

CLIL and Productive Vocabulary Acquisition in the Czech Context

Barbora Reynaert

Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia, Chodske nam.1, Plzen, 306 14, Czech Republic

Corresponding Author: Barbora Reynaert, E-mail: bbenesov@kan.zcu.cz

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: March 04, 2019

Accepted: June 17, 2019

Published: August 31, 2019

Volume: 10 Issue: 4

Advance access: July 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Key words:

Education,

CLIL,

Language Learning,

Vocabulary Acquisition,

Lower-secondary Pupils

ABSTRACT

This paper sheds light on productive vocabulary development in classes of CLIL (content and language integrated learning). Participants in the study were pupils of lower-secondary school (aged 11-15) in the Czech Republic having experienced CLIL instruction in History or Civics. The investigation was aimed at measuring vocabulary acquisition gained during a year of CLIL. Half of the pupils in the experimental group already had one year of CLIL experience prior to the experiment; the second half of the pupils started with CLIL at the time of the experiment. Both of these groups were compared to one another as well as to a control group with no CLIL instruction. Data collection instruments were created on the basis of standardized Laufer & Nation's vocabulary levels tests (Laufer & Nation, 1999). As it turned out, previous experience with CLIL as well as the role of the teacher were significant factors. The study points out differences in productive vocabulary development in CLIL in terms of a one-to-two-year time frame. The role of the teacher appeared to have an undeniable importance as well. These factors are discussed in terms of language education improvement.

INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is undoubtedly one of the most important issues facing European educational research. As stated in a document issued by the CLIL Cascade Network (Talking the Future 2010-2020, Languages in Education), enhanced competencies of a learner stem from innovative environments combining language and other parts of a curriculum.

In other words, languages should be taught in an integrated way, and not only as separate subjects. Language learning partly requires authentic content learning which fosters critical thinking and leads to meaningful communication, as opposed to learning language just for the sake of language.

The theoretical part of the article is based on a literature review concerning up-to-date research on CLIL and CBI (Content-based instruction) in connection with L2 vocabulary acquisition – a key feature of language knowledge. The study is designed to investigate the effect of CLIL on vocabulary development comparing CLIL and non-CLIL classes. More specifically, the research looked into the efficiency of CLIL towards productive vocabulary with respect to possible variables coming into play such as content subject, experience with CLIL, gender and teacher. The study was conducted in the Czech Republic, but the findings could be easily transferred to a context of any other country worldwide.

CLIL: RATIONALE AND INQUIRY

Position of CLIL in Education

CLIL as an umbrella term covers a wide range of instances of bilingual education, CBI and immersion programmes (de Zarobe & Jiménez Catalán, 2009; Deller & Price, 2007; Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008; Harrop 2012). It is having an undeniable influence on education all over the world. In this study I deal with CLIL defined in its basic essence, being an approach with two aims – content and language, offered to mainstream school pupils, where the target content subject is taught and learnt in a combination of L2 and L1.

Dalton-Puffer (2007) points out many of the different driving forces behind CLIL. First, both content and language play an important role in any CLIL programme. As a highly visible method of modern foreign language teaching (European Commission, 2006; Dalton-Puffer, 2007), CLIL is debated in many educational forums on the national as well as international level. On the one hand, the European Commission (2012) acknowledges the existence of CLIL in nearly all European countries at primary and secondary level; on the other hand, they do not consider CLIL yet to be widespread across educational systems. In a majority of cases, CLIL is a bottom-up process coming mainly from local educational authorities within individual countries

(Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2012). However, there is support for CLIL originating from top-down policies such as education ministries within individual countries. In regards to this top-down trend, we need to consider the curriculum recommendations emerging from research concerning CLIL programmes (Banegas, 2012). It is not my intention to judge the influence of these initiatives here; nevertheless, the latter top-down initiative can affect many more schools at once since it stems from various projects supported by the European Union. As stated by the Council of Europe (2015), it is above all a quality education which matters, within which CLIL is supported.

