

Vilija Targamadžė,

Roma Kriaučiūnienė

Vilnius University, Litva

Content and Language Integrated Learning: Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints

ABSTRACT

CLIL is an internationally-recognised approach to teaching a language and a subject simultaneously or in other words, teaching a non-language subject through the medium of a second or foreign language (L2). Having emerged from the evidenced-based, well-documented success of the Canadian immersion model for language teaching, in which mainstream curriculum content (e.g. Science) is delivered through the students' non-native language (e.g. French) (Cross, Gearon, 2013), CLIL has been widely used in Europe for over twenty years now and it has been considered to be an innovative and a successful approach in the promotion of multilingualism in Europe (Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlos Pavlou, 2011). CLIL has been lately acknowledged in Lithuania as well. The Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania issued the Guidelines project which aim at encouraging a wider implementation of CLIL in the system of general education.

In spite of great potential and benefits that CLL offers (i.e. improvement of learners' language skills and subject knowledge alongside the development of their communicative skills and intercultural competence as well as promotion of diverse learning strategies, etc.), it raises some important issues for teachers implementing CLIL too. The essential questions about CLIL, as being pointed out by Ludmila Hurajová and Jana Luprichová (2015), are who should be responsible for teaching content through the second language and how this should be done. Evidently to become a good content or language teacher one has to be an expert not only in the content area but also have a deep

understanding of the cognitive, sociocultural and psychological elements of foreign language teaching and learning. In order to find out the Lithuanian teachers' readiness and willingness to apply CLIL approach in their teaching process, the research was carried out with the aim focusing on Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of CLIL. The research sought to address the following four key questions: what CLIL is, why it is important to learn the subject and a foreign language together, what difficulties could a learner encounter while learning a subject and a foreign language together and finally, what difficulties could a teacher encounter while teaching a subject and a foreign language together. There were 36 different subject teachers from various schools of general education of Lithuania who participated in the research. The article provides the results of the qualitative research data analysis and the insights revealing the Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of CLIL in the Lithuanian educational context.

Key words: *CLIL, language teaching, subject teaching, teachers.*

Introduction

CLIL is an internationally-recognised approach to teaching a language and a subject simultaneously or in other words, teaching a non-language subject through the medium of a second or foreign language (L2). Having emerged from the evidenced-based, well-documented success of the Canadian immersion model for language teaching, in which mainstream curriculum content (e.g. Science) is delivered through the students' non-native language (e.g.

French) (Cross, Gearon, 2013), CLIL has been widely used in Europe for over twenty years now and it has been considered to be an innovative and a successful approach in the promotion of multilingualism in Europe (Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlos Pavlou, 2011). According to professor Coyle's (2010) 4Cs Framework, the teaching purposes of CLIL can be summarized with four words: Communication (language being the means of learning content and the means of communication), Content (focusing on learning the contents),

Culture (fostering intercultural understanding and global citizenship), and Cognition (engaging students in higher order thinking skills).

According to the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe (ECML) (<http://www.ecml.at/Thematicareas/ContentandLanguageIntegratedLearning/tabid/1625/language/en-GB/Default.aspx>) recent developments in CLIL have focused more specifically on academic literacies as well as on the use of CLIL approaches in the teaching of the language of schooling/majority language. CLIL is considered to be important due to the following reasons: firstly, it enriches the content of language learning and teaching making it more interesting and more challenging for learners, enhancing their cognitive powers more instead of focusing only on the development of linguistic competences. Secondly, combining language classes with subject learning is a way of using time more efficiently. Thirdly, it helps learners to foster subject literacies, i.e. the language of the subject, familiarizing learners with specific

linguistic and discourse features of a particular subject. Some scholars (Johnstone, McKinstry, 2008) also enumerate advantages of CLIL: it develops confident learners, enhances their academic cognitive processes and communication skills, encourages intercultural understanding and community values, helps learners become more sensitive to vocabulary and ideas presented in their first language as well as in the target language, facilitates learners to gain more extensive and varied vocabulary in the target language, helps learners reach proficiency levels in all four skills of L, S, W, R.

