

**Katarina Ule**

Filozofska fakulteta v Ljubljani  
ule.katarina@gmail.com

UDK 81'243(497.4+410.5):373.3

## **THE POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATIONS OF CLIL, CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING, IN SLOVENE AND SCOTTISH PRIMARY SCHOOLS FROM A TEACHER'S POINT OF VIEW**

### **1 CLIL AS A TEACHING METHODOLOGY**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

So far, not a lot of countries have developed a thorough educational CLIL system. Even though there are many teachers and pedagogical experts in Slovenia, as well as in Scotland, who are dealing with possible implementations of CLIL, there seems to be still quite a lot of difficulties with implementing CLIL in formal education in Slovenia and Scotland. In today's world of globalization, and given the impact that the English and French languages have in our everyday lives, I find CLIL to be an exceptional tool for achieving multilingual and pluricultural dimensions, but which still lacks frontiers in formal education in Scotland and Slovenia today. CLIL connects content and language with an immersion that consequently assures the learner's proficiency level in both fields without separating them. In the research conducted among Slovene and Scottish primary school teachers, several views were taken into account; mainly the restrictions of the Scottish and Slovene national curricula and the problems of implementing CLIL in primary schools, as well as the limitations of it, due to the lack of knowledge of CLIL vehicular language, namely that being French in Scotland and English and French in Slovenia.

#### **1.2 CLIL in theory**

There is a bit of confusion in trying to identify and specify CLIL because there are so many similar methods used in Modern Language Teaching today; probably because they all have something in common, but also distinct characteristics. The most similar to CLIL is teaching subjects in a foreign language, where a modern language is used as a medium of instruction to teach only the content. CLIL is different because it is a method used for teaching other subjects through another language, where both the content and the language are taught together. In a CLIL programme, there is a dual focus on content and language, as both are exposed in detail to the learner. But the main difference between ESP or other methods and CLIL is that the latter is subject-led, whereas others are in their essence always

language-led. Deller and Price (2007) discuss the differences further, pointing out that in a language-led class the four skills of writing, reading, listening and speaking are taught as a part of an end product, whereas in a subject-led class, found in CLIL programmes, these skills are only a tool for acquiring new knowledge and showing one's understanding of newly acquired information. CLIL and EMILE are compatible expressions designed to represent a relatively new teaching method. While the term EMILE is used in French (*l'Enseignement d'une Matière Intégrée à une Langue Étrangère*), CLIL is used in English. According to Coyle *et al.* (2010), CLIL, meaning *Content and Language Integrated Learning*, basically represents a new teaching and learning approach that consists of incorporating content and language in one lesson, the focus being dual and inseparable. It is a methodology where a part of, or the whole teaching and learning process, occurs in an additional language, different from the learner's first language. This additional language can also be called CLIL vehicular language and it is used for learning non-language subjects such as science, art, etc. CLIL is not a new methodology, since it combines already known teaching techniques for subjects, as well as language education, but it is definitely new in the sense that it represents an original merging of both aspects. According to Gibbons (2002), a CLIL classroom has to deal with topics that have subject-oriented and specific aims in an authentic context, in order to guarantee meaningful language use.

## 1.2 Reasons behind CLIL

Coyle *et al.* (2010) attempt to provide reactive and proactive reasons affecting the implementation of CLIL within a specific area or country. Reasons that are reactive are those that respond to an already created situation, whereas proactive actually create new situations. Here we can draw the first parallels between Slovenia and Scotland. CLIL is carried out for reactive reasons, with minority languages, such as Scots Gaelic in Scotland and Italian and Hungarian in Slovenia, being implemented in primary schools. Returning to proactive reasons listed by Coyle *et al.* (2010) to increase the implementation of CLIL, hands-on solutions should be encouraged in Slovenia, as well as in Scotland, in order to boost language learning. According to the information gathered by *Eurydice* (2006), in both countries, in Slovenia as well as in Scotland, proactive reasons for CLIL have not yet been implemented, meaning that teaching in foreign languages has not yet taken place, whereas reactive reasons for CLIL have existed for several decades now.

