnaire for teachers

Questionnaire for teachers

Dear teacher,
I would like to kindly ask you for your cooperation on my research, which is a part of my thesis with a topic of The CLIL method at Czech secondary schools. By completing the following short questionnaire you will help me incredibly, therefore I would like to thank you for your time in advance.
BcA. Tereza Javnická, FF MUNI

Please circle one of the following options:
1. For how long have you been already using CLIL method in your lessons?
   - first year
   - 2 – 3 years
   - 3 and more years
2. How were you trained for using CLIL in your lessons?
   - a training at my school
   - an external course
   - self-preparation
3. Would you undertake a CLIL method training if it was offered to you?
   - yes, within my school
   - yes
   - no, (please state why)........................................
4. What part of your lessons do you use CLIL method?
   - less than 50%
   - more than 50%
   - other ..................................................
5. What materials do you use in your lessons?
   - text books
   - materials from internet
   - my own materials
6. What is the most common resource of your CLIL materials?
   - school´s library
   - internet
   - my own materials

Please answer the following questions:
7. What do you like about CLIL method? What are the benefits to your lessons?

8. What do you consider to be a disadvantage of this method? What is the hardest part about using CLIL in your lessons?

9. Do you think that using CLIL in your lessons improves student´s language development?
10.2 Interview with teachers

Interview questions:

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?
2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?
3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?
4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?
5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?
6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?
7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?
9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?
10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?
11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?
12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
10.2.1 Interview transcription 1

Interview transcription 1 (School 1 – teacher 1)

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?
   I started my teaching career in 2002 after finishing my university studies of teaching geography and physical education at secondary schools at Palackého University in Olomouc. I started teaching at a private grammar school in Brno, then for one year I worked as a manager of outdoor projects. Because I missed teaching and wanted to get some experience abroad I left to work for a private boarding school in the UK as an intern. At the same time, in 2007, The project "X" was starting to be implemented at this school where I am currently teaching, taking part in the development of teaching in so called “X” classes in which we were initially planning to implement bilingual teaching, but after several years of reconsidering the conditions at our school as well as feedback we focused more on using the CLIL method.

2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?
   It can be said that this is the sixth year now, because already in year 2007 we started with the intentions of bilingual and classical teaching in our lessons, but in the end we realized that the form of new teaching has CLIL features. After five years we focused directly on CLIL, so we can say that I have been teaching in English for 10 years, using the CLIL method for last 6 years.

3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?
   Maybe it was because I realized how powerful communicational advantage English is and during the time I was working abroad I myself experienced that English can be much faster learnt when being used as a means of something. I think I had close relation to this method during my studies in the USA and teaching experience in the UK, so I think these experiences triggered my determination to apply this method also in the Czech Republic and I was lucky since the project X was starting at that time.

4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?
   That is a tricky question since CLIL method can focus more on either content or language aims. Given the fact that we are very limited by the SEF and time outputs we incline to focus more on the content aims rather than on the language ones. I use the CLIL method every lesson and for more challenging topics I use the sandwich method. I cover the topic in L1, then in L2 and then again in L1 in order to get a feedback that the process of cognition was successful in both the L1 and L2. This approach also prevents students from learning the new information by heart.

5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often? Or in your case better said, so often.
It may sound funny, but it may be simply the fact that this method works with obvious results. This is my added value to the Czech education system, the way in which I can do things differently and maybe better. Every year I ask my students for their feedback so that I know how successful my CLIL teaching is and which things I need to change. And I know that self-learning is a long-term process.

6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?

There are several challenges – if I approach it from the legislation point of view, I am obliged to meet the ŠVP targets, so the time schedule is very challenging for me since I need to generalize and adjust the content of the subject to cover the most important things. In order to meet the outputs and not waste time by some unimportant topic. Another challenge is the great difference between the curricula in countries like UK, Netherlands and other countries where generally speaking the teaching materials are available and the situation in the Czech Republic. It is almost impossible to apply the ready-made materials on the Czech curricula, which takes us to the other challenge which is a time demanding creation of tailored CLIL materials which, once made, need to be tested in practise in order to find our whether it fit the schedule and content requirements. Then at the beginning it is very challenging to prepare the class for the implementation of CLIL, since every student comes to the Grammar school with different level of English. At this point we receive a great help from English teachers. Students can have in total 10-12 lessons in English a week thanks to which they improve their English enormously. Geography is a content subject, where the initial knowledge the students enter the Grammar school with affects the amount of preparation students then need.

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?