However, the ECML foresees several challenges in the application of CLIL. One of the key challenges in CLIL is how to optimise both language and subject teaching so that learners obtain in-depth knowledge of the subject in a foreign language as if it were gained in their own native language. The other challenge is the development of CLIL teaching methodologies to generate optimal learning. Finally, positive approach of all the stakeholders, clear expectations

of CLIL. However, the most important issue, in the application of CLIL seems to be quality assurance: *cognitively demanding lesson frameworks* presented in the form of tasks that are *linguistically accessible* to students. Similarly to the challenges pointed out by the ECML, other researchers (Nguyen, Thuy, 2016) emphasise the shortage of competent CLIL teachers as well as raise the question of the appropriate level of the language in CLIL (teachers' and students' linguistic readiness); they also mention important changes in teachers' role and methodology and highlight the necessity of collaboration and team teaching.

In spite of great potential and benefits that CLIL offers (i.e. improvement of learners' language skills and subject knowledge alongside the development of their communicative skills and intercultural competence as well as promotion of diverse learning strategies, etc.), it raises some important issues for teachers implementing CLIL too. Infante, D., Benvenuto, G., Lastrucci E., (2009), for instance, mention the

following problems in the application of CLIL: the lack of materials available, the absence of collaboration, the lack of interest from the teachers of the same class or of the same school, having difficulties in properly integrating content and language, creating an authentic and real setting in the classroom.

It should be pointed out that there is a considerable amount of research into CLIL carried out; there are also developments of practical CLIL methodology, much of them stemming from ECML projects on CLIL, including frameworks for implementing skills, descriptors of the competences used in subject learning as well as resources for plurilingual activities in primary and secondary learning. The ECML also offers a lot of supporting materials for the promotion and implementation of CLIL. The publications, such as: *The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education* (2011) provides a set of principles and ideas for designing curricula for professional teacher development in the area of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) as

well as serves as a tool for reflection; *CLIL-LOTE-START - Integriertes Sprachen- und Fachlernen in anderen Sprachen als Englisch (Für Einsteiger)*(2011) offers insights into different forms and ways of putting into practice content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in primary and secondary education, pre- and in-service teacher education, as well as in the field of research and school development. It promotes the CLIL approach to a wider target public, beyond the area of specialists. The latest publications go further beyond *CLIL: A pluriliteracies approach to teaching for learning (2015)*, that builds on CLIL approaches to help learners become better meaning-makers, who can draw on content knowledge to communicate successfully across languages, disciplines and cultures in this way promoting deep learning and helping learners become responsible, global citizens.

On the practical level, a lot of information about the extent of practical application of CLIL is provided by Eurydice (2012).

According to Eurydice data in nearly all European countries, certain schools offer a form of education provision according to which non-language subjects are taught either through two different languages, or through a single language which is 'foreign' according to the curriculum (with exception of Denmark, Greece, Iceland and it is not widespread across education systems. Belgium (German-speaking Community), Luxembourg and Malta are the only countries or regions within countries in which CLIL provision exists in all schools throughout the whole education system.

CLIL has been lately acknowledged in Lithuania as well. Recently the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania has issued the *Guidelines project* which aims at encouraging a wider implementation of CLIL in the system of general education in Lithuania. Although there have been several EU-funded projects carried out in Lithuania since 2001, there seems to be the lack of systemic approach towards the implementation of CLIL in Lithuania in the formal national educational system.

From the theoretical point of view, CLIL has been in the focus of attention of many foreign and Lithuanian researchers encompassing the problems of application of CLIL in primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlos Pavlou (2011), for example, describe the application of CLIL at primary and pre-primary education, discuss the theoretical background as well as practical issues pertaining to CLIL implementation, encompassing the smooth transition of students into the new learning and teaching approach of CLIL. They also describe the gradual steps how to increase L2 use and create and maintain a supportive learning atmosphere by catering to the students' affective, learning and language needs. Their work fills the gap of still inadequate literature to support the practitioners.

Other scholars (Cross, Gearon, 2013) focus their research on the issues of how teachers are prepared to implement CLIL in Victorian schools in Australia, what factors support or inhibit the CLIL approach, whether it improves learners' motivation and engagement in learning a language.

Their research findings reveal that more communication with parents and wider school community, school commitment is needed as well as generating confidence in CLIL and preparing professionals. Feasibility of CLIL is possible but confidence in it is still to be developed.

