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Over the last few decades, the methodological term CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) has been widely used within the conceptions of language education and professional education. The use of CLIL provides the potential for time saving in terms of language and content integration. Aside from this, it also offers a new dimension of thinking and deepening foreign language competences within non-linguistic subjects. These aspects contribute towards English Language Teaching (ELT) modernization with the aim to develop the learner’s autonomy and acquisition of knowledge achieved beyond the schooling institution. The objective of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses in higher education is to prepare students for their real professional life by developing communicative language skills. This work focuses on CLIL methodology within the context of ESP classes at the Slovak University of Agriculture (SUA) in Nitra, Slovakia. The aim of the work is to find out whether project work, one of the recommended techniques within CLIL methodology, contributes towards the development of communicative language skills and an increase in professional vocabulary. In the model of design-based research the triangulation of three methods – comparative analysis, content analysis, and focus group – provides the holistic view of project work implementation into ESP classes. Two groups of students are compared, one where the CLIL group (81 students) uses project work in ESP classes, whereas the non-CLIL group (23 students) follows the “traditional” approach, i.e. the use of tailor-made textbooks consisting of adapted texts with specific vocabulary and various exercises aiming to develop language competences. Comparative analysis compares the results of the tests in both groups, testing the acquired professional vocabulary, comprehension of professional texts, writing skills and acquisition of chosen grammar structures, within the B1 level of proficiency, recommended by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages CEFR (2001). Content Analysis as a qualitative technique in this research classifies the specific vocabulary used in student projects in the CLIL group and then compares this with the wordlist offered in the textbook used in the non-CLIL group. The “specificity” of the vocabulary is classified according to Coxhead’s Academic Wordlist (Gillet 2011), where the words are defined according to chosen
professional specializations. The focus group, as a qualitative technique of the research, and evaluated by SWOT analysis, looks at the attitudes and critical comments of the students in the CLIL group, on the implementation of the project work within ESP classes at the non-philological universities.

**Keywords:** CLIL, project work, ESP, higher education, non-philological universities
INTRODUCTION

Ideas related to teaching and learning with the aim to make the educational process of a higher quality, and the focus on views of education in the third millennium, show the direction of modernization in education as such: That it should serve as a means of cross-connection of subjects with the problems of the world around us and the life of students, with the aim to develop knowledge mainly through skills and abilities needed for solving life’s situations. That education and upbringing in life are priorities, together with the development of learners’ autonomy, adaptability, creativity, and ability to solve problems. The comparison in the ways of thinking in the second and third millennium clearly shows new tendencies and changes in education that are reflected in English Language Teaching (Table 1).

Table 1 Learning in the second and third millennium (Townsend, Clarke, Ainscow 1999, p. 366)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Millennium Thinking</th>
<th>3rd Millennium Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important learning can only occur in formal institutions.</td>
<td>People can learn from many sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone must learn a common ‘core’ of content.</td>
<td>Everyone must understand the learning process and have basic skills in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educational process is controlled by the teacher. What is to be taught, when it should be taught, and how it should be taught, should all be determined by a professional person.</td>
<td>The educational process is controlled by the teacher. What is to be taught, when it should be taught, and how it should be taught, will all be determined by the learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and learning are individual activities.</td>
<td>Success is based on how well learners learn as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and learning are highly interactive activities.</td>
<td>Success is based on how well learners work together as a team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal education prepares people for life. Formal education is the basis for lifelong learning.

The terms ‘education’ and ‘school’ mean almost the same thing. School is only one of a multitude of steps in the educational journey.

Once you leave formal education you enter the ‘real world’. Formal education provides a range of interaction between learners and the world of business, commerce, and politics.

The more formal qualifications you have, the more successful you will be. The more capability and adaptability you have, the more successful you will be.

The way of thinking in the third millennium defines the term ‘modernization’ in teaching and learning as such. The aim of our work is to find out the contribution of CLIL methodology towards the modernization of English language teaching within the context of English for Specific Purposes.

Thus, the vision of a learner nowadays is to be autonomous, to be able to think critically, to be competent enough to evaluate the source and nature of received information, and to be skilled in both macro- and micro-skills. Therefore, even the learning process should facilitate and enable such learners’ development at all levels of education. English language education has been an inseparable part of the curriculum in the Slovak Republic since 2011. Under this view, learners of English start the foreign language route at the age of ten and finish it in secondary school education with B1, B2, or C1 level in English according to the CEFR, depending on the type of school, whether it is a vocational, a secondary grammar, or a bilingual school (source: minedu.sk). Universities usually continue in language education however, but only within their specific fields and specializations, thus providing specific curriculum covering academic or technical English throughout their courses.