Coyle *et al.* (2010) cite examples from the European Union, which is trying to unify the countries with different points of view. One of them is of course the economic uniformity where languages play an important role. Multilingualism, early language learning programmes, amelioration of weaknesses in language teaching and new approaches were all discussed by the European Economic Community, the European Educational Council and the European Parliament. In 2006, more than a decade after CLIL was officially introduced, the first research about CLIL at schools across Europe was conducted by *Eurydice*. The interesting fact was that CLIL expanded beyond the frames of Europe and is now applied also in countries like Australia, Canada, Russia, China and others.

## 2 SLOVENE AND SCOTTISH NATIONAL CURRICULA

### 2.1 Scotland

While trying to establish the possible implementations of CLIL in Scottish and Slovenian primary schools, the educational system and national curriculum of Scotland and Slovenia had to be taken into consideration. Scotland is not an independent country, although most of the policies have reached a high level of autonomy, including the educational sector. With regards to supervision, the Secretary State for Scotland answers to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The Scottish Government is divided into several offices, one of them being the Educational Department of the Scottish Office, SOED. According to EURIDICE&CEDEFOP (1995), nursery schools in Scotland are available for children aged 3 to 4, then they enter primary school from age 5 until 12, following a seven-year course. In all seven years, there is one teacher per class teaching all the subjects, but normally specialised teachers assist with subjects like music, P.E. or modern languages. There are no formal grades assigned to pupils' knowledge; assessments are done continuously by the teacher of the class in a descriptive manner, according to the levels of attainment specified by SOED. A 1997 report by the Council of Europe shows that after several pilot projects implementing modern languages in Scotland, the conclusion made in 1995 was that it has to be succeeded by a generalisation period, which is to ensure that a modern language is taught in all primary schools in Scotland. There has been a major change in the field of teaching, in that modern language teaching is to be taken on mainly by primary school teachers, rather than by visiting teachers from secondary schools. This area was about introducing Modern Languages which really came alive in the new *Curriculum for Excellence* (a new, innovative concept of coherent and life-long learning), although it is only starting to be implemented in the last couple of school years. The overall aims of the curriculum go hand in hand with the goals of CLIL programmes: advancing an active social conscience, bridging the gap between the mother tongue and the foreign language and developing communicative competence. According to the *Curriculum for Excellence: Modern Languages*, teaching and learning of a modern language in Scotland starts in P6, so at the age of 10.

### 2.2 Slovenia

In Slovenia, only primary education is compulsory, and it lasts two years longer than the Scottish primary school. Preschool education is offered from the ages of one through five. Children start first grade at the age of six. The elementary school is divided into nine years that fall into three-year cycles. In the first cycle, there is one teacher per class for almost all subjects, except for specialist subjects, where a subject teacher, in cooperation with the class teacher, teaches P.E., music, drawing and languages. In the second cycle, teaching is gradually taken over by specialist subject teachers, meaning that some subjects like Art, P.E. and Modern Languages are taught by different teachers. From seventh to ninth grade (the third cycle), the whole curriculum is taught by subject teachers, meaning that each subject is taught

by a different teacher. Assessment in primary school differs from that in Scotland. According to the objectives stated in the national curriculum, teachers assess learners through various types of written and oral tests throughout the school year. In the majority of the cases, the first compulsory modern language in Slovene primary schools is English, with some instances of French and German as well, and is introduced in the fourth grade, at the age of nine. At the end of the primary school, the curriculum dictates that 656 hours of classes on the first foreign language should be completed. The second foreign language is then introduced in the seventh grade, with 204 hours in the curriculum. The first foreign language is compulsory, whereas the second one is optional. While CLIL is not permissible as a full form for practicing lessons, cross-curricular connections between the first foreign language and other subjects is highly recommended in the syllabus.