Firstly the materials need to be created. This happens in cooperation with English teachers who offer a preview of a good quality language teaching. Since only a few of CLIL teachers are qualified in language teaching the combination of both content and language teaching knowledge is necessary to come to a successful final combination. The final outcome should meet at least the basic principles of teaching the language and content in order to follow the SEP. This is the most challenging in materials’ preparation.

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?

Yes, I think that the training should be continuous. At the beginning there should be some more complex training about the CLIL method, on its application and implementation in the lessons etc. I also think that CLIL teachers should be given a possibility to consult their work with a senior teacher or a mentor – for example after a year of teaching CLIL they would consult their materials together with students’ materials and tests with this
mentor, who would tell them what to change in respect to timing, content and language perspective etc. Is that possible in practice? I think it is. It is all about the organisation and the philosophy of teachers’ support within the project.

9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?
   According to the Cambridge ranking it is B2, however when I speak with native speakers it is C1, though I don’t have any certificate. I must say that my assessed level B2 is based on the ability to do, among others, Use of English exercises, which I don’t use when teaching and therefore this ability gets weaker.

10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?
   I think that once the teacher reaches a certain level, for example the B2, it is enough for him or her to use CLIL, then after some time it would be good to refresh the knowledge of L2 by attending some courses. But in case of teachers, who are beginning with CLIL and their level is A1, A2, B1, some initial course is definitely necessary so that they are able to teach CLIL.

11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?
   This is only my opinion and I think that they should. If you take into consideration how much energy they spend to get to a certain level how much time they spend preparing the materials and on analysing feedback and self-evaluating in order to provide some reasonable outcome I think that some financial reward is in place.

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
   I would like to wish the CLIL method to become more spread as well as to the head teachers to be courageous in the CLIL implementation. CLIL implementation is not an easy matter since there are very high demands both financially and personnel speaking, which they need to meet together with their school to have the CLIL as a long-term project.
10.2.2 Interview transcription 2
Interview transcription 2 (School 1 – teacher 2)

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?
   As a teacher of Mathematics and Physics, mainly I have been teaching Physics and IT, later Physics and Mathematics.

2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?
   This is the fifth year. I am using CLIL in Physics in the first grade of grammar school.

3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?
   It was an attractive method. It was convenient for our school.

4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?
   Twice a week, in the whole lesson.

5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?
   I fully use CLIL in my lessons because it has positive impact on my students.

6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?
   Improvement of students’ as well as teachers’ level of foreign language.

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
   I don’t know.

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?
   That isn’t a bad idea.

9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?
   B2.

10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?
    I attended a course, but my motivation didn’t increase significantly.

11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?
    No. I would praise them and supported them at the starting stage when they need to prepare their own strategies and materials.

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
    No.
10.2.3 Interview transcription 3
Interview transcription 3 (School 2 – teacher 1)

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?
   Ok, I am a teacher of geography and history. I have been teaching here for about 10 years and I use CLIL not very often, just in case the class is good enough in the subject and in English.

2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?
   I apply CLIL in both of my subjects and I think we are working with CLIL for about 7 years.

3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?
   I started using CLIL because I thought it was quite good opportunity to join two or three subjects together, which I think is good for students in the real life they can use the complex knowledge.

4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?
   I don’t use CLIL regularly because of time possibilities and the level of students’ English knowledge. So I can say that it’s from time to time. I and my colleague usually apply CLIL by using some words or some short texts in English, so it’s using quite soft form of CLIL.

5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?
   I think that it would be a little bit better with higher level of students’ English and of course with some materials for teaching CLIL.

6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?
   It’s my English.

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
   Maybe some branches for lower and higher grades. That’s what I think missing.

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?
   Definitely. I think that is one of the biggest problems, because the teachers know how to teach their subject, but there is a problem with applying English and methods how to teach English with the subject which is missing. I think that would be helpful.
9. **How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?**
   I don’t know. I definitely need to prepare the list of words, because I need to check them. So it’s definitely needed to have some basic preparation before the lesson.

10. **Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?**
    I think a little bit. Not probably if it would be some basic English course, but it should be somehow connected with CLIL.

11. **In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?**
    That would be awesome, but I don’t think it’s real.

12. **Is there anything else you would like to add?**
    I think there are some problems with realization of CLIL, for example at our school it is a fluctuation of students and teachers and the necessity of teaching them how to work with CLIL, and how to use it and what is CLIL.