Benefits and Drawbacks of CLIL

As CLIL is gradually gaining in popularity and is spreading rapidly all over the world, there are a great many papers that discuss its benefits. Though I state the benefits here as well, I am also concerned about the drawbacks of CLIL: I hope to accurately assess the potential of CLIL within the scope of my study.

The most frequently emphasized benefits of CLIL include stronger student motivation towards learning the language (Catalán & de Zarobe, 2009; Dalton-Puffer 2008), greater linguistic proficiency (Harrop, 2012), better exposure to target language through natural contexts (Nikula, Dalton-Puffer & Llinares, 2013; Harrop 2012; Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010; Navés, 2009; Catalán & de Zarobe, 2009), an increase in learner confidence (Wiesemes, 2009), encouragement and interactivity (Catalán & de Zarobe, 2009; Wiesemes, 2009), fostering of cognitive development (Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010; Dalton-Puffer 2008), overall support for effective learning provided by better activation of prior knowledge and easier connections to the new (Xanthou, 2011), and faster development of academic skills (Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010).

The Cambridge ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) centre adds another positive impact of CLIL through its cultural dimension in a way of promoting learning to understand different cultures and communities (Dale & Tanner, 2012). Further they state that CLIL learners turn out to be more sensitive to vocabulary nuances and experience better opportunities to practice the four skills of language learning – listening, speaking, reading and writing (ESOL, 2010). Another merit of CLIL is an increased cognitive involvement of CLIL learners (Dale & Tanner, 2012; ESOL, 2010).

In today's society, with advanced technology and the demand to get everything fast and immediately, education is also prone to demands for speed and immediacy. This "learn as you use, use as you learn" approach reflects current needs benefit from the CLIL methodology (Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010).

Besides CLIL learners the advantages of CLIL apply also to CLIL teachers and schools. As Dale and Tanner (2012) mention CLIL highlights the position of the school among others, supports development of education and innovative language-learning policy. Because of these strengths, CLIL has become one of the effective ways to respond to European efforts to support language education. As stated in European documents (e.g. European Language Policy and CLIL

or Talking the Future 2010-2020: Languages in Education), within a tight curriculum CLIL, with its mission to combine learning a content subject and a language at the same time, seems to be a perfect way to provide opportunities for more language input without an increase in the number of classes in any grade. That is why CLIL remains in the focus of authorities supporting educational projects as well as researchers setting up CLIL-related studies.

However, along with all these benefits, research also shows certain limitations of CLIL. Harrop (2012) points out the risk of overestimation of CLIL potential when insufficiently defined in terms of expected objectives and planning towards reaching them. She mentions a possible disappointment with the final results of linguistic outcomes if there is the lack of clear definition. Similarly, Vázquez (2007) sees possible problems of CLIL in lack of linguistic expertise (appropriate language competences) of some CLIL teachers. She further criticizes the case when bilingual education concerns just the elite.

Another problematic area could be a certain reluctance of teachers to use CLIL due to the higher workload, lack of expertise with CLIL, shortage of suitable materials corresponding to adequate content of a subject and the level of students' foreign language proficiency at the same time. Furthermore, financial resources are often also at play (Harrop, 2012, Deller & Price, 2007; Vázquez, 2007). In terms of language production, CLIL teachers should allow for enough time to use the foreign language. If a CLIL teacher is a language teacher, they should deliberately reduce teacher-talking time in favour of student-talking time. On the other hand, in subject teaching the learning load prescribed by the curriculum needs to be handled, so teacher-talking time is necessary. Solving this dilemma and finding a way to balance teacher- and student-talking time well, could be seen as another burden (Deller & Price, 2007).

When looking at CLIL students, the same as any other students, they naturally differ in learning styles, cognitive level and language acquisition. So, there is a call for different support regarding different students. Such a differentiation requires considering the learning input, the task itself and the support needed which could be very demanding to provide in a well-thought out way (Cambridge ESOL, 2011).