### 2.3 History and Hitherto Practice of CLIL in Slovenia and Scotland

Before plunging into the recent history of CLIL practices in Slovenia and Scotland, their attitude towards languages needs to be discussed. The need to master another language besides the mother tongue is increasing in the European Union, especially in smaller countries like Slovenia. Ranking third place among EU countries with the best language skills, Slovenia has something to be proud of. Reasons behind this may not only be the fact that Slovenia is a small country, but also the fact that Slovenian language is considered completely useless for the development of a personal and professional career by Europeans polled in 2005 by the *Eurobarometer* that elaborates on reports of public opinions of specific issues relating to EU. On the opposite side, right at the bottom of the same scale, we find the United Kingdom, under which falls Scotland. The UK is, besides Ireland, a country with the worst language skills, with the majority of the population admitting to not knowing any other languages besides their mother tongue. Given that Scotland is part of the UK and shares most of their characteristics and attitudes, it is safe to presume that this data can be to some extent applied to Scotland as well. In the United Kingdom, the three most widely-spoken languages besides English are French, with 23%, followed by German and Spanish with significantly wide-spread appeal. The most common foreign language in Slovenia is Croatian with 59%, followed by English with 57% and German with 50%. *Eurobarometer's* report from 2005 also reveals the perceived value of languages according to different countries. People in the United Kingdom see French as the most useful language, whereas Slovenians choose English, German and Italian. The same survey also shows that when it comes to the age when children start learning their first foreign language, answers differ in both countries. With regards to the answer '*before the age of six*', The UK is at the top with 56%, whereas only 27% of Slovenians support this idea. According to another survey, conducted by the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana, 77% of Slovene parents state that English should be among the first two foreign languages a child should learn, followed by French and German (Lipavac Oštir, *et al.*, 2010).

One of the first mentions of the integration of modern languages with other subjects in Scottish primary schools dates back to 1989. According to Barnes

(2011), Scottish *Curriculum for Excellence* revolves around the cross-curricular approach, making modern languages an integral part of this approach. Because the status of foreign languages in Scotland differs immensely from its status in Slovenia, the importance of implementing modern languages in primary schools was not very high, or was even non-existent, just a couple of years ago. To truly understand the language attitudes in Scotland we have to go back in history. In addition to African and Asian colonies, Britain also subjected Wales, Ireland and Scotland. England forbade Gaelic language throughout history, starting with the *Act of Union* in 1707. Recent history shows that Gaelic was prohibited in Scottish schools and severe consequences followed if a teacher heard Gaelic (similar circumstances prevailed in Slovenia during the German and Italian occupation). It was not until 2005 that the Scottish Parliament passed a bill which granted the Scots Gaelic language complete legitimate equality with the English language. According to Johnstone (2005), CLIL carries great significance for Scotland, though it could not be applied across schools in the same way. Nevertheless, Scotland no longer applies the rule 'same size fits all', and there is opportunity for well-planned local resourcefulness. Johnstone points out that in reality, Scotland is already employing CLIL in certain forms. One example is the early partial immersion in a French project at *Walker Road Primary School* in Aberdeen; another one is provided by the fifty and more primary schools which are doing some form or another of primary education with Gaelic as the language of instruction. CLIL as a pilot project is provisioned in secondary schools across Scotland and England through *ITALIC, Interacting for Teaching and Learning in CLIL*.

The story is a bit different in Slovenia. Due to its size and history, it has always had a special relationship with foreign languages. Until its independence in 1991, foreign languages were imposed aggressively in Slovene schools by the occupiers. Language of instruction had mostly been Hungarian and Italian. After the war, the Slovene language returned to its former glory and is still the only official language used in primary schools, besides the minority regions. But nonetheless, there exist some language islands that offer international programmes where classes are held in a foreign language, for example *Danila Kumar International School, Gimnazija Bežigrad* and *Gimnazija Poljane*. According to Eurydice (2006), CLIL in Slovenia has been provided only within the frames of minority languages since 1959 in the borderline areas of Prekmurje and Istra. Some rare examples show kindergartens that are practising CLIL, mainly in the border areas where Slovene is mixed with German, Italian or Hungarian. Some national and school projects were launched to test CLIL in Slovene schools, but there was no major breakthrough, except for the two-year project *Foreign Language Communication (Uvajanje tujega jezika - UTJ) and Implementing Foreign Languages and Language and Intercultural Awareness (Jezikovni in medkulturno uzaveščanje - JIMU) in the First Triad of the Slovene Primary School*. Its main goals were to ground new approaches for language learning in early childhood, to establish the benefits of new language methods in Slovene schools, to prepare professional basis for implementation of modern foreign languages in the first triad of the Slovene primary schools and to develop and encourage a multi-lingual and intercultural education. Another crucial aim of the project was also to enrich the Slovene national curriculum for primary schools with a more integrated

