Implementing CLIL in Schools: The Case of the GoCLIL Project in Portugal

Maria ELLISON & Álvaro Almeida SANTOS
| University of Porto (FLUP) / CETAPS & J.G.F.A. Secondary School

Abstract | Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), an educational approach in which an additional language is used to teach school subjects, has become increasingly widespread within state schools across Europe since the acronym was coined in the mid-nineties. This now includes Portugal where CLIL activity across educational levels has been growing in recent years. Like other national contexts in Europe, this has also been through the grassroots initiatives of individual schools keen to influence positive change in educational practices and reap the benefits which CLIL is purported to bring about. One such case is the GoCLIL project at Escola Secundária Dr. Joaquim Gomes Ferreira Alves in Valadares, Vila Nova de Gaia, which has been operating a CLIL programme through English since the academic year 2013-2014. This article outlines fundamentals of implementing CLIL in schools and provides an overview of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of the case. It uses data collected from questionnaires administered to teachers, pupils and parents, lesson observations, pupil focus groups, and teacher reflections obtained during the ongoing monitoring process led by the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Porto. The data contribute to the rich description of the project from which it has been possible to identify and compare findings across years, as well as factors which have contributed to its sustainability. Insights gained from this case study will be interesting and potentially useful for schools which are considering setting up a project of this kind.

Key words | Implementing CLIL, CLIL in Portugal, case study, SWOT analysis, monitoring CLIL

1. Introduction

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an educational approach in which an additional language, for example, a foreign, regional, minority, territorial or other state language ("Eurydice 2017" 55) is used to enhance the simultaneous development of both subject and language learning. This dual focus is believed to bring about a range of benefits to learners' linguistic ability, meta-linguistic awareness, motivation, risk-taking, active participation, problem-solving, levels of concentration, capacity to think, meta-cognitive ability, study-skills and autonomy, as well as fostering social awareness and intercultural understanding. CLIL is a highly flexible approach which exists in various guises around the world owing to the socio-political, economic and educational needs of contexts. There is variation in educational objectives, amount and type of CLIL, and human resources available to plan, administer and monitor it. It is particularly prolific within state schools across educational levels in Europe as evidenced in the latest Eurydice Survey, *Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe* 2017 which states that in "nearly all European countries some schools offer CLIL" (Eurydice 55). In a few of these, it is an obligatory part of schooling (e.g., Italy and Austria). Variation in CLIL programmes within and across contexts has made the phenomenon complex and somewhat difficult to monitor and compare the results of research (Bonnet 66; Coyle et al. "CLIL" 165). Thus, the case study is an oft-preferred means of examining and reporting on newly emergent activity. Such studies include multiple cases (of schools) across national contexts, examples of which are those of the British Council with the Spanish and Portuguese Ministries of Education (Dobson, Murillo & Johnstone, and Almeida et al. respectively) or single cases representing an individual school.

The purpose of this paper is to outline the fundamentals of implementing CLIL as the backdrop to the GoCLIL project, a case study in a state secondary school in Portugal. It describes how the project was implemented and highlights the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats from data gathered from questionnaires administered to teachers, pupils and parents, lesson observations, and teacher reflections obtained during the ongoing monitoring process led

by the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Porto. The data contribute to the rich description of the case from which it has been possible to identify and compare findings across years, as well as factors which have enabled the sustainability of the project.

2. Implementing CLIL

As a flexible educational approach, CLIL has morphed itself according to the contexts in which it has been implemented. As such, it lacks, as Kiely states a "policy and practice perspective"(155). This has given rise to many varieties of the approach which have made a one-size-fits all template practically impossible to develop. This flexibility has allowed it to triumph as well as threaten its very existence (see Cenoz et al.; Dalton-Puffer et al.; Perez Cañado for discussions on this). However, in order for quality CLIL, in whatever shape or form, to take place, certain factors must be aligned which may help to safeguard against "disjuncture" (Mehisto 3). Recommendations and key-characteristics of programmes point to actual and future contextual and operational factors incorporating curriculum objectives, planning and evaluation, and human resources (Soler et al.; Pavon & Ellison; Coyle et al. "CLIL"; Naves; Marsh). The 'fundamentals' hereto considered essential by the author of this paper are the identification and development of: aims for the project; model or type of CLIL including percentage of curricular time allocated, which subjects and assessment procedures; teacher competences and collaboration; learner competences and needs; project coordination; CLIL tools and materials; the role of stakeholders; monitoring and project evaluation; and dialogue within and between communities of practice.

