

Putting CLIL into practice in different educational contexts; Italy, Spain, Turkey, and the Czech Republic

Gamze KORBEK^{1*}  Janet WOLF² 

¹Pre-primary and Primary Education, Education Faculty, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic.

²Pre-Primary and Special Education, Education Faculty, University of Hradec Králové, Hradec Králové, Czech Republic.

Article Info

Keywords

CLIL
Foreign Language Teaching
Educational Contexts
Theory & Practice
Legislative Framework

Article History

Received 14.10.2022
Received in revised form
01.12.2022
Accepted 06.12.2022

Article Type

Research Article

 10.29329/pedper.2022.493.3



Abstract

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. This paper represents a comparative study of the differences in implementing CLIL methodology at the various national levels, Italy, Spain, Turkey, and the Czech Republic. The study not only tends to reveal the diversity of approaches towards CLIL as a popular method to teach and learn the content through a second language but also offers an insight into the legislation policies of these countries and their interest to promote CLIL as a national tool in supporting language learning to become a multicultural society. The study aims to find answers to the following questions: (1) Is CLIL used at all levels of education? (2) Is it compulsory or voluntary to implement CLIL at schools? (3) Are these schools private or public? and last but not least, (4) Whether the schools have the right to decide to implement CLIL without needing approval from a higher authority. All four countries record an increase in the popularity of CLIL methodology in teaching and learning foreign languages. However, as this paper demonstrates, levels and forms of implementation differ from each other. The question for further investigation poses itself and sounds “Is it a consequence of legislative support?”

1 Introduction

The methodology has always been an important aspect of teaching foreign languages, starting in the 1500s with the Grammar Translation Method and evolving over time to today’s learner-centered approaches. Teaching a foreign language from a structural perspective is obviously insufficient in today’s educational contexts. There is a need to prepare young people for the future by improving their cognitive and communicative skills besides their linguistic skills. Having multiple learning objectives in the classroom, we may not think of a foreign language teaching method that solely focuses on the linguistic aspect of teaching. This is where CLIL becomes a part of the learning-teaching process of our time. With its dual-focused objectives, CLIL combines academic content with foreign language learning objectives, encourages young students to learn foreign languages, and boosts their self-confidence by giving them opportunities to practice critical

Cite: Korbek, G., & Wolf, J. (2022). Putting CLIL into practice in different educational contexts; Italy, Spain, Turkey, and the Czech Republic. *Pedagogical Perspective*, 1(2), 99-114. DOI: 10.29329/pedper.2022.493.3

thinking (Eurydice, 2017). With its broad definition (Marsh, 1994) that incorporates immersion, bilingual education, multilingual education, and enriched language programs, among other things (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008), CLIL is thought to be the most well-liked form of bilingual education in Europe and Asia (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2014). However, this broad term may lead to complications in various educational contexts.

The perception of CLIL shows an alteration among different countries depending on the society, educational background, teaching and learning habits, and implementation. Due to the differences in educational policies of each country, “there is no single blueprint of content and language integration that could be applied in the same way in different countries” (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993, p. 39), “it needs to be tailor-made to fit the national/local circumstances” (Takala, 2002, p. 42). Coyle (2007) supports Baetens Beardsmore’s idea by saying, “there is no way we may know the differences of CLIL implementation” (p. 5), which makes things complicated and creates a blurred contour for CLIL in connection with related programs such as bilingual education, immersion education, CBI or Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) (Alejo & Piquer, 2010). As a result, with this paper, we aimed to provide a glimpse into the legislative frameworks of these mentioned countries, as well as their interest in promoting CLIL as a national tool to support language learning, to clarify the blurred contours and provide an unambiguous outline of CLIL.

Regarding the choice of the nations, the main factor was that both authors completed their international Ph.D. programs in Italy and Spain thanks to a corporate collaboration between the University of Palermo, Italy, and the University of Burgos, Spain, which gave them the chance to examine the educational environment in terms of CLIL closely. The authors also had the chance to assess the CLIL context in their home countries carefully and include it in their study for a broader understanding of CLIL, which may lead to improving the CLIL type of practice in the mentioned countries. This paper offers a valuable contribution to the field with the analysis of CLIL procedures of four countries that have never been analyzed deeply. Not only does it provide unique examples of CLIL practice in these countries, but also it requires a significant theory of legislative documents of each country which were read and synthesized in their languages by the authors of this paper. Furthermore, the results of this analysis serve as a basis for subsequent research on CLIL provision and practices within these countries.

1.1 CLIL as the national education policy: Italy

Even though bilingual education is considered a part of CLIL, Coyle (2008) views it as a unique approach distinct from bilingual or immersion education. We can agree with this statement since neither bilingual education nor immersion has been adopted as a national education policy by any of the European member countries as CLIL, like Italy, which continues English Language Teaching with CLIL methodology compulsorily since March 2010 (MIUR, 2010a). Describing CLIL as teaching “a non-linguistic subject in a foreign language,” as Leone states (2015), it is crucial to emphasize that Italy is the only European country in which CLIL has been administered legally since 2010 by Italy’s Ministero dell’Istruzione, dell’Università e della Ricerca (MIUR).

To better understand the CLIL implementation, it is crucial to have a closer look at the general structure of education in Italy. The compulsory education lasts for ten years, starting at the age of six from Primary School, known as Scuola Primaria or Scuola Elementare for the first five years. The students begin learning English as a foreign language in addition to reading and writing to reach A1 according to the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR),

with the idea that language should be fostered and developed starting in primary school (Edelenbos, Johnstone, & Kubanek, 2006). English is the first foreign language taught in Italy at the primary school level.

