

Teachers' Perspectives on Clil: A Case Study

Badurina, Dorina

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2016

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:715796>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-01-30**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Dorina Badurina

TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES ON CLIL: A CASE STUDY

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the M.A. in English Language and
Literature and Pedagogy at the University of Rijeka

Supervisor: dr.sc. Irena Vodopija Krstanović

Rijeka, June 2016

ABSTRACT

The aim of this Master's Thesis is to explore teachers' perspective on the benefits and challenges of content and language integrated learning (CLIL). The implementation of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) triggers significant changes in the specific educational context and creates challenges for teachers working with CLIL as it introduces a new type of teaching. The study, conducted in a private high school in Rijeka, provides insights into teachers' experiences in CLIL in relation to materials, support, teacher training, the role of L1, assessment and students. The data for this study have been collected by means of semi-structured interviews conducted with eight CLIL teachers. The findings suggest that CLIL poses more difficulties to the teachers than provides benefits to them. The major challenges identified by the teachers are related to difficulties finding materials, correlating the curriculum with the National Curriculum Framework and assessing students. Data also revealed differences between subject and language teachers with respect to the challenges they encounter. The study shows that teachers need more support, and a successful implementation of CLIL requires deeper coordination and cooperation among teachers, learners and CLIL stakeholders.

Key words: CLIL, teachers' perspective, challenges, benefits, Croatia, high school

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	I
Table of Contents.....	II
List of Abbreviations	IV
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. ABOUT CLIL.....	4
2.1 DEFINING CLIL.....	4
2.1.1 Principles of CLIL	4
2.1.2 Selection of subjects and students involved in CLIL.....	7
2.1.3 CLIL in the European education system.....	8
2.1.4 CLIL in Croatia.....	10
2.2 BENEFITS OF CLIL.....	11
2.2.1 CLIL and ICT	12
2.2.2 Benefits for the students.....	13
2.2.3 Teacher benefits	16
2.2.4 Parental support	17
2.3 CHALLENGES OF CLIL	17
2.3.1 Teacher difficulties	18
2.3.2 Support for CLIL	24
2.3.3 L1 /L2 in the CLIL classroom and codeswitching.....	26
2.3.4. Assessment in CLIL.....	27
3. THE PRESENT STUDY	30
3.1 Aim and Research Questions	30
3.2 Context.....	30
3.3 Participants.....	32
3.4 Research Method	33
4. DATA ANALYSIS.....	34
4.1 SCHOOL CONTEXT DESCRIPTION.....	34
4.2 BENEFITS OF IMPLEMENTING CLIL.....	37
4.2.1 Benefits for the students.....	37
4.2.2 Benefits for the teachers.....	40
4.3 CHALLENGES OF CLIL	43
4.3.1 Matura and the curriculum.....	44
4.3.2 Teacher difficulties	46
4.3.3 Support needed.....	54
4.3.4 The role of L1	57

4.3.5 Assessment.....	59
4.3.6 Challenges for the students	66
5. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	68
References.....	70
Appendix.....	76

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CLIL	Content Language Integrated Learning
BICS	Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills
CALP	Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency
ICT	Information and communications technology
EU	European Union
L1	Language 1, i.e. mother tongue
L2	Language 2, i.e. foreign language
CQF	Croatian Qualifications Framework
BEP	Bilingual Education Programme
CEFT	The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
IELTS	International English language test system
IDRA	Intercultural Development Research Association
EFL	English as a foreign language
TEFL	Teaching English as a foreign language
TKT: CLIL	Teaching Knowledge Test: CLIL
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
IPA	Independent Project Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

CLIL, as an educational approach that integrates content and language, is perceived as innovative, successful and helpful key tool for developing multilingualism, deeper intercultural competence and critical thinking (Brüning and Purrmann, 2014). Since one of the ideas of the EU is a multilingual society, the promotion of linguistic diversity has become a key point in constructing and planning successful teaching and training all over Europe. Moreover, CLIL has a long tradition in numerous countries where it is an essential part of bilingual programs (Lasagabaster, 1998; Dalton-Puffer, 2002; Dalton-Puffer and Nikula, 2006). CLIL fosters the development of knowledge and use of second language by delivering the content through the medium of a foreign language (Vazquez and Rubio, 2010; Coyle, 2007). The idea of CLIL has been embraced by various education policy makers, institutions and schools, resulting in CLIL being implemented in more and more schools throughout Europe.

Several studies on CLIL revealed interesting benefits of CLIL programme (Pavesi et al., 2001; Scot and Beadle 2014; Lasagabaster, 2008;), such as greater students' motivation (Coyle, 2010; Marsh, 2008), higher language competence (Admiral et al., 2006; Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Zarobe, 2008), more opportunities for professional development of teachers (Pavesi, 2001; Vasquez 2010), better cooperation among teachers (Clegg, 2007; Vasquez 2010), and greater parental involvement in their children's education (Naves, 2008; Jeynes, 2005). However, since the objective of this approach promotes content and language proficiency, such integration of language and content imposes its own set of challenges both for teachers and students. Some of the difficulties that arise from the CLIL approach relate to materials, national exams, teacher training, teacher and student support needed, role of collaboration and L1 and assessment. Studies aiming at identifying the obstacles and challenges of the CLIL approach highlight the difficulties of selecting and adapting materials (Bernabe, 2013; Ballman, 1997; Kelly, 2014; Clegg, 2007), organized and extensive teacher training (Zarobe, 2008; McDougald, 2015; Bernabe, 2013) and collaboration (Coyle, 1999; Pellegrini, 2010; Vazquez and Ellison, 2013), use of L1 in CLIL lessons (Gierlinger, 2015; Tang, 2002; Lasagabaster, 2013) and assessment (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010; McKay, 2006; Svenhard, 2012).

The motivation for this study emerged in 2015 when I spent a semester at the University of Alcala de Henares in Spain as part of the Erasmus exchange programme. During that time, I did my English as a foreign language pre-service teaching practise in a bilingual primary school which offered CLIL courses, and my mentor was both an English as a foreign language

teacher and a CLIL teacher. Apart from attending her English classes, I got the chance to observe CLIL classes as well. In addition, I also took an introductory course on CLIL at Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros at the University of Alcala, Spain. In the course, I learned about the benefits and challenges of CLIL, and from classroom observation, I gained insight into the realities of CLIL classes. Given my interest for the subject, I arranged to additionally observe CLIL classes in a different school, and upon my return to Croatia, decided to capitalise on the knowledge gained and investigate CLIL in this context.

The aim of this thesis is to explore teachers' perspective on CLIL and investigate their experiences of teaching content through the medium of a foreign language. Moreover, it examines the benefits and challenges of CLIL which emerged from the context, and highlights the perceived teacher difficulties in relation to materials, support, teacher training, collaboration, the role of L1 and assessment. Finally, it looks at students' benefits and challenges through the teachers' lens.

In line with these aspects, the paper is organised as follows:

Chapter 1 will present a short introductory chapter on the CLIL approach, describing why it is estimated beneficial in the educational context. Moreover, it will give an insight into some of the most mentioned CLIL benefits and challenges. This will serve as a theoretical basis for the definition and description of CLIL features, CLIL context in Europe and analysis of CLIL benefits and challenges, in chapter 2, and for the subsequent research.

Chapter 2 aims at defining CLIL, the principles of CLIL, and the background to CLIL. Furthermore, it briefly describes CLIL practise in Europe and Croatia. Also, it gives a detailed overview of benefits and challenges of CLIL. It will examine the positive aspects and obstacles from teachers' perspectives related to the implementation of CLIL in a particular context and benefits and obstacles emerging from it: such as materials, teacher training, teacher support, collaboration, the role of L1, assessment and the difficulties the students face. The benefits relate to the difference between CLIL and FL programmes, higher students' attainment and motivation, greater collaboration among teachers and opportunities for professional development. However, greater attention is given to the challenges as they have emerged in the study. In addition, other studies discussing on the effectiveness of CLIL, with a focus on its benefits and challenges, will be discussed in detail.

Chapter 3 reports on the study carried out among eight teachers at one grammar school in Rijeka, Croatia. This section provides an account of the methodology and describes the aims,

research questions, contexts and participants. The overall aim of the study is to examine teachers' perspectives on their experiences of teaching through the medium of a foreign language. The findings reveal that teachers tend to encounter more challenges than benefits.

Chapter 4, which is the last chapter of this thesis, offers some concluding remarks, considers the potential implications for teaching, and offers a recommendation for future research that could reveal the direction in which the benefits and challenges may be examined. Thereby, future research could contribute to guidelines for successful implementation of CLIL programmes. The analysis of these data may hopefully shed light on issues that may arise from the implementation of CLIL and provide insights for educational practitioners who are planning on implementing CLIL.

2. ABOUT CLIL

2.1 DEFINING CLIL

CLIL stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning, but there are various understandings of the approach. Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), is a language teaching methodology that emerged in the mid-1990s, with situations where subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with dual-focused aims, namely the learning of content and the simultaneous learning of a foreign language (Marsh, 2000). CLIL was launched in 1994 by David Marsh and Anne Maljers in conjunction with the European Commission as a methodology similar to language immersion and content-based instruction (Eurydice, 2006). Generally speaking, it is a competence based teaching approach in which an additional language is used for learning and teaching of both content and language (Montalto et al., 1994). The objective of this approach is promoting both content and language proficiency, whereas the non-language content is developed through the foreign language and the foreign language is developed through the non-language content. The term has been used since 1996 to refer to “an integration of teaching the content of a subject with teaching through the second language” (Pokrivčáková, 2007). CLIL can be seen as an umbrella term for many educational approaches that include “immersion, bilingual education, multilingual education, language showers and enriched language programmes” (Švecova, 2008). CLIL is perceived as a general expression that refers to any teaching of a non-language subject through the medium of a second or foreign language.

2.1.1 Principles of CLIL

In CLIL, the learning of an additional language is integrated in content subjects such as Science, History, Geography, Art, Music, etc. CLIL can relate to any language, age and educational level from pre-primary, primary, secondary, higher to vocational and professional learning. CLIL supports the EU lifelong learning programme for all citizens where multilingualism and multiculturalism promote integration and mobility among all Europeans (Eurydice, 2006). CLIL emphasises the use of 5 Cs that are essential for a successful CLIL lesson and integrated in the curriculum: content, communication, cognition, culture and competences (Eurydice, 2006). Content and acquisition of knowledge, skills and understanding

are at the heart of the learning process. Content, i.e. subject or theme of the lesson is presented through elements that the students already know, so learning implies building new knowledge, upgrading it and putting it in relation to those things the students are already familiar with. Communication is based on the formula learning to use language and using language to learn (Coyle, 2005). It relates to the use of the target language, meaningful interaction and authentic communication which goes beyond the grammar system. Communication entails learners using the language rather than learning about the language. CLIL lesson emphasises the importance of communication between students themselves and between the teacher and the students. Regarding cognition, students develop their thinking and metacognitive skills, assess their knowledge and knowledge of their peers. Cognition focuses on mastering critical thinking skills, such as categorizing, evaluating, estimating, summarizing, classifying, debating, interpreting, matching and solving (Eurydice, 2006). Culture is an important part of CLIL lessons because learning about diversity deepens understanding of another culture and awareness of others and self (Coyle, 2005). Culture introduces the topics on community, local and global citizenship, tolerance and difference. Competences include can-do statements which describe the learning outcomes of a lesson. Competences relate to both content and learning objectives, and can-do statements express what the students are able to do after the lesson. As in all approaches to language teaching, all 4 language skills should be included in a lesson: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Equally important is Bloom's taxonomy, where the first 3 categories are considered lower-order thinking skills (LOTS): remembering, understanding and applying. Analysing, evaluating and creating are HOTS, higher-order thinking skills. What characterises CLIL is that it is first of all, a student-centred approach that promotes active learning. Students interact with teachers, but the teachers are only facilitators of the learning process. Teachers create opportunities for learners to think, evaluate and construct their own understanding. CLIL teachers have to correlate the content the students learn to the world that surrounds them. Therefore, lessons must be practical and relevant to student's life, the community he/she lives in and potentially other cultures.

One word in particular is often mentioned in CLIL- scaffolding. The term was taken from the field of children's psychology and pedagogy and reflects a modern view of second language teaching that puts the child into learner-centred approach (Gerakopoulou, 2011). The notion of scaffolding was initially presented by Lev S. Vygotsky, a Russian philologist and psychologist, but other scaffolding models were developed later (Bruner's scaffolding model). Learning is scaffolded when someone or something helps students to build their knowledge. It can refer to any resource or learner, teacher, parent, other learners or various materials.

Scaffolding is particularly important because learning is challenging. However, using scaffolding and guidance of the teacher, the goal is always attainable. Scaffolding relative to language refers to reformulation, simplification and exemplification. The teacher guides the students and involves them in various activities, then the students work in group and finally, the students are able to work on their own without any help. One of the key components of CLIL is the use of scaffolding as “building on a student’s existing knowledge, skills, attitudes, interests and experience” (Marsh, Mehisto and Frigols, 2008). In CLIL, tasks need to be designed in such a way that they challenge and support aspects from both the linguistic and the content perspective, which entails an additional challenge in planning teaching (Švecova, 2011). The most important scaffolding for conducting a CLIL lesson is as follows (Švecova, 2011):

- brainstorming a topic to determine the existing level of knowledge
- placing notes in the margin of handouts
- shortening sentences
- using pictures
- breaking material into chunks
- highlighting the most important text in a passage
- giving clues and asking follow-up questions

Students learn content-specific vocabulary for the topic they are learning, such as ‘terrain’, or ‘flood plain’ for geography (Montalto et al, 2006). Through vocabulary they also teach the grammar needed for the particular subject, such as, phrases, tenses, and functional language used for expressing actions and for working in a group. This type of language learning is called CALP – Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, introduced by Jim Cummins in 1979, as opposed to BICS- Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills. BICS are language skills needed in social situations to interact with other people. As a result, students should be able to talk about the content both in their L1 and L2.

It is important to note that CLIL enables pupils to develop both linguistic and educational objectives. Linguistic objectives refer to language skills that emphasise effective communication. Educational objectives include subject-related knowledge and learning ability. The scales of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages may be used in specifying the linguistic objectives (Wewer, 2014). The overall language objective is the attainment of functional language proficiency, which denotes that the learner is able to use the target language accurately in different subject contexts (Wewer, 2014). The relations of

curricular objectives, instructional objectives and assessment in content and language affect each other. Language proficiency and academic achievement are equally significant in learning (Wewer, 2014). Content objectives define the academic language needed in achieving the content standards and shape instruction aiming at English language proficiency. Moreover, content objectives influence decisions on choosing the materials and activities, while language objectives sets the academic language needed to master the desired content (Met, 1994). Thus, every lesson plan should include both content and language objectives.

2.1.2. Selection of subjects and students involved in CLIL

Some countries have established conditions governing pupil's access to CLIL, particularly when the target language is a foreign language (Eurydice, 2006). The selection is based on an interview or the results of an exam that tests student's level of foreign language and sometimes even their general knowledge of curricular subject matter. In France and Romania the examinations focus mainly on language-related knowledge, while in Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Bulgaria examinations focus mainly on general knowledge (subjects such as the mother tongue and mathematics). In Slovakia and Bulgaria school marks are taken into account and an entrance examination is held for accessing the CLIL programme. In France, students have to submit a record of attainment if they want to enrol CLIL classes (for example as a result of time spent abroad, or learning the language at an early age), and then take an oral test (in primary education) or written and oral examination (in secondary education) to determine their proficiency in that language. In the Netherlands, nearly all schools of secondary education have adopted selection procedures. In general, all selection procedures are based on student's previous performance at primary level and approved by their test results at the end of primary school. Additionally, students' motivation is also an important aspect when selecting the students for accessing CLIL programmes.

There is no clear preference for any particular subject. In primary and secondary education, all subjects in the curriculum may be targeted by CLIL. The official recommendations for CLIL subjects include physical and natural sciences, Geography, History, and Economics (Eurydice 2006). The choice of subjects varies between schools and regions and depends on the level of education (primary or secondary). The recommendation is to select a level that can combine various contents and subjects across the curriculum since CLIL is a cross- curricular approach. Teaching at secondary level is primarily concerned with

science subjects or those in the field of social sciences. In countries such as Latvia and Malta, provision of this kind also covers artistic subjects or physical education. In primary education, creative, sports or environmental activities are most frequently taught in the CLIL target language in Belgium (the German-speaking Community) and Estonia (in the case of schools for the Russian minority) (Eurydice, 2006). In Spain, France, Italy, the UK, Poland, Austria, Norway any subject may be chosen for CLIL. In Sweden, the Netherlands, Bulgaria and Finland there is a combination of science and social sciences with artistic and physical education (Eurydice, 2006). In the United Kingdom (England), at primary level CLIL is offered in the very small number of schools and involves a single subject selected by the school. In Malta, all schools offer bilingual education (in English and Maltese) from primary level onwards and teaching in English focuses mainly on science subjects.