These are now briefly explained and used in the analysis and interpretation of SWOT findings in the case study described later.

2.1. *Aims for the Project*

These should be clear, realistic and depict a coherent vision of the project in the school which is accessible to all stakeholders. Aims commonly referred to relate to improving proficiency in the

additional language (usually a foreign language), developing intercultural understanding through the use of materials from other contexts and dialogue which CLIL affords as it has the potential to connect teachers and learners from schools in different national contexts (Sudhoff). Increasingly aims relate to 'internationalisation' as schools feel they need to be more accessible to engaging in European partnerships. In addition, in contexts where there is foreign language medium instruction (usually English Medium Instruction (EMI)) in institutions of higher education, CLIL at school level is seen as preparation for this in the national context as well as abroad.

2.2. *Model or Type of CLIL*

CLIL can be anything from a single lesson to a whole subject taught through the additional language over an academic year (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols 13). Modular CLIL is common across contexts and also preferable when starting out in CLIL. Here CLIL is applied to the teaching of part or parts of the subject (a particular topic/s) over the year which allows for recycling of content and language in the mother tongue which helps to allay parental fears of children missing out on these. Importantly, modular CLIL also allows teachers and learners time to acclimatise to the new way of working. It would also allow for regular contact with CLIL if more than one subject is involved and CLIL lessons in these subjects are alternated. Any subject can be taught using the CLIL approach though in most cases the national curriculum must be followed. CLIL is not a substitute for lessons in the additional language (e.g., it does not substitute English as a foreign language lessons). Rather, these run parallel to CLIL and may serve to support language in CLIL, for example through preparation or consolidation of key language structures and subject terminology. Assessment should be considered at all stages of the planning process. What to assess – content, language or both and how to do this will depend on the aims of the project. If these are mainly language-oriented, then there will necessarily be a firm focus on this. Both language and content teachers should be jointly involved in assessing learners in CLIL.

2.3. *Teacher Competences and Collaboration*

So much of a CLIL project will depend on the human resources available at the school, namely the teachers – their competences, drive and motivation. A CLIL teacher may be a foreign language teacher or subject content teacher (e.g., a geography teacher). Whoever they are, they will need to develop "multiple types of expertise" (Marsh et al.) owing to the fusion of language and content subject knowledge bases (Ellison "CLIL as a Catalyst") which make CLIL methodology complex. A consequence of this is that they will need to adjust their regular practice accordingly and adopt an "inter-disciplinary mindset" (Marsh 66) as opposed to a subject specific one, and the necessary complementary 'sensitivity', of language or content teacher. Thus, a language teacher will need to also think and act like a content teacher and vice versa. In CLIL therefore, it is not just a matter of changing the medium of instruction (Pavon & Rubio 51), but of mindsets and methods. Both demand that teachers adopt a highly reflexive attitude as they proceed through their CLIL practice (Ellison "CLIL as a Catalyst"). A particular challenge for some content teachers is the additional language itself. Language proficiency levels differ across contexts. Ideally, they should not be lower than C1 level on the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe). That does not necessarily mean that a language teacher is best placed to be the CLIL teacher because it is unlikely that they will know the specific language of the discipline, not to mention have the in--depth understanding of the subject content. CLIL, therefore, necessitates collaboration between language and content teachers where each pools their expertise and practical theory of their respective knowledge bases (Pavon & Ellison). Teacher collaboration can include: observation of each other teaching regular lessons in order to gain awareness of subject literacy, methodology, cognitive challenge, language use and classroom management; planning CLIL lessons together where both content and language are accounted for, and tasks and materials are designed and appropriately scaffolded; and team teaching or observation of CLIL lessons.