10.2.4 Interview transcription 4

**Interview transcription 4 (School 2 – teacher 2)**

1. **Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?**
   I have been teaching history for almost 12 years

2. **For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?**
   I have been using CLIL in my history lessons for about 6 years now.

3. **Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?**
   I think it is an interesting form of learning foreign language and can improve L2 knowledge of my students.

4. **How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?**
   I usually prepare some vocabulary or articles for my students, but I don’t use CLIL in my lessons very often because I don’t have time. It is also difficult for students to use English in history lessons, so it takes longer time.

5. **What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?**
   If there were prepared CLIL materials available or even some books I could follow in my lessons.

6. **In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your**
lessons?
Materials need to be adjusted to the English level of students. Usually they need to be prepared completely by the teacher.

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
Wider variety of materials available on the market.

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?
I think that yes. Using CLIL method is challenging and complex process.

9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?
I think that intermediate.

10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?
Yes. I would feel more confident.

11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?
Yes, but I think this is not possible because of the school’s tight budget.

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
I think that no. Thank you.

10.2.5 Interview transcription 5
Interview transcription 5 (School 3 – teacher 1)

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?
I have been teaching for almost 20 years, before I was teaching at Secondary medical school, now I am teaching at Elementary and Grammar Art School. I teach arts, art workshops for drawing, painting and art techniques.

2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?
I started using the CLIL method in the year 2011, I had been using it for three years, then I stopped for two years and now I am returning to its use again.

3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?
A colleague of mine invited me to the pilot program, when the lessons were piloted, observed and the preparation for other teachers took place. It was informative, entertaining and I think it benefits the children.
4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?
   I use CLIL approximately once a week in the lessons of sixth and seventh grades of grammar school. (prima and sekunda). I teach them two lessons per week.

5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?
   The preparation of CLIL lessons is time consuming and it is extra work. I would welcome some extra financial reward.

6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?
   I am using the CLIL method because I had been working on its implementation of three years.

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
   The database of vocabulary and preparatory materials is needed to be completed by the materials we made. These are various pictures, crosswords, test and quizzes.

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?
   Definitely.

9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?
   Intermediate. I started to learn English in my adulthood. I have no problem with communication, but my pronunciation is bad.

10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?
    Courses are definitely needed. I regularly attend a private course of English with a native speaker. But I am not making any huge progress.

11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?
    Yes, it is extra work done only by teacher who are interested in their students, who like it and want to do it. Teachers who take teaching to be only their job definitely would not start with CLIL in their lessons.

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
    CLIL method is little widespread. Teachers are hesitant towards CLIL. Another problem is in teacher`s language skills, only a few of them have sufficient level of English so that they dare to implement CLIL in their lessons. Perfect knowledge of English is not needed, but you need sufficient
knowledge. Good pronunciation, with which I am also struggling, is also important. You need to listen to the pronunciation in the audio database online and be ready for the lesson.

10.2.6 Interview transcription 6
Interview transcription 4 (School 3 – teacher 2)

1. Can you briefly describe your teaching experience?
   For 1 year I taught at a language grammar school and now I have been teaching at art grammar school 19 years.

2. For how long have you been applying CLIL in your lessons and in which subjects?
   I have been using CLIL for four years in history.

3. Why did you start using CLIL approach in your lessons?
   Because of the possibility to combine English and teaching in my lessons.

4. How often and in what way do you apply CLIL approach in your lessons?
   I use CLIL in my lessons once or twice a week by means of handouts and documents in English.

5. What would motivate you to use CLIL approach in your lessons more often?
   Probably some extra financial reward since the preparation of CLIL lessons is very time demanding.

6. In your opinion, what are the challenges of using materials designed for CLIL in your lessons?
   Specialized terms in English.

7. How could be the CLIL materials improved?
   Development of vocabulary bank.

8. Do you think teachers should receive a specialized training on applying CLIL in teaching?
   Yes.

9. How would you assess the level of your English language knowledge?
   Intermediate.

10. Would a possibility to attend an English course increase your motivation to use CLIL?
11. In your opinion, do you think teachers who are incorporating CLIL in their lessons should be financially rewarded than regular teachers?
   Yes. The time demanding character of this method should be taken into account.

12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
    No. Thank you.
10.3 Questionnaire for students

Questionnaire for students

Dear students,
I would like to kindly ask you for your cooperation on my research, which is a part of my thesis with a topic of The CLIL method at Czech secondary schools. By completing the following short questionnaire you will help me incredibly, therefore I would like to thank you for your time in advance.
BcA. Tereza Javnická, FF MUNI

Please circle one of the following options:

1. I like using English in other subjects than English.
   a) I totally agree   b) I partly agree   c) I don´t know   d) I don´t agree
   Why?............................................................................................................