Even though the overall results of the discussion on benefits and drawbacks of CLIL show more strengths than weaknesses, the limitations should not be ignored. They ought to be further examined to shape the position of CLIL in education. CLIL is having an undeniable influence on education all over the world, but we should be alert not only to the potential problems mentioned, but also to the variety and educational specifications on a national level of individual countries.

Czech Context of CLIL

Notions about CLIL in the Czech Republic started to develop in the 1990s through initiatives of the Ministry of Education in cooperation with other educational entities (the National Institute for Education - NUV and the National Institute for Further Education - NIDV). Nevertheless unlike

in other countries (Belgium – the Flemish Community, the Netherlands, Germany, Spain, Italy, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, UK, Bulgaria, Norway) there were no pilot projects related to CLIL provisions up to 2004-2005 (Eurydice, 2006).

As stated in the Eurydice report (2006) in line with the educational goals of the Action Plan on Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity 2004-2006, CLIL has become one of the key aspects of language education throughout Europe. Thus also in the Czech Republic (which joined the European Union in 2004) various projects have been organized providing an introduction to CLIL with its principles and methods. The first CLIL project in the Czech Republic started in 2006.

Almost all Czech universities provide their students with a possibility to get educated in CLIL by methodology courses offered mainly at English Departments of Faculties of Education. Teachers who did not have a chance to learn about CLIL during their studies at the university can get CLIL training in the form of various workshops organized, among others, by the institutions mentioned above.

According to Mužík (2008), a representative of the National Institute for Further Education in the Czech Republic, 6% of Czech schools offer CLIL education in a more or less intensive format. The languages of instruction include English (in most cases), German and French, as well as, to a far lesser extent, Italian and Spanish. 75% of all schools using CLIL are primary and lower secondary schools (pupils aged 6-11 and 11-14), 25% upper-secondary schools (pupils aged 15-19). According to the last complex investigation into CLIL education organized by NIDV in 2011, the overall number of schools offering some kind of CLIL instruction increased to 30%. Yet it is necessary to keep in mind that this number covers any type of CLIL provision, so also non-systematic try-outs. 19% of the schools provide CLIL officially acknowledged by the Ministry of Education, i.e. CLIL is a part of the curriculum and thus these schools have to organize for a certain number of CLIL classes (Kubů, Matoušková & Mužík, 2011). Ministry of Education does not provide any specific guidelines of CLIL, but there are guidelines for topics to be covered in particular levels of education.

Czech teachers involved in CLIL are qualified teachers of relevant subjects. In the case of not possessing an academic degree in the target language along with the degree in the relevant content subject, teachers are required to prove language proficiency of at least C1 level according to CEFR (Eurydice, 2012).

CLIL and Vocabulary Acquisition

Learning vocabulary is one of the many goals of language learning. Learning a language is complex and we cannot separate vocabulary from the content it represents i.e. text or discourse (Nation, 2001). Furthermore, vocabulary acquisition, being an inseparable part of language learning, depends on many different variables such as the amount of exposure, motivation, learners' L1, cultural background and age (Schmitt, 2000).

Lexis is one of the key areas affected by CLIL. Some studies show that there is a positive effect on overall vocabulary acquisition in classes of CLIL instruction (Espinosa,

2009; Dalton-Puffer, 2008, Lansagabaster 2008, Xanthou 2007). Other studies speak in favour of CLIL as an activator of prior lexical knowledge (Augustín Llach, 2014) or as a tool to help learners to be less shy when using the vocabulary they learn (Sylvén, 2010). On the other hand, some results are not as straightforward in lexical learning between CLIL and non-CLIL learners as expected (Whittaker & Llinares, 2009). The advantages of CLIL do not necessarily increase with time (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008) and if there is too little attention on forms of the word (its morphological and phonological features), it can lead to slowing down vocabulary development (Harrop, 2012). Also, the initial knowledge of L2 can make a difference in future vocabulary growth within CLIL (Catalán & de Zarobe, 2009).