The secondary school level is divided into two, “Lower Secondary School” and “Upper Secondary School,” called Scuola Media and Scuola Superior. Students continue their education life in Scuola Media at the age of eleven for three years before moving to Scuola Superior. At the end of this process, students are allowed to take the university entrance exam called Esame di Maturità or Esame di Stato.

“Le Indicazioni esplicitano che l’apprendimento di almeno due lingue europee, oltre alla lingua materna, permette all’alunno [...] di esercitare la cittadinanza attiva oltre i confini del territorio nazionale [...]. L’apprendimento delle lingue straniere si innesta su un’iniziale motivazione intrinseca, sulla spontanea propensione dell’alunno verso la comunicazione verbale, sul suo desiderio di socializzare e interagire con l’ambiente circostante” (Istruzione Ministero della Pubblica, 2007, p.58).

The Guidelines state that “the learning of at least two European languages, in addition to the mother tongue, enables student [...] to exercise active citizenship beyond the borders of the national territory [...]. Learning foreign languages involves an initial intrinsic motivation, the spontaneous propensity of the pupil towards verbal communication, and his/her desire to socialize and interact with the surrounding environment” (Istruzione Ministero della Pubblica, 2007, p.58).

Italy has approved the European Policy in Language Teaching and applied it consistently within its educational system by teaching one non-linguistic subject in a foreign language in the last year of high schools and technical institutes and two non-linguistic subjects in linguistic high schools starting from the third and fourth year in 2010 (MIUR, 2018). Article 7 of Law 107 of 2015 defines priority training objectives as the development and improvement of linguistic abilities, with a focus on Italian, English, and other EU languages, as well as using the content language integrated learning technique (MIUR, 2018). Even though the real implementation started in 2018, Italy had many pilot projects in 2008 for six years (Eurydice, 2008), it has been put into practice in the final year of upper secondary schools (*Licei and Istituti Tecnici*) legally. Still, it seems like there are some future plans to apply it also to primary schools as the Minister of Education Giannini (2015) said that Italy has made quick advances in recent years in teaching English in schools and added that students in Italian primary schools would soon be able to study subjects in English.

The Ministry of Education strongly emphasizes the promotion of CLIL at all academic levels and throughout the country, from the north to the south (Serragiotto, 2017). In the Italian school system, the standards of learning a foreign language (mostly English) are shown in Table 1 below;

Table 1 The aims of the Italian school system’s foreign language to the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) (Broek & van den Ende, 2013).

Educational Stage	Age	The CEFR Level
Primary School	6 - 11	A1
Lower Secondary School	11 - 14	A2
Upper Secondary School	14 - 16	B1
Upper Secondary School	16 - 19	B2

The chart above demonstrates that Italian nationals enter universities with a B2 level in the foreign language they are studying. If we consider the foreign language as English, which is the most common foreign language taught at schools in Italy, we can draw a conclusion as the subject

teachers are supposed to have at least C1 proficiency in the English language after completing their university education. It is also the criteria to attend the teacher training programs of CLIL, organized by the Italian Government. Also, with respect to a Eurydice report (2017), the Italian Ministry of Education has defined the competencies and qualifications teachers need to teach CLIL classes concerning the level of proficiency as a C1 level on the scale defined by the CEFR (Eurydice, 2017) which shows us the accuracy of our inference.

Another crucial point is that because all students in Italy are required to attend school until the age of 16, even if they choose not to continue their education, we can infer that every citizen who participates in this system has at least a B1 level of English proficiency. Additionally, the last year of upper secondary school for students who remain enrolled after turning 16 will use the CLIL methodology. Since they already have a B2 level, they should have no trouble comprehending, communicating, and learning new material in English.

In terms of the legislative point of view, CLIL activities can be developed at all levels of educational contexts at an international level in Italy, as we may understand from article 4, paragraph 3 of the Presidential Decree 275 of 1999 which says within the framework of didactic autonomy, training courses including a variety of subjects and activities may be designed, including on the basis of the interests indicated by the students, as well as foreign language instruction in implementation of agreements and international agreements.

“Nell'ambito dell'autonomia didattica possono essere programmati, anche sulla base degli interessi manifestati dagli alunni, percorsi formativi che coinvolgono più discipline e attività nonché insegnamenti in lingua straniera in attuazione di intese e accordi internazionali”(MIUR, 2013).

Implementing CLIL as a national concept brings a set of obligations together. Teacher education is one of them. Teachers' foreign language proficiency level is highly important in implementing the CLIL methodology. It is important to provide CLIL teachers with training opportunities to enhance the quality of their instruction (Coyle, 2006). Langé (2016) claims that teachers of other subjects in Italy are aware of the CEFR, are very interested in how its levels and competencies are defined, are eager to learn or improve their foreign language skills and are attempting to define and grade the competencies for their respective subjects. In Italy, there are numerous initiatives to train teachers for subject teachers and foreign language teachers in various subjects and languages. In 2013 there were 30 University Methodological Courses and 50 Language Courses for teachers, whereas, in 2014-2015, the number of these courses increased to 70 Methodological Courses and 200 Language courses (Langé, 2016). It is clear from the numbers how much attention is paid to teacher training in Italy. The education authorities are financing most of the continuing professional development activities for the teachers from primary, lower secondary, and vocational schools to improve the skills of CLIL teachers (Eurydice, 2017). In other words, Italy pays great attention to organizing teacher training programs. It requires a B2 level of proficiency to attend the courses which are designed by universities with Article 249, 14th item on 10 September 2010 (MIUR, 2013) but being a CLIL teacher requires one to have a C1 level of CEFR plus they need to certify their completion of professional improvement and updating 60 credit courses recognized by the MIUR to implement CLIL approach in their classes.