2.4. *Learner Competences and Needs*

It is said that CLIL is for learners of all abilities, and learners who are considered less able in languages are found to cope well with CLIL as the focus is not solely on language learning (Marsh 73). However, CLIL is demanding for learners as it requires more concentration, cognitive agility in processing content concepts through another language code, and active knowledge construction and demonstration of understanding through peer interaction. These are also where benefits are derived. When a school is beginning a CLIL programme, it is advisable to start implementation with one class at the beginning of an educational cycle and monitor this class against others at the same educational level within the school if that is possible. This will allow for comparisons to be made between CLIL classes and non-CLIL (control) classes in terms of progress in language and content areas. Pupils' opinions should also be heard regarding how they feel about CLIL and their perception of learning.

2.5. *Project Coordination*

Project coordination is essential in ensuring coherence and the smooth running of a CLIL programme. This will involve a number of stakeholders and liaison with school director, content and language teachers, learners, parents and an external monitoring body. Coordination may be the responsibility of an individual or delegated, what Stoler et al. term "distributed leadership" (478). For example, there may be a different coordinator for the various groups: one for language teachers, another for content teachers or one for each year group of content and language teachers, and another for parents. Each group should meet regularly to coordinate when CLIL lessons will take place, exchange ideas and materials, diagnose strengths and weaknesses and discuss how evidence of progress will be obtained. These are fed back to the main project coordinator who should have prior training in CLIL. Coordination involves ensuring that teachers determine which areas will be covered in CLIL and when, in other words, the timetabling of CLIL lessons into coherent sequences if modular CLIL is undertaken. In addition, it involves ensuring

that appropriate frameworks are used for planning e.g., the 4Cs model (Coyle et al. "CLIL" 53-56) which involves consideration of content, communication (language), cognition, and culture. Other channels of communication could be developed such as a virtual environment for uploading and storing materials, as well as forums for discussion and links to other communities of practice within and beyond the local/national context.

2.6. *CLIL Tools and Materials*

Ready-made materials for CLIL lessons are rare, given the highly contextualised nature of CLIL. For this reason, and more often than not, teachers find themselves adapting or designing their own pedagogical materials to suit the needs of their learners and the subject curriculum of their national context. This is a time-consuming process, to say the least. Materials must be chosen or designed to adequately convey the key concepts of the subject area as well as highlighting the language needed to do so. Thus, teachers need to be attuned to useful criteria for adapting and developing quality CLIL materials (Mehisto) as well as techniques for scaffolding both content and language through multimodal means using a range of resources which account for different learning styles (Massler et al. 66-95).

2.7. *Role of Stakeholders – Parents and other Schools in the Community*

Parental support for initiating innovative projects is vital. Often it is pressure from parents which ignites the flame for action. Parents can be allies when all is going well or indeed foes if projects do not yield the predicted positive results. With a CLIL project new to a community, parents will need to be informed of a school's intentions for implementation and briefed about CLIL, its benefits and challenges, and how they can support the project and their child. Parents will see this as an investment and may well seek out a school which is offering something which they envisage as having long-term consequences to their child's education and future employment possibilities. Common parental concerns regarding CLIL tend to relate to their child missing out on key

concepts and language in the mother tongue, their child's and their own aptitude for languages (Baetens Beardsmore 24; Mehisto et al. 20), and assessment, especially in national exams. Modular CLIL in particular helps support recycling of key concepts and language in the mother tongue. Parents may be encouraged to engage in post-CLIL lesson reflection with their child at home in the mother tongue, thus encouraging articulations of their understanding in the mother tongue. This may also be done with other older pupils at school as in peer tutoring conferences and study groups in non-lesson time.

Parents should also be involved as informants in ongoing monitoring of CLIL programmes via questionnaires, interviews or focus groups. Parents are usually keen to maintain educational practices which they see as having positive effects on their child's schooling. This may involve them in searching for a school which may allow their child to continue with CLIL in another educational cycle. Thus, it is vitally important that provision for CLIL beyond the immediate cycle catered for by the school is factored into the long-term vision of the project within a given community. Discontinuing CLIL education after one level may well lead to a decrease in motivation and a missed opportunity to capitalise on learner achievement in CLIL. The CLIL experience may even cause problems for teachers of foreign languages who receive mixed classes of children who have experienced CLIL and others who have not, as a common consequence of CLIL is improved proficiency in the additional language. Thus, schools which learners go on to attend must consider provision for them whether through implementing CLIL or creating extra-curricular language clubs where the CLIL language is used for other learning.