The latest research findings presented by Linh Nguyn and Thi Thuy (2016) show the difficulties of the application of CLIL in the Vietnamese context, where CLIL is implemented in the formal national education system. In Vietnam they have encountered the following obstacles hindering the application of CLIL: unclear declaration by the government regarding the objectives of CLIL; lack of qualified teachers both in content and language; students' readiness as only the gifted students were chosen for the application of CLIL and finally lack of CLIL materials.

Yvonne Mathole (2016) discusses the issues of using CLIL in a diverse multilingual South African schools as a way to help learners improve the process of learning languages firstly their mother tongue ahead of anything

else then easily acquiring more languages, and lastly finding it easier to understand other subject contents.

The research results of the pedagogical experiment carried out in China by Cheng Liu, Xiaofang Wang (2013) proved the application of CLIL to be successful and lead to the conclusion that CLIL teaching provides a direction for college English teaching reform in China and that CLIL will improve the effect of college English teaching in their country.

Other researchers such as Ľudmila Hurajová and Jana Luprichová (2015) discuss the suitability and feasibility of the application of CLIL approach in Higher Education Institutions within the framework of the internationalization of HE. G. Chmelíková (2015), L. Hurajová and J. Luprichová (2015) point out that for the successful application of CLIL the readiness and willingness of all the stakeholders is necessary in order to create a favourable learning environment, as well as the cooperation of subject and language teachers. The conclusion is made that views of all the stakeholders should be cleared out as a

necessary prerequisite for the application of CLIL in HE.

Lithuanian researchers are also interested in CLIL and concentrate on its different issues, however, there seems to be a larger attention given to the implementation of CLIL at the tertiary level.

L. Vilkancienė (2011) analyses key dimensions of both LSP and CLIL by looking at the main similarities and differences of both approaches and identifies the main aspects that can enrich traditional tertiary level language classes. Other researchers (Būdvytytė-Gudienė, Toleikienė, Alminienė, Bikulčienė, 2010) overviewed theoretical aspects of CLIL as well as presented practical materials to be exploited in the process of renewal of three study programmes: Educology, Special Pedagogy and Primary Education on the basis of CLIL at Šiauliai University. It should also be pointed out that in 2011-2012, after implementing the project of SOMID at Šiauliai University, CLIL method has been purposefully and actively applied in social sciences, for instance in Bachelor's Degree Programmes such as

education, social education, Primary education and Preschool education (lecturers of the subject and foreign languages are cooperating while preparing their lectures in teams at Šiauliai University (Didactic Innovations at Siauliai University, 2012).

However, the analysis of the theoretical literatures revealed, that in spite of the benefits of CLIL some important questions, as being pointed out by Ľudmila Hurajová and Jana Luprichová (2015), who should be responsible for teaching content through the second language and how this should be done, remain unanswered. Moreover, to become a good content or language teacher one has to be an expert not only in the content area but also have a deep understanding of the cognitive, sociocultural and psychological elements of foreign language teaching and learning. The above mentioned authors (Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlos Pavlou, 2011) acknowledge the uncertainty many teachers feel about CLIL, because of the requirement for both language and subject knowledge.

What is more important, there should be teachers' commitment and belief in CLIL in order to gain success in its application.

In spite of the on-going research into application of CLIL in Lithuania, there is a noticeable lack of evidence about different stakeholders' views of CLIL. In order to fill this gap an attempt is being made to find out Lithuanian teachers views of CLIL. Thus, **the subject** of the article is Lithuanian teachers' attitude towards CLIL. **The aim** is to identify Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of the possibilities and obstacles of the application of CLIL at schools of general education in Lithuania. In order to find out the Lithuanian teachers' readiness and willingness to apply CLIL approach in their teaching process, the qualitative research was carried out seeking to address the following four key research objectives / questions:

- 1) what is the Lithuanian teachers' understanding of CLIL;
- 2) why is it important to learn the subject and a foreign language together;

- 3) what difficulties could a learner encounter while learning a subject and a foreign language together and finally;
- 4) what difficulties could a teacher encounter while teaching a subject and a foreign language together.