Need for the Study

A document on European language policy and CLIL released by the European Commission stresses the importance of special attention to CLIL in Europe to support its beneficial role within language education ("European language policy," n.d.). This statement could be linked with opinions of CLIL specialists who say that it is a proper understanding of CLIL at the local level that contributes to the value of CLIL in a wider context. Thus we can say that small scale projects and classroom insights set into a context of CLIL within a particular country are the key elements to develop theoretically-based principles for effective CLIL (Nikula, Dalton-Puffer & Llinares, 2013; Swain & Lapkin, 2013) and to foster understanding of the CLIL approach (de Bot, 2001).

"It is of critical importance to conduct further research [...] as new CLIL experiences are emerging [...]. In addition to further exploring the effectiveness of CLIL in terms of learners' L2 proficiency, research on CLIL acquisition should examine the causes of the slight difference between CLIL learners and non-CLIL learners" (Fontecha, 2009).

Catalán & de Zarobe (2009) deal with this matter as well and state that "more studies are needed in which vocabulary tests of an integrative kind are given to both groups of students [CLIL and non-CLIL...], tests based on frequency, as is the 1000-word and 2000-word test. [...] These tests] should be complemented by specific vocabulary tests on the vocabulary and terms related to the curricular subjects studied by CLIL students by means of English language". (p.89)

Catalán & de Zarobe (2009) further add that the research sample should ideally contain both male and female students from different age groups.

As stated by del Pilar Agustín Llach (2014) when examining studies of CLIL pedagogy (Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Sylvén, 2010; Xanthou, 2007, 2011), vocabulary-oriented research within CLIL needs to be strengthened. One of the contributing areas should be a comparison of CLIL and non-CLIL learners (del Pilar Agustín Llach, 2014). This argument is supported by Nikula, Dalton-Puffer and Llinares (2013), who point out that a major objective of further research should be to determine the role of CLIL in language education. Vocabulary learning can serve as an ideal tool here, being a key element of language learning.

Drawing from the literature review, this study was conducted to investigate vocabulary acquisition in connection with CLIL by looking at comparisons of CLIL and non-CLIL classes regarding general vocabulary knowledge. When examining individual CLIL classes further, I wanted to find out whether a year of previous experience with CLIL matters regarding the general vocabulary development and also whether there is a difference in vocabulary development when comparing CLIL classes of different subjects.

The intention of the whole experiment is to broaden the empirical basis for knowledge acquisition within CLIL and to help understand the overall efficiency of the CLIL method coming from concrete contexts of CLIL on school level. In order to shed light on CLIL and vocabulary acquisition in a wider context, the focus was on ordinary CLIL classes, i.e. classes of schools without enhanced learning of foreign languages or being a bilingual school. Thus, mainstream schools were targeted, particularly lower secondary schools (pupils aged 11 – 14). This study can potentially lead to comparative studies of similar design across the curriculum of mainstream schools of both the same or different age groups.

The general research question was formulated as follows: To what extent does general vocabulary size increase over a year in CLIL? The subsequent specifications are linked to the amount of pupils' previous experience with CLIL, gender and a teacher factor.

METHOD

The study reports on the results of a year of investigation into vocabulary development within CLIL. To obtain reliable data, the testing process took place in CLIL schools clearly depicting the current situation in the Czech Republic. Both schools were equal in size. The content subjects I focused on (Civics and History) were taught predominantly in English. Thus, these schools held the best assurance that the data collected would answer the research question. Next to the two schools providing CLIL education, a mainstream school of the same size where there was no CLIL provision was involved.

Research Design

The research sample was a cohort of 286 lower secondary pupils spread over 3 grades (grade 6, 7 and 8, age ranging from 11 to 14 years, a total of 12 classes altogether, over 3 Czech schools (2 schools serving as experimental groups and 1 school as a control group). In the experimental school number 1, CLIL pupils studied History in English in the 7th grade (12-13-year-olds) and Civil Education (Civics) in English in the 8th grade (13-14-year-olds). In the experimental school number 2, CLIL-pupils studied Civil Education (Civics) in English in the 6th (11-12-year-olds) and 7th grade. As can be seen from Table 1 – Distribution of participants, some pupils had a year of CLIL experience prior to the experiment. Therefore next to the investigation into CLIL versus non-CLIL distinction, the extra year of CLIL experience was also considered. In the control school, the sample consisted of the 7th grade and the 8th grade pupils. Pupils of the control school had no experience with CLIL instruction whatsoever. The national curriculum is standardized towards certain topics to be covered in lower secondary education (grades 6-8), which enabled comparison between the lower secondary grades of different schools.