Along with training, cooperation is a key term in a CLIL setting that is essential for high-quality CLIL instruction between teachers. Both subject and language teachers require the urge to plan their lessons, create their materials, and collaborate with one another, which adds to their

workload and demands their time (Di Martino & Di Sabato, 2012). In other words, preparation, teachers' commitment to the approach, and a lack of CLIL-designed materials are other significant issues that impact the implementation of the approach. All these factors make a difference in how theoretically CLIL is and how it is implemented in practice.

There are several reasons why CLIL gained popularity in each country. In the Italian context, it has been dealt with since the 1990s in terms of research on an international and national basis, as well as regional in-service teacher training (Coonan, 2017). Moreover, it is still being improved by the courses provided by the Ministry, and major attention is being paid to the improvement of the CLIL practice not only at the secondary school level but also at the primary school level with the new regulation that has been published on the Ministry of Education website recently (MIUR, 2022).

1.2 CLIL in the Czech Republic

New trends in Europe and overseas have changed our perspective towards learning and teaching foreign languages, and the use of a foreign language has been shaped into a tool, a means of teaching and learning, rather than a goal. One of the responses to the need to increase the active knowledge of foreign languages in the Czech Republic is, among others, the development of bilingual education at Czech elementary, secondary schools, and higher educational institutions. Bilingual education, bilingualism, plurilingualism, and multilingualism are subjects of today's interest and discussions. The term 'bilingual' can be literally translated as two languages, i.e., the use of two languages, both a mother tongue and a foreign one, in an educational or another context (García, 2008). The implementation of bilingual education in the Czech Republic came into existence at the beginning of the 1990s. However, it was limited to certain schools chosen for a project and experimental research carried out by the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports. Only at these schools, bilingual education was tolerated. The situation significantly changed when schools received higher autonomy and were equipped with specific competencies. Today, we can proudly say that bilingual education is not the privilege of a few bilingual schools; on the contrary, it has spread among many primary and secondary schools in the Czech Republic, mainly due to the introduction of CLIL. (Novotná, 2012).

The definition of CLIL has constantly been developing since 1994 when the term was first introduced ('Drafting a new strategy for CLIL in Europe recommendations from the political workshop in Como 10-12 March 2014,' 2014) in 1995, the European Commission adopted a program on education and training that emphasized plurilingual education in Europe and in which foreign language teaching and learning through real, concrete content should play an important role (Hofmann & Novotná, 2014). In today's globalized worldview, where the different fields blend and enrich each other, CLIL has become a specific pedagogical approach that integrates the didactics of a foreign language teaching with the didactics of a non-linguistic subject. The term CLIL has become an umbrella term used by the Council of Europe for various forms of teaching and learning non-linguistic subjects or their parts in a foreign language (Hlaváčová, Dvořáková, Klečková, Novotná, & Tejkalová, 2011).

Since the definition of CLIL is still uneven, and there are several approaches in Europe to what CLIL really represents, it is necessary to outline how CLIL is applied in practice in the Czech Republic. In addition, practical implementation is more important than the definition itself. Currently, the use of CLIL in the Czech Republic is still driven by an endeavor to enrich language education, underpinned by the fact that foreign language used in schooling is perceived as

prestigious and/or enriching. However, the duality of objectives, which is the basic characteristic of CLIL, remains. CLIL in the Czech Republic exists in two basic forms. The first is the so-called hard CLIL, whose form of foreign language teaching and learning is often subordinated to the content objective of a subject and is primarily realized by teachers of non-linguistic subjects. And the second is the so-called soft CLIL, where the content selection is subordinate to linguistic competencies and is implemented by language teachers.

Even though CLIL is sometimes referred to as one of the approaches to bilingual education (Graddol, 2006), in the Czech school environment, we distinguish between bilingual programs, bilingual teaching, and CLIL as a pedagogical approach to schooling. Bilingual programs take place at grammar schools, the curriculum of which is specially regulated in the framework education program for bilingual grammar schools. Other primary or secondary schools that wish to introduce some subjects in a foreign language are governed by the decree *Pokyn ministra školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy k postupu při povolování výuky některých předmětů v cizím jazyce č. j. 527/2008-23* [the Decree of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports on the procedure for authorizing the teaching of some subjects in foreign language No. 527 / 2008-23], from 2008. CLIL constitutes a separate group and is not subject to any of the above regulations.

Since 2006, the National Institute for Education has devoted itself to the issue of integrated learning of foreign languages and non-linguistic subjects (Šmídová & Sladkovská, 2012). In the Czech Republic, CLIL is supported by both state and private schools at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of education. As mentioned above, while fully bilingual teaching non-linguistic subjects require accreditation by the Ministry of Education, CLIL in the Czech Republic is not regulated by any restrictions. Its implementation is fully within the competence of the school principals. It depends on the qualification and preparedness of the school's teaching staff and other factors, such as students' and parents' approach (Pavesi, Bertocchi, Hofmannová, & Kazianka, 2001). The way of implementation and its inclusion in the school curriculum depends on the individual conditions of each school. CLIL can become a part of compulsory education, but it can also be offered optional subject to students interested in this type of learning.