Research participants: there were 36 teachers representing different subjects (history 4, ethics 6, mathematics 2, IT 2, physics 2, chemistry 4, geography 3, arts 5, theatre 3, German language 1, Russian language 1, English language 1, biology 2) and different regions (Vilnius, Klaipėda, Ukmergė, Alytus, Molėtai) from various schools of general education of Lithuania who participated in the research. In 2011 - 2013 the Institute of Foreign languages of Vilnius University administered the project financed by the European Structural Funds and the Lithuanian Ministry for Education and Science „*Development of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Education*“), project No.VP1-2.2-ŠMM-05-K-02-011 with 75 teachers of different subjects participating in it

from Vilnius, Klaipėda, Ukmergė, Alytus, Molėtai regions of Lithuania, therefore, the research sample was chosen to represent those regions. The teachers from these regions were randomly selected according to the following criteria: the length of teaching experience - more than three years'; three categories of teachers: teachers, senior teachers and expert teachers, 12 teachers to represent each category (36 teachers all in all).

The **methodology** of the research:

Social constructivism: people construct their personal understanding and this is not a simple mirroring of the transferred knowledge and skills, this is their personal reflection (Kukla, 2000).

The **methods** of the research were:

- *Analysis of the theoretical literature* on recent research on CLIL and its application.
- *Qualitative research:* structured interviews with teachers of different subjects (history, ethics, mathematics, IT, physics, chemistry, geography, arts, theatre, German language, Russian language, English

language, biology) to reveal teachers' approach to the possibility of CLIL application at contemporary schools of general education in Lithuania. The qualitative research was carried out in the end of 2014 and the beginning of 2015. The teachers who took part in the research were asked four questions concerning the application of CLIL. The questions of the interview were aiming at revealing the teachers' perception of CLIL, the importance of its application and finding out the obstacles that the learners and the teachers might encounter in the process of the application of CLIL in the teaching / learning process at Lithuanian schools of general education. All the participants' answers were on the basis of anonymity. The data of the structured interviews was analyzed by applying categories and subcategories for each question of the interview.

➤ *Theoretical modelling*: 'co-design' solution framework and stages suggested by Murray R., Caulier-Grice J., Mulgan G. (2010, p. 31-39) could be applied to the improvement of the implementation process of CLIL: *user-led design* ('user-led design' described as 'user engagement in design', with designers and professionals still playing key roles as orchestrators and facilitators), *re-designing services with users and developers* (multidisciplinary teams working collaboratively together), *engagement of ex-users* (involving people with know-how), *web-based tools for co-design* (sites for the interested ones), *creative thinking methods* (work of consultancy groups), *continuous improvement methods* (generating new ideas from pioneers in the field through quality circles), *quality circles* (volunteers meeting up to identify, analyse and solve

CLIL-implementation-related problems), *engaging citizens through media* (direct media engagement in processes).

As it has been mentioned above, the research questions aimed at finding out the Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of CLIL. The data presented in Table 1 provide the research participants' answers to the first research question.

Research results

Table 1. Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of CLIL.

CATEGORIES	SUBCATEGORIES	NUMBER OF STATEMENTS	EXAMPLES OF STATEMENTS
What is CLIL?	Several subject are being taught together	3	'<...>joining two subjects together<...>'. '<...>when two subjects (mathematics and IT) are taught in one lesson<...>'. '<...> when several subjects are integrated into one another<...>' '<...>renaissance being taught in a lesson of history and arts<...>', '<...>when the content of several subjects is presented together according to the context and aims of the lesson<...>'. '<...>when a subject (physical training for example, is explained in a foreign language<...>'. '<...>teaching a subject in a foreign language, the language is learnt faster<...>', '<...>when subject knowledge is complemented by the terms in a foreign language, and foreign language is being filled by separate subject knowledge<...>'. '<...>teaching a subject consistently in a foreign language, starting with separate words, term.<...>'. '<...> when subject is taught in a foreign language, the programmes are harmonized to fill each other<...>'. '<...>this is two in one<...>', '<...>' A possibility to learn a language and a subject differently<...>', '<...>when one teacher teaches several subjects (foreign language and mathematics, history, geography)<...>', '<...>'it is the way to improve the learning process of a language and a subject, it motivates learners and provides more possibilities for a teacher to improve. <...>'. '<...>some themes of the subject are taught in a foreign language<...>' '<...>some words or phrases are included in a foreign language<...>' '<...>using some foreign language knowledge in a subject lesson and vice versa<...>', '<...>When
	Subject being taught in a chosen foreign language with an aim to teach both – the subject and the foreign language	25	
	Subject being taught in a native language and a foreign language together	8	