All of the participants were native speakers of Czech. Every pupil involved in the research has attended classes of English as a foreign language from the age of 8-9. They all had a class of English three times a week (3 x 45') throughout the school year and they all had the same number of content classes (History and Civics). Table 1 illustrates the variables taken into consideration.

First, I needed to determine how large the vocabulary size of each pupil was. I used the vocabulary level tests developed by Laufer & Nation (1999), tests which measure the extent to which learners of English master (the most) frequently used English words. Randomly chosen words ranging from the 1000 to 2000 word family, i.e. 0-2000 most frequent words were tested. This is the word range pupils should master in the grades corresponding to lower secondary level (Webb, Sasao & Balance, 2017). The focus was on productive vocabulary since that fitted the type of tests pupils were used to.

Table 1. Distribution of participants

Groups	School + Grade + Teacher	Count of pupils	Count of classes	Count of boys/girls	CLIL subject	1 year of previous CLIL experience
Experimental	a7 teacher 1	54	2	27/27	History	yes
	a8 teacher 1	43	2	24/19	Civics	no
	b6 teacher 2	68	3	37/31	Civics	no
	b7 teacher 2	73	3	41/32	Civics	yes
Control	c7 teacher 3	26	1	14/12	-	no
	c8 teacher 3	22	1	15/7	-	no

a, b, c = different schools, 6, 7, 8 = grades

Data Collection and Analysis

The first administration of the tests took place at the beginning of the school year. Each pupil worked on the test individually when sitting in the classroom with the others, no dictionary support was allowed. I also controlled for the length of the test to fit the test conditions pupils were used to, so that the attention span could remain constant during the test. I learnt from the teachers that receiving grades makes the pupils take the test seriously. Nevertheless, I felt that it can cause nervousness and anxiety and grading was not my target, so I decided to motivate pupils and give grades just to those whose scores would result in an A or B grade. The same process was repeated at the end of the school year.

Drawing on the literature and previous research findings, different variables came into play when looking at the general vocabulary acquisition. The major distinction investigated was CLIL versus non-CLIL classes. Within the CLIL classes, I took account of the group with a year of previous experience with CLIL and compared that group to the pupils that did not have that previous experience. Furthermore, other variables that were taken into consideration included gender and teacher factor. I checked whether these variables show significant differences both treated individually and in collaboration. The number of pupils whose data could be used for the final comparisons dropped since I had to exclude those who were absent at the final testing either being ill or taking part at various school excursions happening at the end of the school year.

To check the vocabulary development within the CLIL context, various features were analysed and compared. I opted to work with unstandardized residual scores. These scores were obtained by means of regression analysis in which the post score was the dependent variable and the initial score on the test was the independent variable. The two tests correlated with each other ($r=.56$). Then I used these residual scores as dependent variables for all upcoming analyses. I used analysis of variance (ANOVA). The analyses first comprised of calculations for experimental (CLIL) versus control (non-CLIL) group, afterwards I looked at the part of the CLIL group with a year of previous experience with CLIL versus the part of the CLIL group with no CLIL experience before the experiment. Additionally, I checked for possible differences regarding gender, CLIL subject and teacher involvement.

RESULTS

On first sight, it looks as though a year of CLIL has a beneficial effect on vocabulary acquisition. In a bivariate ANOVA,

the experimental group scores significantly higher than the control group (experimental group $\bar{x}=4.2$, control group $\bar{x}= -2.23$) ($F(1, 189) = 7.66$; $p < .006$). When I look more closely at the data using a multivariate ANOVA, I see that it is not the opposition control group – experimental group that causes this significance, but the previous year of CLIL. Mean values of the scores for the six classes are included in Table 2.