2.1.3 CLIL in the European education system

Since 1995, the EU supports CLIL as a curricular approach which can contribute to individual and collective prosperity and can strengthen social cohesion (Ioannou and Pavlou, 2011). In 2002, the European Council emphasised the importance of improving the mastery of basic skills in at least two foreign languages from a very early age. In 2003 the European Commission brought out an Action Plan for language learning and linguistic diversity where CLIL was listed as one of the innovative methods to improve the quality of language teaching (Ioannou and Pavlou, 2011). As a result, the CLIL momentum coupled with the recognition of its benefits resulted in many initiatives in different parts of Europe, at pre-primary, primary, secondary and tertiary levels. These initiatives support school practise, training and research opportunities that guide the implementation of CLIL. On the whole, CLIL practise across Europe has become increasingly popular, although very diverse in implementation due to different national, regional and local varieties and education policies and constraints. Some examples of different varieties of CLIL across Europe are as follows (Ioannou and Pavlou 2011):

- Language classes based on thematic units
- CLIL camps
- Student exchanges
- Local and international projects
- Family stays

- immersion programmes ¹

Despite the varieties of CLIL, all countries offering CLIL have similar aims - to ensure that pupils acquire knowledge of curricular subject matter and develop their language proficiency in a language other than the normal language of instruction (Eurydice, 2006). The first countries that introduced CLIL were the ones that had strong political, geographic and demographic reasons, such as the existence of minorities, several official state languages, regional languages, etc. (Eurydice, 2006). In Luxembourg and Malta, where CLIL was introduced in the 19th century, it is present in all schools on a general basis. Other countries such as Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and the United Kingdom introduced CLIL at the end of the 1940s or in the 1950s. In order to establish CLIL, most countries have introduced legislation since the beginning of the 1990s. CLIL has become a part of mainstream primary and secondary education in the great majority of countries across Europe. Although it exists in almost every European country, it is offered to a minority of pupils and in just a few schools. In the majority of countries it is offered at primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels of education. Several countries, such as Belgium, Spain, Italy, Latvia, Poland and Finland organise CLIL programmes at pre-primary level, and the Czech Republic, Estonia and Bulgaria at secondary level (Eurydice, 2006). In Poland and Romania, CLIL in a regional language is provided at both primary and secondary level, and CLIL in a foreign language is available at secondary level only. The minimum amount of time officially recommended for teaching in the target language varies due to the fact that schools are free to determine the nature and scale of their own CLIL-based activity (Eurydice, 2006). Besides the differences in terms of classes and subjects that exist in all countries, there are also differences in the amount of lesson time each week. In Germany, Spain and Italy, the amount of lesson time devoted to CLIL depends from one region or locality to the other. In Belgium (the French community), the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Finland, it differs from one school to another.

¹CLIL immersion includes both an early immersion, where the entire curriculum is taught in the foreign language, and partial immersion where only part of the curriculum is delivered through the target language. Double immersion programmes use two foreign languages and the mother tongue to teach the curriculum (Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlou, 2011).

2.1.4 CLIL in Croatia

In Croatia, bilingual education exists in few secondary schools: The XVIII. Grammar School in Zagreb, the X. Grammar School Ivan Supek, the IV. Grammar School in Zagreb, the XVI. Grammar School in Zagreb. However, not much information is available on CLIL in Croatia since it is still very much unrepresented in both primary and secondary schools, and it is usually more common in private than in public schools. It is surprising that no data regarding the number of schools offering CLIL in Croatia is available on the Internet. Although CLIL is considered to be an effective tool for improving language learning (Council of Europe, 2008) in Croatia, CLIL is offered in less than 10% of administrative units (SurveyLang, 2010). When it is introduced, there are no specific criteria regarding students' enrolment in CLIL programmes in primary and secondary education, and every school is autonomous in making decisions regarding CLIL. Support for CLIL is provided by the British Council in Croatia which offers courses to teachers of primary and secondary education. However, it should be noted that these courses may not be relevant to teachers who teach content through the medium of languages other than English.

According to information available on the Internet, Private Secondary School of Economics Inova from Zagreb offers CLIL classes in Chemistry, Biology, Maths and economic subjects. However, not much data is provided on teachers' challenges. The School's official web page offers only a brief insight into the problems they encountered when introducing CLIL. For instance, the school had to adapt the content, but at the same time respect the prescribed curricula for the subject. Secondly, they had to design and introduce different teaching methods which stimulated students' interest and helped them overcome their fear of the new approach. One teacher attended a seminar in Oxford held by British Study Centres, School of English. The goal was to teach techniques and methods for creating tasks and activities for students, and establishing a successful atmosphere in the class.

In the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County the only school to introduce CLIL is the private secondary school Andrija Ljudevit Adamić. CLIL was introduced in the school as a part of the EU project „Multilingual education – improving language learning and intercultural skills“ whose goal is to introduce bilingual teaching. Students have CLIL classes in English, German and Italian. The subjects that are partly taught in English, German or Italian are Psychology, History, ICT, Politics, Geography, Ethics and Music art. Teachers attended seminars and workshops led by the CLIL experts. The content teachers attended English classes to improve their language skills. They also attended teacher training seminars during which

they were introduced to CLIL methodology and how to teach the curriculum in the foreign language. No data on challenges or benefits the teachers encountered is available on the Internet pages. This particular study focuses on Andrija Ljudevit Adamić High School and the ensuing benefits and challenges of introducing CLIL methodology.

2.2 BENEFITS OF CLIL

EU language policies strive to adopt an educational model to account for the diversity of European programmes and create a multilingual society (Zarobe, 2008). CLIL has been perceived as a key instrument to ensure such policy and has been adopted as a dual-focused approach by various European professional networks and supported in numerous CLIL projects, studies, organisations and experimental initiatives as an integral part of foreign language teaching (Zarobe, 2008). Moreover, it was argued that CLIL is more beneficial than traditional foreign language teaching (Sprat, 2009; Zarobe, 2008). The traditional teaching of foreign languages has been criticised “for not providing sufficient input, an input that is inauthentic, functionally restricted and therefore lacking a real communicative function” (Lasagabaster, 2011). Experts argue on some issues in EFL, such as the insufficient exposure to FL, meaningfulness of input and interaction, low learner motivation and insufficient classroom interaction (Sprat, 2009). The basic flaw seems to occur in its conceptual content, where topics are subordinated to the underlying linguistic objective. As a result, the content is often undermined because of the importance of language practice (Ball, 2013). In CLIL, students learn how to think in the language, not just learn about the language itself, as they do in foreign language class (Coyle, 2007). Moreover, students in CLIL do not focus on language itself but rather on learning activities in different fields of studies. When comparing language in CLIL and the EFL classroom, it is evident that the language taught through the content is specific authentic and oriented towards task completion (Sprat, 2009).

According to the International CLIL Research Journal ‘Coping with CLIL: Dropouts from CLIL Streams in Germany’, CLIL has the following benefits (Eurydice, 2006):

- Improves language competence
- Develops intercultural communication skills
- Increases learner’s motivation
- Develops multilingual attitudes
- Allows students more contact with the target language

- Develops higher order thinking skills

CLIL benefits for the school, learners and teachers (Pavesi et al., 2001) relate to the support of school's development, CLIL helps students develop great organisational and critical thinking skills and boost independence in learning. Teachers get the opportunity to share their individual knowledge, form teams and become more autonomous in using learning materials. In some countries teachers are likely to have an increased opportunity for professional development and benefit from exchange programmes (Pavesi et al., 2001). These benefits shall be explained in more detail below.

2.2.1. CLIL and ICT

Since the major goal in CLIL is effective communication, ICT is one type of communication evidently beneficial for both students and teachers in modern society as we live in. Teachers and students have already encountered ICT in several forms (personal computers, tablets, smart phones). Digital technologies represent a powerful tools for educational change and reform which can improve the effectiveness of education (Kirubahar et al., 2011). ICT is an unavoidable part of the European dimension for European citizens because it prepares the learners to use the technologies effectively and responsibly (Padurean, 2009). The technologies are used for communication in everyday life and are therefore closely intertwined with language use. This is one of the reasons why using the technologies during the language lessons is beneficial and helpful. CLIL teachers are invited to take full advantage of the technologies, including the use of digital content and services as teaching or learning resources, use of the technology for structuring learning situations and finally the use of the Internet to share teaching resources and enter into international cooperation (Drápalík, 2013). Numerous advantages of ICT (Padurean, 2009) include combining visual with listening materials, text with graphics and pictures, creativity in using materials, fast feedback to students' answers through error correction and adaptability of materials to suit students' needs and level of language knowledge. The use of ICT creates more opportunities for communication between peer learners, participation in blog discussions, exchange of emails, search for information (Isisag, 2012). ICT is found to increase learners' motivation, enhance student's engagement, improve independent learning and learners' attainment (Houcine, 2011). Using ICT requires trained teachers and especially the ones that are eager to learn. A study conducted by Wojtowicz (2009) examined how ICT can enhance the process of learning language and

subjects in CLIL. The most commonly used type of ICT was Google, then educational Websites, the Internet and presentations e.g. PowerPoint. Using Smartboards or games was at 8th place, and the last one was using chats and video conferences. Participants were asked which of the ICT types they would like to use to improve their ICT skills, and smartboards had the most responses. Other responses included video conferencing and educational software packages (Wojtowicz, 2009). Most of the teachers had access to ICT, but availability and access is one of the most common issues in connecting ICT and CLIL. Teachers agreed they do not see any potential problem for the students as the students are very adaptable, but were concerned about the possibility of the students being distracted (Wojtowicz, 2009). Teachers found the idea of combining CLIL and ICT interesting and beneficial for students and more effective than traditional methods. Among the top applications that help the improvement of language skills were online dictionaries, grammars and informational websites, e-mail and discussion forums (Stevens and Shield, 2009). The Interactive Whiteboard is often used in CLIL classes because it allows students to come into closer contact with the subject matter. The problem with ICT is often lack of high quality, availability of materials and lack of well-trained users willing to investigate and use such materials into their lessons.

2.2.2 Benefits for the students

For students who have no previous experience of CLIL, the approach requires a transition period which enables learners to accept this new approach to learning. Learners need to know why they are suddenly learning in another language. Students can be given introductory activities whose aim is to get to know the CLIL approach and understand its values. After accepting CLIL, students have to be supported in a variety of ways. Teachers and students aim at creating a nurturing and safe environment with no stress or anxiety.

Pavesi et al. (2001) listed a variety of advantages for the learners:

- CLIL leads to greater involvement, helps learners increase their motivation through the exposure to authentic (i.e. real world) contents
- CLIL helps boost self-confidence, raise self-esteem, build learner independence through the interactive and co-operative work
- CLIL enhances language proficiency through the greater number of contact hours with the foreign or second language
- CLIL encourages creative thinking processes

Other research suggests (Paran, 2013) that CLIL students do not achieve less well in terms of content than their monolingual peers. Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) confirmed students acquire self-confidence, improve their competences in L2 and develop oral communication skills, as well as develop their understanding and tolerance to culturally different people. Several studies showed students involved in CLIL have better language competences as opposed to the non-CLIL students (Scott and Beadle, 2014; Lasagabaster, 2008; Admiraal et al., 2006). CLIL fosters greater participation than classes in L1 and reduces stress since the focus is not only on language forms (Heras and Lasagabaster, 2014). There is more interaction in classes (Long, 1996) and the L2 input is more comprehensible (Krashen, 1982). Also, CLIL aims at creating real communicative situations (Lasagabaster, 2008) and equips students with language use to manipulate authentic content.

Motivation

It was shown that students are more motivated in CLIL classes (Coyle, 2010). A study of the extent to which students were motivated by CLIL in 11 schools in England and Scotland showed half of students had positive attitudes towards CLIL and felt motivated to continue learning the foreign language (Coyle, 2010). Similarly, a study in Spain on evaluation of the Bilingual Education Programme (BEP) showed that the students felt confident learning in English and that BEP had helped them broaden their understanding of other subjects (Dobson et al., 2010). They felt motivated by the fact that they were learning other subjects through foreign language. Some of the reasons for the increased motivation is that students in CLIL classes had more opportunities to speak in authentic communicative situations, produced longer utterances and engaged more in debates and discussions (Coyle, 2010). Learners confirmed they had more fun in CLIL classes, experienced more cognitive challenge and engagement in the learning process and dialogues. The benefits of CLIL are triggering high levels of communication between teachers and learners and among learners themselves (Heras and Lasagabaster, 2014). To continue, the students feel more motivated to learn foreign languages, as they are not exposed to great stress and anxiety in a learning environment in which the focus is both on language forms and on meaning and communication. It improves specific language terminology due to the fact that the FL in CLIL is used to transmit information in real communicative situation with no explicit focus on grammar (Ball, 2013). EFL learning can be demotivating for learners (Chambers, 1999; Davies and Brember, 2001), whereas CLIL with its dual focus (Coyle 2008; Marsh 2008) seems to sustain motivation

(Lasagabaster, 2011). Lasagabaster (2015) found that the CLIL approach has a positive effect on students' integrative motivation, i.e. students' interest in interacting and learning about the L2 community of speakers.

Language competence

One of the greatest benefits of CLIL is its positive impact on student's language competences when compared to standard FL programmes (Scott and Beadle, 2014; Dalton-Puffer, 2007). In Spain, students involved in CLIL type provision achieved better language competency levels than non-CLIL students, especially in written comprehension (Puerto and Martínez, 2013). CLIL programmes in upper secondary education develop reading skills (Lasagabaster, 2008). The study found that 74 % of CLIL students scored satisfactorily on the IELTS (International English language test system) Reading for Academic Purposes Module Test compared to 33 % for non-CLIL students (Scott and Beadle, 2014). Admiral et al (2006) conducted a study in Netherlands with 1,305 students in five schools, 584 of which were a part of a CLIL programme and 721 of which followed the regular programme. He found that students in the CLIL programme performed better on reading comprehension and general oral. CLIL students reached higher levels in a foreign language in comparison to the ones reached in conventional foreign language classes (Dalton-Puffer, 2007). In accordance with these evidence, in CLIL classes certain aspects of language competence are developed more than others, such as receptive skills (listening and reading as opposed to the productive skills of speaking and writing), vocabulary, morphology, creativity, risk-taking and fluency and the quantity of spoken language (Dalton-Puffer, 2007). Several other studies in Germany and Spain showed that students in the CLIL programmes performed better on listening comprehension, reading comprehension, grammatical proficiency, writing, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and content (Lasagabaster, 2008; Ruiz De Zarobe, 2008) . A study carried out in Hungary compared two forms of language learning by exploring English language achievement of CLIL secondary school students and those of non-CLIL intensive foreign language learners. The data showed language competence of the CLIL students was of a higher level than that of the control group, meaning CLIL students had significantly better skills in lexical knowledge and applying grammar rules (Varkuti, 2010). Certain evidence suggest that CLIL students experience a slower progress at first but as soon as they catch up with their peers they do as well or even better than non- CLIL students (Bonnet, 2012; Coyle, 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2007). On the contrary, a Finnish study investigated the effects of CLIL on the development of

children's literacy skills during their first six school years and found that CLIL students achieved significantly better spelling skills in the Finnish language than children in the other classes (Merisuo-Storm, 2011). Monolingual students show greater competence in acquiring and memorising information while bilingual students tend to adopt a more analytical approach to learning and are more capable of applying the knowledge acquired to new learning situations (Gajo and Serra, 2002).

2.2.3 Teacher benefits

Not many studies have dealt with the benefits for teachers, but rather focus on the learners. The benefits of CLIL are primarily focused on students' higher language proficiency and motivation. However, several studies (Pavesi, 2001; Vasquez 2010) revealed that CLIL has substantial benefits for the teachers as well. Specifically, the benefits for the teachers are examined from 2 aspects: more opportunities for professional development and better cooperation with colleagues.

Working together, content and language teachers share their individual knowledge, have an increased opportunity for professional development and are involved in exchange programmes and financial increments (Pavesi et al., 2001). Similarly, Vasquez (2010) suggest that bilingual teaching offers teachers opportunities for continuous learning and professional development “ in a way that is key to the learning of students and to their quality as a professional”. Subject teachers collaborate with other subject teachers who are teaching in L2, and the most crucial form of collaboration is between subject teachers and language teachers (Clegg, 2007). Language teachers influence good practice in CLIL projects by helping their subject colleagues. They can advise subject teachers on their own language use, on the language demands of their subjects and on the kinds of language support practice which the subject teachers can incorporate into their lessons. Teachers can work together while making materials or assessing. In addition, Clegg (2007) proposes this kind of collaboration has to be paid for and accounted for in teachers' timetables, although it is rarely the case.

2.2.4 Parental support

Some of the initial effective immersion programmes were established due to parental interest in engaging their child into enriched language education. Many parents' associations perceive bilingualism as a family and educational goal. Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) found that in the successful bilingual school the parents knew the component of CLIL programmes, had a positive attitude towards CLIL, and were strong advocates of the CLIL programmes (Naves, 2009). A study conducted by Jeynes (2005) found significant positive connection between parental involvement and academic achievement. On the other hand, parents initially may have some concerns and questions due to the specific characteristics of the CLIL approach. According to Marsh (2010), some of the usual questions are:

- Will my child learn the main content as well as if s/he studies only in the first language?
- What if my child is not as good at languages as the other children in the classroom?
- Is it likely that my child will have to do more work, and possibly face more stress, if s/he joins the CLIL class?
- Is it important that the parent can also speak in the CLIL language?

Research found that parents' major concern is whether their children would be "able to cope in the programme and whether the use of a foreign language would create problems which would affect their children's results and overall learning of the subject content" (Ioannou and Pavlou, 2008; 2009). In order to avoid concerns or at least, reduce them, teachers could present to parents their teaching methods in CLIL classes and explain the support the children get in these beginning stages. Parents can also observe CLIL classes and be involved through the assessment process, they can be active participants in European or international projects or partners in homework projects.