There are no official qualification requirements or limitations for subject teachers in the Czech Republic who wish to apply CLIL in their classrooms. The decision on who can teach through CLIL is entirely within the competence of the school's top management. What concerns foreign language teachers is that they should have proficiency in the target language at the level of C1. (Eurydice, 2008, p. 85). Teachers' willingness to cooperate with the desire to educate and develop themselves in this area is an important element for successful implementation. Teacher training activities in CLIL methodology have their place in both pre-service and in-service education in the Czech Republic. Higher education institution already provides future teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills during their studies (Novotná, Háj-Mousová, & Hofmannová, 2001). For in-service teachers, there is an offer of courses, seminars, and other possibilities from which teachers can choose and enrich their further professional development. Furthermore, many national pilot projects that were focused on CLIL gradually raised awareness among teachers and offered them to get acquainted with basic didactic-methodological concepts of content and language-integrated learning and gain practical experience. Above all, many materials from which teachers can freely draw and/or online platforms that are regularly updated were created within these projects (Integrated Foreign Language and Professional Subject - CLIL Conference Proceedings, 2011).

The development of CLIL has not been halted in the Czech Republic. Thanks to many international projects and exchanges of good practices at the international level, CLIL has constantly been developing. Nevertheless, teachers' years of practice and readiness will show how this methodology can help transform Czech education and enrich the unsatisfactory state of contemporary foreign language teaching and learning together with non-lingual teaching and learning performed simultaneously.

1.3. CLIL implementation in Spanish contexts

Globalization brings the necessity of learning foreign languages as communication is the aim itself within the European frame. Within the frame of the conclusions European Council in March 2002 in Barcelona, The European Council calls for further action as a long-term aim for the EU citizens to learn two foreign languages in addition to their mother tongue at a very early age (European Council, 2002). This action brings the question together; 'How to learn languages?'

In 1978 Spain had three different laws for education: LOGSE (Organic Law on the General Education System), LOCE (Organic Law on the Quality of Education), and LOE (Organic Law of Education), passed by the different governments in 1990, 2002 and 2006 (Madrid & Hughes, 2011). In 2006 Spanish Law on Education (LOE) was selected by the Spanish Government to change the previous education system, representing a different concept from the previous laws (LOGSE and LOCE) and covering all the aspects related to education, such as; the principles, the organization, the curriculum, the equity, the teaching staff, the schools and the evaluation and inspection of the education system and resources (Madrid & Hughes, 2011).

Recently CLIL has undergone rapid development in Spain (Lagasabaster & Zarobe, 2010). It is noticeable that Spain adopts European policies as Italy does to advance foreign language learning with the aim of being plurilingual. Bilingualism has long been important in Spain because of its multilingual character with 17 different autonomous regions plus the autonomous cities of Ceuta and Meilla, most of them with their own minority language, namely, Catalan, Galician, Valencian, and Basque as The Spanish Constitution establishes that the wealth of linguistic diversity in Spain is a component of a cultural heritage that deserves special consideration and respect (Spanish Education System, 2009). Without any doubt, the official state language is Spanish under the 1978 Spanish Constitution. Therefore, all Spanish citizens are obliged to be proficient in it and entitled to use it (Eurydice, 2008).

The structure of education in Spain is the same as in Italy. Starting at the age of 6, the students are expected to fulfill the primary education for six years. They are supposed to continue to secondary school for four years (*Educación Secundaria Obligatoria*) and post-compulsory secondary education, which will be treated henceforth as secondary education as a part of compulsory education (Madrid & Hughes, 2011). Foreign language education starts at primary school, and in the last year of secondary education, students have a second foreign language within their curriculum. Not being compulsory, if a second foreign language is wanted to be added to the curriculum at the primary school level, the decision is left to the regional governments (Madrid & Hughes, 2011). Even if there is no imposition on including foreign language teaching within the curriculum of the pre-primary school, most of the schools in Spain start teaching at an early age. In fact, CLIL provision in mainstream education begins at the pre-primary level. It continues till the end of the secondary level or until the end of compulsory education. There is no CLIL provision at the tertiary level in Spain.

Coyle mentions that Spain is rapidly becoming one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research (Lagasabaster & Zarobe, 2010, p.7). Spain has different administrations of CLIL, though, thanks to its multilingual character. Not all autonomous regions implement this methodology as a part of mainstream education, though there are pilot projects and experimental programs as well. For instance, the Basque Country, Catalonia, Galicia, Navarre, and Valencia have “Fostering Multilingualism in a Bilingual Community” with differences in implementation. In contrast, Madrid and the Balearic Islands have signed the “MEC/British Council Agreement” to implement the “Bilingual and Bicultural Project” (Frigols, 2008, p.231). However, it is a crystal-clear fact that CLIL has been implemented within the mainstream education at pre-primary, primary, and secondary levels in Spain quite frequently with direct support from educational authorities as it is the best way to foster multilingualism and language diversity (Lagasabaster & Zarobe, 2010). It is seen as an effective way of second language teaching, as Diezmas mentions in her article (2014) according to the research how successful is the integrated curriculum at helping students learn a second language that typical EFL classes are when it comes to the effect of CLIL on the development of language competencies (Admiraal, Westhoff & de Bot, 2006; Alonso, Grisaleña & Campo, 2008; Jimenez Catalán & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2009; Lagasabaster, 2008; Loranc-Paszylk, 2009; Navés, 2011; Navés & Victori, 2010; Pérez Cañado, 2011; San Isidro, 2009; Várkuti, 2010).