When using multivariate ANOVA, and entering four variables as independent ones (gender, CLIL subject, previous year of CLIL and teacher), it comes out that gender and CLIL subject are not significant and previous year of CLIL and teacher are. After redoing the analysis with only the experimental group and the two factors that are significant, the results are as follows: For CLIL-experience $F(1,157) = 18.97$; $p < 0.001$; for teacher $F(1,157) = 17.42$; $p < 0.001$; $R^2 = .20$. So, both previous experience with CLIL and the teacher have an effect on the gain in vocabulary acquisition during the year the pupils were followed.

DISCUSSION

The results obtained yield the information that previous exposure to CLIL is crucial for seeing any significant difference in general vocabulary acquisition in CLIL. As the results show, the significant difference between the control group and the experimental group applies solely to the groups having two years of CLIL experience. One year of CLIL experience does not make a difference.

The study contributes to a broad research dealing with the effect of CLIL on vocabulary acquisition. It strengthens and supports previous studies in different settings (e.g. in Spain: Llach, 2014, in Finland: Merikivi, 2014, in Iran: Moghadam & Fatemipour, 2014) investigating the relation of CLIL instruction and vocabulary development. While results of vocabulary tests given to CLIL pupils after a year of experience with CLIL do not significantly differ from those of pupils not experiencing any CLIL, in the case of two years experience with CLIL the difference is significant. In other words the benefit of CLIL in connection with vocabulary development was observable not earlier than after two years. This interesting finding could be linked with Hunt (2011) who calls for research looking at language learning outcomes of CLIL in longer-term perspective as well as Nikula, Dalton-Puffer and Llinares (2013) who appeal for specifying conditions for language development within CLIL.

Although the test results do not speak of CLIL effects in a scope of one year, it cannot be simply stated that it will

Table 2. Description of classes

School/grade	Mean value	Experimental x control	An extra year of CLIL experience
a7	- 0.27	exp.	yes
a8	- 2.46	exp.	no
b6	- 0.40	exp.	no
b7	3.65	exp.	yes
c7	- 1.24	control	-
c8	- 3,53	control	-

a, b, c = different schools, 6, 7, 8 = grades

always be this way. As I see it, the vocabulary tests fit the traditional test format and are thus prone to be closer to traditional education. CLIL being viewed as innovative education (Van de Craen, 2016) is not necessarily in line with traditional testing. This fact may result in a test format disadvantageous for an unconventional CLIL environment as opposed to traditional standardized testing of the curriculum. Another explanation why an extra year of previous experience with CLIL makes a difference could be the CLIL education itself. Like any innovation, CLIL requires time to bear fruit. This fact is supported by Smitt's (2000) claim that the amount of exposure to CLIL matters. Pupils in a CLIL class may need some time to get used to different organization of work during CLIL classes, an organization which promotes cooperation and various learning aids. They need to get familiar with different activities based on scaffolding and get used to another language as a language of instruction. As mentioned previously by Deller and Price (2007) CLIL rises challenge to both pupils and teachers. CLIL teachers often have to change their teaching style, especially if they used frontal teaching previously.

On the basis of results of this study, it could be pointed out that CLIL can be an effective way of vocabulary acquisition, but it is essential to consider certain time needed for significant productive vocabulary development. As the results of the further analysis show, a teacher is a very significant factor coming at play when evaluating the results of productive vocabulary acquisition in CLIL classes both at the very start with CLIL and in case of classes already experiencing CLIL instruction for some time. To understand the success of CLIL in connection with the role of a teacher, it could be interesting to look into the organization of the CLIL classes, planning of a lesson, methods and strategies used as well as instructions and scaffolding techniques.

IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

As stated by the results and explained in the discussion, these are interesting outcomes to vocabulary development in CLIL. These might be introduced not just to other CLIL researchers, but also to CLIL practitioners such as teacher trainers, headmasters of CLIL schools and CLIL teachers themselves. I am very well aware of the fact that the study is limited in its scope by the age of pupils involved and conditions of CLIL in the Czech Republic. On the one hand, it can be stated that the variables of this study could be easily transformed into any other country worldwide. On the other hand, the reality of individual CLIL classes can vary substantially and so could the outcome of measuring the vocabulary acquisition not just across different countries but also within individual countries.