This work is divided into two parts: theoretical and research. The theoretical part comprises the key concepts of the work, namely new trends in English Language Teaching (ELT), modernization of ELT, and related terms such as learners’ autonomy.

Then the second chapter being the theoretical part approaches the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) methodology with its aims, concepts, and uses in different European countries. CLIL as an umbrella term covers a lot of advised techniques and this work focuses mainly on project work as one of them.
The third chapter focuses on one context of English language teaching and learning and that is English for Specific Purposes (ESP). There are various definitions and approaches however, and this part of the work attempts to define the relationship between ESP, CLIL, and project work. The theoretical part finishes with the mapping of research carried out in higher education within CLIL methodology in the context of ESP.

The research part describes the study carried out within ESP classes at the Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Slovakia. The objectives of the design-based research were to learn about the impact of CLIL implementation in ESP classes in higher education at non-philological universities. Design-based research comprises of a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative methods, particularly comparative and content analyses and focus group meetings. The three techniques were applied on two groups of students, specifically the one where CLIL was implemented and the second one without the impact of CLIL (from now on called the non-CLIL group). The results showed that at the B1 level, according to the CEFR, the students in the CLIL group developed their language communicative competences through their project work comparably to the non-CLIL group; however, with the added value of the extra amount of specific vocabulary within the chosen topics. The focus group meetings revealed that the students’ opinion of CLIL in ESP classes was positive and they accepted the challenge of taking responsibility for their learning in terms of building learner autonomy as one of the key concepts of the modern way of teaching and learning languages.
MAIN CONCEPTS

1.1 Trends in English Language Teaching

The orientation and choice of a foreign language is influenced by the needs of markets, economies, cultures, and traditions etc. These needs feed back into newer forms of effective and modern forms of language teaching procedures and methods. On that account, a re-evaluation of the procedures for language teaching has appeared. Foreign language acquisition is not only seen as a prestigious matter in the eyes of the public anymore, so much as it has become essential and inevitable. Approaches and methods in language teaching have changed throughout history. Historical trends are to react and respond to one another with totally opposing views on the same issue, and English language teaching is not an exception. In the direction of behaviorism, English language teaching developed methods such as Audio-lingual, Total Physical Response, and Silent Way, etc. (Cf. Kováčiková, Veselá; 2016). Later on, as a response to behaviorism, cognitive theories appeared, diverting from imitation highlighted in behaviouristic approaches, focusing instead on mental processes in the human brain. Bloom’s taxonomy and its revised version by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) reflected this notion in education with a double-layered learning design. The first layer names and describes the types of knowledge we learn and the second describes the processes through which we obtain knowledge. Language education has profited from this taxonomy, currently in widely used language communicative textbooks where tasks follow the principles of the aforementioned taxonomy. The main aim is to develop the language user as a critical thinker, as at the top of Bloom’s pyramid is critical thinking and creativity. Furthermore, constructivism introduced the theory that every person constructs his or her knowledge based on critical consideration.

According to Karn (2007), language teaching in the twentieth century principally underwent numerous changes and innovations. He claims that the history of consideration in language teaching goes back to the teaching and learning of Greek and Latin in the Middle Ages, however, it became
an independent profession only in the twentieth century. When Latin became a dead language, modern languages like English, French, and Italian started to be taught using the same method of teaching as used for Greek and Latin, commonly known as the Grammar Translation Method. This method was ultimately opposed and rejected as it ignored the development of the oral proficiency of learners.

Ever since then language teaching seems to be in search of better and more effective methods of teaching. Realizing the need for communication and oral proficiency in learners, some individual language teaching specialists (C. Marcel, T. Prendergast, F. Gouin) promoted alternative approaches to language teaching. None of these approaches were scientifically proven. In the 1880s, linguists (H. Sweet, W. Viëtor, P. Passy) stressed that speech was the primary form of language communication and methods should be based on scientific analysis of language and the study of psychology. It was realized that speech patterns were more significant than grammar structures. This led to the development of what is called the Natural Approach and also to the development of the Direct Method. However, they both lacked a methodological background. The most active period in the history of approaches and methods in English language teaching (ELT) was from the 1950s to the 1980s.