linguistic approach, where one of the key approaches used in the project was CLIL. There were 49 schools who participated in the realization of the project. Practical examples of CLIL used during this project are collected in a publication called *Pot v večjezičnost - zgodnje učenje tujih jezikov v 1. VIO osnovne šole - Zgledi CLIL-a* (2010). In the year 2009, draft of a new curriculum for foreign language lessons in the first triad of the primary school (*Osnutek učnega načrta za pouk tujega jezika v prvem vzgojno-izobraževalnem obdobju v osnovni šoli*, 2009) was presented to the public. CLIL as a method where pragmatic-cultural, linguistic and content competence are developed simultaneously is therefore suggested by the new draft for early foreign language learning in Slovene primary school. But for now, one of the obstacles preventing the full implementation of CLIL is surely the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia, where it is clearly stated that the only official language of instruction is Slovene (with the exception of the two minority languages).

## 2.4 European examples of CLIL

According to *Eurydice* (2006), one of the first fragments of legislation concerning European collaboration in CLIL is the 1995 *Resolution of the Council*. In 2001, the European Year of Languages focused on the fact that the campaign for language learning and diversity can be attained through a wide diversity of approaches, one of them being CLIL type provision. In 2003, The European Commission launched its *Action Plan* (2004-2006) where the CLIL programme is mentioned as having a key input for the making of EU's language learning goals. The discussion on CLIL all over the European Union is very much alive at this moment, with some new initiatives endorsing this fresh method. The debates held by experts of the *Group on Languages* (brought together by the 'Education and Training' Work Programme), as well as the exchange of examples from good practice in the field of CLIL in Member States, will undoubtedly add value to CLIL's progress. Eurydice's project of observing CLIL at schools in the European Union in 2006 came to the following conclusions: CLIL is often provided by schools, but not on a broad scale, there exists the language prevalence of English, there is no strong inclination for any particular subject, and the need for teacher training more focused on CLIL is strongly exposed. This evaluation made in 2006 was far from general practice, but was nevertheless marked as an encouraging one.

## 3 THE RESEARCH ON POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATIONS IN SLOVENIA AND SCOTLAND

### 3.1 Survey Data

For my research, I have chosen to do a survey. The focus was mainly on the attitudes towards modern language teaching in primary schools and consequently the teachers' perspective on CLIL. 15 Scottish primary school teachers from *Abernyte* and *Inchture Primary Schools*, 15 Slovene teachers from *Osnovna šola Brinje*

(Primary school Brinje) and 15 teachers from *Osnovna šola Poljane* (Primary school Poljane) took part in my survey. After the analysis of my results, my findings were discussed in comparison to my starting hypotheses. My first hypothesis was that since there are major differences between the Slovenian and Scottish relationship towards the learning and acquisition of foreign languages, the possible implementations of CLIL in primary school differ immensely. My second hypothesis was that teachers in primary schools in Slovenia are more inclined to the implementation of CLIL, since their knowledge of a foreign language is strong enough, whereas a lot of Scottish teachers might reject the same idea mostly because of their lack of knowledge of the CLIL vehicular language. It is also worth pointing out that the sample of teachers participating in my survey is relatively small and therefore does not represent the entire teaching population in sufficient detail.

### 3.2 Analysis of Results Obtained by the Survey

Fifteen teachers from two different schools from Scotland participated in the survey, where the questions revolved around the usage of French in a CLIL setting. Among those 15 teachers, 9 of them already teach French as a modern foreign language. But the majority do not have a high proficiency level in French, since most of them only reached A2 level, which is only an elementary knowledge of French. Consequently, the French they are teaching to primary school pupils includes only basic vocabulary and simple phrases. On the other hand, the results were quite different when Slovene teachers were asked to answer. I decided to include 30 Slovene teachers because of two reasons. The first one was that CLIL pilot projects have already been carried out in some Slovenian primary schools, so the comparison between the two schools was possible. The second reason is that I have researched the usage of English, as well as French, in the Slovenian educational milieu. Thus 15 teachers from the school which was used in the CLIL pilot projects and 15 teachers from another school which did not use CLIL at any point were asked to give their answers. While 60% of Scottish teachers included in the survey give French lessons, only 33.3% of Slovene teachers included in the survey teach a foreign language. This is due to the fact that in the upper grades of the Slovene primary school, each subject is taught by a different teacher who is specialised in only one or two subjects. Among the Slovene teachers, quite a lot of them have a very high level of English, as oppose to French, where the vast majority has basic or no knowledge whatsoever.