2.3 CHALLENGES OF CLIL

A survey conducted by Eurydice in 2004/05 on obstacles to the general implementation or further expansion of CLIL in foreign target languages in primary education and general secondary education showed some of the important obstacles, such as shortage of appropriately qualified teachers, lack of appropriate teaching materials, high costs, restrictive legislation (Eurydice, 2006). The Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, Austria and Poland emphasize the

high cost of introducing CLIL (Eurydice, 2006). Additional costs include teacher training specifically for CLIL, the preparation and distribution of appropriate teaching materials, the official certification of pupils. In accordance to this fact, funding still limits the spread of CLIL initiatives in schools. Other obstacles include unequal access from all socio-economic groups and several language issues (language is approached lexically rather than grammatically, difficulties designing language objectives more than content objectives) (Eurydice, 2006). CLIL requires the use of human resources (specialist teachers) and suitable teaching materials to a significantly greater extent than conventional school language teaching. One of the challenges is faculty development which assists both subject and language teachers. The idea is that they collaboratively teach subject-matter because most of the teachers has not been initially trained. Another issue refers to the discrepancy between national exams that are focused mainly on content and CLIL objectives focused on both language and content (Serragiotto, 2007). This poses a challenge when designing the CLIL curriculum. CLIL integrates language with parts of the curriculum through single subjects or through links with a range of subjects or themes. Lesson content can be addressed according to the national curriculum for individual subjects and involve planning across various subject areas (Coyle, 2009). CLIL curriculum may vary in length from a single unit to modules lasting a term or more, but curriculum differs from the ordinary one in a mother tongue so CLIL teachers have a hard time designing the curriculum.

2.3.1 Teacher difficulties

Materials

Finding and accessing teaching materials is a major difficulty. The materials have to be available in the target language and cover contents and subjects in the national curriculum. Teaching materials, especially for primary and pre-primary level, are rare because there is no market for them, the number of users is small and the books are mainly written to the requirements of a country's national curriculum and do not easily sell across national boundaries (Clegg, 2007). Course books have to be related to learners' lives in their contexts (Ballman, 1997). Nevertheless, this idea implies huge investment and little profits since publishers are not especially interested in creating a localized course book, rather a global one. International course books cannot match the national curricula in every country, so most schools import native speaker textbooks. The problem is that the language demands of native

speaker textbooks are highly challenging because of the subject-specific language and general academic language (Kelly, 2014; Met, 1994). Therefore, most of the teachers create their own material or adapt the existing materials what requires much time and energy (Met, 1994, McDougald, 2015). The Basque country has invested in publishing English-medium content textbooks written specifically to meet the language and activity needs of Basque learners, and English language textbooks for courses to be taught alongside the content classes (Kelly, 2014). Not all countries are lucky enough to have such resources. Efforts have been made to provide a centralized support infrastructure for the distribution of user-generated teaching and learning resources from the side of European Commission, such as the E-CLIL: a European Union funded project aimed at developing and building resources, a resource centre for the use of CLIL. The CLIL Centre provides support to current and future CLIL education programmes all over Europe, it offers high quality and already proven materials and resources for content and language learning and enriches teachers' and children's knowledge of other European cultures. With the increasing CLIL popularity, CLIL materials are being created internationally and nationally in different formats, such as:

- CLIL coursebooks (for example 'First choice', 'Explorers', 'Essential Science', 'Drawing and Painting Fun')
- parts of coursebooks or coursebooks with CLIL elements (for example 'Playway', 'Green Keystones' (national/Germany)),
- supplementary materials (for example 'Cross-Curricular Resources for Young Learners', 'Cook for Fun', 'Green English', 'Watch Out') and websites (for example Onestopclil), (<http://www.macmillanenglish.com/>) (Steiert and Massler 2011.)

CLIL teachers mostly organize their teaching around annual plans of the content taught and plan only particular activities (Bernabe, 2013). Regarding the materials CLIL teachers use with the CLIL methodology, teachers usually use a course book as their main source (Bernabe, 2013). Teachers design and develop the materials either themselves or with the help of the language teachers, while some use authentic materials (Bernabe, 2013). Teachers often work together to create their own materials, share them online and support each other. Various CLIL experts give their advice on how to write your own CLIL materials, criteria for producing CLIL learning material, requirements for certain topics, etc. Mehisto (2012) enlisted a variety of criteria for quality CLIL material that serves as a practical tool for CLIL materials development. According to him, CLIL materials should make language, content and learning

skills visible to students, systematically foster academic language proficiency, learner autonomy, include self, peer and other types of formative assessment, foster cooperative learning, foster critical thinking and cognitive fluency through scaffolding (Mehisto, 2012). Other criteria proposed include authentic classroom materials such as video clips, flash-animations, web-quests, foreign language websites, scaffolding (providing phrases, subject-specific vocabulary and collocations), activities providing rich interaction and activation of thinking skills (Meyer, 2010), visuals, print and non-print media (Coyle, 2009).

Teacher training

According to the Eurydice survey (2006) teachers of CLIL programmes should either (Gierlinger, 2006):

- be native speakers of the target language,
- have completed a course or studied in the target language,
- have undergone in-service training on CLIL type provision, and
- have taken a language test or examination to prove their proficiency level

Teachers have to be qualified to teach at more than one educational level. In most cases, they are specialists in one or more non-language subjects or have two areas of specialisation, one in a language subject and the other in a non-language subject (Eurydice, 2006). European Centre for Modern Languages states that teachers need to have a number of special skills and competences (Scott and Beadle, 2014):

- Knowledge of the psychological aspects of bi- and pluri-lingualism;
- Subject-related second language skills;
- Knowledge of a wide range of methodologies for the teaching of subject content and the second language;
- the ability to find teaching materials in the second language and adapt them for use in the CLIL classroom;

Other authors emphasise these competences (Pavesi et al., 2001):

- Knowledge of the L1 to understand learners' difficulties
- Good command of the language used for instruction
- Good knowledge of the content subjects
- Production of lesson plans

- Planning and organization of lessons according to cognitive demands
- Gradual content and language progression

More required teacher competences are presented in detail in *The CLIL teacher's competencies grid* (Bertaux et al., 2010). The Teacher's competence grid is a reflection tool for guiding professional development for future and currently in-service CLIL teachers. It represents a set of skills to be aimed at in CLIL, including (Bertaux et al., 2010):

- Knowledge of methodology for integrating both language and content.
- Ability to create rich and supportive target-language environments.
- Ability to making input comprehensible.
- Ability to use teacher-talk effectively.
- Ability to promote student comprehensible output.
- Ability to attend to diverse student needs.
- Ability to continuously improve accuracy.

In order to teach in a foreign language, teachers are required to have reached the level B2, C1 or C2 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, in the case of the language subject (Eurydice, 2006). Teachers have to take an oral exam to show their ability to use the target language. The situation that only few countries require evidence for CLIL type provision may be due to the fact that CLIL is still not highly developed in educational systems, or has existed for only a short period in pilot project forms. On the contrary, where CLIL is considered normal practise, in the case of Malta and Luxembourg – there is no need for further requirement. In countries where CLIL occurs in communities speaking a minority or regional language, teachers generally have a good command of two languages, both regional that is usually their mother tongue and the other language which is the official state language. In most countries there is no legislation by the education authorities that ensure CLIL teachers any financial or other benefit. Apart from Spain, all countries offering benefits to teachers who work in CLIL type provision are central and eastern European countries. In the Netherlands, benefits usually come in the form of extra time to prepare lessons (Eurydice, 2006). In some countries, special benefits are targeted at schools in the form of increased school budget, not teachers (in Poland and Slovenia).

Usually, teachers go through initial and in-service training in order to acquire the specific skills needed for CLIL type provision. The majority of countries' education authorities

offer courses, training modules, or specialised qualifications for CLIL type provision. The duration and quality of these courses is different in every country and can last a few lessons or one single semester. In Italy, Romania and the Netherlands teachers have to complete training teaching course on methods and approaches in CLIL. However, in the case of the Netherlands, this condition is not prescribed by the central government, but agreed between schools in the CLIL's network. Teacher training should cover areas such as CLIL fundamentals, content and language awareness, methodology and assessment, learning resources and class management (Marsh, 2010). In some countries teachers are required to take a language test (Eurydice, 2006). Tests can be organized by different authorities, either local (schools) or central. These examinations are often not compulsory, except in the Netherlands and Slovakia. Several online CLIL courses can be taken and an adequate certificate is received after completing the course. For example, Oxford online CLIL course covers the following areas: Introduction to CLIL , CLIL Syllabus design , Materials (Multimedia in CLIL) , TEFL techniques in CLIL (Learning styles, Testing and assessing) , Supervised lesson planning, Teaching structures and vocabulary in CLIL , Expert groups (Nowak, 2011). The most popular test for CLIL teachers is TKT: CLIL (Teaching Knowledge Test), a test of professional knowledge for English language teachers and also subject teachers who use English as a medium for teaching their curriculum subject, designed and produced by University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations (Cambridge ESOL). It tests knowledge of CLIL and concepts related to the approach, knowledge about subject teaching in a target language and the learning, thinking and language skills which are developed across different curriculum subjects, knowledge of how to plan lessons, activities and resources to support the CLIL approach, and knowledge of teaching strategies and assessment in CLIL contexts. This test can be taken as a part of teacher's professional development at any stage in a teacher's career. It is suitable for pre- or in-service teachers of English or teachers of other subjects who use the medium of English at any educational level. Several cooperation centres such as the British Council often play an important role in teacher training. British council is at the forefront of offering modules and teacher education in CLIL. Some education authorities organize training placements or training visits and the teachers are obliged to visit the target language country. In-service training differs from one country to the next. Courses may be organized by bodies or groups temporarily formed to support schools offering CLIL in pilot projects, as in Belgium. In the Czech Republic, in- service training is based on international cooperation agreements. Institutions or centres for the promotion of languages abroad, such as the Goethe Institut, are an important contribution to in-service training. Moreover, highly experienced teachers are also of significance in establishing in-

service training programmes. In the case of Italy and the Netherlands in-service training is compulsory, especially in pilot projects. Certain schools demand the presence of a native speaker during classes (Spain) (Eurydice, 2006).

In general, there is a big shortage of qualified CLIL teachers. On the other hand, teachers complain there are no initial and in-service training programmes aimed at developing skills needed to teach in CLIL. Another disadvantage is that there are not many faculty programmes that teach the CLIL approach or develop subject-language teachers. As a result, teachers are not trained enough and confront several difficulties in implementing CLIL. For example, they are not trained to teach content in a foreign language and design objectives and outcomes in both areas. Content teachers who usually lack linguistic expertise may have the tendency to emphasize content and neglect language learning (Kong, 2009; Creese (2005). Teachers require specialised training (initial teacher training and continuing professional development) in language pedagogy and second language pedagogy (Ruiz De Zarobe, 2008). Also, training should include “observation in CLIL classes, training sessions at university, the teaching of CLIL classes and training placements in a school in the target-language country” (Scott and Beadle, 2014).

McDougald (2015) conducted a research in Colombia regarding teachers’ attitudes, perceptions, and experiences with CLIL. Many teachers pointed out that administrators and coordinators did not take much time into consideration when deciding to implement CLIL. Also, they claimed they needed far too much time for class preparation in CLIL. The study showed that most of the teachers strongly agreed that CLIL requires cooperation with subject teachers. Teachers saw this as an important aspect in successful CLIL implementation. Moreover, the majority of the teachers reported that they require more knowledge on methodology and subject in order to give excellent CLIL lessons. In another study, teachers claimed not to have enough skills to work within the CLIL methodology and indicated they need to be better trained in this methodology (Bernabe, 2013). Moreover, teachers agreed they should also improve their knowledge in the specific curriculum subject taught through the second language. When asked on the desired teacher’s skills necessary for implementing CLIL, they agreed on identifying students’ needs, introducing formative and summative assessment, developing multimodal blended learning approaches and cooperating with colleagues (Griva et al, 2014). Language teachers who have not got a diploma of the subject highlighted difficulties explaining the content (McDougald, 2015; Reierstam, 2015). Teachers emphasize the importance of the educational institution involvement, the entire educational community/stakeholders, parents, caregivers, and members of the foreign language because

CLIL is not isolated in the classroom. Teachers are sometimes uncertain about what is expected from them, especially when they are required to put content and language together (Banegas, 2012). When asked what factors helped achieve CLIL programme success, teachers listed training opportunities, support by Immersion Centres, and teaching materials of greatest importance in CLIL programmes (Mehisto, 2008). Another study on challenges and experiences of EFL teachers of Greek and Cypriot primary education showed that the teachers felt incompetent to implement CLIL because they were not well trained to teach CLIL (Griva et al., 2014). Teachers reported the need for further training in designing and using cognitively and linguistically appropriate learning materials to address the learners' needs, adopting and making use of the various teaching techniques in line with the CLIL approach (Griva et al., 2014). In line with these claims, effective teacher training should be reflected and guided (Lyster, 2006, Mehisto, 2008).

2.3.2 Support for CLIL

Teacher support

In their document *Guidelines for CLIL implementation in Primary and Pre-primary Education*, Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlou (2011) highlight 3 types of support for the teachers:

- pedagogical (subject-content or language methodology)
- linguistic (assistance in appropriate lexis or pronunciation)
- practical (resource finding)
- psychological (encouragement, stress management or stress release).

Several authors found a positive relation between successful CLIL programmes and teacher collaboration (Coyle, 1999; Pellegrini, 2010). In a similar vein, (Vázquez and Ellison, 2013) suggest that content teachers may benefit from observing how the language teacher organizes communicative tasks which can be adapted for the subject material of the CLIL class. Forming teacher/ buddy groups according to subjects taught (e.g. CLIL-science, CLIL-geography) is also of great help to CLIL teachers. Local authorities or CLIL programme coordinators should enable teachers to form such groups. Moreover, technology can be a great support in a way it expands teacher support networks and is a great source of teaching materials and linguistic and pedagogical support. The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education is a document primarily aimed to provide a set of principles and guidelines for designing CLIL lessons and

professional development curricula and serves as a tool for reflection. Successful bilingual education programmes depend “on the extent to which teaching teams in schools are mobilised and the level of collaboration between linguists and teachers (i.e. non-linguists)” (Pellegrini, 2010). In Spain’s BEP, teachers indicated a wish to have more contact with other BEP colleagues from other schools in order to share ideas and materials.

Ministry support

In recent years, government interest in CLIL programmes has been rising, but long term interest in CLIL implementation seems to be less frequent (Kelly, 2014). The Austrian government, for example, has passed legislation requiring of Higher Technical Schools to offer 72 hours through the medium of English for all students in the third year. Moreover, the government is funding in-service training programmes in CLIL for practising teachers. The schools have identified senior staff to be responsible for the CLIL initiative, a group of teachers have drawn up guidelines for other schools beginning to implement CLIL, a national portal and a national electronic network for CLIL were made for gathering information and resources to share among CLIL teachers (Kelly, 2014). Interestingly, in Croatia, there is no legislation on CLIL, no internet network connecting CLIL teachers or data on schools offering CLIL type of provision. The Ministry, managers and departments should work to provide time in the curriculum for CLIL teachers because they need extra time to prepare. The Ministry should make the curriculum fit with this need for time. All of the bottom-up initiatives from teachers and the classroom need the support from top-down factors. For CLIL to work, there needs to be communication and success in the three factors: teachers, resources, learners (Dobson, 2010).

2.3.3. L1 /L2 in the CLIL classroom and codeswitching

Ioannou and Pavlou (2011) discuss on how foreign language should be introduced to the students. First step refers to the gradual introduction of the L2 in a relaxed, supportive atmosphere. At the beginning, students can express themselves in their mother tongue and make up the time-out sign that signifies they need a break from the L2 due to not understanding the content, etc. Children gain confidence by gradual introduction and increase of the foreign language. At first learners are exposed to L2 only 20% of the lesson in the form of simple instruction, such as Good morning, Open your book, Listen to me, etc. Gradually, classroom

language and subject terms increase. In these initial stages of gradual introduction of L2, children's language progress may not be identical to the progress they make in subject content. It is due to the fact that children are still getting used to understanding and using the L2. In this stage teachers need to support the children so that they can show their understanding of the content and actively participate in a lesson. This can be done by numerous techniques without forcing production in the L2, such as Total Physical Response (TPR) activities, listening, ordering activities, matching and labelling, classifying, colouring, selecting, miming and acting out (Ioannou and Pavlou, 2011). Use of English develops language skills and confidence in using the language (Kiely, 2011), but continuous use of L2 in the classroom can lead to misunderstanding and less comprehension of subject content. Teachers should balance between the two because CLIL classroom is actually a classroom of 2 languages. Teachers can help students learn key communication strategies that the students can fall back on if having problems with L2. Some of the communication strategies include explicitly indicating non-understanding, asking for help and miming (Kiely, 2011). Teachers may also establish rules regarding L1/L2 use because the goal is to use L2 as much as possible in every discourse. Unlike the foreign language classroom, where the use of the mother tongue is discouraged, the native language can be used when checking comprehension in CLIL. Learners at an early ages are allowed to code-switch in order to understand the content better and to communicate effectively (Butzkamm, 1998). Code switching in English helps students' understanding, boosts debate, stimulates the learning of both language and content, makes students comfortable in the CLIL class, enables students to tell anecdotes and helps teachers deal with disciplinary issues (Gierlinger, 2015). Teachers' classroom codeswitching for regulative purposes is mainly used for dealing with classroom and task management or with behaviour management (Gierlinger, 2015; Duff, 2002; Levine, 2003). Classroom and task management codeswitching is used for general announcements: opening and closing lesson turns, issuing homework, giving instructions or learning arrangements. It is often placed in a framing pattern of L2 – L1 – L2 (Gierlinger, 2015). Teachers mostly use L1 to give instructions, explain words or complex ideas (Tang, 2002), translate unknown vocabulary (Duff, 2002, Levine, 2003). L1 is used mainly to help students understanding, to make L1 and L2 comparisons, to feel comfortable in the CLIL class, to boost debate and to deal with disciplinary issues (Lasagabaster, 2013). The L1 is also used as a scaffold tool which allows students to make comparisons and to help lower grade students gradually increase their use of the English language. Students often use L1 to ask clarifying questions, express frustrations concerning their lack of understanding, clarify meaning of words in L2 and build shared meaning while

evaluating written tasks through shared discussion (Morahan, 2010). Additionally, they use L1 when ashamed to speak (Morahan, 2010; Bhooth et al, 2014), but L1 could be used by students as a learning or scaffolding strategy to translate new words, define concepts and help students in their groups (Bhooth et al, 2014). The use of L1 in the L2 classroom is beneficial and even necessary in the language learning process since it increases comprehension and acceptance of the new language (Morahan, 2010).