Richards et al. (2002, p.2) says that “language teaching in the twentieth century was characterized by the frequent change and innovation and by the development of sometimes competing language teaching ideologies.”

It is here when we see the adoption of a grammar based method, which came to be known in the United Kingdom as the structural approach, and then came the Audio-lingual Method in the 1950s and the 1960s, which itself was later surpassed by the Communicative Approach. McDonough (2003) put to the centre the concept of Hyme’s ‘communicative competence’ and his criticism of Chomsky’s attention to correctness at the expense of appropriacy of use in specific contexts.

During the same period other methods attracted enthusiastic followers including the Silent Way, the Natural Approach, and Total Physical Response, etc. In the 1990s, Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language Teaching emerged. Other approaches, such as Cooperative Learning, the Whole Language Approach, and Multiple Intelligences also developed (Cf. Gardner 1993; Karn 2007).

According to Larsen-Freeman (2004, p.186) “language learning and teaching are dynamic, fluid, mutable processes. There is nothing fixed about them.” Unlike the teaching of other subjects which by and large remain the same, the ELT tradition has been subject to constant change.
especially throughout the twentieth century.

Crossovers from general educational trends such as Cooperative Learning, Neurolinguistic Programming, and Multiple Intelligence theory have influenced language teaching and learning considerably. Content-based and task-based approaches emphasized teaching language through communication rather than for it. They aim for students to use English to learn it. Further developments in foreign language teaching and learning show an increasing significance of non-formal education in terms of global tendencies shifting from formal education into self-education, otherwise known as autonomous and lifelong learning. The autonomous approach shifts the responsibility for learning onto the learners. It does not mean that when applying such an approach a teacher is side-lined. As Holúbeková (2004) points out, it is necessary to realize that there is a very low percentage of learners who are completely independent. The role of teachers is thus to help their students on their own journey towards autonomy, meaning to teach them how to learn and fully respect their rights for self-regulation. The author then states that it is necessary to draw the attention of students from the content part of learning toward the process of learning. This means that the main focus is not put on what to learn, rather how to learn. Opposing traditionally oriented classes where teaching how to learn was neglected, the autonomy of a learner and other learner-oriented approaches require the students to get to know the rules of acquiring the language. Pokrivčaková et al. (2010, p.7) says that “the common denominator of all the innovative and reforming approaches are learner-centred approaches.” Learner centeredness as one of the modern trends in ELT is the demand of its time. English teachers stopped delivering lectures to passive students in the classroom. They play the roles of facilitators, motivators, and supervisors, not authorities, and learners are the active co-operators who take responsibility for their learning.

Out of all the modern approaches in ELT, our work mainly focuses on two approaches: Content-Based Language Learning and Task-Based Learning, as these are closely connected to our further study.

Content-Based Language Learning (CBLL) is based on the view that language is best learned when it is used as a medium of instruction to acquire knowledge about a subject matter presented in a meaningful context (Brinton et al. 1989). Subject matters may include themes or topics governed by students’ needs, purposes, and interests, or any subject in their curriculum. Students also determine the context of vocabulary and grammar teaching and skill improvement (Snow 2011). In this approach, language learning is carried out through several learner-centred tasks in
which the students read, write, listen to, and speak about selected content in an organized way. For example, there may be authentic reading materials that require students to interpret and evaluate a text in oral or written form (Brinton et al. 1989). In CBLL, academic writing is seen as an extension of reading and listening, and students are asked to synthesize facts and opinions from multiple sources in their academic writing process. Research in educational and cognitive psychology provides support for CBLL. According to Alexander et al. (1994) there is a relationship between student interest in the subject matter and their ability to process it, recall information and elaborate on it. Project work being a part of CBLL is according to Stoller (2001):

“a natural extension of CBLL and a versatile vehicle for fully integrated and content learning making it a viable option for language educators working in a number of instructional settings, including General English, English for Academic purposes and English for Specific Purposes.”