The distinctive features of CLIL in Spain are its coordinators and assistants. Teamwork is the key component and becomes compulsory in a CLIL type of provision. The success of CLIL implementation mainly depends on the collaboration of the subject matter teachers and foreign language teachers. It is clear that Spain makes provision for this situation by assigning CLIL coordinators to be in charge of the organization among the teachers. They are the people responsible for the whole CLIL process. The coordinators are supposed to have linguistic and pedagogical knowledge; moreover, they are expected to encourage activities inside and outside the centers or schools, promote bilingual teaching, and create a climate of collaboration between the components of teaching staff involved in the program.

In most countries, no qualifications are required to be a CLIL teacher. It is generally sufficient to require the qualifications that teachers have. In Spain, the teachers are expected to require the certification of their proficiency in the target language, but no level is mentioned to be a CLIL teacher (Eurydice, 2008).

In Spain, there are three types of CLIL provision depending on the autonomous region. Firstly, the curriculum can be designed with Spanish plus one of the minority languages. The curriculum can include Spanish plus one or two foreign languages as a second option. The third option can be the organization of the curriculum, including Spanish, plus one minority language and partly one or two foreign languages (Frigols, 2008). As mentioned before, thanks to Spain’s wealthy multilingual structure, each region has not only a different implementation of CLIL but also different aims to provide this methodology in their mainstream education. This situation is almost the same for CLIL teacher training organizations. Most autonomous communities do not supply a training program for pre-service teachers, whereas face-to-face or online courses are provided for in-service teachers. These programs include both language and methodology courses for in-service teachers (Frigols, 2008).

1.4 CLIL; Turkish point of view

Foreign language learning has always been crucial in Turkey due to its strategically important geological position. Turkey is located at the junction of Asia and Europe, which led it to be a bridge or a barrier between the two continents throughout history. Being a member of NATO in 1952, Turkey still does not fulfill all the requirements of the European Council. Meanwhile, negotiations have been carried on, and the situation itself brings the necessity of keeping the system up to date with the renovations and innovations in education organized by the European Council.

CLIL emerged as a pragmatic European solution to the European need (Marsh, 2002). Focusing on the dual aspects of teaching, as content and language, does not just serve the European aims of being plurilingual to create a common future by mutual understanding with the European citizens who are capable of speaking at least two European languages proficiently enough to communicate and switch between languages in addition to their mother tongue. Still, it also answers the question of how to learn a foreign language. At the same time, the curriculum is already crowded enough for all students from different levels of mainstream education by providing exposure to the target language with the medium of instruction without requiring extra time (Actions I.2.4 to I.2.7) (European Union, 2003). From this point of view, it totally met a need in Europe for reinforcing second language education and bilingualism. In fact, it is not merely a convenient response to European needs and the challenges posed by rapid globalization; rather, it is a timely solution that is in harmony with broader social perspectives and has proved effective (Coyle *et al.*, 2010).

Not just being the methodology for teaching and learning foreign languages, CLIL aims to prepare young students for their future life by creating an environment in which they are expected to improve their content knowledge, solve problems, find creative solutions, enhance their critical thinking and gain awareness about the others as well as making it possible for them to arrive at a particular level of competence by communicating in the target language with the guidance of either their subject matter or foreign language teacher.

In Turkey, foreign language teaching starts in the second year of ISCED 1, which means at the age of 7 or 8, with the new regulation in 2012. As compulsory education lasts for 12 years, students continue improving their foreign language proficiencies until the end of high school, which is the equivalent of ISCED level 3, regarding the International Standard Classification of Education.

Bilingual education dates back to the 1950s when the Maarif Schools were founded to teach a foreign language through an integrated curriculum right after Turkey started negotiations with the European Union (Coşkun-Demirpolat, 2015). Although humanities are still prohibited from being taught in a foreign language under the Treaty of Lausanne, science and mathematics have been taught in these institutions together with extensive language and literature instruction as independent subjects (Sarçoban, 2012). Later, these schools were named Anatolian High Schools in the 1970s. At Anatolian High Schools, students are prepared for the lessons, which will be explained in the target language, such as math, physics, geography, etc., with a year of intensive English classes. Teachers used to teach each subject in English through interdisciplinary contexts when the students reached a level of competence in English in the prep classes. According to a Eurydice report, there is currently no CLIL provision in Turkey (Eurydice, 2012), even though the education system described above mainly fits in with today's CLIL concept. It cannot be claimed whether the approach for foreign language teaching was properly implemented as CLIL with its 4C structure as there are so many details to apply a CLIL lesson with its communication, cognition, culture, and content. These classes in Anatolian High Schools were mainly about integrating

content and language with all their aspects aiming to improve students' communication skills in the foreign language they were learning.

Today when it comes to the legislative point of view, it is clear that in Turkey, there is no CLIL provision as a part of mainstream education. However, there is CLIL implementation is not so common, both in state and private schools at all levels of education except the secondary level. There is scarcely any CLIL provision at Turkey's 2nd and 3rd ISCED levels. One of the reasons for this is not being compulsory and not being mentioned in the law concerning foreign language education. Each school administration has the authority to decide whether to use this approach for teaching or not, considering the quality of their teachers, the materials, and the evaluation tools. Most state schools implementing the CLIL approach carry out a diagnostic test that serves as an entrance exam to evaluate the students' competencies (e.g., Anatolian High Schools) in the finishing year of secondary school. Those who are not proficient enough will not get the opportunity to be educated in this system. This can be considered as a precaution for the problems that students may face because of their lack of linguistic skills within CLIL implementation.