2.8. *Monitoring and Project Evaluation*

This may be done on two intersecting levels involving participants internal to the process through school project coordinator(s) and through an external body with expertise in the field. The role of the latter is to ensure internal coordination is appropriate and effective, can provide teacher education if necessary, and monitoring through regular meetings and observation of practice. All

of this should be drawn up as a protocol in the planning stages of the project to ensure professional accountability. Observation may be general or structured to focus on specific incidents of teaching or learning. Standardised tools for observation of CLIL lessons exist such as the Planning and Observation Checklist (Mehisto et al. 232-35) or others specific to the context and dependent on the aims for CLIL. Observation by external advisors may provide for more neutral feedback. Triangulated data collection procedures should be employed at regular intervals to ensure close monitoring of the projects strengths and challenges.

2.9. *Dialogue within and between Communities of Practice*

Engaging in dialogue about new pedagogic interventions is an essential part of professional practice. Where there are other similar institutions within the same local/national context, coordinators should actively engage in sharing experience of practice, ideas and materials. Not only will this provide an important supporting network, but also potentially help to save time spent on materials production where materials are produced with national curricula in mind. Equally important is dialogue with communities of practice beyond the national contexts. These may provide interesting perspectives on CLIL practice which lead to further reflection on one's own. Although lesson plans and materials will not be in accord with the same national curricula, there may be similarities, and materials may be adapted. Sharing such resources, links to useful sites and knowledge of updated use of technology will always be welcomed. Aside from this, the opportunities it affords intercultural dialogue, not only among teachers, but learners too, is potentially very enriching.

There needs to be careful consideration of the above prior to project implementation as well as synergy between all elements as it progresses for there to be quality CLIL provision, and for it to stand a chance of working effectively. This is because CLIL is an integrated, whole school approach which inevitably extends beyond its immediate boundaries to affect schooling within the broader community (Ellison "The Added Value").

3. CLIL Activity in Portuguese State Schools[1]

There is as yet little documented evidence of CLIL in state schools in Portugal despite acknowledgement by the recent Eurydice survey ("Eurydice 2017") of CLIL through French and English. The first project to gain recognition by Eurydice ("Eurydice 2012") in the country was the *Secções Europeus de Língua Francesa* (SELF) project – a collaboration between the Portuguese Ministry of Education and the French Embassy which began in the academic year 2006-2007 and involved the use of French as a medium of instruction in over 20 lower and upper secondary schools across Portugal. Since then CLIL through English has been acknowledged with the Bilingual Schools Project (Ensino Bilingue Precoce no 1.º ciclo), a pilot project and joint initiative of the British Council and Portuguese Ministry of Education (2011-2015) involving the teaching of curricular content through English in primary schools from 6 school clusters[2] across the country (Almeida et al.). Owing to the success of the project, the Ministry of Education extended applications to pre-, middle, and more recently lower secondary schools. At the time of writing, there are currently 19 school clusters engaged in CLIL activity in Portugal.

Grassroots projects in state schools involving English as the CLIL language include: Support for Teaching English in Primary Schools – University of Porto (STEPS-UP) 2005-2009 involving 56 schools and over 5000 children each year in which the many primary English language teachers recruited to teach English in schools within the city of Porto were encouraged to experiment with CLIL (Ellison "(De)Constructing CLIL"). A major contributory factor to this project being awarded the European Language Label and Label of Label awards was teachers' involvement in CLIL activity; Benchmarking CLIL (BECLIL) (Costa & Lopes 83-86) which involved two secondary schools in the teaching of Civic Studies and Information Technology through English as part of a European multilateral project; Project English Plus 2010-2011 (Simões et al.) in which History was taught through English for 45 minutes per week to one 7th year class in a lower secondary school. More recently, this project has been developing CLIL practice in Science

(Piacentini et al.); the doctoral study of Ellison (Ellison "CLIL as a Catalyst") involved the implementation of CLIL by English language teachers in three state primary schools in the north of Portugal.