2.3.4. Assessment in CLIL

CLIL teachers guide the assessment process and decide on how they will define assessment in CLIL, will they assess language or content or both (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010). Moreover, it is necessary to establish clear learning objectives, use the correct assessment criteria (appropriate to the level of students), and acquaint the students with the assessment criteria (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010). Assessment could be done at different stages: during or after lessons (Marino, 2014). There are different positions with respect to the question “what to assess” in CLIL, because a real assessment model has not been proposed so far. European CLIL states that the focus should be on content, and the language is intended as instrumental to the latter’s development” (Coyle et al. 2010). The content area teachers are not necessarily trained in using English in their instruction or in the assessment of English texts, so they argue that they should not be expected to assess a student’s ability to construct a well-argued essay (Moje, 2008). Usually, it is optional whether or not to assess English. Research shows CLIL teachers and students may choose how to use the language, and how often in a CLIL context (Brevik and Moe 2012). Moreover, in a CLIL context the language and content teacher often collaborate in making the criteria and assessing. Assessing content learning is done through tests, essays, projects, mini quizzes, etc. Attitudes and strategic development are assessed by techniques such as self-assessment, student journals and systematic observation of students’ development. Experts claim it is better to have separate and clear criteria for language and content independently (Bachmann and Palmer 1996). Content and language can be assessed in the same task, but teachers can give separate marks for each component. Content taught in the foreign language should only be tested in the foreign language (Massler, 2011). When deciding on how to assess, teachers need to take into account whether the teaching during that time was focused on language or content and should use assessment tools accordingly (Massler, 2011). A study conducted in Norway aimed at analysing assessment practices of written texts in Norwegian upper secondary education, indicate that teachers correct texts more

than actually assessing them (Svenhard, 2012). The assessment of English should be optional in CLIL settings (Svenhard, 2012), but when language is to be assessed, analytic criteria is the most effective. An analytic criteria such as a rubric shows the students what is expected of them in terms of both language and content. Analytic criteria requires more effort in designing, but is more reliable as an assessment tool for the teacher (Svenhard, 2012). By using assessment criteria, the teachers are more conscious of what kind of feedback needs to be provided and how to give advice to their students. Assessing learner's development fosters learning and motivation. Feedback on student's learning strategies and levels of effort could be done by teachers or student themselves. Effective feedback must focus on the goals for the task, student's progress and advice on what steps the students should undertake in order to make progress (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). This can be achieved through formative assessment, focused and systematic observations, collections of learning documents and use of portfolios. Peer and self-assessment are often used to make learners more independent, because this gives them tools to monitor their own progress. Peer assessment has numerous benefits: to encourage student autonomy, to develop critical judgement by judging the work of others, to gain a sense of ownership of the assessment process, to learn to evaluate their own and their peers achievements, to improve key skills development (critical thinking, communication, self-motivation; time management, etc.) (Massler, 2011). On the other hand, some of the problems with peer assessment include reluctance of students to participate in process, general dislike of assessing/judging friends, time consuming, lack of evaluative/assessment skills.

To assess the students properly, teachers have to set learning objectives. Since the specific objectives of linguistic and non-linguistic subjects are different, setting learning objectives is sometimes difficult. Teachers are often not sure whether to include linguistic goals in non-linguistic subjects or not. Teachers of linguistic and non-linguistic subjects could work together to ensure that the linguistic demands for the students in the content subjects are completely covered (Vázquez and Rubio, 2009). Evaluating linguistic goals should mean only extra-credit for students' marks (Boja, 2016). Since the European CLIL practise puts more focus on the content, CLIL teachers may neglect the importance of setting language objectives and assessing language.

Negative feedback is very uncommon in CLIL classes (Dalton- Puffer, 2007). Absence of formal correction helps students feel more competent and relaxed to engage in a conversation. Learners feel encouraged to involve in any interaction when their language skills are not under scrutiny and constant evaluation (Nikula, 2013). Differences in giving feedback are related to teachers' different kinds of training. Language teachers who teach their second

subject through the medium of English can have the attitude that language mistakes don't matter, or tend to correct more language errors than their non-EFL counterparts (Dalton- Puffer, 2007). Errors should not be ignored, but teachers can create specific opportunities to assess language rather than offer continual corrective feedback which undermines content confidence (Dalton- Puffer et al, 2010). Since the primary focus of assessment is on content, assessment in CLIL is similar to assessment of non-language subjects.

Drawing on the strengths and weaknesses of the CLIL implementation, a study to explore the benefits and challenges perceived by teachers of a private school in Rijeka that is carried out at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Rijeka, Croatia, was made. It is going to be thoroughly explained in the next chapter.

3. THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Aim and Research Questions

The overall aim of the study is to obtain insight into teachers' perspectives on CLIL and explore their experiences of teaching content through the medium of a foreign language. In line with this aim, the study focused on the following questions:

- RQ 1: What are the benefits of implementing CLIL?
What benefits do teachers highlight, referring to both teachers and students?
- RQ2: What are the challenges of implementing CLIL?
What are the challenges of implementing CLIL perceived by teachers, in relation to teachers themselves, students, support provided, materials, role of English vs. the native language and assessment?

3.2 Context

The context where the study took place is a private secondary school in Rijeka which was founded in 2005. The school is rather small and comprises 14 teachers and 58 students in four grades, freshman to senior. Students take 20 obligatory subjects and 3 optional subjects (Ethics, IT, European Civil Society). CLIL was introduced in the school in 2014 with the support of the IPA project “Multilingual education – improving language learning and intercultural skills”. Financial support for the project, obtained through the IPA programme – Human Resources Development, was used for implementing CLIL, translating and buying books, equipping classrooms and financing teacher-training programmes, developing language development courses, and organising teachers’ study visits to Germany and Spain. The aim of the IPA project was to provide the necessary conditions for the systematic introduction of CLIL methodology in the grammar school curriculum, i.e. to use CLIL methodology to teach certain subjects through the medium of English, Italian and German. The project lasted 18 months, from August 2013 to February 2015. The outcome of the project is that, the CLIL approach has been implemented in 8 subjects: Music Art (in German or Italian), Fine Arts, History, Psychology, Politics and Economy, Geography, ICT and Ethics in English.

The school has continued with the CLIL programme even after the project finished.

The CLIL project activities included the following:

- professional development of teachers in the following areas: improving language competencies of the content teachers to teach subjects in a foreign language, Linguae test (to estimate the level of English) organized 2 months before the implementation of CLIL attended by all content teachers (5 teachers), TKT: CLIL test organized by Cambridge English
- training teachers for CLIL methodology and its implementation in the school curriculum: assessment workshop help by a Spanish CLIL expert Maria Jesus Frigols Martin (after the implementation of CLIL) - attended by everyone, CLIL essentials online course (taken by 7 teachers) organized by the British Council
- providing assistance for defining learning outcomes in accordance with the Croatian Qualification Framework corresponding standards,
- training teachers in the use of different e-tools in the educational process: 2 seminars on ICT for the new programmes the school received (Adobe Photoshop and Adobe Captivate)- attended by everyone
- organising study visits to German and Spanish High Schools implementing CLIL
- Peer teaching in XVI. and XVIII. Grammar Schools from Zagreb- attended by everyone
- designing teaching materials (including e-materials for teaching and e-tools)
- organising round tables - opportunities for discussing and sharing of insights, best practice experience and the challenges regarding the wider use of CLIL methodology in Croatian secondary education

Special emphasis was put on the standards of the Croatian education system and Croatian Qualifications Framework, wider use of e-learning, i.e. updating the educational process with the systematic use of information technology and e-tools adapted to the needs of this high school. There were no special recruitment criteria for the teachers imposed by the institution, and participation in CLIL was a matter of self-selection. At the time this study was carried out, CLIL had been implemented in school for 2 years. In this study, all the teachers took the TKT: CLIL test organized by Cambridge English. During the training, 4 content teachers received certificates in English language (B2 or C1), TKT: CLIL certificate and a diploma of CLIL essentials online course. One subject teacher did not take only the CLIL essentials online course because she was already involved on too many project levels. Language teachers took the TKT: CLIL test and the online course CLIL Essentials. Prior to implementation of CLIL, all teachers

attended 2 workshops and seminars organized by dr. Diana Hicks and Lucy Norris, the advisors to CLIL methodology in the British Council and International Study Programmes. Prior to the implementation of CLIL, teachers had the opportunity to visit several primary, secondary and nursery schools in Valencia (Spain) as a part of the study visit. Another visit (to Frankfurt) was organized after the CLIL was already implemented in the school. The organizer and host of the study visit in Frankfurt was professor dr. Britta Viebrock, head of the Department of English and American Studies at the "Goethe-Universitat" in Frankfurt. Teachers attended CLIL teaching in one language high school and in a primary school. Teachers observed teaching practise in politics and business in English in the fourth grade. In elementary school teachers observed numerous subjects, also in English. Teachers also collaborated with the teachers from the Goethe University who are involved in CLIL teaching. Teachers got an insight into how CLIL classes are conducted throughout Germany. The main discussion themes were teaching materials and CLIL certificates. Content teachers teaching in English attended 140 hours of English language held by a school English teacher also involved in CLIL. However, teachers did not get any special training in teaching CLIL in their subject.

3.3. Participants

The study comprises 8 participants, all of them CLIL teachers who teach content courses in the private school. Three participants are male teachers, five of them are female teachers. They have a total of 100 years of teaching experience and their mean age is 39 years. Six teachers teach only one subject in a foreign language, and the two male teachers teach two subjects in English. Teachers teach CLIL classes from first to fourth grade of high school.

All the teachers except three were involved in the IPA pilot project from its very beginnings. Three teachers started working in the school after the project had begun, but before CLIL was implemented. Among 8 teachers, 3 of them have a diploma in the foreign language (English, Italian or German) and 4 teachers have a diploma of the subject. Only one teacher has a dual diploma of both language (English) and the subject. Content teachers have been tested by the Linguae school of foreign languages to assess their level in English language according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Three teachers have a B2 level and two teachers have a C1 level of English. The teachers that have a language diploma in either English, Italian or German have not been tested.

3.4 Research Method

This piece of research is a case study aimed at investigating the CLIL phenomenon within a particular context. According to Bromley (1990), a case study is a “systematic inquiry into an event or a set of related events which aims to describe and explain the phenomenon of interest in real-life context”. A case study focuses on the complexity of a single case, but simultaneously takes account of the context, and so involves many variables and qualities (Johansson, 2003). However, because of the nature of case studies, it is not possible to establish generalizations about the findings of this study, but it can provide in-depth insights about a particular context.

The data in this study is derived from individual interviews with 8 teachers. The data were collected by means of a one-on-one semi structured interview. A semi-structured interview is a method of qualitative research used in the social sciences that allows new ideas to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says (Cohen, 2006). The interviewer uses an interview guide, an informal grouping of topics and questions that the interviewer has to explore, but also has the freedom to stray from the guide when he or she feels this is appropriate (Cohen, 2006).

All the interviews were conducted one-on-one at the school and lasted approximately 45 minutes each. The interviews were conducted in English or Croatian and all were recorded, transcribed and coded. The participants were informed about the questions that would be asked and signed an informed consent form. The names of the interviewees were withheld by mutual agreement and the female gender is used throughout the article as only three of the interviewees were male.

The interview comprised 46 questions organised in 8 parts. The first part consisted of 5 general questions about CLIL methodology, reasons for implementing CLIL, obstacles and benefits and the position of CLIL in the Croatian education system. The second part, consisting of 12 questions, enquired into teachers' competences and qualifications, training in CLIL and difficulties they encounter while implementing CLIL. The third part, comprising three questions, investigated the reasons for introducing CLIL in those particular subjects and curriculum. The fourth part, consisting of 7 questions, elicited information about the materials and the use of ICT in the classroom. The fifth part, comprising 6 questions, investigated the support provided to teachers. The sixth part, consisting of 6 questions, examined the teachers'

perspectives regarding the benefits of CLIL for students and the challenges they encounter in the CLIL classroom. The seventh part, comprising 3 questions investigated the use of L1 in the classroom. The last part consisting of 5 questions, revealed the teachers' opinions on CLIL assessment and feedback.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The eight themes that emerged in this study will be examined in the light of the presented literature review to reach a clearer understanding of CLIL in a specific educational context.

4.1 School context description

All teachers mostly gave the same answers when asked on the reasons for implementing CLIL in their school. Most of them replied the school wanted to be different from all the other schools, boost language development, offer its students something new and interesting that would motivate them and engage in the learning process (also found in Mariño, 2014). Three teachers said the students need to know languages because some of them go to studies abroad (Mariño, 2014) and only three hours a week are not enough to reach a good level of English.

We wanted to be different, we need to invent all the time, most of our kids go to study abroad so they need to know the language. Teacher 5

We thought that nowadays it is crucial to know more languages, and 3 hours a week is not enough to reach a good level of a foreign language. (Teacher 6)Translation

Recruitment criteria for teachers and students

When asked whether there was a recruitment criteria for teachers involved in CLIL programme, the teachers mostly offered the same answers, stating that a B2 level of English was the major criteria (cf. Eurydice, 2006). The younger teachers who wanted to participate in this project gauged that their level of English was adequate for CLIL, and 2 months prior to the implementation of CLIL took the Linguae test (written and oral).

*The criteria was a B2 level, it would have been good that the teachers had a diploma of the language, but that's not necessary, you don't have to be a language teacher (...)
We looked for teachers who were better in English. (Teacher 4) Translation*

There was no special criteria, basically who wanted and thought he could do it... Who wanted to do this had to take the tests. (Teacher 1) Translation

The criteria for teachers involved in CLIL is closely related to the selection of subjects taught in CLIL, but that shall be explained in the section about CLIL subjects.

There was no criteria for the students enrolling CLIL provision. Since the school has only one class per generation, all the students are enrolled in CLIL in every grade and several subjects.

Selection of subjects

The school has the freedom to choose any subject. The selection of subjects in CLIL was, in a way, based on the availability of teaching staff in the school. As one teacher said:

*Every school has those subjects in CLIL for which there are people, you cannot choose a subject that is taught by a 55 year-old woman who doesn't know languages, and it has to be someone young of whom you expect to have a foreknowledge of English.
(Teacher 7) Translation*

From this it would follow that the first criteria is staff availability. Another way decisions are made is in reference to the students. Specifically, when asked why the school chose these subjects, all the teachers said they opted for the ones they considered suitable and easier for the students because the subjects are not obligatory on the matura exam, and these subjects that had fewer hours per week. Since the official recommendations for CLIL subjects include the physical and natural sciences, Geography, History, and Economics (Eurydice 2006), the school opted for subjects in the field of social sciences (as can be seen in table 1).

*We googled the Internet, searched which subjects are the most eligible ones according to the literature, we investigated how it was done outside, we found examples...
(Teacher 1) Translation*

The table below shows the distribution of subjects from first to fourth grade and the language in which these subjects are taught.

Table 1: CLIL subjects from 1st to 4th grade

Teacher	History (in English)	Ethic(in English)	Art (in English)	Music Art in German	Music Art in Italian	Geography (in English)	Politics and Economy (in English)	Information Technology (IT) (in English)	Psychology (in English)
T 1	Only in 4 th grade (3 hours per week)	3 rd and 4 th grade(1 hour per week)							
T 2			1 st to 4 th grade (1 hour per week)						
T 3				4 th grade (1 hour per week)					
T4		1 st and 2 nd grade (1 hour per week)				3 rd grade (2 hours per week)			
T5							4 th grade (1 hour per week)		
T6								1 st to 3 rd grade (2 hours per week)	
T 7									2 nd and 3 rd grade
T8					4 th grade (1 hour per week)				

Source: Made by the student according to the school curriculum and research analysis

CLIL methodology is conducted in English in the first grade in Information technology, 2 hours per week, Fine Arts, 1 hour per week and Ethics, 1 hour per week. Psychology is added in the second grade, 1 hour per week, which makes a total of 5 hours a week. Geography is added in

the third grade, 2 hours per week, due to the availability of a large number of multimedia content in English and the content close to the students. History and Politics and Economy are introduced due to the fact that the content is related to the 20th century so the topics are close and presumed to be relatively well-known to the students. In addition to the two subjects, Music Art in introduced in German or Italian. However, English is the main language of instruction with Music Art offered in both German and Italian so the students may choose.

4.2 BENEFITS OF IMPLEMENTING CLIL

Teacher opinion regarding the benefits of CLIL can be examined from three perspectives, the benefits for students, teachers, and those derived from the implementation process (or the context).

4.2.1 Benefits for the students

All teachers stated that one of the most frequently identified benefits of CLIL is that it creates a natural learning environment (also found in Met, 1998; Marsh and Langé, 1999; Marsh and Marshland, 1999) and that language learning is unintentional.

Language learning happens accidentally, you are not working on grammar structures intentionally, language learning is something that happens along the way depending on the content you are teaching. (Teacher 6) Translation

They also draw a comparison between CLIL and the foreign language classroom and state that learning English in a CLIL setting is much easier for the students because the teachers are not focused on the grammar. Language learning is facilitated since it happens naturally, emerging from the contents the students are dealing with.