The results give an indication of what works and what does not work in CLIL when looking at vocabulary acquisition. The findings may instigate other researchers to inquire into the elements to improve CLIL education. This study may then serve as a basis for further investigation both in the Czech Republic and abroad. Any such investigation would contribute to the research around vocabulary acquisition in CLIL. A possible direction of further research could

specifically concern receptive vocabulary knowledge being compared to the productive, different school subject of CLIL instruction or investigating into the role of a CLIL teacher while going more in depth of classroom environment.

CONCLUSION

This article discussed the mutual relationship of vocabulary acquisition and CLIL instruction. Introducing the notion of CLIL approach in the scope of modern foreign language education, certain benefits and drawbacks of CLIL were pointed out in line with various studies on this issue. Given these, the specifications of CLIL in the Czech context as well as European documents around CLIL were mentioned. Afterwards vocabulary acquisition in relation to CLIL instruction was discussed. The main aim of the research was to investigate into impact of CLIL instruction on productive vocabulary. Additionally, I enquired into a difference between groups having a year of experience with CLIL and groups starting with CLIL at the time of the experiment. When checking for the specifications concerning the influence of CLIL on productive vocabulary acquisition, I looked into a factor of gender, a factor of the CLIL subject and a factor of the role of a teacher.

The year-long experiment carried out at lower secondary level of education resulted in outcomes enriching the domain of CLIL research. Despite the limitations mentioned, the study brings insight into the extent to which CLIL affects acquiring new vocabulary. It may be concluded that significant changes in general productive vocabulary increase are observable after two years of experiencing CLIL education. In this study significance is also attributed to the factor of a teacher, but no significance was found on the basis of gender of the pupils and the CLIL subject of the classes involved in the research.

The research raises an important question of what is a good practice of CLIL when vocabulary acquisition is concerned. Evidence emerged from the study regarding importance of time of exposure to CLIL along with good quality teachers as vital pillars of successful contribution of CLIL into vocabulary acquisition. Based on this study, both CLIL experience and the role of a teacher are undoubtedly key aspects of successful CLIL and therefore CLIL policy makers as well as CLIL practitioners should take them into consideration.

REFERENCES

- Asikaine, T., Bertaux, P., Martin, M. J. F., Hughes, S., Marsh, D., & Mehisto, P. (2010). Talking the Future 2010-2020, Languages in Education.
- Banegas, D. (2012). The challenges of CLIL implementation in EFL contexts. BETA-IATEFL Conference Proceedings.
- Brown, P. S. (2013). Teaching a medical English CLIL course with vocabulary learning strategies instruction in Japan. *Asian EFL Journal Teaching Articles*, 15(4), 276-305.
- Catalán, R. M. J., & de Zarobe, Y. R. (Eds.). (2009). The Receptive Vocabulary of EFL Learners in Two Instructional