There is another factor that is currently contributing to interest in CLIL in the Portuguese context. This is the recent policy of curricular 'flexibility' which schools have seen as an opportunity to foster more interdisciplinary programmes. Curriculum flexibility was introduced by the Ministry of Education in September 2017 and allows for up to 25% autonomous curriculum management. This flexibility programme is expected to expand gradually in each school involved in it and to be generalised to every Portuguese school by 2018-2019.[3]

Although CLIL is not widespread in compulsory state schooling in Portugal, there are increasing numbers of institutions of higher education which offer under and post-graduate programmes, wholly or partially taught in English to keep pace with internationalisation. Thus, CLIL provision in lower cycles of compulsory education may well be seen as preparation for future study in the home context.

4. Case Study: the GoCLIL Project

4.1. *Design and Methodology of Study*

The purpose of this section is to provide a summary of the GoCLIL project which is ongoing. It is beyond the scope of this article to provide the full, rich description of the project which covers almost 5 academic years. The methodology selected is a case study with one school (Escola Secundária Dr. Joaquim Gomes Ferreira Alves) as the single case and unit of analysis within which are embedded other sub-units (teachers, pupils, parents, external monitor/researcher who were also providers of evidence (Yin 39-41). This type of methodology allows for in-depth study of real-life events (Yin 3; Duff & Anderson 112) where flexibility in design is an advantage as "it often changes as the study unfolds" allowing us "to address timely questions" (Duff 95) particularly in longitudinal studies such as this, allowing for the emergence of new factors which afford opportunities for further exploration of the phenomenon (Friedman 182) contributing to the

richness of the study which may "yield insights of potentially wider relevance and theoretical significance" (Duff 96).

The boundaries of the study relate specifically to the single case (the school) and study of the phenomenon of CLIL over the years in which it has been in operation at the school. The objective of the study is to analyse the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) in each academic year allowing us to identify key factors which have influenced this project across years. This has enabled us to determine how the school has responded to circumstances which have both challenged the project and helped it to thrive. These are set against the fundamentals of implementation previously outlined. The SWOT analysis used data gathered from questionnaires administered to teachers, pupils and parents, teachers' written and spoken reflections, pupil focus groups, and lesson observations which have provided multiple perspectives and sources of evidence, both emic and etic, from various informants internal and external to the case study. This also allowed for triangulation of methods and sources. Teachers were involved in data collection and feedback on results as often happens in case study research.

The study is framed by the following research questions related to implementing and sustaining the project:

1. What are the main strengths of the project?
2. What are its main weaknesses?
3. What opportunities arise?
4. What threatens the project and how does the school respond to this?

4.2. *The School Context*

Escola Secundária Dr. Joaquim Gomes Ferreira Alves is a secondary School (7th to 12th year) situated in the municipality of Vila Nova de Gaia in the southern suburbs of Porto, a socially and culturally heterogeneous area, which has been gradually changing, through progressive conurbation,

from a typically suburban region to a more urban one. The number of pupils has increased steadily in recent years from 1430 in 2013-2014, 1624 in 2016-2017 to 1705 in 2017-2018. There are currently 129 teachers, of whom 83% have at least ten years of teaching experience in the school. A variety of courses are offered from general secondary studies aimed at preparing pupils for higher education to vocational/professional courses aimed at offering suitable training and qualifications for the job market in line with local and regional economic demand.

The tradition of early school leaving and low interest in educational attainment, as a social (and family) established culture, was one of the central problems to be tackled in a sustained and effective way. In fact, the school managed to reduce numbers of early school leavers from 42% in 2001 to 15% in 2013, and to below 3% in 2016-2017. 21 % of pupils benefit from free school meals and 40% of those in upper secondary courses are entitled to financial support (bolsa de mérito) for very good academic achievement. Pupils' English language results are consistently good. The school works hard to maintain a healthy and collaborative social environment among pupils, staff, parents, and other stakeholders.

In October 2013, the school signed an Autonomy Contract with the Ministry of Education and Science. Conditions for the granting of an autonomy contract include school self-evaluation and positive external evaluation. The school's autonomy contract focused on three very important dimensions:

1. improving Portuguese Language and Mathematics results by reinforcing human resources for the mentoring programme;
2. being allowed to implement innovative pedagogical approaches, mainly CLIL in lower secondary years;
3. avoiding cluster inclusion in order to maintain and develop its strategic plan.