I think it's easier for them to speak English in a CLIL class than speak English in a foreign language class because they are not under scrutiny. (Teacher 2) Translation

Language is learnt by speaking, it is not learnt as something that is just being implemented in students' head without logic. To these students the language becomes natural. (Teacher 8) Translation

Students are not aware that they are studying foreign language, they are not focused on the language. (Teacher 5)

In fact, this position has been corroborated by several studies which revealed that CLIL students attain significantly better results in reading comprehension tasks, cloze tests and lexical tests (found also in Zarobe, 2007). These results support the teachers' claims that students in CLIL acquire higher language competency and serve as an evidence the CLIL approach can be more effective than traditional foreign language teaching, a result also revealed by Zarobe, 2007.

CLIL teachers generally agreed on the benefits of implementation and highlighted the following: CLIL motivates students (also found in Coyle, 2006; Grabe and Stoller, 1997; Pavesi et al, 2001) and creates relaxed atmosphere, improves fluency, extends vocabulary (similar to the results obtained by Sprat, 2009).

I noticed they are more motivated for CLIL subjects than the ordinary ones (Teacher 1) Translation

They have wider vocabulary, and they are encouraged more to speak in English. We checked their English grades and they are better. (Teacher 6) Translation

Moreover, teachers confirmed CLIL develops communicative competence (found in Met, 1998; Marsh and Langé, 1999; Marsh and Marshland, 1999).

CLIL is a continuous interaction, it is not a lecture. (Teacher 7) Translation

The goal is to speak English more, English is constantly spinning in the classroom and that's how the students remember the content and structures. (Teacher 6) Translation

The foreign language was introduced gradually in a relaxed atmosphere and students used more L1 in the beginning. Ioannou and Pavlou (2011) suggested foreign language should be introduced in the same way, allowing the students to express themselves in their mother tongue at the beginning. Students gained confidence by gradual introduction and increase of the foreign language, which has been described as desirable and helpful (Ioannou and Pavlou, 2011). Teachers said that at the beginning they had to constantly repeat that making language mistakes won't affect the grade and encourage the students to speak in front of everyone.

They reacted very well, their knowledge of English is actually really good thanks to the Internet, but some were afraid. In the third grade they asked me what this subject in English will look like, but when we started it was not like that anymore (...) At first they don't raise their hands so often, as we proceed with CLIL, they have more courage. (Teacher 3) Translation

Several studies revealed many benefits for the students (Pavesi et al 2001; Coyle, 2010; Lasagabaster, 2011; Chen and Kraklow, 2014; Admiraal et al 2006; Varkuti 2010 etc.). Heras and Lasagabaster (2014) explain CLIL triggers high levels of communication between teachers and learners and among learners themselves. In line with this data, teachers emphasized more benefits for the students. They perceived the students are more interested in the lesson and motivated, they developed their language competence, feel less stressful and made progress in their self- confidence.

I noticed they seem more interested, they showed the will to master the language. They are also more motivated for CLIL subjects, at least I feel they are. (Teacher 1) Translation

They are not focused on the language, they are not aware that they are learning it, and that's why they are not so stressed out. Teacher 5

This is corroborated by research on students' motivation which showed the students in general have positive attitudes towards CLIL and are more motivated in such classes (Coyle, 2010; Lasagabaster, 2011). With respect to this findings, the interview data yielded similar information.

Students that are good in language are more motivated for the subject, and the ones that are good in the subject, then the language forces them to start talking because they know the content but are afraid to speak in English. (Teacher 2) Translation

Some students that were not good in the subject but were good in English are now better and have better grades because they found learning interesting and motivating. (Teacher 6) Translation

The second extract suggests CLIL can be beneficial for both type of students since it engages them in authentic communicative situations, in debates and discussions, similar to what is found in Coyle (2010). The teachers believe the students feel more motivated to learn because they are not exposed to great stress and anxiety since the focus is on communication rather than accuracy (also found in Heras and Lasagabaster, 2014). CLIL curriculum also plays a crucial role since the content is reduced in comparison to the Croatian curriculum. Teachers find this beneficial and motivating for the students:

It's easier for them because the content is reduced and the lessons are always interactive, it's not frontal teaching at all and they find it interesting (Teacher 7) Translation

The teachers in the school witnessed a positive relationship between the amount of exposure through a FL and the linguistic outcomes meaning that students with more exposure through the L2 achieve higher levels of language proficiency on the speech production task (also obtained by Zarobe, 2008).

I notice the evolution from second to third grade(...) They improved in vocabulary, and they dare to talk more in English (...) We monitored their grades in English and they are better. (Teacher 6) Translation

Studies comparing CLIL and non-CLIL student language competencies in relation to standard FL programmes highlighted CLIL strengths in the field of student's written comprehension, reading skills, vocabulary, morphology, pronunciation (Scott and Beadle, 2014, Lasagabaster, 2008, Admiraal et al., 2006, Varkuti, 2010 etc.).

4.2.2. Benefits for the teachers

CLIL creates situations for professional development (Pavón et al., 2005). Three teachers highlighted the benefit of having opportunities for professional development and lifelong learning which they perceive extremely important.

First of all, I received 3 certificates! (Teacher 5)

The development in my English is very important, I am constantly learning. (Teacher 6) Translation

CLIL offers plenty opportunities for collaboration. In the CLIL literature, successful CLIL programme is linked to the degree of teacher collaboration (Coyle, 1999). Moreover, collaboration and plenty of support within teams working in the same school is perceived as one important prerequisite for professional development (Coyle, 2009). In this study, the teachers stated that they cooperate with other school teachers often.

I cooperate with my CLIL colleagues, we share information, mostly tests, exercise types... we are a good team. (Teacher 4)

The teachers indicate that they collaborate in various ways. One very useful aspect is peer review. When observing each other's classes they give each other feedback on the language and clarity of content, but they also discuss on the lesson structure and planning.

Yes, we collaborate, we observed each other classes and talked about how to structure a lesson (Teacher 2) Translation

I collaborate with the English teacher when preparing the materials. We have meetings of CLIL teachers so we share experiences. (Teacher 1) Translation

Moreover, content teachers mentioned collaboration with language teacher in the form of correcting the language and assessing together.

Before I do a lesson I show my lesson plan to the English teacher, she corrects me, and we talk about terminology. (Teacher 8) Translation

This is a good example of language teachers turning to content teachers before preparing a lesson to help them choose and explain the content, if needed. Another example is:

I bother my Music Art professor way too often, I tell him: what is this dodecaphonic scale, could you explain?

Only one language teacher mentioned the collaboration with the subject teacher in a way that they deliberately assess the tests together.

My Music Art colleague and I assess together, I want it to be assessed in this way. Teacher 7, Translation

Their strongest cooperation emerged between the teachers when creating the curriculum and writing language and content objectives.

We did the curriculum together, English teacher helped me write the objectives and corrected them. (Teacher 1) Translation

Since this is a small school, there are more opportunities to collaborate on a daily basis with every teacher. However, the disadvantage of a small school is that there is usually only one professor teaching a particular subject in the school, which sometimes doesn't create enough space and time for frequent cooperation.

ICT

Many schools invest in ICT because ICT is viewed as an effective tool for reviving educational practice (Isisag, 2012). In CLIL this is particularly important as it promotes active learning and highly motivates students, meaning the use of information technology is actually required in CLIL (Kisby, 2011). All the teachers highlighted the importance of ICT saying that nowadays there is no CLIL lesson without ICT. Likewise they expressed several benefits of using ICT in the classroom, similar to what was found in Isisag, 2012; Padurean, 2009; Houcine, 2011. ICT actively engages students in learning, there is no need for writing and access to all materials is simple.

There is basically no writing anymore, smartboard is everything, you are on the Internet, I have everything prepared and I just open it during the lesson. (Teacher 6)
Translation

Teachers mostly use smartboards that were furnished as a part of the project. Other applications used include informational websites, PPTs, e-mail, web platforms, videos (found also in Stevens and Shield, 2009). Several teachers use games, mobile phones and mobile applications, mostly for revising the content.

I use KAHOOT, an online quiz they take on their mobile phone. They have a code, they log in and take the test, I see the answers on the smart board, they love it. (Teacher 3)
Translation

All of the teachers have access to ICT and smartboards. Having in mind that this is a private school and a pilot-project, it is questionable whether high quality ICT materials are available in public schools. Contrary to what Wojtowicz (2009) claims, the teachers didn't notice the students got distracted when using ICT, although they highlighted the importance of an appropriate balance between hands-on and other work (cf. Kisby, 2011).

If used wisely, moderately, they don't exploit it (the ICT), the concentration decreases if you constantly use the same things. (Teacher 1) Translation

Parental concerns

In general, teachers did not confront any problems with parents, nor did the parents express any major concerns regarding (the quality and challenges of) CLIL. However, at the beginning parents were mostly uncertain whether their child knows English that good. As one teacher said:

They asked if their child knew the language enough, but the children grew up with English so it is not a problem. (Teacher 1) Translation

Parents had questions about the influence of CLIL subjects onto matura exam and children overall success (cf. Ioannou and Pavlou, 2008; Marsh, 2010), seen from the example:

They asked: "Will they have this on their matura exam, will it affect their grades, will they learn the content good enough?" (Teacher 1) Translation

However, the teachers claim the parents soon perceived several benefits for their children and completely approve of the CLIL programme. The teachers perceive parents as advocates of the CLIL programme, also obtained by Naves in his study (2008). Furthermore, the teachers have never received any negative feedback from the parents regarding CLIL, but pointed out that more information on this topic is probably available to homeroom teachers, who could have insight into parents' concerns. Given that this study focuses on teachers and their perceptions, the data on parental concerns could not be as reliable as it could have been if I were interviewing parents or class teachers.

4.3 CHALLENGES OF CLIL

Apart from the mentioned benefits and positive effects it has on teaching and learning, CLIL methodology may pose challenges as well. Data on challenges is examined from the perspective of teachers, but referring to the CLIL context, difficulties the teachers themselves face, and challenges posed for students.

4.3.1. Matura and the curriculum

The teachers in this study state that the matura exam could complicate the implementation of CLIL because the content in CLIL classes is reduced in comparison to the content needed to be carried out as proposed by the National Curriculum Framework.

(...) but the obstacle is that we have the matura exam , so if they choose matura in my subject then I need to take into consideration, they need to know all the terms in Croatian. (Teacher 5)

Another issue one teacher emphasized is the discrepancy between National Curriculum Framework and CLIL curriculum. CLIL methodology requires more time while the content is reduced. Nevertheless, the teachers complain that there is still too much content that needs to be covered in line with the National Curriculum Framework. The teachers have to follow the National Curriculum Framework while at the same time decide what content could be avoided, what is a direct evidence of the discrepancy between national exams focused mainly on content and CLIL which aims at diminishing the contents (Serragiotto, 2007). The teachers in this study also express concern regarding the disparity between CLIL and national guidelines, as can be seen from the following extract:

We follow the Croatian curriculum, but we are in an ungrateful position since we are doing the program posed by the Ministry, but in CLIL, and we cannot reduce a lot of content, but it is impossible not to reduce it. (Teacher 2) Translation

The teachers created the curriculum in collaboration with other CLIL colleagues. The major difficulty was to streamline the CLIL curriculum within the National Curriculum Framework. The teachers stated the subjects were poorly correlated in the National Curriculum Framework in the first place, which in turn, created an even more demanding situation when trying to implement the CLIL curriculum into the Croatian context. They explain that the subject teachers have a tendency not to discard any content despite the overloaded Croatian curriculum.

It is hard to explain the teachers to reduce some content, they don't want to avoid anything. (Teacher 7) Translation

The mitigating circumstance is that CLIL curriculum requires the adaptation of content. This however, seems to be a problem in other context as well where content teachers are reluctant to adapt the syllabus to the medium of instruction (Ball, 2013).

The teachers in general were insecure whether the curriculum was designed correctly.

No one told us what to do, no one was sure if we are doing it well. (Teacher 2)

Translation

Adapting the curriculum is even more time-consuming and challenging since the state institutions do not provide extra time in the curriculum for CLIL teachers, although some authors suggest The Ministry should make the curriculum fit with this need for time (Dobson, 2010). Thus, teachers spend extra time adjusting the CLIL curriculum within the national framework.

It was very difficult, to correlate with the mandatory requirements of The Ministry and introduce these changes and modernization. (Teacher 1) Translation

Moreover, they do not seem to be informed about the administrative part of the project.

We had a partner that helped draw up the project, but we made a lot of mistakes also we learned as we proceeded with the implementation, we had too much stuff to do.

(Teacher 6) Translation

When you get the European project you do not know what to do, how to do those 2-month reports, when you see all the things you have to write, from bus tickets, financing... (Teacher 6) Translation

Another problem they face is a general state of oblivion regarding CLIL. When asked about the position of CLIL in the Croatian educational system, all of the teachers stated that CLIL does not exist in Croatia.

It very poor, there is no CLIL in Croatia. (Teacher 4)

There is no position, it could and should be done but nothing by now is done. (Teacher 5)

When asked what could be done for CLIL in Croatia, three teachers proposed CLIL could be promoted by the Ministry and the schools implementing it.

It should be somehow incorporated into the state curriculum, and the ministry should be aware that this exists, but we are a private school and the first one that teaches in CLIL. (Teacher 5)

However, it is interesting to note that the teachers are in general uncertain whether they are the only ones implementing CLIL in Croatia.

There is no CLIL in Croatia except in our school. Zagreb has bilingual schools but CLIL as we have it...there is no school apart from us since the last time we checked. (Teacher 1) Translation

There is this grammar school in Zagreb that has a bilingual programme, but I don't know if any other school has CLIL like we do. I think that maybe one primary school in Rijeka got the Erasmus project for CLIL. (Teacher 3) Translation

This shows that there is a general lack of communication between teachers, the Ministry, Education and Teacher Training Agency (AZOO), and school principals. Furthermore, there does not seem to be available data on CLIL in Croatia.

4.3.2. TEACHER DIFFICULTIES

The aim of this section is to find out about teachers' qualifications and skills, their training experience and difficulties they encounter while conducting CLIL lessons. As for the challenges the CLIL teachers face, they made reference to materials, support needed, language problems, further teacher training and assessment.

Materials

CLIL methodology encourages the use of a wide range of materials: visuals, manipulatives, print and non-print media (Coyle 2009). Commercially produced materials are rarely appropriate for students learning content in a foreign language, often demanding a high level of linguistic proficiency (Met, 1994). Thus, teachers adapt existing materials or develop their own. Although teacher-made materials are designed to meet the students' needs and abilities, they require a considerable investment of teacher time and energy (Met, 1994). All teachers agreed they have to work and prepare more, also found in McDougald (2015), as simple stated by one teacher having a dual diploma:

You have to prepare more and to work more. (Teacher 4)

Although it could seem that teachers with dual diploma would need less time to prepare, this extract shows it is not the case and that CLIL requires more preparation time for all teachers regardless of their diploma in content, language or both. Likewise, in this study, all eight

teachers state they create and adapt materials on their own, sometimes in collaboration with other colleague (language or content teacher).

We invent everything on our own. I search the internet, I have a Croatian book, but you have to adapt all the time. (Teacher 1) Translation

I show my English colleague my lesson plan, but not every time. (Teacher 8) Translation

As mentioned above, the process of choosing and adapting the materials is considered to be one of the biggest challenges they face as CLIL teachers. Interesting, two teachers claim there is even too much material on the Internet, and the problem is that they sometimes get lost while searching. Teachers complain that they spend hours in search of the proper materials, adjusting them and creating activities that actively engage students in the learning process.

When you start surfing the net, you get lost. Sometimes I realize I have been surfing for 2 and a half hours and I still have nothing. (Teacher 7) Translation

It is a challenge, but the biggest problem is finding and preparing the materials (...) I have to prepare all the materials in English, the tests, it takes me too much time. (Teacher 3) Translation

Teachers find the materials on the Internet, use Croatian textbooks prescribed from the Ministry and various English books which were bought using the project funds.

I have a book in English, it is some kind of equivalent to the subject (...) I use these enormous books, like encyclopaedias, I found it on the Internet and we bought it as a part of the project. I have a Croatian textbook, also. (Teacher 6) Translation

Some parts of the Croatian textbooks were translated into foreign languages (either English, German or Italian) and are being used as extra material for the students.

The lack of support is evident even when it comes to choosing the course books, as one teacher pointed out:

It would have been better if someone told us: yes, this book is in CLIL for your subject, but we bought these books on our own (...) these books are not really for CLIL, they are more like encyclopaedias. (Teacher 2) Translation

The teachers also highlighted there are more materials available for primary school than secondary education, and that it is easier to find materials related to certain subjects such as Geography.

When we were talking about CLIL all the experts had examples of primary school. As high school teachers we have a problem (...) (Teacher 5)

There are a lot of materials and Internet pages, it's easier for me because it's Geography. (Teacher 8) Translation

This should be taken with caution since the teacher training mainly focused on primary education, so it may be the reason why the teachers have troubles finding the materials for secondary education. Furthermore, teachers did not find books on CLIL subject-specific methodology, but only general CLIL methodology.

We bought books referring to CLIL methodology, but there are no, at least we did not find the CLIL book for our subjects, these are books related to Fine Arts, and in English but they are not CLIL books. (Teacher 2) Translation

Despite the fact that all teachers choose the materials they will use during instruction, CLIL teachers must add special criteria for selecting materials (Met, 1994) and should make sure to follow some criteria also found in Mehisto (2012). The language should be comprehensible, have a lot of visual scaffolding (also found in Meyer, 2010) and enable creating activities that engage students to learn on their own.

I: How do you choose your materials, what criteria do you follow?