			some time of a subject lesson is devoted to teaching some useful phrases words in a foreign language <...> ‘<...>when a particular subject is being taught together with a foreign language (mathematics), e.g. terminology, words phrases are being used in two languages <...>’ ‘<...>when foreign language is taught not only in a language lessons<...>’.
--	--	--	---

The analysis of the research data made it obvious that Lithuanian teachers’ viewpoints of CLIL could be considered to be positive, as the majority of the qualitative research participants demonstrated good understanding of CLIL (*subject being taught in a chosen foreign language with an aim to teach both the subject and the foreign language*) and only less

than a third of the respondents had a slightly misleading understanding of CLIL (*subject being taught in a native language and a foreign language together*).

The data presented in Table 2 reveal the research participants’ answers to the second research question.

Table 2. Lithuanian teachers’ viewpoints of the significance of CLIL.

CATEGORIES	SUBCATEGORIES	NUMBER OF STATEMENTS	EXAMPLES OF STATEMENTS
Why is it important to learn the subject and a foreign language together?	Teachers’ and students’ skills are developed better	4	‘<...>all the school staff should be more supportive <...>; ‘<...>more interesting<...>; ‘<...>innovative teaching methods could be applied, language teachers could cooperate with subject teachers more, share their experience<...>; ‘<...>it is a challenge for teachers and students<...>’..
	It is good for practical reasons: study and / or work abroad	16	‘<...>students will be prepared for the studies or / and work abroad<...>’ ‘<...>useful for students’ mobility<...>’ ‘<...>many learners are thinking of going abroad to gain their education<...>’ ‘<...>students will need this at universities, they would be prepared to read the professional literature<...>’ ‘<...>wider perspectives for students in the EU labour market<...>’.
	Language skills are developed faster when it is learnt in an integrated way	8	‘<...>lots of material in the English language on different subjects<...>; ‘<...>there are more possibilities to practice a foreign language<...>; ‘<...>different abilities should because to grasp the increasing amounts of information<...>;

			'<...>more terminology is acquired in a foreign language<...>'; '<...>useful, convenient, innovative<...>'; '<...>the scope of literature is expanded in this way, learners are acquainted with the <...>'; '<...>foreign language knowledge is improved, language skills are developed better, world outlook is broadened<...>'; '<...>specific vocabulary is developed<...>'; '<...>more competences are developed<...>'; '<...>future perspectives are developed<...>'; '<...> future students will be able to find professional literature in the English language, could communicate with foreign students, could understand foreign language<...>'.
	It is not important at all	8	'<...>additional workload for a teacher<...>'; '<...>Lithuanian identity is being damaged, students should be educated as Lithuanians<...>'; '<...>the school is not prepared to teach the subject and a foreign language together in an integrated way<...>'; '<...>perhaps it will not do much harm<...>'; '<...>it is a consequence of fashion: everybody does, so we have to do that too<...>'; '<...>this is only fashion, as those who will need the language will learn without any integration<...>'; '<...>learning the subject will deteriorate<...>'; '<...> neither the subject nor the language will be learnt by average learners <...>'; '<...>subjects should be learnt in a national language<...>'.

The Lithuanian teachers' perception of the significance of CLIL seems to be lacking depth and breadth, as most teachers are not very well familiar with the methodology of CLIL (four Cs and the framework of 3 As, etc.). The greatest advantage of CLIL was considered to be a very practical one- it is beneficial for learners' studies or work abroad. An equal number of the respondents provided the opposing views: some of them explained that learners' language skills are developed faster when it is learnt in an integrated

way, while others expressed the opinion that it is not important at all. Only very few teachers saw the real benefits of CLIL to learners and teachers. Therefore it might be assumed that, a more positive approach to CLIL should be fostered among teachers and all other stakeholders, and expectations of CLIL should be more explicitly explained to them.

The data presented in Table 3 show the research participants' answers to the third research question.