In general, the contract has allowed for greater autonomy in areas such as pedagogy and curriculum, human resources, school social support and financial management.

4.3. *The GoCLIL Project*

The GoCLIL project began in 2013 as a grassroots initiative at the school. At this time there was very little information available about CLIL projects in Portugal and no *modus operandi* which could serve as a benchmark or broad template. A protocol with the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Porto ensured the external monitoring of the CLIL project by a specialist with a doctoral thesis in this area. This consisted of:

1. Advising: developing a shared understanding/vision of CLIL; determining aims and a model; ensuring within-school coordination and teacher collaboration.

2. Providing pedagogic support in key areas: CLIL methodology; framework for planning lessons; scaffolding teaching and learning.

3. Monitoring: observation of lessons; filming of lessons; encouraging self-monitoring through reflective practice; encouraging teacher-led data collection of learners' perceptions and learning outcomes.

Specific aims were developed for the project which were in keeping with the school's ethos and strategic plan to create opportunities for social and academic mobility as well as success in English language. These were:

- To develop pupils' general proficiency and cognitive academic linguistic competence in English;

- To promote an integrated, inter-disciplinary approach to learning the English language as opposed to language learning in isolation;

- To promote inclusivity in education;

- To equip pupils with the skills to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

An English language teacher who had undertaken a CLIL course and was familiar with the core principles of CLIL was nominated to coordinate the project. It was decided that implementation would be gradual starting with one 7th year class and that this would increase to the involvement of more classes in subsequent years. English language lessons ran alongside CLIL lessons. A modular approach was adopted which would consist of short lesson sequences of CLIL within content subjects negotiated by subject content teachers and English language teachers at the beginning of the school year and further negotiated at the start of each school term. A grid for long and medium term planning was developed by the external coordinator as well as a lesson planning template based on the 4Cs framework (Coyle et al "CLIL" 53 - 56) with both content and language teachers planning together. A virtual space was created to facilitate the exchange and storage of relevant articles about CLIL, materials, plans and links to useful sites. Teachers were instructed to collect data which would provide evidence of learner progress within the project through diagnostic tests of English language proficiency at the beginning of academic years, questionnaires to learners about their perception of CLIL, and end of term test results in content and English language which could be compared with non-CLIL 'control' classes. Filming of CLIL lessons was also encouraged to stimulate teacher reflection on practice as well as evidence that could be presented to parents. Meetings were planned with the external advisor as well as lesson observations and post-lesson discussions.

Data have been collected over the five years of the project which provide evidence of the perspectives of pupils, teachers and parents as well as an indication of academic results of pupils involved in the CLIL programme compared to those who were not. A summary of data collection procedures and analysis for monitoring and evaluating the project can be found in Table 1 below.

Year	Data collection tools and procedures	Analysis
2013-2014	**Pupils** • Diagnostic tests of language proficiency (beginning of year) • Questionnaires • Final end of year results (CLIL and Non-CLIL) • Lesson observation **Teachers** • Teacher spoken reflections on practice with external advisor	• Quantitative analysis of questionnaire data • Comparative analysis of test results of CLIL and non-CLIL classes (language and content) • Qualitative analysis of spoken reflections
2014-2015	**Pupils - as for previous year plus:** • Results (end of 2nd and 3rd term) CLIL and non-CLIL in English and content subject. Global average results. • Filmed interviews with pupils • Focus groups **Teachers - as for previous year plus:** • General language proficiency tests • Questionnaires • Lesson plans • Observation and films of lessons • Teacher spoken reflections during post-observation feedback with external advisor	**As for previous year plus:** • Content analysis of filmed interviews with pupils • Content analysis of focus group data • Analysis of language proficiency test results • Quantitative and qualitative analysis of questionnaires • Analysis of lesson plans for 4Cs, coherence of procedures and compatibility with actual learning outcomes • Analysis of excerpts of filmed lessons for 'critical incidents' in teaching and learning • Content analysis of teachers' reflections