For the tertiary level, at private universities, the situation is almost the same as the public ones. The students selected up to the points they gained in the university entrance exam are prepared for their future classes at the university through a year of intensive English lessons. Then they are supposed to attend the classes and the exams in their area of expertise in the target language.

As the European Commission aims (European Union, 2003), mutual understanding is only possible to manage in multilingual environments originating in classrooms, taking it as an opportunity to learn other languages for intercultural communication and acceptance of cultural differences by the guidance of a well-trained teacher. The guidance of a well-trained teacher is of high importance in the concepts where CLIL is implemented, as it is the methodology that integrates content and language learning. The knowledge of the subject area solely will not be sufficient as the teacher needs to teach in the target language, and surely foreign language knowledge alone will not be enough for students' content progress. According to Genesee (1998), teachers require specialized training in language pedagogy, especially second language pedagogy, along with the pedagogy required of all teachers who teach academic subjects. However, according to a recent national report, there is still a shortage of qualified CLIL teachers (European Commission, 2014). Consequently, CLIL teachers are generally supported by continuing professional development, and there is a need for more pre-service initial teacher training in CLIL (Scott & Beadle, 2014). And in the Turkish CLIL context, it is still early to talk about CLIL training in pre-service teacher training programs of the faculties. As not mentioned in the legislation, still needs to be more adequate attention paid to this area.

2 Conclusion

Based on the bibliographic and legislative research, we could answer questions that we have set to be examined in all four countries, namely: (1) Is CLIL used at all levels of education? (2) Is it compulsory or voluntary to implement CLIL at schools? (2) Are these schools private or public? (3) Can a school decide to implement CLIL? If not, who approves? (4) Do teachers need any special qualification/s?

The following comparison chart shows that CLIL is used at all levels of education (pre-primary level, primary level, secondary level, upper secondary level, and tertiary level) only in Italy and the Czech Republic. CLIL is not promoted in Spain at the upper secondary and tertiary levels.

However, in Turkey, there is no evidence of using CLIL at the pre-primary level. As mentioned above, CLIL in Italy is implemented compulsorily only for the upper secondary level and is the only country of these four that adopts CLIL across the whole country as an obligatory teaching and learning approach. There is no difference between public and private schools in promoting CLIL; thus, all four countries allow and implement CLIL in both types of schools. While in the Czech Republic and Turkey, schools themselves can decide whether they implement or not CLIL, which might be the consequence of the lack of CLIL in the legislation in both countries, Italy and Spain have the authority, which approves the implementation of CLIL. In the case of Italy, it is Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca and in Spain, the responsible organs are regional governments. Turkey is the only country that does not set any requirements on teachers (neither subject nor language teachers) to use CLIL.

In contrast, in the Czech Republic, language teachers have to reach at least a C1 level in the performed language. For subject teachers, no special qualification is required; it is only recommended to be at least two levels above the language level of students. Spain requires a certificate showing the knowledge level in a foreign language. However, it does not mention what level it should be. It seems that Italy is a country where the rules are stricter, which concerns CLIL, and also, in the case of teacher preparedness, it is required to prove that teachers obtain at least a C1 level of proficiency in the language. It is also interesting to find out that while foreign language teachers in Italy, Spain, and Turkey are qualified to teach foreign languages only, it is not the same case in the Czech Republic (Eurydice, 2012). In the Czech Republic law, 563/2004 determines that also a pedagogical staff for whom the foreign language is a mother tongue or who masters this language at the level of mother tongue fulfills the prerequisite of a professional qualification for teaching a conversation in the foreign language if he/she achieved at least a secondary education with a school leaving exam or received a university degree in teaching a foreign language.

Table 2 Comparison chart: Results from research

Research Questions	Italy	Spain	Czech Republic	Turkey
Is CLIL used at all levels of education?	YES	NO	YES	NO
Is it compulsory or voluntary to implement CLIL at schools?	Voluntary/ Compulsory	Voluntary, depending on the autonomous community.	Voluntary	Voluntary
Are these schools private or public?	Both	Both	Both	Both
Can a school decide to implement CLIL? If not, who gives the approval?	Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (MUIR) is the authority for all the levels.	Regional Government decides themselves.	No approval from any authority. The decision is up to the principal of a school.	The school itself and the University administration decides whether to implement it or not.
Do teachers need any special qualification/s?	The C1 level in CEFR	Certificate testifying to the knowledge of the target language. No level mentioned.	For subject teachers, no qualifications are needed.	No requirements.

That being said, there are several reasons why CLIL gained popularity, and for each country, the goals for implementing it are a bit different. In the Czech Republic, CLIL is implemented for socio-economic aims, socio-cultural aims, language-related aims, and educational aims (learning ability). In contrast, it is there just for socio-economic and language-related aims in Spain. On the other hand, in Italy, CLIL is implemented just for language-related aims (Eurydice 2006).

All four countries have different aims and different types of CLIL provisions, depending on the autonomy of the education bodies, linguistic needs, teacher competencies, and national curriculums. The results of this study are enough to show us how popular CLIL is in European and non-European contexts. It is clear that even the school administrations consider CLIL as a methodology for teaching, whether it is a decision made by the Ministry of Education or not. In light of the information we have gained from this paper; there are different aspects of CLIL which vary from one country to another; CLIL is promulgated by the government to be applied in the educational contexts as a national policy to support the learning of foreign languages as in Italy, it is divided into different types of implementation within the education system, with not being considered as the privilege anymore like the bilingual education as in the Czech Republic, it is being implemented not only to encourage the foreign language learning but also fostering the minority languages as in Spain, and finally, it is being promoted in the educational contexts as in Turkey, where there is no legislative support.