Table 3. Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of difficulties learners might encounter in CLIL.

CATEGORIES	SUBCATEGORIES	NUMBER OF STATEMENTS	EXAMPLES OF STATEMENTS
What difficulties could a learner encounter while learning a subject and a foreign language together?	Not enough language knowledge, not enough subject knowledge	20	'<...>subject would be presented in a superficial manner, no depth of the subject knowledge would be transferred<...>' '<...>the focus on language not the subject, the subject knowledge would deteriorate<...>' '<...>the knowledge of the language is insufficient to gain the specific subject knowledge<...>'; '<...>lack of specific terminology<...>' '<...>twofold difficulty<...>' '<...>it is difficult to learn the subject even in the Lithuanian language<...>'; '<...>the lack of language knowledge would limit the learning of the subject<...>'.
	Lack of motivation, lack of time, increased workload	10	'<...>weaker students would have to face two difficulties<...>', '<...>lack of time<...>', '<...>students have a huge workload, it is difficult to learn the subject in the Lithuanian language<...>'; '<...>additional workload<...>'; '<...>more challenges during lessons, fear to make mistakes<...>', '<...>unwillingness<...>'; '<...>longer preparation for lessons<...>'.
	The subject could only be learnt well in the native language	6	'<...>students' native language will deteriorate<...>' '<...>negative attitude towards a foreign language<...>' '<...>students do not know how to write and pronounce properly in their own native language <...>'; '<...>no use in that at all<...>' '<...>if both language and subject teachers worked together, less difficulties for students<...>' '<...>there should be methodology of such work developed<...>'; '<...>it depends on individual learners<...>'; '<...>in-depth subject knowledge could only be gained in the native language<...>' '<...>the native language will deteriorate<...>'; '<...>lack of resources<...>' '<...>unclear evaluation criteria<...>' '<...><...>'.

The teachers expressed a clear concern for students, as their workload might increase significantly, lowering their motivation to learn even more. The teachers were nearly equally worried about their students'

inadequate academic foreign language skills necessary to gain the subject knowledge. Only the minority expressed the opinion that the subject content could only be well-learnt in one's native language.

The data presented in Table 4 answers to the fourth research question. reveal the research participants'

Table 4. Lithuanian teachers' viewpoints of difficulties teachers might encounter in CLIL.

CATEGORIES	SUBCATEGORIES	NUMBER OF STATEMENTS	EXAMPLES OF STATEMENTS
What difficulties could a teacher encounter while teaching a subject and a foreign language together?	Lack of foreign language knowledge	12	'<...>one has to learn the language well<...>' '<...>good pronunciation is necessary<...>' '<...>lack of knowledge<...>' '<...>teachers should have a diploma to teach both the subject and the language<...>' '<...>teachers might feel discomfort due to the lack of foreign language, this might inhibit their freedom to teach the subject<...>' '<...>difficult to deal with different language knowledge level of students<...>'.
	Lack of time, increased workload	16	'<...>more time should be allocated for the understanding of the material<...>' '<...>more energy and time should be spent for the preparation of the lesson<...>' '<...>lack of experience, too little information about how to do it<...>' '<...>subject quality would go down<...>' '<...>lack of methodology, resources<...>' '<...>increased workload<...>'; '<...>the subject will not be fully delivered as the time will be spent on the explanation of the language issues<...>', '<...>lack of textbooks<...>', '<...>no additional financial support for such teaching<...>' '<...>unwillingness and too big workload<...>' '<...>special preparation is necessary<...>'; '<...>language teacher would lack subject knowledge and subject teachers would lack language skills, superficial learning would be the outcome<...>'; '<...>lack of the support from school and the school environment<...>'; '<...>unclear evaluation<...>'.
	No proper conditions for integration of CLIL at schools	8	'<...>no additional funds/ payment for teachers for such teaching<...>' '<...>no resources, textbooks<...>' '<...>no evaluation criteria<...>', '<...>lack of cooperation with colleagues<...>' '<...>unsatisfied parents<...>' '<...>less time to cover the subject curriculum<...>', '<...>subject could only be taught superficially<...>' '<...>lack of specialists who are prepared specifically for CLIL<...>', '<...>the number of students in the classroom is big<...>', '<...>more additional lessons should be added<...>' '<...>different language level/ or and languages of students<...>', '<...>lack of additional help for teachers<...>'..