2015-2016	Pupils (as for previous year) Teachers - as for previous year plus: • Written reflections Parents • End of year Questionnaire	As for previous year plus: • Content analysis of teachers' written reflections • Quantitative analysis of parents' satisfaction questionnaire
2016-2017	Pupils (as for previous year) Teachers - as for previous year plus: • Teachers' reports on their teacher education practices. Parents (as for previous year)	As for previous year plus: • Content analysis of teachers' reports
2017-2018	As for previous year	As for previous year

Table 1. Data Collection and Analysis

4.4. *Findings and Discussion*

In general terms, there was significant growth in numbers of pupils involved in the project from 30 in 2013-2014 to 206 in 2015-2016 (Table 2 below). Numbers remained stable the following year and are currently at 177 pupils. Reasons for these changes in pupil numbers relate to parental demand for CLIL and teacher availability. An example of this is the extension of the school to 2nd cycle (5th and 6th years) in 2015-2016, a cycle of education it had previously not offered and was granted authorisation to do so by the Ministry of Education. The oscillation in the number of pupils involved is attributed to distribution of human resources, which is related to non- -permanent teaching staff mobility. The number of teachers involved has grown from an initial five, two of whom were English language teachers acting as CLIL teachers in history, geography and natural science lessons in 2013-2014 to the current 16 teachers (six English language and

eight content teachers) in the same subject areas, but including educational technology and of the project by English language teachers in the presence of their content teacher colleagues served as a catalyst for the involvement of the latter in teaching in subsequent years. The amount of CLIL has increased over the years from 20% in 2013-2014 to between 25-40% currently.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Total no. pupils	30	120	206	206	177
Curricular time	20%	20-30%	25-40%	25-40%	25-40%
Classes Beg = beginning Cont. = continuation	7th year (1)	7th year (3) beg. 8th year (1) cont	5th year (1) beg. 7th year (2) beg. 8th year (3) cont. 9th year (1) cont.	6th year (1) cont. 7th year (1) beg. 8th year (2) cont. 9th year (3) cont.	7th year (2) beg./ cont. 8th year (1) cont. 9th year (2) cont. 10th year (2) beg.
Teachers	2 English language	2 English language 3 Content	6 English language 8 Content	7 English language 7 Content	7 English language 9 Content
Subjects No. in brackets relate to teachers	History Geography Science	History (1) Geography (1) Science (1)	History and History and Geography of Portugal HGP (1) Educational technology (1) Geography (3) Science (3)	History and History and Geography of Portugal (2) Educational Technology (1) Geography (2) Science (2)	History (2) Visual arts (1) Geography (2) Science (2) ICT(1) Philosophy (1)

Table 2. Project Growth from 2013-2014 to 2017-2018

4.5. *SWOT Analysis and Interpretation*

The implementation of the GoCLIL project over the academic years from 2013-2014 to the current year 2017-2018 reveals recurrent factors in terms of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats, as well as factors unique to each year. These are outlined and discussed below in light of the fundamentals of CLIL projects previously mentioned.

4.5.1. *Strengths*

The project aims are realistic, achievable and consistent with the ethos of the school in terms of inclusivity, the long-term vision for the CLIL programme and its reach to all pupils. These also capitalise on the school's reputation for high achievement in general proficiency in English language and the opportunities this affords to the development of pupils' academic language. Equipping pupils with skills to meet the challenges of the 21st century relates to critical thinking and intercultural education as well as preparation for entry to higher education in Portugal and elsewhere in the world where internationalisation is a key objective, and EMI a reality. The constant project monitoring by the school director, CLIL coordinator, external advisor has helped to keep the project on track. As it has grown, year group coordination (e.g., independent coordinators for the 7th, 8th, 9th years) has also been adopted, thus ensuring closer supervision and collaboration at year level. These coordinators are English language teachers who are part of the CLIL project and work with different content teachers within the year groups. Parental interest in and continued support for the GoCLIL project has been ongoing. They have been kept informed of the project each academic year and have been invited to give their opinions through questionnaires in 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 which revealed overwhelming support for the project. They were highly satisfied with their child's motivation, understanding of subject content, and performance, satisfied that it was not interfering with their understanding of content given in Portuguese and were convinced of its contribution to their child's current and future academic success. Parents were influential in the expansion of the project to include the 2nd cycle of basic education at the school in 2015-2016.