This paper aims to shed light on CLIL measures while conducting an in-depth analysis of legislative documents and other relevant resources to detect similarities and differences that influence how CLIL is eventually performed in the field. Furthermore, the article provides unique examples of CLIL practices in the examined countries. The results of this analysis serve as a basis for a subsequent comparative study on CLIL provision and practices.

2 Limitations and future directions

Although this study is only conducted considering the Turkish Social Studies Curriculum, its results may guide researchers and inspire them to conduct new studies on alternative literacies in classroom environments.

3 Statement of researchers

3.1 Researchers' contribution rate statement: The researchers contributed equally to the research.

3.2 Conflict statement: There is no conflict of interest to declare.

3.3 Support and thanks: We thank Res. Assist. Betül Gökçınar for her efforts in the process of developing the article.

References

- Admiraal, W. G., Westhoff, & de Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12, 75-93. DOI: 13803610500392160
- Alonso, E., Grisaleña, J., & Campo, A. (2008). Plurilingual education in secondary schools: Analysis of results. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 36-4.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1993) European models of bilingual education: Practice, theory, and development. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 14:1-2, 103-120, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.1993.9994523

- Broek, S., & van den Ende, I. (2013). The Implementation of the common European framework for languages in European education systems. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/495871/IPOL-CULT_ET\(2013\)495871_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/495871/IPOL-CULT_ET(2013)495871_EN.pdf)
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243–262. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amt011
- Coonan, C. M. (2017). CLIL teacher education: Issues and direction. *Language Teacher Education*, 4(2), August 10. <http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL4NO2.pdf>
- Coyle, D. (1999). Theory and planning for effective classrooms: supporting students in content and language integrated learning contexts. Masih, J (Ed). *Learning through a foreign language*. London: CILT.
- Coyle, D. (2006). Developing CLIL: Towards a theory of practice. In Monograph 6 APAC Barcelona.
- Coyle, D. (2008). CLIL—A Pedagogical Approach from the European Perspective. In: Hornberger, N.H. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer, Boston, MA. DOI: 10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_92
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language-integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Coşkun-Demirpolat, B. (2015). Türkiye'nin yabancı dil öğretimiyle imtihanı sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. https://file.setav.org/Files/Pdf/20150707131308_131_yabancidil_web.pdf
- Dalton-Puffer C (2008) Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Current research from Europe. In: Delanoy W, Volkman L (eds) *Future perspectives for English language teaching*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, pp.139–157.
- Drafting a new strategy for CLIL in Europe recommendations from the policy workshop in Como 10-12 March 2014. (2014). *CLIL Policy and Practice: Competence-Based Education for Employability, Mobility, and Growth* (March), 1–5.
- Di Martino, E., & Di Sabato, B. (2012). CLIL implementation in Italian schools: Can the long ago employed teacher be trained effectively? The Italian protagonists' voice. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 5(2), 73–105. DOI: 0.5294/laclil.2012.5.2.9
- Diezmas, E., N. (2016). The impact of CLIL on the acquisition of L2 competencies and skills in primary education. *International Journal of English Studies*, 16(2), 21-34. DOI: 10.6018/ijes/2016/2/239611
- Edelenbos, P., Johnstone, R., & Kubanek, A. (2006). *The main pedagogical principles underlying the teaching of languages to very young learners*. Final Report of the EAC 89/04, Lot 1 study. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/language-policy/documents/young_en.pdf
- European Council. (2002). Presidency Conclusions, 35, 0–72. <https://doi.org/10/1/11 REV 1>
- European Union. (2003). Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions. *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004-2006*. Brussels.
- Eurydice. (2006). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/704958d3-5bdc-4ad4-be6f-11dff3731df/language-en/format-PDF/source-276809984>

- Eurydice. (2008). Key data on teaching languages at schools in Europe. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/544da035-905d-49a4-b638-d92c0b350cd8/language-en/format-PDF/source-276811160>
- Eurydice. (2012). Key data on teaching languages at schools in Europe. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/5775673/EC-XA-12-001-EN.PDF/917d3746-886e-456a-8b01-1971013d1cef>
- European Commission. (2014). Improving the effectiveness of language learning: CLIL and computer-assisted language learning. ICF GHK London.
- Eurydice. (2017). Key data on teaching languages at schools in Europe. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/3b929832-3f61-11e7-a08e-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>
- Frigols, M. J. (2008). CLIL Implementation in Spain: an approach to different models. CLIL e l'apprendimento delle lingue Le sfide del nuovo ambiente di apprendimento. *Università Ca' Foscari Venezia* ISBN: 978-88-7543-220-1
- García, O. (2008). Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Genesee, F. (1998). A case study of multilingual education in Canada, in J. Cenoz and F. Genesee (eds.), *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education, Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon, UK.
- Giannini, S. (2015). <https://www.thelocal.it/20150130/italy-to-teach-school-subjects-in-english>
- Graddol, D. (2006). English Next. British Council.
- Hlaváčová, M., Dvořáková, P., Klečková, G., Novotná, J., & Tejkalová, L. (2011). Seznamte se s CLILem. (T. Šmídová, Ed.) (Vol. 20003). Národní ústav pro vzdělání, školské poradenské zařízení a zařízení pro další vzdělávání pedagogických pracovníků (NÚV), divize VÚP.
- Hofmannová, M., & Novotná, J. (2014). CLIL – nový směr ve výuce. *Cizí jazyky*, 2002/2003, 46 (1).
- Integrovaná výuka cizího jazyka a odborného předmětu – CLIL sborník z konference. (2011). Praha: Výzkumný ústav pedagogický.
- Istruzione Ministero della Pubblica. (2007). Indicazioni per il curricolo.
- Jiménez Catalán, R.M. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2009). The Receptive Vocabulary of EFL Learners in Two Instructional Contexts: CLIL versus non-CLIL Instruction, in Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R.M. Jiménez Catalán, R.M. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning. Evidence from Research in Europe. Bristol: Multilingual Matters*, 81-92.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign Language Competence in Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1: 31–42.
- Lagasabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training, *Cambridge Scholars Publishing*.
- Langé, G. (2014). CLIL/Emile in Italy: a real driver for lifelong learning.
- Langé, G. (2016). CLIL provision in Europe and state of the art in Italy.
- Leone, A. R. (2015). Outlooks in Italy: CLIL as language education policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 30(1). <http://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol30/iss1/3>.