The analysis of the research data made it evident that teachers are worried about the quality assurance, as most of them think that they lack the language knowledge to transmit the subject content well. Most of them expressed the belief that it will be very difficult for them to become good CLIL teachers, as it will increase their workload significantly, diminish their motivation and time. Most importantly they admitted the lack of necessary favourable teaching/ learning environment, which means lack of school support, resources, expertise knowledge and finances.

Conclusions

A more *systemic approach* is needed to better implement CLIL approach at Lithuanian schools of secondary education: more orchestrated efforts of formal and informal

educational section, forming clusters of educational institutions. It could be assumed that the success of CLIL might rest on the participation and involvement of a wide variety of interests being represented by different stakeholder groups. The theoretical model presented by Murray R., Caulier-Grice J., Mulgan G. (2010) could be applied to the improvement of the implementation process of CLIL.

All the stakeholders' (policy makers, administrators, teachers, students, parents) approach to CLIL should be strengthened in order to gain their support and more positive attitude to CLIL implementation on all educational levels: primary, secondary, tertiary in Lithuania.

CLIL teacher training programmes should be offered to students that would guarantee quality assurance of the teaching / learning process.

REFERENCES

- Būdvytytė-Gudienė, A., Toleikienė, R., Alminienė, R., Bikulčienė, R. (2010). *Praktinės CLIL taikymo galimybės*. Šiauliai: VšĮ Šiaulių universiteto leidykla, ISBN 978-609-430-054-7.
- Cheng Liu, Xiaofang Wang (2013). Study on the Application of CLIL in English Teaching of Acupuncture and Moxibustion. International Conference on Advanced Information Engineering and Education Science (ICAIEES 2013).
- Chmelíková, G. (2015). Preparing the Postgraduate Students for Academic Environment by Specific Training and by Utilizing Technologies. Proceedings ICETA 13th International Conference of Emerging eLearning Technologies and Applications.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Coyle, D. 2010, p. 41 <http://blocs.xtec.cat/clilpratiques1/files/2008/11/slrcoyle.pdf>
- Cross R., Gearon M. (2013). *Integrated Learning (CLIL). Approach to Teaching and Learning Languages in Victorian Schools*. ISSN 1324-9320.
- Didactic Innovations at Siauliai University. (2012). Sud.: Liukinevičienė L. Šiauliai: VšĮ Šiaulių universiteto leidykla. ISBN 978-609-430-151-3.
- Eurydice (2012).
- Hurajová L., Luprichová J. (2015). Content and Language – how to integrate them on tertiary level. Open Online Journal for Research and Education Special Issue #4, December 2015, ISSN: 2313-1640.
- Infante, D., Benvenuto, G., Lastrucci E., (2009) The Effects of CLIL from the Perspective of Experienced Teachers. In. Marsh, D. and Mehisto; P. Wolff, D., Aliaga, R., Asikainen, T., Frigols-Martin, M. J., Hughes, S., Langé, G., (eds.) *CLIL Practice: Perspectives from the Field*. <http://www.icpj.eu/?id=title>
- Ioannou-Georgiou S., Pavlou P.. (2011). *Guidelines for CLIL Implementation in Primary and Pre-Primary Education*. ISBN 978-9963-9058-1-2
- Johnstone, R and McKinstry, R (2008) *Evaluation of Early Primary Partial Immersion document*.

- Kukla, A. (2000). *Social Constructivism and the Philosophy of Science*. New York: Routledge.
- Mathole Y. (2016). Using Content and Language Integrating Learning (CLIL) to address multilingualism in South African schools. In: *European Journal of Language Policy*, p. 57-79.
- Murray R., Caulier-Grice J., Mulgan G. (2010). *The Open Book of Social Innovation*. Nesta Innovating Public Services.
- Nguyen, T. (2016). Reconsidering the first steps of CLIL in Vietnam. In: *European Journal of Language Policy*, p. 29-56.
- Vilkancienė L. (2011). *CLIL in Tertiary Education: Does it Have Anything to Offer? Studies about languages*. Print ISSN: 1648-2824. Online ISSN: 2029-7203