2. Using English in other subjects is difficult for me.
   a) I totally agree   b) I partly agree   c) I don´t know   d) I don´t agree
   Why?............................................................................................................

3. Using English in other subjects is necessary.
   a) I totally agree   b) I partly agree   c) I don´t know   d) I don´t agree
   Why?............................................................................................................

4. Materials which we use in other subjects in which also English is used are interesting.
   a) I totally agree   b) I partly agree   c) I don´t know   d) I don´t agree
   5. Materials which we use in other subjects in which also English is used could be improved in terms of... (please tick maximum 3 options)
   o topics (more current topics, more interesting topics)
   o language content (instructions from the teacher)
   o graphic design (pictures, design of the materials)
   o variability of used materials (books, videos, audios...)
   o testing materials

6. Using English in other subjects improves my English.
   a) I totally agree   b) I partly agree   c) I don´t know   d) I don´t agree
   Why?............................................................................................................

7. In case you (partly/totally) agree with the previous statement in which areas does your English improves? (please tick maximum 3 options)
   o understanding   o reading skills   o grammar
   o communication   o writing skills
   o pronunciation   o vocabulary

8. Using English in other subjects motivates me to take an English exam (for example FCE, Maturita exam)
   a) I totally agree   b) I partly agree   c) I don´t know   d) I don´t agree
10.4 Questionnaire for the school’s management

Questionnaire for the school’s management
Dear school’s management,
I would like to kindly ask you for your cooperation on my research, which is a part of my thesis with a topic of The CLIL method at Czech secondary schools. By completing the following short questionnaire you will help me incredibly, therefore I would like to thank you for your time in advance.
BcA. Tereza Javnická, FF MUNI

Please circle one of the following options:

1. In which subjects is CLIL implemented at your school?
   history    geography    civics    mathematics    other: .......................

2. How many teachers teach CLIL method at your school?
   only 1-2    more than 3    majority of teachers

3. In what way are CLIL teachers at your school prepared for using CLIL in their lessons?
   training at our school (covered by school)
   external training (covered by teachers)
   they are not prepared
   other: ...................................................

4. Are the teachers willing to take part in the training?
   yes    yes, if.......................    no

5. CLIL lessons at our school are taught by:
   Qualified teachers both in the content subject and the foreign language
   Qualified teachers in the content subject
   Qualified teachers in the foreign language
   other: ................................................................

6. CLIL teachers at our schools:
   have CLIL teaching books and materials available
   prepare their own CLIL materials

Please answer the questions below:

7. What is the time allocation of CLIL method at your school?

8. In what way are CLIL teachers motivated to use CLIL in their lessons at your school?

9. Do you think CLIL helps in students’ language development? If yes, in what way?
10.5 Lesson observation sheet

Lesson observation sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Language(s) used in the lesson:</th>
<th>Material(s) used:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Following CLIL methodology principles were observed √ or were not observed X during the lesson:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL METHODOLOGY PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>observed √</th>
<th>not observed X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of CLIL from the perspective of intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language showers (students and teacher use L2 partly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total immersion (students and teacher use exclusively L2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of CLIL from the perspective of aim/focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft CLIL (language-driven character, CLIL implemented by language teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard CLIL (content-driven character, CLIL implemented by content subject teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple focus accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content subject-related goals accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-related goals accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting reflection on the learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing learning through cross-curricular themes and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIL features according to 4Cs Coyle’s principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content subject matter learning opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language learning and use opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of learning and thinking processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development of intercultural awareness within an intercultural context

- **Tolerance towards L2 limited knowledge and scaffolding techniques**
  - Tolerance to limitations in students’ language knowledge
  - Tolerance to limitations in teachers’ language knowledge
  - Building on a student’s existing knowledge, skills, interests and experience
  - Fostering creative and critical thinking
  - Responding to different learning styles

- **Safe and enriching learning environment establishment**
  - using routine activities and discourse
  - displaying language and content throughout the classroom
  - building student confidence to experiment with language and content
  - making a regular connection between learning and the students’ lives
  - using current materials from the media and other sources
  - guiding access to authentic learning materials and environments

- **Active learning**
  - students communicating more than the teacher
  - favouring peer co-operative work
  - teachers acting as facilitators

- **Co-operation**
  - planning lessons/themes in co-operation with CLIL and non-CLIL teachers