Task-Based Language Learning (TBLL) is an approach based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching. As an extension of Communicative Language Teaching, TBLL is based on the rationale that learners learn a language by interacting meaningfully and purposefully while engaged in tasks. Language is seen primarily as a means of making meaning, and it involves three dimensions: structural, functional, and interactional (Nunan 1991). The theoretical foundations of TBLL can be drawn from second language acquisition theories highlighting the importance of meaningful interaction. In order to develop communicative competence learners must have extended opportunities to use the language productively. In TBLL, the belief is that the tasks can provide such opportunities (Ellis 2003). According to Bygate et al. (2001, p.11): “tasks are activities where the target language is used by the learner for the communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome.”

Ellis (2003) describes a task with the following criteria:

- A task is a means to develop language proficiency through communicating. In order to do this, a task should involve real-world processes of language use. These may appear in the form of simulated activities found in the real world such as having an interview or completing a form, or functions that are involved in the communicative behaviours of the real world.
To achieve these ends, a task should involve a gap in information, opinion or reasoning. This gap creates a potential to challenge the learner to close it.

The linguistic resources of the learner are activated by making use of any of the four skills (receptive – reading, listening, or productive – speaking, writing).

The non-linguistic resources are the cognitive processes that affect the linguistic form that the learners choose and use. Some examples are selecting, classifying, ordering, reasoning, and evaluating the information.

All these are best done by setting work plans with clearly defined communicative outcomes.

Both approaches are implied in CLIL methodology (discussed further in this work) and their common objective is to develop communicative competence as one of the main aims of English Language Teaching.

### 1.2 Communicative Competence

In the following chapter the main concepts, fields, and terms connected with this area of research are discussed. Firstly, language communicative competence as the objective of language education, as well as outcomes of TBLL and CBLL (discussed in the previous chapter), are defined. Then, CLIL as a way of modernization of the learning process is approached. Eventually, ESP as a branch of ELT, and our main area of research, is introduced.

All human competences in a certain way contribute to the development of communicative ability of a language user and they can be considered as aspects of communicative competence. Communicative competence related to language teaching and learning was used for the first time in 1972 by Hymes. In his study he argued with Chomsky on concepts of competence and performance which belong to Chomsky’s theory of generative grammar. Chomsky understood competence as “systems of rules which can be called the grammar of language” (Chomsky 1969 p.9), i.e. as a competence of the language system on the side of the speaker and performance as a real speaking action with the use of that competence. According to Hymes, it is necessary to think of competence in a broader sense by implementing cognition of how to act based on competences in real speaking activities. As a sociolinguist he also emphasized the socio-cultural dimension – what a speaker needs to know in order to comprehend and use the language. This broader sense of Chomsky’s
competence conception Hymes called ‘communicative competence’.

Since Hymes, other authors have further tried to define communicative competence.

One is Widdowson (2003), who states that:

“a basic problem of different modes of communicative competence lies in a fact that in those modes a complex process is divided into a static file of parts and in such a file the particular models cannot cope with mutual dynamic relations which are active in communication itself. Thus, when trying to make those models operational in a language learning, basic mutual relations which make the whole, are absent.” (Widdowson, pp.169-170).

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) includes the description of key terms, such as communicative competences, skills, and knowledge, within various contexts under various conditions, involving language processes. Communicative language competences are described as the sum of knowledge, skills, and characteristics that allow a person to act by using specifically linguistic means (CEFR 2001, p.9). In a narrower sense they have the following components:

- linguistic competences (consisting of lexical, grammatical, phonological competences, orthographic, and orthoepic competence),
- sociolinguistic competences,
- pragmatic competences.

Communicative competence is thus an ability to use a language in different situations where a language user comes out with a basic knowledge of a language system. It is the ability to purposefully choose the most suitable language material from a language system. In other words, communicative competence is the level of language acquisition and the ability to use it in communication. It is important to acquire not only verbal behaviour but also non-verbal expressional components, i.e. to draw attention to paralinguistic as well as extra linguistic parts of speech (Findra 2004).

Communicative competence also covers other knowledge which helps a speaker to communicate on a certain linguistic and social level, so that their linguistic and communicative behaviour is in accordance with social manners.

It is thought to be one of the main objectives of ELT classes at all levels of schooling. This study is set in the context of ESP courses in higher education and thus the development of communicative competence
in ESP becomes compelling. The competences defined at B1 level according to and described in detail in the CEFR within ESP context are discussed in the following chapter as they are also the subjects of the research.