I was also interested in the teachers' familiarity with CLIL. The results are quite interesting - the same percentage, namely 53.3% of Scottish teachers, as well as the Slovene teachers from the primary school included in the CLIL pilot project, have already been introduced to CLIL, whereas only 13.3% of Slovene teachers from the non-CLIL school have already heard of CLIL. It is quite reasonable that half of the teachers from the Slovene CLIL school are familiar with it, but it is rather interesting that the same part of Scottish teachers is also acquainted with CLIL, since similar results would be expected with the Slovene non-CLIL school, as both of these groups of teachers work in schools that were not included in pilot projects concerning CLIL. This can mean quite a few things, for example that the

Scottish teachers in general are more overt and conscious about new methodologies in the education than the Slovene ones, but this cannot be firmly attested because the number of participants in my survey was quite low. I also wanted to see how many of the partaking teachers were not only acquainted with CLIL, but had already used it in one way or another. Only four teachers out of 45 gave the affirmative answer, and all four of them come from the CLIL pilot project school in Slovenia. Three of the teachers use English as CLIL vehicular language and one of them uses German.

In order to confirm or disprove my first hypothesis, I also wanted to see the attitude of Scottish teachers in comparison to the Slovene towards foreign languages. No major differences were discovered, since the majority in Scotland answered with the grade 4 out of 5, meaning that the knowledge of a foreign language is 'very important' to them, and the majority of teachers in Slovenia answered with grade 5, meaning 'extremely important'. These results disprove the main part of the first hypothesis that there are major differences between Slovenian and Scottish attitude towards the learning and acquisition of foreign languages.

Among the 15 Scottish teachers, only 27% of them would consider teaching other subjects in French, whereas none of the Slovene teachers would use French as a language of instruction. But when English was considered the language of teaching, 30% of Slovene teachers answered affirmatively. Here we can draw the parallel that French has a similar status in Scotland as English has in Slovenia.

Another important issue that is relevant when it comes to implementing CLIL is the confidence the teachers have about using a foreign language in their teaching. Here the majority of the Slovene and Scottish teachers do not feel that their knowledge of French or English is high enough, although in fact about a third of the Slovene teachers do feel confident about using the English language. In connection, teachers in Scotland do not feel that pupils in primary schools (even in the higher grades) are proficient enough in French to follow a CLIL course. The same goes for the Slovene teachers who participated in the survey. The majority of them do not believe that primary school pupils have a sufficient knowledge of French. On the other hand, it is interesting to see that only 2 Slovene teachers out of 30 think that pupils in primary school do not have the sufficient level of English for the implementation of CLIL, whereas the rest believe that CLIL in English would be possible if the language proficiency of the students would not be put in question. Once again, we can observe the predominance and range that the English language has in Slovenian education, as opposed to the minority status of French.

Another perspective on CLIL that I wanted to explore was the effects that CLIL might have from the teachers' point of view. One question was about the positive and negative effects that teaching non-language subjects in a foreign language might bring. The results were quite interesting because in Scotland, 67% of teachers included in the survey agreed that teaching non-lingual subjects in a foreign language brought more positive effects than the negative ones, whereas only 37% of Slovene teachers completely agreed with this statement. In my first hypotheses I anticipated that the Slovene teachers would have a more positive attitude, but as it turns out it is quite the other way around. In connection with



these types of prejudgements about CLIL, we also find the stereotype that CLIL can damage the mother tongue. Surprisingly, neither Scottish nor Slovene teachers see it this way. The majority of them say that by teaching even parts of the subject in a foreign language cannot harm the pupils' mother tongue.

At the end, the final question was quite straightforward, asking the teachers about their assessment of realizing CLIL in primary schools in Scotland and Slovenia. Here the Slovene teachers gave higher scores for the possibility of CLIL implementation in Slovenian primary schools than in Scottish Schools.