T1: Well, the student has to do something on his own, it (the material) has to have questions that stimulate thinking, scaffolding is important, a lot of visual aids, and the level of the language has to be appropriate. The language shouldn't be too difficult.

Three (2 subject teachers and 1 language teacher) teachers emphasized the biggest criteria they follow when choosing the materials is the average language level of the class and many are developed for the L1 classroom. There are rarely materials the teachers can use without adaptation, and, in the end, students usually learn from teachers' handouts.

I found material on rock music but it was for German students in a grammar school, I cannot take it because the terminology is different, I take it just as an idea (...) There is

*no such thing as finding the material and use it without adapting it. (Teacher 3)
Translation*

Although it requires a lot of time and effort, four teachers expressed that the need for continual exploration and renewal of knowledge was a positive drive.

I find it challenging in a sense I have to do a lot of things by myself, I explore. (Teacher 4)

Teachers admit that decisions regarding materials and experimenting in the classroom does not always yield the desired results.

I decide myself what is suitable, sometimes I do right, sometimes I do wrong. (Teacher 4)

One teacher explicitly said that it wouldn't help if they had a special database from where the teachers could get the materials.

I wouldn't like that. My class is unique, I have to give them what they need (...) All I get is the idea and then you adjust it (...) After all, our programme is not compatible to other European high school programmes, there is no form that I can just copy. (Teacher 7) Translation

In contrast, (two teachers) claim that no obstacles were faced during the implementation of CLIL.

There are no obstacles, I don't feel there are any obstacles. According to me no, but you have to work more. If that is an obstacle, then yes. (Teacher 4)

No obstacles. Everything was perfect. (Teacher 7) Translation

This, however, should be taken with caution since other teachers identified various difficulties, and these teachers had a FL diploma.

Materials need to be scaffolded as one of the principles of CLIL methodology is scaffolding. The scaffolding activities used by the teachers include notes in the margin of handouts, using pictures, writing certain words in frames, breaking material into chunks and giving clues and asking follow-up questions (cf. Švecova, 2011). A CLIL teacher emphasized the use of chunk book, i.e. a notebook where the students write phrases and chunks of the text that they can later use in the context and other sentences.

I have a chunk book but we are not writing words because we think the glossary is not such a good thing to do, it's no good learning a language without sense, so we learn some phrases, chunks which they can use in context. (Teacher 5)

Two teachers agree the glossary is not the most suitable scaffolding tool. The reason for this claim is that it is no good learning a language without sense.

I hate glossary, it's stupid, give the student a word from the context, word alone does not mean much, only if it is in the context. (Teacher 7) Translation

Teacher training needed

These teachers comply to the requirements: they have completed a course or studied the target language, undergone in-service training on CLIL type provision, and have taken a language test, what Gierlinger (2015) found is necessary to be able to conduct CLIL lessons. Teacher training in this case covered several areas proposed by Marsh et al. (2010), such as CLIL fundamentals, content and language awareness, methodology and assessment, learning resources, classroom and CLIL management which was explained above. During the training, teachers developed their competences in several areas, but still expressed their need for further training.

Skills

CLIL teachers need to possess a number of special skills and competences (Scott and Beadle 2014; Pavesi et al., 2001; Mehisto et al., 2008). The interviewees accentuated several skills needed of CLIL teachers, such as the ability to find teaching materials in the second language and adapt them for use in the CLIL classroom, good command of the language used for instruction, planning and organization of lessons according to cognitive demands, knowledge of methodology for integrating both language and content (also obtained by Scott and Beadle 2014, Pavesi et al., 2001 and Mehisto et al., 2008), ability to attend to diverse student needs (found in Griva et al., 2014) and good command of information technology.

I think the most important thing is to understand students' needs and that we have to do as if we were students (Teacher 3) Translation

You need to have the skill of recognizing the student level of English, and adapt in a way that the student who has a lower English level doesn't feel isolated, but actually this should apply also to non-CLIL teachers. (Teacher 6) Translation

Teachers need to adjust themselves first, accept new methods, master the IT and learn how to work with smartboards. (Teacher 1) Translation

It is interesting to note that two teachers stated that all of these skills which are attributed to CLIL teacher, should also be possessed by a non-CLIL teacher, i.e. teachers in general, as well. Apart from the fact that CLIL teachers should possess these skills, this type of teaching should be carried out by teachers with an open mind to teaching, with a non-traditional view of teaching and positive attitudes towards new methodology (Vazquez and Rubio, 2010). Therefore, the interviewees stated CLIL teachers are required to be open-minded, innovative and creative, adaptable to new methods, ready to learn and work a lot and not be ashamed to speak FL.

The teacher needs to be creative and innovative, and not focused on traditional approaches to teaching. (Teacher 2) Translation

She should be open-minded and normal, and not hide behind the title, not ashamed of his ignorance or to speak in a FL. (Teacher 7) Translation

Additionally, some emphasized the need for continuous development is a desired personal trait of CLIL teachers.

The teacher should know the language really well, study the literature, work on himself continuously. (Teacher 8) Translation

Teachers should be ready to study a lot, more than usual, and be open to every criticism, suggestion and life-long professional development. (Teacher 2) Translation

Challenges the teacher confront, such as language problems, choosing the materials, deciding on assessment, using code-switching relate to the quality of teacher training.

Language and subject teachers' difficulties

Language teachers are not trained to teach content in a foreign language and design objectives and outcomes in both areas (also found in Kong, 2009), so the data that language teachers would like to expand knowledge on the content matter does not come as a surprise. Sometimes, the teachers make up for the lack of subject-specific CLIL training by taking courses to improve their teaching. One language teacher enrolled in an online course on Music Art through Coursera webpage organized by the Yale University. The teacher stated:

I am trying to educate myself as much as possible. The course is not so formal and it's free, although you don't get a certificate if you don't pay. (Teacher 3) Translation

The above extract points to the lack of teacher training and suggests much of the personal training is left to teachers themselves and that general training in CLIL does not offer sufficient training in content-specific CLIL methodology direly needed for classroom practice.

When asked whether they felt competent to teach in CLIL without the proper support, one teacher said:

For now I feel competent, I know that I'm not doing by the exact CLIL principles but when I saw what they are doing in Spain and what is their tempo, I realized I'm doing pretty well, and I am very self-critical. (Teacher 6) Translation

This extract suggests that teachers might feel incompetent to implement CLIL because they were not trained enough (Griva et al., 2014), or they need further development. However they realised that teachers in other contexts have similar difficulties and that their progress is rather slow.

The lack of linguistic knowledge creates aggravating conditions for teachers (Vazquez and Rubio, 2010). Teachers who only hold a degree in the respective subject emphasized that they encountered language-related difficulties and expressed the need to develop their language skills. Content teachers claimed to have more language difficulties at the beginning of the project, but are still uncertain whether they are competent to teach the content through the English language (Vázquez and Ellison, 2013).

Everything is a challenge to me, I am still not confident in my competence to teach the content through English with my level. (Teacher 2) Translation

It would appear that in spite of the language training, the teachers who do not hold a foreign language degree, still face challenges when teaching in L2.

Beyond increasing the basic knowledge of the language, content teachers should develop a language consciousness of their own foreign language input as well as expected output from students (Vázquez and Ellison, 2013). Furthermore, in some instances, subject teachers doubt in their own ability to deal with unfamiliar subject content in a foreign language (c.f McDougald, 2015; Reierstam, 2015).

*It was difficult to learn new content. (...) For example, I had to explain what passacaglia is. It took me a while to explain it first to myself, so I can explain to them.
(Teacher 3) Translation*

Teachers believe that a lack of linguistic or content knowledge has a negative impact on instruction. For example, content teachers may have the tendency to emphasize content and neglect language learning (Kong, 2009; Creese, 2005). As an evidence, the majority of content teachers from the study expressed they should probably give more focus on the language.

Evidently the teachers would benefit from continuous language assistance (Scott and Beadle, 2014). Despite the challenges, they do manage to find ways to support each other, as one teacher pointed out:

*If the students are doing the same topic in Psychology and English, then we try to cooperate in a way that she (English teacher) goes into more detail while teaching this particular lesson, she puts more emphasis on some terminology, so that they (the students) already have some vocabulary when they come to my class. (Teacher 6)
Translation*

Regardless of the diploma, three professors want further training in the field of CLIL methodology. One content teacher expressed she would need more training in CLIL methodology in the particular subject she teaches. In this respect, general CLIL training courses are not considered sufficient for developing skills and competences to teach specific subjects. A point often overlooked is that each subject has a subject-specific methodology.

There was a course in Great Britain, professional development in one area. We all attended a general course on CLIL methodology, but I never had an example from my

subject, I would need that. Other teacher experiences would be very helpful to me, because I just don't know who to ask. (Teacher 2) Translation

Several authors (Lyster, 2006; Mehisto, 2008) agree that teacher training needs to ensure that teaching and learning is reflected and experience is processed. Training is perceived more effective if participants are guided in reflecting critically on their own practice (Mehisto, 2008). Interviewed teachers stated self-reflection is something they do on their own when comparing the materials and learning goals from the previous year. They are neither being guided nor they do use any particular self-reflection tool, but write notes to themselves.

It would have been good if there was a self-reflexion portfolio. I write the advantages and disadvantages of my lessons. (Teacher 2) Translation

There is much more that could be done. Although the teachers did not mention this type of collaboration, language teacher may learn about the intellectual demands of the content subject (Vázquez and Ellison, 2013).

4.3.3 Support needed

One important difficulty the teachers mentioned is the lack of support, resulting with teachers' uncertainty about their work effectiveness (Banegas, 2012).

There is no one who can tell you- you have to do this in this way, you are doing this wrong. (Teacher 8) Translation

We do CLIL in our own way, we don't know if it is good. (Teacher 2) Translation

Teachers require several types of support, such as pedagogical (subject or language methodology), linguistic (assistance in language), practical (materials) and psychological (encouragement) (Georgiou and Pavlou, 2011). Teachers report that they lack specific support although they cooperated with the XVIII. Grammar School from Zagreb (a partner in the project, implementing bilingual programme), British Council, institutions in Germany and Spain during the implementation of the project. Teachers reported there was no official support from the Ministry or Agency for Education. In Croatia, there is neither legislation referring to CLIL nor guidelines for implementation.

We didn't have any support because it was a new thing to everyone. We had a partner, XVIII. Grammar School from Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, but from the Ministry- there was no communication, we just asked them to approve what we are doing in CLIL (...) They don't ask much. (Teacher 2) Translation

In general, teachers would need the support of the Ministry. Interestingly, three teachers declared they don't necessarily need the support from the Ministry.

I don't need it /Ministry help/(...) I have plenty of support from my colleagues. (Teacher 4)

Two content teachers expressed their insecurity whether the Ministry has any restrictions or preference referring to the type of teachers who can teach in CLIL, either language or content teachers. They are uncertain whether the Ministry allows the language teachers to work in CLIL and teach a certain subject, since they are primarily language teachers and have not been trained to teach the specific subject.

I don't necessarily need Ministry support, they would maybe forbid me to work, I don't have a subject diploma. (Teacher 3) Translation

One teacher emphasized that the biggest obstacle are teachers themselves who are afraid to speak the language, which seems to be corroborated by the fact that only two of four teachers teaching in English agreed to answer the interview questions in English.

T7: You know what is the hardest part?

I: What?

T7: The teachers are ashamed to speak a foreign language, the students are not the problem, they speak really well. The teachers have a problem, it's in their head. (Teacher 7) Translation

Other desired types of support refer to an expert in CLIL methodology, language assistant in the classroom and a supervision expert.

I would like more development, development should never stop (...) A language assistant would maybe be good. (Teacher 5)

It would have been good if there was one educated person that I can turn to, that knows more than we do, that could direct me to someone else, tell me what book to take (...) Someone who can give me advice at any time. (...) It would have been ideal if there was a person for every subject in CLIL, but it would be enough to have a person for CLIL methodology in general. (Teacher 2) Translation

The idea of a CLIL expert who would bridge the gap between theory and practice presented in the above extract would be of great benefit to all teachers. The role of CLIL coach or supervisor is to support the awareness and development of CLIL teachers in subject specific CLIL methodology and in language development. The CLIL coach may observe lessons, discuss them and give feedback, help CLIL teachers to implement CLIL in their lessons, organize workshops that focus on CLIL methodology, assists in developing a CLIL career plan, suggest courses, assist with language development, help in finding resources and adapting them, or give language-related feedback. However, this kind of supervision is not available.

There is no supervision or anyone that can tell me “you are doing this wrong”, we improvise... (Teacher 2) Translation

The example builds on the notion that CLIL is relevant to the context in which it is implemented, encouraging teachers to experiment according to the demands of their own settings (Coyle, 2007).

Overall, insufficient pedagogical guidance and unclear theoretical framework may result in various misperceptions and uncertainties regarding CLIL implementations (Vazquez and Rubio, 2010). The CLIL approach requires considerable pedagogical and procedural changes in the way the teachers teach. Therefore, teachers need plenty of reflection, support and training to avoid teacher's feeling of uncertainty in the teaching (Vazquez and Rubio, 2010).

Another type of support needed is richer collaboration. One of the prerequisite for successful CLIL education programmes is rich collaboration between linguists and subject teachers within the school (Pellegrini, 2010). However, it is doubtful to what degree there is collaboration with the experts, and the teachers emphasized the biggest support they have is each other.

The biggest support is that we talk to each other all the time. (Teacher 8) Translation

The problem they face is that they don't want to bother other colleagues, either CLIL or non-CLIL teachers, so they try to do as much as possible on their own. Given that this is a small school, many of the CLIL teachers are the only ones teaching a particular subject.

We are a small school so I have no one to ask because I am the only Art professor in the school. (Teacher 2) Translation

Although they reported to collaborate often, teachers generally feel they don't collaborate as much as they would like because of the lack of time. It is also important to note that there is only one English teacher in the entire school and she is not always available when the CLIL teachers need assistance.

Well, we cooperate as much as we can. Unfortunately, the colleague hasn't got much time, we don't have the resources to cooperate as much as we want to. She didn't observe my class, but before I do a lesson I give her my handouts so she can correct me, we talk about glossary... (Teacher 8) Translation

4.3.4 The role of L1

School teachers and students enrolled in CLIL type of provision are allowed to code-switch and use L1 in various contexts for helping students' understanding, boosting debate, telling anecdotes and dealing with disciplinary issues (Butzkamm, 1998, Gierlinger, 2015). Empirical studies of code switching in ESL classroom revealed teachers switch to L1 mainly to manage class and discipline, to create solidarity towards students, to translate unknown vocabulary items and to help students in solving problems (Duff 2002; Levine, 2003). CLIL teachers use L1 for similar purposes. The interviewees explained they use L1 for classroom and task management (used for general announcements such as opening and closing lessons, issuing homework, giving instructions), behaviour management, discussions (found in Gierlinger, 2015) and giving feedback.

I tell them in Croatian when we will have a test, or when I have to explain something in more detail. (Teacher 8) Translation

When they misbehave I admonish them in Croatian. I'm not sure if they would take me seriously if I spoke in English. (Teacher 2) Translation

In the heat of discussions it is hard to stick to English. (Teacher 4)

It is interesting to clarify that even the language teachers switch to Croatian during the discussions. Mother tongue is used as a pedagogical strategy to facilitate students learning and to maximize their engagement in the classroom (Morahan, 2010). Teachers emphasize they are not obliged to use English all the time and that they introduced English gradually. Some

teachers use Croatian more often than others, while some claim they try to speak the foreign language as much as possible.

If they don't know the word in Italian, I tell them the word in Italian, I don't translate (...) You have to scaffold all the time, if the student stops, you tell him (the word). (Teacher 7) Translation

I try to use English as much as possible. If there is a word they did not understand after the introduction of the content, I tell them in Croatian, and sometimes when we need to systemize the content, but only as a repetition, not explaining. (Teacher 1) Translation

When they can't think of the word, but I encourage them to use it more, I won't let them use Croatian all the time. (Teacher 1) Translation

The amount of first language use varies greatly from teacher to teacher. The frequency of code-switching may be related to the teacher's competence in English. Content teachers who do not have a diploma in the language tend to shift more than language teachers. Language teachers scaffold more while the content teachers allow more shifts to L1. One teacher explicitly suggested the frequency of students' use of L1 depends on the teacher's competence:

Teachers shift according to their needs, not the needs of the students (...) The students shift as much as the teacher allows (Teacher 7) Translation

However, the use of L1 also depends on the topic difficult to comprehend. As one subject teacher said:

I do some topics deliberately in Croatian because of the difficult terminology, because when we are doing the brain we do it in Croatian. (Teacher 6) Translation

Clearly, generalizations in relation to code-switching should be taken with caution as some classes have better English students and some teachers feel more competent in English or have a higher level of English. Teachers usually follow the framing pattern of L2 – L1 – L2 (Gierlinger, 2015) and encourage students to fall back on foreign language after using Croatian. Teachers observed the students use L1 mostly in questions, when they cannot think of the English word, and when they are ashamed to speak (Morahan, 2010; Bhooth et al., 2014). The teachers also noticed collaboration and encouragement among students related to code-switching:

The students say “I am shamed now, can I try in Croatian?”, and the others say “Come on, try!”, they encourage each other. (Teacher 3) Translation

All of the findings should be interpreted with caution due to the fact that the study sample is small and that there is not much research dealing with code-switching frequency of separately content and language teachers and the differences in their L1 use.