**1.3 Learner Autonomy**

New trends and approaches in education explicitly and implicitly mention the term *Learner Autonomy*. As Tandlichová (2010, p.164-165) says, autonomous learning is one type of learning, i.e. the human possibility to actively and creatively broaden the ability to adapt to a changing situation. In foreign language teaching it means never to be satisfied with the level of gained knowledge in a language but improve constantly. It is a never-ending story in which we still should develop accuracy and fluency through different courses, authentic devices like TV and radio etc.

Schools and educational institutions are supposed to teach us how to satisfy our hunger for knowledge, how to find and work with information, as well as use it in the most appropriate way.

Choděra (2006) on the other hand, states that autonomous learning is learning without a teacher. Students set their educational aims and also the means in which to follow them. Humanization attempts which called for learners’ independence in a learning process, introduced autonomous learning as a process which is managed by the learners in terms of when, what, and how they want to learn. However, learners in some way must have an “authority” figure that serves as their help and support, and thus avoid making mistakes and errors.

Success in autonomous learning of foreign languages depends on many circumstances such as:

- typological differences between the target language and mother tongue;
- possibilities to use the target language;
- age, level, and language competences;
- previous experience in language learning;
- creativity and independence of the learner;
- motivation;
- typological characteristics of a learner (if a learner is communicative or not).
However, Little (2011) mentions that despite the ever-expanding literature, learner autonomy remains a minority pursuit, perhaps because all forms of ‘autonomisation’ threaten the power structures of educational culture. Later on, he states that in the particular case of second and foreign languages, effective communication depends on a complex of procedural skills that develop only through use; and if language learning depends crucially on language use, learners who enjoy a high degree of social autonomy in their learning environment should find it easier to master the full range of discourse roles on which effective spontaneous communication depends. According to the model in which the teacher’s role is to create and maintain a learning environment in which learners can be autonomous in order to become more autonomous, the development of their learning skills is never entirely separable from the content of their learning. Learning how to learn a second or foreign language is in some important respects different from learning how to learn maths or history or biology.

Nevertheless, in our work learner autonomy is understood as a process more than a product of a modern educational approach. It is an important and necessary objective in further mentioned concepts of the research, namely CLIL methodology, English for Specific Purposes, and Project-work.
CLIL METHODOLOGY

Content and Language Integrated Learning is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. It can be viewed as one example of curricular integration. CLIL as an educational approach was developed in Europe and is, therefore, very strongly European-oriented. It is based on the assumption that foreign languages are best learnt by focusing in the classroom not so much on language but on the content which is transmitted (Marsh 2007).

According to Pokrivčaková et al. (2008, p.7), CLIL does not represent “a revolutionary change” in education as it actively flows from the way of schooling in some European bordering regions. She also states that it is derived from methodologies such as ESP as one of the most widely spread methodologies of bilingual education which is discussed in the following paragraph. However, it does not only cover the immersion and subject learning through another language (Mehisto et al. 2008). Its typical context would be European classrooms taught in English by non-native content teachers, classified as ‘strong’ or ‘hard’ CLIL by Ball (2009) and Bentley (2009).

The term CLIL has been used since the nineties in the 20th century, however the integrated teaching of language and subject (as a methodology of bilingual education) was realized earlier. Each country has its own terminology concerning integrated learning, for example cross-curricular language learning, content-based learning, or dual education. Martín de Lama, M.A. (2015), in her case study on university students’ opinions towards CLIL tries to find the link between content and foreign language. After applying CLIL scaffolding techniques in her research she recommends the CLIL application in a higher educational context.

Thus, CLIL offers an interdisciplinary approach in teaching content through the language and by introducing scaffolding techniques it brings its fruits through language acquisition within content topics at the same time.
2.1 From Integration towards CLIL

As we would like to introduce CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) methodology we are unlikely to avoid the basic term “Integrated Teaching” (also known as “cross-curricular teaching”). The word integration creates a fusion of sectors that used to be isolated in the past.

Škodová (2010) mentions that integrated teaching is a modern teaching form which is very useful for a learner living in an “integrated world”. Learners of today naturally have practical experience with integrated information and communication technologies and they want to use their knowledge immediately as well as learn within their practical experience. This trend should be unavoidably reflected in the educational process.