### 3.3 Review of the Hypotheses

After discussing all the results of the survey, I can now review my two hypotheses. The first hypothesis was already partially disproved, as there are no major differences between the Slovenian and Scottish relationship towards learning and acquisition of foreign languages. The projected consequences which was for the possible implementations of CLIL in a primary school would differ immensely, which is definitely not true. From the teachers' point of view, Scotland has quite a positive and welcoming attitude towards foreign languages, as well as CLIL. My second hypothesis was that the teachers in primary schools in Slovenia are more inclined to the implementation of CLIL, since their knowledge of a foreign language is relatively strong enough, whereas a lot of Scottish teachers are likely to reject the same idea, mostly because of their lack of knowledge of the CLIL vehicular language. Here we can confirm the hypothesis if we compare the status of the French language in Scotland and that of the English one in Slovenia. Both are considered as first and most wide-spread foreign languages, but as seen from the survey, the knowledge of English obtained by teachers and pupils is relatively higher in Slovene than the French proficiency of teachers and students in Scotland. The Scottish and Slovenian teachers are well acquainted with CLIL and share the same positive attitude, so I can affirm that the reason why Slovene teachers give higher odds to CLIL provision lies in the fact that the foreign language know-how is in fact much higher in Slovenia than in Scotland.

## 4 CONCLUSION

To conclude, CLIL as a dual-focused teaching method is relatively new to teachers across Europe. Its implementation has not yet taken full swing, especially in primary schools. The same cannot be said for the abundant research and development CLIL has undergone in the last decade, which can be seen in my literature review. I have tried to focus mainly on primary schools, since I believe that children should be immersed in new cognitive and linguistic challenges already at a very early age. Since there is no doubt that young learners have the capability to develop their full linguistic potential, the same does not go for all the teachers. In order to implement new teaching methodologies like CLIL, the teachers have to be aware that this is not a method one can follow by the cookie-cutter principle.

Comparing two countries like Slovenia and Scotland was not the easiest analysis to do, since they do not really share a lot of similar characteristics. One speaks the global language and the other one a marginal one. One is connected to one of the oldest, most influential and developed countries in the world, while the other just celebrated its 20<sup>th</sup> birthday. On the other hand, there are some similarities that lead to the same implementations of CLIL already established in both countries. That is the provision of CLIL with minority languages, which are present equally within the governments of the two countries. In addition, CLIL pilot projects were already tested in Slovenia, as well as Scotland, even though the latter has used it only in secondary schools. The implications that my study showed were that there were no major differences in the attitude of Scottish and Slovene teachers towards the importance of foreign languages, but there were substantial differences in the actual foreign language knowledge that both of these groups of teachers possess. I believe that the Slovene teachers are nonetheless more aware of the actual significance of foreign languages, and consequently of CLIL. Limitations within my research were mostly that the number of participating teachers was quite low, so I could not really get a clear and assertive image. That is why one can also use the researches already conducted by the EU and other educational institutions about the implementation of CLIL. For further research, I believe that a focus could also be made on parents and children involved in the entire process. Another area that was not explored and analysed in depth was also the negative effects that CLIL could bring, since the majority of literature I studied was mostly pro-CLIL. I believe that it would take at least a couple of years of observation of the actual implementation of CLIL to establish the down sides of what at first sight seems to be the perfect teaching tool in today's world of globalisation.

## REFERENCES

- Bela knjiga o vzgoji in izobraževanju v Republiki Sloveniji 2011.19. avgust 2012. [http://www.belaknjiga2011.si/pdf/bela\\_knjiga\\_2011.pdf](http://www.belaknjiga2011.si/pdf/bela_knjiga_2011.pdf).
- CANTONI-HARVEY, Gina (1987) *Content-area language instruction : approaches and strategies*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- DOYE, Peter/Alison HURRELL (1997) *Foreign Language Education in Primary Schools (age 5/6 to 10/11)*. Council of Europe Press.
- COYLE, Do (2006) *CLIL- Motivating Learners and Teachers*. University Nottingham. Towards an integrated curriculum - CLIL National Statement and Guidelines. 8. junij 2008. [http://www.languagescompany.com/images/stories/docs/news/clil\\_national\\_statement\\_and\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.languagescompany.com/images/stories/docs/news/clil_national_statement_and_guidelines.pdf).
- COYLE, Do/Philip HOOD/David MARSH (2010) *CLIL Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curriculum for Excellence - Experiences and outcomes - Modern languages - Learning, teaching and assessment. 11 maj 20012. <http://www.education-scotland.gov.uk/learningteachingandassessment/curriculumareas/languages/modernlanguages/eandos/index.asp>.