- Loranc-Paszylk, B. (2009). Integrating reading and writing into the context of CLIL classroom: some practical solutions. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 46-53.
- Madrid, D., & Hughes, S., (2011). Introduction to bilingual and plurilingual education. *Studies in Bilingual Education*, 122. Peter Lang.
- Marsh, D. (2002). CLIL/EMILE the European dimension actions, trends, and foresight potential. CLIL/EMILE the European Dimension. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2009). Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education. *Oxford: Macmillan Education*.
- Ministero dell'istruzione, D. e della ricerca. (2010a). Ministero dell'università e della ricerca. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2008.12.008.5.E.Gavi>
- Ministero dell'Istruzione, D. e della Ricerca (2013). Ministero dell'università e della ricerca. Retrieved from <http://www.miur.gov.it/normativa1>
- MIUR. (2018). Contenuti in lingua Straniera - Clil (2018) Available at: <https://miur.gov.it/web/guest/contenuti-in-lingua-straniera-clil> (Accessed: November 28, 2022).
- MIUR (2022) Clil, la formazione per l'insegnamento di una disciplina in lingua straniera Arriva Anche nella scuola dell'infanzia, nel primo ciclo e negli istituti professionali. Mi. Available at: <https://www.miur.gov.it/web/guest/-/clil-la-formazione-per-l-insegnamento-di-una-disciplina-in-lingua-straniera-arriva-anche-nella-scuola-dell-infanzia-nel-primo-ciclo-e-negli-istituti-p> (Accessed: November 28, 2022).
- Naves, T. (2011). How promising are the results of integrating content and language for EFL writing and overall EFL proficiency? in Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. Sierra & F. Gallardo del Puerto (eds.), *Content and foreign language integrated learning*. Bern: Peter Lang, 103-128.
- Navés, T. & Victori, M. (2010). CLIL in Catalonia: An overview of research studies, in Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & D. Lasagabaster (eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars, 30-54.
- Novotná, J. (2012). Bilingvní výuka na území České republiky. Retrieved February 12, 2018, from <http://clil.nuv.cz/uvod-do-clil/3-clil-v-ceskem-vzdelavacim-systemu/3-2-bilingvni-vyuka-na-uzemi-ceske-republiky.html>
- Novotná, J., Hadj-Mousová, Z., & Hofmannová, M. (2001). Teacher training for CLIL: Competences of a CLIL teacher. *Proceedings SEMT 01*, 122–126. Retrieved from <http://people.fffi.cvut.cz/novotant/jarmila.novotna/Novotna-et-alSEMT01.pdf>
- Pavesi, M., Bertocchi, D., Hofmannová, M., & Kazianka, M. (2001). CLIL guidelines for teachers. TIE CLIL. Milan: M.I.U.R., 2001.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2011). The Effects of CLIL within the APPP: Lessons learned and ways forward, in R. Crespo & M. García de Sola (eds.). *Studies in honour of Ángeles Linde López*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 389-406.
- Poza, L. (2017) Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 6. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5070/b86110060>.
- San Isidro, X. (2009). Galicia: Clil Success in a Bilingual Community, in D. Marsh, P. Mehisto, D. Wolff, R. Aliaga, T. Asikainen, M.J Frigols-Martin, S. Hughes & G. Langé (eds.), *CLIL Practice*:

- Perspectives from the Field*, (pp. 4-13). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 4-13, Available from <http://www.icpj.eu/?id=1>, accessed 19 December, 2014.
- Sarıçoban, G. (2012). Foreign language education policies in Turkey. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2643 – 2648
- Serragiotto, G. (2017). The Problems of Implementing CLIL in Italy. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 9(5), 85. doi:10.5296/ijl.v9i5.11829
- Scott, D., & Beadle, S. (2014). Improving the effectiveness of language learning: CLIL and computer-assisted language learning.
- Smídová, T., & Sladkovská, K. (2012). Předmluva. Retrieved February 12, 2018, from <http://clil.nuv.cz/predmluva.html>
- Spanish Education System 2009 (Rep. No. 978-84-369-4898-1). (2010). Ministerio De Educación. Secretaría De Estado De Educación Y Formación Profesional.
- Takala, S. (2002). 'Positioning CLIL in the wider context,' in D. Marsh (ed.), *CLIL/EMILE—the European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential*, European Commission. DG EAC.
- Várkuti, A. (2010). Linguistic Benefits of the CLIL Approach: Measuring Linguistic Competences. *International CLIL Research Journal*. 1, 3: 67-79.