According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP 2010), although students are learning the basic information in core subject areas, they are not learning to apply their knowledge effectively in thinking and reasoning. Interdisciplinary/cross-curricular teaching provides a meaningful way in which students can use knowledge learned in one context as a knowledge base in other contexts, in and out of school. Many of the important concepts, strategies, and skills taught in the language arts are “portable” (Perkins 1986). They transfer readily to other content areas. The concept of perseverance, for example, may be found in literature and science. Strategies for monitoring comprehension can be directed to reading material in any content area. Cause-and-effect relationships exist in literature, science, and social studies. Interdisciplinary/cross-curricular teaching supports and promotes this transfer. Critical thinking can be applied in any discipline (Houghton Mifflin 1997). Considering the fact that the aim of education is to prepare a learner for living in a modern society, with critical thinking and the ability to choose from information “floods”, integrated teaching has been increasing in its value and should be considered in any type of schooling, whether it is primary, secondary or higher education.

Hánková (2007) in her paper mentions a few terms related to CLIL; CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning means education of non-linguistic subjects through a foreign language whereby the attention is paid also to the development of the target language. CLIL belongs to the stream of language education which is labelled as Content-Based and Task-Based Language Learning which we have discussed in Chapter 1. Marsh (2008) states that compared to other content-based approaches, the specific novelty of the CLIL approach is that classroom content is not so much taken from everyday life or the general content of the target language culture but rather from content subjects, from academic or
CLIL Methodology

The author outlines three points which are essential in the context of CLIL.

- CLIL must not be regarded simply as an approach to language teaching and learning, however, it is concerned both with content and language. Thus, learners are more motivated than in non-CLIL context and they look at content from a different and broader perspective.

- Within a CLIL framework content and language are learnt in integration. The two subjects – a language and a content subject – are related to each other and dealt with as a whole. In non-CLIL surroundings the learners have difficulties in establishing relationships between subjects.

- In CLIL another language is used to teach and learn content subject, i.e. it is the medium of instruction. Language is both content and medium in the CLIL classroom. (Ibid.)

Learning languages and other subjects in an isolated way is not very effective. If it was, then learners would not be able to use gained knowledge in cross-curricular relations. CLIL creates a fusion between content and language, between subjects, and challenges independent and cooperative learning, and creates the base for lifelong development. Interdisciplinary education can increase a student’s motivation for learning, as well as the level of their engagement. As opposed to isolated learning, students within a cross-curricular project are able to see a practical use for what they have been learning (Houghton Mifflin 1997).

Language and content are mutually connected, dependant, and inseparable. The CLIL potential is to use language as an instrument naturally. It can be realized in various ways and situations and has a lot of advantages concerning the quality of learning, as it increases opportunities for communication, increases gained knowledge from other subjects, supports interdisciplinarity, prepares students for lifelong learning, and strengthens learner’s autonomy and decision making in learning (Pokrivčáková et al. 2008).

2.2 Types of CLIL

As Pokrivčáková (2008) states, in the majority of European countries, preschool institutions and elementary schools implement immersion CLIL programmes. The first language of education is the pupils’ mother tongue, while a foreign language is only used in some lessons, for teaching some
topics or some subjects.

Johnson and Swain (1997) define immersion programmes as follows:

- A foreign language is the medium of instruction.
- The immersion curriculum parallels the local mother language curriculum.
- Overt support exists for the mother language.
- The programme aims for additive bilingualism (see 2.3).
- Exposure to the foreign language is largely confined to the classroom.
- Students enter the programme with similar (and limited) levels of proficiency in the foreign language.
- The teachers are bilingual.
- The classroom culture is that of the local mother language community.

A **Subtractive CLIL programme** is a programme in which a foreign language is used at the expense of the mother tongue. It does not pay attention to the national cultural values, however they are not suppressed. An example is a course for immigrants with the aim to adapt very quickly (Pokrivčáková 2008).

Distinguished authors writing about CLIL, Ball (2009) and Bentley (2009), differentiate between ‘hard’ or ‘strong’ CLIL and ‘weak’ or ‘soft’ CLIL. A typical context of hard CLIL would be teaching and learning academic subjects in a foreign language mainly instructed by subject teachers. On the other hand, weak CLIL is more focused on language rather than content. As Ikeda (2013) states, CLIL has been introduced as an alternative language teaching methodology already mentioned in the ELT methodology textbooks by Scrivener (2011), Harmer (2011), or Ur (2012). Other evidence of bringing CLIL into the practical world of ELT are the numerous published CLIL textbooks launched by MacMillan publishing house, Oxford University Publishing, or Cambridge University Press (Cf. macmillanenglish.com, elt.oup.com, cambridge.org). Therefore, CLIL methodology is expected to grow in its importance implemented in various age and learners’ groups.