- DELLER, Sheelagh/Christine PRICE (2007) *Teaching other subjects through English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Europeans and their Languages. 1. junij 2012. [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_243\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_243_en.pdf).
- EURYDICE (2006) *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice.
- GIBBONS, Pauline (2002) *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning : teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- GROSMAN, Meta, et al. (2004) *Učni načrt : program osnovnošolskega izobraževanja. Angleščina*. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- JAZBEC, Saša, et al. (2010) *Pot v večjezičnost - zgodnje učenje tujih jezikov v 1. VIO osnovne šole. Zgledi CLIL-a*. Ljubljana : Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Letno poročilo o delu Zavoda Republike Slovenije za šolstvo za leto 2010*. Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo, 2011.
- MARSH, David/Anne MALJERS/Aini Kristiina HARTIALA (2001) *Profiling European CLIL Classrooms*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä & European Platform for Dutch Education.
- MEHISTO, Peeter/David MARSH/María Jesús FRIGOLS (2008) *Uncovering CLIL*. Oxford: Macmillian.
- RETELJ, Andreja/Karmen PIŽORN (2010) "Povezovanje tujih jezikov z nejezikovnimi predmeti : misija nemogoče?" *Vestnik za tuje jezike*. II/1-2, 135-142.
- Slovensko šolstvo včeraj, danes, jutri* (2007) Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport.
- Sporazumevanje v tujih jezikih/ Uvajanje tujega jezika (UTJ) in medkulturnega/medjezikovnega uzaveščanja (JU) v prvo vzgojnoizobraževalno obdobje OS. 29. maj 2012 <http://zrss.edus.si/moodle/course/view.php?id=3>.

## POVZETEK

### **Močne implementacije metode CLIL v osnovnih šolah v Sloveniji in na Škotskem z učiteljskega vidika**

Članek povzema bistvene točke metodologije CLIL z namenom, da se ugotovi možne implementacije CLIL-a v slovenskih in škotskih osnovnih šolah z učiteljskega vidika. Pri tej metodi gre za vsebinsko usmerjen pristop k učenju tujih jezikov. Obe državi, Slovenija in Škotska, sta si pri izvajanju te metodologije podobni, čeprav je njun odnos do učenja tujih jezikov drugače pogojen, saj je slovenščina na svetovni lestvici eden izmed manjših jezikov, medtem ko je angleščina najbolj razširjen svetovni jezik. Za boljše razumevanje možnosti izvajanja CLIL-a je obdelan tudi slovenski in škotski učni načrt za poučevanje modernih tujih jezikov. Na koncu pa so predstavljeni še rezultati, pridobljeni z anketo, narejeno med slovenskimi in škotskimi učiteljicami o njihovem odnosu in mnenju o CLIL-u.

**Ključne besede:** CLIL, osnovna šola, Slovenija, Škotska, možne implementacije

## ABSTRACT

**The Possible Implementations of CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning, in Slovene and Scottish Primary Schools from a Teacher's Point of View**

The following article summarizes the main characteristics of CLIL methodology in order to determine the possible implementations of CLIL in Slovene and Scottish primary schools from the teacher's point of view. This method has a dual focus on the content as well as on language learning. The provision of CLIL is to an extent similar in both countries, in Slovenia as well as in Scotland, although their relationship to modern language learning is differently conditioned, since English is the most widely used international language. To better understand the potential implementation of CLIL in Slovene and Scottish primary education, part of it is also devoted to the national curricula for modern language learning, current in both countries. Finally, the results obtained by a survey made among Slovene and Scottish primary school teachers are presented on the subject of their relationship towards CLIL.

**Key words:** CLIL, primary education, Slovenia, Scotland, modern language learning