4.3.5 Assessment

As for assessment, many issues arise as CLIL teachers guide the assessment process and decide on what to evaluate, how and when (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010). Thus, it is necessary to establish clear learning objectives, to use both formal and informal assessment criteria, to familiarize the students with the assessment criteria and to use assessment methods appropriate to the level of students (Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Mariño, 2014). Given that CLIL highlights language problems during class activities, it is important that teachers consider how they correct and give feedback to students (Scott and Beadle, 2014). There are different positions with respect to this question, but European CLIL is focused more on content rather than language (Coyle et al., 2010). The methods used to assess learning outcomes usually depend on local decisions within schools (Coyle, 2009). In line with these discussions, assessment is a key challenge as they are not sure how to assess, what and how. Nevertheless, the teachers expressed they are more interested in the content and usually only assess content. Although the experts claim it is better to have separate criteria for language and content independently (Bachmann and Palmer, 1996), the teachers do not separate language from the content. The majority of teachers give more attention to content, regardless whether they are language or subject teachers.

We are all focused more on content. I assess only the subject but maybe this is not good, but I don't neglect the language. (Teacher 2) Translation

I assess content regardless of my FL diploma. (Teacher 3) Translation

One of the reasons why they put emphasis on the content has been explained by the teachers:

The thing is that you shouldn't frustrate the students, or give them another subject that will test the language also, because the aim of CLIL is not to stress them but make them feel free and encourage them to express themselves. (Teacher 6) Translation

Nevertheless, some of them gave ambiguous answers showing they are uncertainty about what to assess and how.

I assess only the content in the tests, mostly the content, if the language is really bad then it affects the grade (...) I correct the mistakes but they don't affect the grade. (Teacher 1) Translation

What is assessed? We never got the answer to that question, although there were a lot of questions about that, but there are no rules. (Teacher 2) Translation

The reason why subject teachers tend to neglect the language and avoid assessing it may be the lack of teacher training and little knowledge of how language works in their subject (Kelly, 2014). Teachers would give more focus on language if they knew certain activities and techniques for helping students develop the language needed in their subject in English. As opposite to the results obtained by Vazquez and Rubio (2010), teachers did not seem to regard themselves as the only ones having control for linguistic development or foreign language being used as a secondary tool. Content teachers teach content using all the content required to make it understandable, but these teachers might as well omit language elements (Ball, 2013). Considering most CLIL subject teachers have less practice in assessing language than English language teachers, collaboration between content and language teachers is often considered necessary (Svenhard, 2012). However, all the teachers in this study define the assessment criteria and assess by themselves except for one language teacher who emphasized she assesses together with the subject teacher.

My Music Art colleague and I assess together, I want it to be assessed in this way. (Teacher 7) Translation

Content teachers usually ask for language help, while the language teachers seem to seek less help of their colleagues. The analysis shows that the choice of assessing the language is optional (Svenhard, 2012). This is in line with the principles of CLIL, as well as the idea behind pupil satisfaction, which aims to increase student involvement in the subject and improve learning outcomes (Brevik and Moe, 2012). One teacher emphasized she sometimes assesses both language and content, depending on the importance of the topic.

The scales are not the same, sometimes I have a language criteria sometimes I just have content criteria (...) I also asses language (...) it depends of the topic, kid, you need to adjust to a kid, some kids do not understand so good so you need to give them

explanation in mother tongue, you need to create 2 handouts in L1 and L2, or just explain them by retelling the task, you are swimming all the time, you need to adjust all the time. (Teacher 5)

The most neglected aspect of assessment is probably the assessment of students' language skills (Mat, 1994), and all teachers admitted they were aware of the fact that they should include language more.

But we should pay attention to the grammar, for example if there are a lot of adjectives we should make an adjective comparison exercise, but I think of it every now and then, I don't pay that much attention to the grammar but we should, we are more interested in the content. (Teacher 3) Translation

On the other hand, two teachers said the language does affect the grade in some situations, but their answers show they are uncertain when to assess the language and which criteria to use.

If it is really a disaster then you give him a lower grade, but not drastically just because of the language, in CLIL you have to do it really soft. (Teacher 7) Translation

I assess both language and content. (...) Well, I think the content prevails. (Teacher 7) Translation

The teacher is not absolutely convinced what to assess, when and how, maybe due to the fact that we are here dealing with a language teacher that might have the tendency to focus on language.

I never assess language, never. I think it shouldn't be that important to a content teacher, and maybe it is because of the feeling that I am not a language teacher and now I am assessing them, no matter what level of English I have (...) (Teacher 6) Translation

The extract shows the observed preference of content teachers is to neglect language and language objectives and focus more on the content (Moje, 2008). Language teachers gave different answers on assessing the language.

I assess both. Maybe the content more even though I am a language teacher. (Teacher 3) Translation

Just the content, I underline the mistakes but I don't mark them, mistakes don't matter as long as the message is clear. (Teacher 4)

Although it might seem that language teachers would put emphasis on language, it was not the case.

I am not an examiner, I am not that important, I just have to create a situation in which they can speak, it's important that he knows to address the class, to have an attitude and to see what HE will teach US. (Teacher 7) Translation

The extract confirms the role of the language teacher in CLIL setting as a facilitator, helping them to use the language effectively while dealing with content and not becoming a language teacher in the traditional sense (Vázquez and Ellison, 2013), thus not assessing language. On the other hand, the same language teacher expressed her belief that language teachers tend to unconsciously focus on language:

The tendency of CLIL is, and language teachers will have a hard time understanding it because they will always look for the language mistakes, and CLIL shouldn't do that, it has to liberate the student to talk so they don't even notice they are learning another language. (Teacher 7) Translation

The last extract shows language teachers may have difficulty neglecting the language more than they would in a FL class.

My colleague and I <both language teachers> constantly remind each other not to exaggerate with language. (Teacher 7) Translation

Speaking of lexical or pronunciation errors, they should not be ignored (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010), but treated in a more relaxed way than in FL classroom.

I sometimes correct my students, some terminology that is important, but if I correct all the time it makes no sense (...) They feel more relaxed than on a FL class because there is no grammar. (Teacher 3) Translation

This lack of formal correction helps learners to feel more relaxed in using the foreign language because learner language skills are not under constant evaluation in the same way as in language lessons, also found in Nikula (2013). However, individual teachers differ in their attitude towards language problems in the CLIL classroom. Since the teachers primary focus

on content, assessment in CLIL can be similar to assessment of non-language subjects. Teachers use a mix of assessment techniques: written assignments, essays, peer –teaching, projects, quizzes and classroom observation, also found in Oscarson and Apelgren (2011). They rarely use oral tests since they are time-consuming and create stressful situations.

*I have essay questions because it's important to me that the student can express himself.
(Teacher 2) Translation*

I use written tests, I monitor who is active (...) I am very subjective (...) The criteria is flexible, but in CLIL it has to be. (Teacher 3) Translation

Two teachers stated there are no oral exams. The conclusion can be drawn to Dalton-Puffer (2011) claims on discourse style in CLIL as being problematic because of the use of simple and short sentences. Other types of assessment include portfolios of student work (projects), systematic observation of classroom performance, and consultations with students about their assignments and projects (also found in Mat, 1994). Peer and self-assessment are used by few teachers, and some teachers even encourage students to assess the teacher's lesson and teacher work.

They can explain in their own words for example I learnt this, I know that, I should have learnt that, you should give me more this or you were great... (Teacher 5)

*They tell me "I liked the class today", or I ask them "What do you think of this topic?"
(...)I use peer assessment and they asses even me, my work. (Teacher 7) Translation*

Peer and self-assessment is mostly used when students present to others.

Sometimes I use peer- assessment, they assessed others at the end of the lesson with arguments (...) I don't use it often because it takes a lot of time. (Teacher 6) Translation

The use of L1 and assessment are highly related, meaning that the content taught in the foreign language is tested in the foreign language and vice versa, following Massler (2011). It is often impossible to detect a boundary between repairing content and repairing the way it is linguistically expressed (Dalton- Puffer, 2008), but teachers often assess highly subjectively and do not use clear criteria.

I say that I will give them a lower grade if they don't write the test in German, I assess subjectively. One student is not so good, and if I say to him that everything needs to be in German and he knows the content...How could I do that? The criteria is flexible, but you have to be flexible... (Teacher 3) Translation

Teachers also report they sometimes have difficulty determining whether students fail to perform as expected because they have not mastered the content or because they lack the linguistic resources to demonstrate it (cf. Met, 1994), as seen in this extract:

Every criteria is hollow, in CLIL you have to do everything softly in a written form. When there is an oral exam, the student has a lot of posters on the wall, he can use everything, you are not sure if he is reading or he really learnt it but at least he knows where it is written, some don't. (Teacher 7) Translation

Different teachers mentioned different assessment techniques, such as written tests, essays, projects group work, pair work. To avoid creating difficult assessment criteria, teachers mostly use rather simple exercises such as matching exercises, fill in the gaps, true- false statements, multiple choice tests. These items provide opportunities for students with limited language abilities to demonstrate their content knowledge (Met, 1994). Since the teachers are still confused on what and how to assess, one teacher expressed it is important to know how to avoid such situations:

I never give them essays, they don't write a lot, they match, as a professor you have to know and find the way out of it. (Teacher 7) Translation

We do tests, we use matching exercises, fill in the gaps. (Teacher 5)

Lesson planning requires teachers to think about how language and content objectives will be assessed (Met, 1994). Decision on setting learning, especially language objectives, without a doubt causes most controversy among teachers (Vázquez and Ellison, 2013) and it is easier to define the former (Becher et al., 2013). For everyday classes, teachers rarely write language objectives due to the fact it is time-consuming.

I don't write lesson preparation. I don't have time. I wrote the objectives on several samples, but no... I have enough work to create materials, above all. (Teacher 2) Translation

The need for teacher training and CLIL lesson planning plays an important role in the teaching-learning process (Mariño, 2014). Interestingly, the issue of writing lesson plans come into light

with the mention of content and language objectives. This topic seems highly controversial as one teacher stated:

We write the formal lesson plan in Croatian, we also write in English but not so formal, with the objectives and all... (...) The Ministry does not require lesson plans in English, but in Croatian. (Teacher 2) Translation

It would appear that the teachers need to focus more on the language development of their students and consider the “academic language needed for successful mastery of subject matter instruction (content-obligatory language), the language needs of students in future content lessons, and the language demands beyond the classroom (content-compatible language)” (Met, 1994). Language objective should thus be included in lesson plans as well.

Every lesson plan has to have a language objective, although we are not focused on them. But there has to be at least one. (Teacher 2) Translation

The discrepancy between the national system and CLIL is evident also in the area of lesson plans. How the teachers claim, they write the formal lesson plans because it is required of the Ministry, although they carry out the CLIL lesson in a different manner than the Croatian one.

The lesson plans are different in CLIL. I do my personal preparation in English, but the formal one... I do it in Croatian. But it is because the Ministry doesn't require the lesson plans in English We are not doing our lesson following the lesson plan in Croatian, it is a double task. (Teacher 2) Translation

The importance of effective feedback to students on the content and language is often mentioned in CLIL methodology (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Some teachers admitted they do not give feedback as often as they should. One teacher said she doesn't use feedback due to her opinion that the students are not interested in other types of feedback except from grades. Some teachers indicated they use feedback every class, others after every unit (similar to the findings by Met, 1994). Teachers mostly give feedbacks during class, not individually.

We do it all the time, there are 10-15 of us in every class, there is no monologue, only dialogues (Teacher 8) Translation

I tell them immediately: "This time you were not active", for example. You can't talk to everyone in the same moment but when something was good I tell them. (Teacher 7)

Translation

The extract shows feedback can be practised frequently due to the fact this is a small private school, which would be a limitation if implementing CLIL in a large public school with more than 25 students in the class. Few teachers mentioned they use peer and self- assessment, but not often since it is time-consuming.

The data shows it is very difficult to separate content and language in assessment and teachers are not confident of their assessment competence. Overall, the majority of answers were blurry and depended on the teacher beliefs and practise, proving there is no criteria and the teachers decide on their own depending on the context, content complexity or specific situation. Hence, all of the evidence presented should be carefully discussed. Moreover, it was difficult obtaining data dealing with assessment tendencies of separately language and content teachers. It would be necessary to design assessment instruments that incorporate both content and language criteria (Reierstam, 2015). Developing these instruments means a challenge and an invitation to educationalists and researchers to raise the language awareness among teachers and to define its role in learning and assessment (Reierstam, 2015). Assessment and planning of feedback can establish evidence of the effectiveness of CLIL in schools and classrooms. Moreover, it can provide a basis for understanding of good practices and guidance for schools and educational communities engaged in a CLIL context (Kiely, 2009).

4.3.6 Challenges for the students

Apart from the benefits, some research showed learning in L2 rather than L1 may lead to weaker performance on exams, slow advancement in subject, lower self-perception and self-esteem and less classroom participation (Sprat, 2009). Teachers admitted the students confronted such difficulties, especially language ones, deprecation because of writing tests in English, doubt whether they would have been better if the subject was in Croatian, and insecurity because of the matura exam.

Some think they would have been better if it was in Croatian. (Teacher 3) Translation

They don't have negative aspects but the obstacle is that we have the matura exam, so if they choose matura in IT then I need to take into consideration. (Teacher 5)

There are no special obstacles, but some complain: “Oh, Why does it have to be in English?” (Teacher 6) Translation

The teachers claim the students were at first afraid of this type of teaching and lacked the courage to speak in the classroom.

Some were scared, they were doubtful whether they could follow the class in English. (Teacher 1) Translation

At the beginning they did not raise their hands often during the class, but now they do, they are encouraged. (Teacher 3) Translation

Similarly to what Bonnet (2012) and Coyle (2010) observed, teachers noticed the students experienced a slower progress at the beginning. However, there are still students that need extra help because of their low level of English. In this case, teachers use more scaffolding techniques, translate parts of the material and allow students to write the tests in Croatian.

Some believe they would have been better if it was in Croatian, but then you have to let them write tests in Croatian if they don't know how to express themselves. (Teacher 3) Translation

For them, the biggest problem was examination and writing, some of them weren't sure if they could follow the lesson in English, it is easier just to listen than reproducing it, but they are getting better (Teacher 1) Translation

It should be noted, however, that the above are students' difficulties as perceived by the teachers. Given that the study is primarily concerned with teacher difficulties, the findings related to students' challenges would be more credible and extensive if they were corroborated by the students. Nevertheless, the study has revealed interesting data, which would merit further investigation.

Overall, the study has identified some of the interrelationships of various factors affecting CLIL. The findings have shed light on the benefits and challenges of CLIL, revealed teachers' experiences, and highlighted the need for improved planning by government authorities.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

By changing the medium of instruction, CLIL imposes increased organisational and cognitive demands on both educators and students. Since educators shift from their current practices to those favoured by the CLIL approach, the implementation of CLIL often causes various challenges. This has multifaceted implications for both teachers and students, which need to be recognised, discussed and addressed by CLIL experts, state institutions and stakeholders.

This study has attempted to investigate educational practice of the CLIL context and to analyse the challenges posed by CLIL from teachers' perspective. The findings show various benefits and challenges that arise during the implementation of CLIL. It focuses heavily on the perspective of teachers and their view on the benefits and challenges they perceive. The results suggest that teachers face more difficulties than advantages, but overall are proud to be a part of CLIL. More specifically, key findings of this study reveal that teachers confront major difficulties in finding the materials, correlating the curriculum with the National Curriculum Framework and assessing the students. Moreover, they need further support in teacher training and more collaboration within the school and national institutions, CLIL coaches and supervisors. Other findings reveal that there are differences between subject and language teachers with respect to the language and content-related challenges, available support, frequency of use of L1 during CLIL lessons and problems faced when assessing students. Additionally, the research has shed light on teachers' uncertainties in their role as successful implementers of CLIL. The reasons for that lies in the fact that they receive little guidance, they are not supervised and they lack information about other schools offering CLIL in Croatia. To my knowledge, there are only two schools implementing CLIL in Croatia. Secondly, CLIL literature in the Croatian context encompasses no studies on CLIL or teachers' perspective on CLIL. Although this study reports these uncertainties that teachers have described in the process of CLIL implementation, it would not be fair to leave unsaid that these teachers in the Croatian context have also showed a very positive attitude towards their challenge and made an enormous effort to make CLIL happen. The results obtained in this study coincide with

those obtained by Vazquez and Rubio (2010), who suggests that when there is a will, there is a way.

However, it is worth mentioning that the study is based on a small sample composing only 8 teachers as they are the only ones involved in CLIL in Rijeka. Therefore, future research could be expanded by examining CLIL teachers from various Croatian schools. Further aspects that could be investigated in more detail are, for example, the difference between language and subject teachers' use of methods of assessment or the use of code-switching. In like manner, it would be useful to examine students' perspectives and compare and contrast them with the teachers' perspectives. In other words, students' experiences of CLIL would help paint a more complex picture of the phenomenon. Moreover, research could focus on how a specific content affects CLIL methodology. However, the study can help to understand the complexity of CLIL educational change.

This study has pedagogical implications for schools implementing CLIL programs. The study may propose conditions for successful CLIL, emerged from the data and teacher proposals. Furthermore, the results of the present study could be used comparatively for further research with other national contexts in which CLIL has already been introduced. As Spratt (2009) also proposes, it should be invested in the long-term language training of teachers, in training teachers in specialist pedagogy for working with low-L2 learners, re-orient training of language teachers towards teaching of language for subject learning, develop a national centre of expertise in teaching subjects through L2, write textbooks with L2-medium learners in mind, do small scale piloting of CLIL in a small number of schools to develop policy and practice, scale up implementation of CLIL when sure it is working. Finally, a greater involvement and coordination of efforts by CLIL stakeholders working as professional learning communities is crucial for supporting schools who decided to implement CLIL. As Mehisto (2008) proposed, a central body responsible for CLIL programme coordination also makes an important contribution to programme development. An interesting suggestion was made by Clegg (2009), who stated:

“Spend a lot of money and give yourself 10 years for it to succeed!”