Ikeda (2013) shows the comparison of CLIL authors Ball, Bentley, Dale, and Tanner, in the CLIL continuum as follows:

Ball (2009) recognizes total immersion, partial immersion, subject courses, language classes based on thematic units and language classes with greater use of content.
Bentley (2009) differentiates partial immersion, subject-led (modular) courses, and language led courses, whereby Dale and Tanner (2012) talk about subject lessons taught by CLIL subject teachers and language lessons taught by CLIL language teachers. All in all, that is a great shift from the simple division of strong/hard CLIL (content oriented) to weak/soft CLIL language oriented lessons.

In our research, under the term CLIL implementation, the type of immersion of weak CLIL refers to the fact that CLIL techniques were applied in the lessons devoted to language within the contents of specific areas of the specialisations (ESP) of the learners in the higher education.

### 2.3 Benefits and Drawbacks of CLIL

According to the European Commission (2011) the benefits of CLIL methodology are as follows:

- builds intercultural knowledge and understanding;
- develops intercultural communication skills;
- improves language competence and oral communication skills;
- develops multilingual interests and attitudes;
- provides opportunities to study content through different perspectives;
- allows learners more contact with the target language;
- does not require extra teaching hours;
- complements other subjects rather than competes with them;
- diversifies methods and forms of classroom practice;
- increases learners’ motivation and confidence in both the language and the subject being taught.

Our attention is paid especially to the point which says that CLIL complements other subjects rather than competes with them, which is in concordance with our initial comments on “integrated teaching/learning”. The same is approved in the last point where it positively influences motivation as well as the content of the subject.

As for drawbacks, CLIL should be perceived in objective reality and its implementation brings with it some challenges and problems. Primarily, its ‘global’ perception brings several misunderstandings and problems mainly in applying its principles in particular contexts. For example, in Slovakia, as stated by Naštická et al. (2018), when defining the key term CLIL it can sometimes be interchanged with bilingual education, which is wrongly misunderstood as teaching and learning in
another language instead of the mother tongue and excluding instruction in
the mother tongue completely. Therefore, instruction during CLIL lessons
is basically led in one language only (foreign language in this case) as is
not always the case with bilingualism. Thus, it is somewhat difficult to
state what CLIL really is or is not.

Another unclear definition might be the balance between integrating
content with language. It is partially explained by dividing ‘soft’ and
‘hard’ CLIL. As Naštícká et al. (2018) claim, there is still not enough
scientific evidence to prove that CLIL is more effective than ‘traditional’
approaches. Moreover, there are several functional models for evaluation
and assessment in CLIL (Otto 2018) so it is difficult to choose and apply
some of them in particular educational contexts. Then there is still the lack
of relevant CLIL materials. Last but not least, CLIL efficacy is quite hard
due to the above-mentioned reasons. Paran (2013) introduces ten
significant conditions that should be fulfilled for CLIL to be effective.

- CLIL can be successful in the case that it is implemented
  selectively. That covers two levels – the individual level of the
  learner and the institutional level.
- CLIL brings the highest achievements to those students who have
  already been “good”. This indicates that CLIL lessons are usually
given to a group of ‘selected’ students, as although CLIL
methodology is highly recommended by state authorities, it is still
not compulsory and thus only a selected group of students can
attend CLIL lessons.
- CLIL is successful if CLIL teachers are highly competent in L2.
The recommended level of language competence is B2 (Bentley
2009), but in reality content subject teachers do not often achieve
this level and they struggle with language instruction in their
lessons.
- CLIL lessons are successful in cases where, apart from the content
  of the lesson, students have extra language support in L2. This
speaks about the benefit to the students, provided that they feel
confident enough to grasp the basics of the language of instruction
during CLIL lessons. Thus, as suggested by Naštícká (2018), CLIL
lessons at elementary and secondary schools should be supported
by language lessons as well.
- CLIL is more of a success the higher the teacher’s education level.
This means that in cases where the language competence of a
teacher is accompanied by the methodology of teaching languages