- Contexts: CLIL versus non-CLIL Instruction. In Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe (pp. 81-90). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-008>
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011>
- Coyle, D. (n.d.). Content and language integrated learning motivating learners and teachers. Retrieved from: https://alojamientos.uva.es/guia_docente/uploads/2012/404/40526/1/Documento3.pdf
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. UK: Cambridge.
- Dale, L., & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities: a resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles?. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182-204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092>
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Current Research from Europe. In Werner Delanoy & Laurenz Volkmann (Eds.), *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-22). Heidelberg: Carl Winter. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.20>
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.20>
- Deller, S., & Price, Ch. (2007). *Teaching Other Subjects Through English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Graaf, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10 (5), 603-624. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb462.0>
- De Zarobe, Y. R., & Catalán, R. M. J. (2009). Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from research in Europe. Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675>
- Eurydice: Eurostat - Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe. (2012). Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- European language policy and CLIL (n.d.). European Commission, Commission Européenne, Bruxelles, Europese Commissie, Belgium, Retrieved from: http://www.eduxunta.es/centros/cpicruce/system/files/clilbroch_en.pdf
- Espinosa, S. M. (2009). Young Learners' L2 Word Association Responses in Two Different Learning Contexts. In Y. R. de Zarobe & R. M. J. Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 93-107). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-009>
- Fontecha A. F. (2009). Spanish CLIL: Research and Official Actions. In Y. R. de Zarobe & R. M. J. Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 3-16). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-004>
- Harrop, E. (2012). Content and language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Limitations and possibilities. *Encuentro*, 21, 57-70.
- Hunt, M. (2011). Learners' perceptions of their experiences of learning subject content through a foreign language. *Educational Review*, 63(3), 365-378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.571765>
- Languages at the Heart of Learning. (2015). European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe: 2016-2019 programme. Graz: ECML.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1999). *A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability Language Testing* 16(1): 33-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229901600103>
- Lindahl, K., Baecher, L., & Tomaš, Z. (2013). Teacher language awareness in content-based activity design. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(2), 198-225. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.2.03lin>
- Llach, M. del P. A. (2014). Exploring the lexical profile of young CLIL learners: Towards an improvement in lexical use. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(1), 54-73. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.1.03agu>
- Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The Role of Language in CLIL*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyster, R., Quiroga, J., & Ballinger S. (2013). The effects of biliteracy instruction on morphological awareness. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(2), 169-197. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.2.02lys>
- Marsh, D., Maljers, A., & Hartiala, A. (2001). Profiling European CLIL Classrooms, Languages open door. Europees Platform voor het Nederlandse Onderwijs, the Netherlands and University of Jyväskylä, Finland: The Need for Research on CLIL in Europe - Kees de Bot, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, p.12.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M.J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Merikivi, R. (2014). Vocabulary in CLIL in Mainstream Education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3), 487-497. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.3.487-497>
- Moate, J. (2011). Reconceptualising the Role of Talk in CLIL. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 5(2), 17-35.
- Mogdham, N. Z., & Fatemipour, H. (2014). The Effect of CLIL on Vocabulary Development by Iranian Secondary School EFL Learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 2004-2009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.635>
- Navés T. (2009). Effective Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). In Y. R. de Zarobe & R. M. J. Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 22-37). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-005>
- Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, Ch., & Llinares, A. (2013). CLIL classroom discourse: resource from Europe. *Journal of*

- Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 70-100. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.04nik>
- Pujol, I. M. (2008). The Influence of Age on Vocabulary Acquisition in English as a Foreign Language (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from: http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/1670/02.IMP_CHAPTER_2.pdf?sequence=3, 51-70.
- Sánchez, A., & Manchón, R. M. (2007). Introduction. In Research on secondary language vocabulary acquisition and learning: an introduction. *International Journal of English Studies*, 7(2), vii-xvi.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 101-129. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.05swa>
- Van de Craen, P. (2016). How Language Learning Can Make You and Your Kids Smarter.or If CLIL is the answer, what are the questions? Retrieved from: <http://www.langcen.cam.ac.uk/lc/events/docs/Van-de-Craen-Make-You-and-Your-Kids-Smarter.pdf>
- Vázquez, G. (2007). Models of CLIL: An evaluation of its status drawing on the German experience. A critical report on the limits of reality and perspectives. *Volumen Monográfico*, 95-111.
- Webb, S., Sasao, Y., & Balance, O. (2017). The updated vocabulary levels test. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 168(1), 33 - 69. doi 10.1075/itl.168.1.02web <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.168.1.02web>
- Whittaker, R., & Llinares, A. (2009). CLIL in Social Science Classrooms: Analysis of Spoken and Written Productions. In Y. R. de Zarobe & R. M. J. Catalán (Eds.), Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe (pp. 215-232). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-015>
- Wiesemes, R. (2009). Developing Theories of Practices in CLIL: CLIL as Post-method Pedagogies?. In Y. R. de Zarobe & R. M. J. Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 41-57). Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-006>