In spite of the suggestions, there is no single recipe for CLIL and as Vazquez and Ellison claim (2013), success depends on a thorough analysis of context, an evaluation of needs and human and material resources available. As a final remark, I would like to argue that there is a

great need for further research and training that would help CLIL stakeholders to address the multiple interrelated factors which contribute to or detract from successful implementation of CLIL programmes.

REFERENCES

- Admiral, S.W., Lafleur, P.M. and Roulet, N.T. (2006). Controls on latent heat flux and energy partitioning at a peat bog in eastern Canada. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 140(1), pp.308-321.
- Adrián, M.M., del Puerto, F.G. and Mangado, J.G. (2013). Phonetic and syntactic transfer effects in the English Interlanguage of Basque/Spanish Bilinguals. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, pp.51-83.
- Apsel, C. (2012). Coping with CLIL: Dropouts from CLIL streams in Germany. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(4), pp.47-56.
- Bachman, L.F. and Palmer, A.S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Ball, P. (2013). Language, concepts and procedures: Why CLIL does them better!
<http://www.onestopenglish.com/clil/methodology/articles/article-language-concepts-and-procedures-why-clil-does-them-better/500731.article>. Webpage. Accessed March 12, 2016
- Ballman, T.L. (1997). Enhancing Beginning Language Courses through Content-Enriched Instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(2), pp.173-186.
- Banegas, D. L. (2012). CLIL teacher development: Challenges and experiences. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 5(1), 46-56.
- Bernabé, M.M. and Mateos, L.M.F., 2013. The Effects of CLIL from the Perspective of In-service Teachers in Salamanca (Castilla y León, Spain). *Exedra: Revista Científica*, (8), pp.200-217.
- Bernabé, M.M. and Mateos, L.M.F. (2013). The Effects of CLIL from the Perspective of In-service Teachers in Salamanca (Castilla y León, Spain). *Exedra: Revista Científica*, (8), pp.200-217.
- Bertaux, P., Coonan, C.M., Frigols-Martín, M.J. and Mehisto, P. (2010). The CLIL teacher's competences grid. *CLIL Cascade Network*.
- Bhooth, A., Azman, H. and Ismail, K. (2014). The Role of the L1 as a Scaffolding Tool in the EFL Reading Classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, pp.76-84.
- Bonnet, A. (2012). Language, content and interaction: How to make CLIL classrooms work. *Quality interfaces: Examining evidence & exploring solutions in CLIL*, pp.172-189.
- Brevik, L.M. & Moe, E. (2012). Effects of CLIL teaching on language outcomes. In: Tsagari, D. & Csepes, I. (eds.), *Collaboration in Language Testing and Assessment*. Frankfurt, Peter Lang.
- Bromley, P.D. (1990). Academic contributions to psychological counselling. 1. A philosophy of science for the study of individual cases. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 3(3), pp.299-307.
- Brüning, C.I. and Purrmann, M.S., 2014. CLIL pedagogy in Europe: CLIL teacher education in Germany. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, (27), p.315.

- Brüning, C.I. and Purrmann, M.S., 2014. CLIL pedagogy in Europe: CLIL teacher education in Germany. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, (27), p.315.
- Cattaneo, C. (2013). Core Features of CLIL Methodology. Webpage. <https://prezi.com/c1qr17ilkjy6/core-features-of-clil-methodology/> . Accessed February 1, 2016.
- Chambers, G.N. (1999). *Motivating Language Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Clegg, J. (2007). Providing language support in CLIL. Webpage. http://ateneu.xtec.cat/wiki/form/wikiexport/_media/cmd/llc/clpi/modul_2/language_support_clegg.pdf, Accessed May 1, 2016.
- Clegg, J. (2009): Skills for CLIL. Webpage. <<http://www.onestopenglish.com/clil/methodology/articles/article-skills-for-clil/501230.article>>. Accessed April 21, 2016
- Cohen, D. and Crabtree, B. (2006). *Qualitative research guidelines project*. New Jersey: Rober Wood Johnson Foundation.
- Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe. (2006). Eurydice European Unit. Brussels, European Commission. Webpage. <http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/eurydice/CLIL_EN.pdf> Accessed February 3, 2016
- Coyle D., Hood Ph., Marsh D. (2010). *CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coyle, D. (1999). Theory and planning for effective classrooms: Supporting students in content and language integrated learning contexts. *Learning through a foreign language*, pp.46-62.
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 543-562.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., Marsh, D. (2010). *WHAT IS MEANT BY CONTENT LEARNING?* Webpage. <<https://sites.google.com/a/xtec.cat/clil-principles/content-learning>> Accessed February 5, 2016
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL. Content and language integrated learning*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Coyle, et al. (2009). *Towards an integrated curriculum – CLIL National Statement and Guidelines*.
- Creese, A. (2005). *Teacher collaboration and talk in multilingual classrooms* (Vol. 51). Multilingual Matters.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). *Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): current research from Europe*.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T. and Smit, U. eds. (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms 7*, John Benjamins Publishing.
- Davies, J. and Brember, I. (2001). The closing gap in attitudes between boys and girls: A five year longitudinal study. *Educational Psychology* 21, 103-115.

- Dobson A., M. D. Perez Murillo, Johnstone, R. (2010). British Council and Ministry of Education, Spain (<http://www.britishcouncil.org/spain/sites/default/files/pdfs/bep-ingles.pdf>, Accessed May 1, 2016
- Dobson A., M. D. Perez Murillo, R. Johnstone. (2010). British Council and Ministry of Education, Spain (<http://www.britishcouncil.org/spain/sites/default/files/pdfs/bep-ingles.pdf>, Accessed May 1, 2016
- Drápalík, M. (2013). Content and Language Integrated Learning with ICT using the Interactive Whiteboard. Prague: Charles University.
- Duff, P. (2002). Research approaches in Applied Linguistics. In R, Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 13-23). New York: Oxford University Press.
- First European Survey on Language Competences. European Commission. SurveyLang. Webpage http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/language-survey-final-report_en.pdf . Accessed April 22, 2016
- Gajo, L. and Serra, C., (2002). Bilingual teaching: Connecting language and concepts in mathematics. *Education and society in plurilingual contexts*, pp.75-95.
- Genesee, F. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerakopoulou, O. (2011). Scaffolding oral interaction in a CLIL context: A qualitative study.
- Gierlinger, E. (2015). 'You can speak German, sir': on the complexity of teachers' L1 use in CLIL. *Language and Education*, 29(4), 347-368.
- Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Heras, A. and Lasagabaster, D. (2014). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*.
- Hönig, I. (2009). *Assessment in CLIL* (Doctoral dissertation)
- Houcine, S. (2011). "The effects of ICT on learning/teaching in a foreign language". Webpage, http://www.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2011/common/download/Paper_pdf/IBL69-437-FP-HoucineICT4LL2011.pdf, Accessed April 7, 2016
- Spratt, M. (2009). CLIL and EFL Side by Side .Webpage, <http://www.fcsh.unl.pt/docentes/cceia/images/stories/PDF/tefl2/sprat-clil-and-efl-side-by-side.pdf>, Accessed April 10, 2016
- Keith Kelly - Ingredients for successful CLIL. Webpage, <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/keith-kelly-ingredients-successful-clil-0> Accessed April 12, 2016
- Ioannou-Georgiou, S., Pavlou, P. 2011. *Guidelines for CLIL Implementation in Primary and Pre-Primary Education*. PROCLIL.
- Isisag, K. 2012. The positive effects of Integrating ICT in foreign language teaching. International Conference "ICT for language learning" 4th Edition. Webpage, <http://conference.pixel->

online.net/ICT4LL2012/common/download/Paper_pdf/235-IBT107-FP-Isisag-ICT2012.pdf,
Webpage. Accessed April 10, 2016

- Jeynes, W.H., 2005. A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban education*,40(3), pp.237-269.
- Johansson, R. (2003). Case study methodology. In *the International Conference on Methodologies in Housing Research, Stockholm*. Webpage,
http://www.psyking.net/HTMLObj-3839/Case_Study_Methodology-Rolf_Johansson_ver_2.pdf, Accessed May 25, 2016
- Kiely, R. (2008). *CLIL –The question of assessment*. Webpage,
<http://www.unifg.it/sites/default/files/allegatiparagrafo/20-01-2014/kiely_r_clil_assessment.pdf >Accessed February 3, 2016
- Kirubahar, J.S., Subashini, A. and Santhi, V.J., 2011. ICT Enabled Language Learning Using Handphones-An Experimental Study. *Language in India*,11(3).
- Kisby, N. (2011). “The Role of ICT in EFL Teaching: An action research project with young learners.
- Kong, S. (2009). Content-based instruction: What can we learn from content-trained teachers’ and language-trained teachers’ pedagogies? *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 66(2), 233-267.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2015). Different educational approaches to bi-or multilingualism and their effect on language attitudes. In *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments* (pp. 13-30). Springer International Publishing.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers’ perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 6(2), 1-21.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), pp.3-18.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1(1).
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: report of a questionnaire study. *Mod Lang J*, 87, 343-364.
- Lyster, R., Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 269-300.
- Maljers, A., et al. (2010). *Diverse Contexts – Converging Goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Mariño, C. M. (2014). Towards implementing CLIL at CBS (Tunja, Colombia). *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 16(2), 151-160.
- Marsh D. (2000). *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*, Jyväskylä, University of Jyväskylä, Langé G. (ed.).
- Marsh, D., & Langé, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Implementing content and language integrated learning: A research-driven TIE-CLIL foundation course reader*. University of Jyväskylä, Continuing Education Centre.
- Marsh, D., & Marshland, B. (1999). *Learning with languages*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Marsh, D. et al. *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education*. *European Centre for Modern Languages*.

- Marsh, D. Frigols, M. Mehisto, P. & Wolff, D. (2010). The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education, Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages, Council of Europe.
- Massler et al. (2011). Effective CLIL Teaching Techniques in *Guidelines for CLIL Implementation in Primary and Pre-Primary Education*, eds S Ioannou-Georgiou & P Pavlou.
- Massler, U., Ioannou-Georgiou, S. and Steiert, C. (2011). Effective CLIL Teaching Techniques. *Guidelines for CLIL Implementation in Primary and Pre-primary Education*, p.66.
- McDougald, J. (2015). Teachers' attitudes, perceptions and experiences in CLIL: A look at content and language. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 17(1), 25-41.
- McKay, P. (2006). *Assessing Young Language Learners*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Mehisto, P. (2012). *Excellence in Bilingual Education: A Guide for School Principals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mehisto, P. (2012). Criteria for producing CLI learning material. *Encuentro* 21: 15-33.
- Mehisto, P. and Genesee, F. (2015). *Building Bilingual Education Systems*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL counterweights: Recognising and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), pp.93-119.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., Frigols, M. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Macmillan: Oxford.
- Merisuo-Storm, T. (2011). Literacy skills and learning attitudes in bilingual education. *Education in Finland*.
- Met, M. (1994). Teaching Content Through a Second language. In Genesee, F. (ed) *Educating Second Language Children: The Whole Child, the Whole Curriculum, the Whole Community*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 159-182.
- Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. *Multilingual Matters*, pp.35-63.
- Meyer, O. (2010). Introducing the CLIL-pyramid: key strategies and principles for quality CLIL planning and teaching. *Basic issues in EFL teaching and learning. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag*, pp.11-29.
- Moje, E.B. (2008). Foregrounding the Disciplines in Secondary Literacy Teaching and Learning: A Call for Change. In: *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52, 2, pp. 96-107
- Morahan, M. (2010). The use of students' first language (L1) in the second language (L2) classroom. Retrieved April 30, 2106.
- Navés, T. (2009). Effective content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes. *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*, pp.22-40.
- Network, E., (2006). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe.
- Oscarson, M. and Apelgren, B.M. (2011). Mapping language teachers' conceptions of student assessment procedures in relation to grading: A two-stage empirical inquiry. *System*, 39(1), pp.2-16.
- Padurean, A. and Margan, M. (2009). Foreign language teaching via ICT. *Revista de Informatica Sociala*, 7(12), pp.97-101.
- Paran, A., (2013). Content and language integrated learning: Panacea or policy borrowing myth?. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(2), pp.317-342.
- Pavesi M. et al. (2001). Teaching through a foreign language. Webpage. www.ub.edu/filoan/CLIL/teachers.pdf, Accessed February 19, 2016

- Pavesi, M. Bertocchi, D. Hofamannova M. & Kazianka, M. (2001). CLIL Guidelines for Teachers, TIE CLIL, Milan.
- Reierstam, H. (2015). Assessing Language or Content? A comparative study of the assessment practices in three Swedish upper secondary CLIL schools.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y.R. (2008). CLIL and Foreign Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study in the Basque Country. *International CLIL Research Journal* 1.
- Scott, D., Beadle, S. (2014). *Improving the effectiveness of language learning: CLIL and computer assisted language learning*. ICF International.
- Serragiotto, G. (2007). Assessment and evaluation in CLIL. *Diverse contexts—Converging goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Stevens, A. , Shield, L. (2009). *Study on the impact of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and New Media on Language Learning – Annexe I*. Ellinogermaniki Agogi, Webpage. Accessed April 15, 2016.
- Švecová, L. (2011). *CLIL in Very Young Learners*: Diploma Thesis. Brno : Masaryk.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), 36- 43. Webpage.http://www.labschool.pdx.edu/PD_Mini_Modules/images/8/81/MorahanL2inL1classes.pdf, Accessed April 30, 2016
- Nikula, T. , Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A. (2013). CLIL classroom discourse. *Journal of Immersion & Content-Based Language Education* 1, 70–100.
- Várkuti, A. (2010). Linguistic benefits of the CLIL approach: Measuring linguistic competences. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(3), pp.67-79.
- Vázquez, B.M. (2014). Lexical transfer in the written production of a CLIL group and a non-CLIL group. *International Journal of English Studies* 14 (2): 57-76.
- Vázquez, V. P., & Ellison, M. (2013). Examining teacher roles and competences in content and language integrated learning (clil). *Linguarum Arena: Revista do Programa Doutoral em Didáctica de Línguas da Universidade do Porto*, 4.
- Vazquez, V.P., Rubio, F. (2010). “Teachers’ Concerns and Uncertainties about the Introduction of CLIL Programmes”. *Porta linguarum* 14: 45-58.
- Wewer, T. (2014). *Assessment of young learners’ English proficiency in bilingual content instruction CLIL*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Turku.
- XVII. gimnazija Zagreb. Webpage. http://www.gimnazija-osamnaestazg.skole.hr/nastava?ms_nav=aad Accessed March 14, 2016

APPENDIX

University of Rijeka
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

This interview is part of a research on teachers' perspective on CLIL as part of the thesis under the mentorship of prof. Ph. D. Irena Vodopija- Krstanović, in the second year of graduate study of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Rijeka.

The data obtained in this interview will be used solely for the purposes of this research and not for any other purpose. Please answer the questions honestly, not thinking about the "desirable" response. The interview will be recorded on an audio recording device. Respondents' anonymity is guaranteed.

Thank you for your trust and consent to participate in the research.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What makes CLIL language learning different from language learning in a foreign language?
2. What are the reasons for implementing CLIL in your school?
3. What are the obstacles to CLIL implementation in that school?
4. What are the benefits to CLIL implementation in that school?
5. What is the position of CLIL in the Croatian education system? What could be done?

TEACHERS DIFFICULTIES

1. What are the challenges of CLIL for you as a teacher/ what difficulties do you face when teaching through CLIL?
2. What skills are required of CLIL teachers?
3. What skills do you lack of?

4. What was the recruitment criteria for teachers?
5. What qualifications and competences do you have to teach CLIL?
6. How were you trained to teach CLIL?
7. Did you spend a certain period of time in a country in which the CLIL target language is spoken?
8. What level of English do you have (B1, 2, C1, 2)?
9. Were you obliged to take some exams to prove your level or develop your language skills?
10. In what ways do you cooperate with language /content teacher?
11. Do you have financial or other benefits for teaching CLIL?

SUBJECTS TAUGHT THROUGH CLIL

1. Why does the school teach those particular subjects in CLIL?
2. How did the school choose the subjects/ Who had chosen the subjects?
3. Who created the CLIL curriculum and how?

MATERIALS IN CLIL

1. Who creates the materials? What books do you use?
2. How do you choose your materials?
3. Where do you find suitable resources at the appropriate level?
4. How difficult is it to create your own materials?
5. Do you create materials in cooperation with someone else?
6. How often do you use ICT in your lessons and what forms of ICT do you use the most?
7. What do you think of using ICT in your lessons?

SUPPORT

1. What kind of support was offered during the implementation of CLIL?
2. What kind of support is given to teachers?
3. What kind of support would you need and from whom?
4. What are the major parents' concerns regarding CLIL? In what way do they support CLIL?
5. What support do you get from the Ministry and AZOO?
6. Are you supervised by the Ministry/AZOO?

INTRODUCING CLIL TO STUDENTS

1. What was the criteria for students enrolling CLIL classes?
2. How do students react to CLIL and learning in another language?
3. What negative aspects of CLIL the students usually highlight?
4. What are the benefits of CLIL for the students?
5. Are the students more motivated?
6. How do more hours in English relate to students' overall performance in a FL, i.e. do they perform better on English language exams and in which areas?

THE ROLE OF L1 IN THE CLIL CLASSROOM

1. How often do you use L1 in your classes?
2. When do students use L1?

3. When do teachers use L1?

ASSESSMENT IN CLIL LEARNING

1. Who evaluates in CLIL- the teacher of the discipline or language teacher or together?
2. What is evaluated and how?
3. Are the students familiar with the assessment criteria?
4. What difficulties do you face when setting learning objectives (both content and language)?
5. How often do you give feedback?