The modular approach adopted from the outset was an appropriate choice given the initial experimental nature of the project and inexperience of both teachers and pupils. This approach allows both teachers and pupils to get to grips with new ways of working and using the English language, and gives teachers some respite to prepare for future CLIL modules. The continuity of CLIL in the subject areas (history, geography, natural sciences) and the increase in the amount

of CLIL over the years has ensured that pupils have had CLIL classes every week and gained familiarity and deepened awareness of subject literacies in English in these areas. The fact that the majority of content teachers working within the project have B2/C1 level in English language, are permanent members of staff and have been teaching CLIL in one or more school year groups year after year has helped nurture effective ways of working as well as positive attitudes, enthusiasm and motivation in pupils during CLIL lessons. This is reflected in the academic results of pupils which are consistently better overall in English language and the other CLIL subjects than their non-CLIL counterparts. The majority of pupils say they are generally satisfied with CLIL lessons. Teachers have embraced CLIL and the hard work that it entails. As experienced teachers, they have stepped out of their comfort zones and have taken risks as exemplified in the teachers' comments below from open-ended questionnaire data (QD) in 2014-2015, and written reflections (WR) in 2015-2016:

- It obliges me to have a different approach – to be more attentive to the needs of each child. (QD)

- It is a big challenge, but I am sure it will contribute to my personal and professional development. (QD)

- It keeps me on my toes – it challenges me. (QD)

- Evidently, we are not in a bed of roses, as some students are weaker and need more scaffolding strategies, but it seems to me that we are connecting to most of the students and to real life through language and content and the four C's – communication, culture, content and cognition – have been present in CLIL lessons. (WR)

- It's difficult to engage all the students, but by looking at the impact of the CLIL lessons we can rethink strategies and, step by step, try to involve more students in the activities. (WR)

The teacher partnerships have undoubtedly been crucial to the success of the project. These have involved an English language teacher and content teacher (e.g., history teacher)

collaborating during the planning stages for CLIL lessons incorporating task and materials design or adaptation as well as during the delivery in class. This has helped ensure more language sensitivity – teachers' own and their pupils' need for and use of language. English language teachers help content teachers determine key language of and for learning, linguistic accuracy in materials and tasks designed to provide opportunities for pupils to interact with one another in class. As CLIL does not follow grammatical hierarchies of language input like English language teaching, but uses language to express meaning of subject content, this requires English language teachers to help content teachers consider appropriate ways of scaffolding content concepts and language. The 4Cs framework (Coyle et al. "CLIL" 53-56) which focuses planning for content, communication, cognition and culture has been an essential guide for planning. Sample lesson plans provided by the external advisor helped teachers in the initial phase to construct plans which had a clear logical thread and progression in terms of cognitive and linguistic challenge. The creation of lesson plans and materials has improved year on year with teachers investing time in formulating aims and learning outcomes which focus on both content and language, as well as multi-modal tasks and activities. Lesson plans and materials are stored virtually enabling teachers to share them with each other. Where possible English language teachers have been present in CLIL lessons to provide linguistic support to teachers and pupils where necessary as well as monitor language used by both. The filming of lessons from the second year of the project, initially by a teacher from the IT department using specialized equipment and thereafter by English language teachers and the external advisor using smartphones, has greatly facilitated the internal monitoring process as teachers have been able to view both their own and each other's practice and identify critical incidents in teaching and learning. English language teachers who accompany content teachers in CLIL lessons are more adept at capturing incidents in the classroom which serve to illustrate progress/development. Pupils have also viewed the filmed excerpts which has helped improve participation and motivation. In addition, it has provided evidence of the project in practice which has been made accessible to parents and other communities of practice including

pre-service teachers studying CLIL at FLUP who have been able to analyse and interpret CLIL in practice in the Portuguese context. Observation of lessons and post-lesson feedback by the external advisor with experience of CLIL has helped to keep this on track and provide objective feedback.

4.5.2. *Weaknesses*

The main weakness across the years of the project is time to plan for CLIL within teaching partnerships which necessitates that both English language teacher and content teacher meet to discuss and prepare lessons. This is problematic on two levels, namely teachers' timetabling commitments, which may not be compatible or allow them enough time to work together, and the amount of time needed to prepare for CLIL. This includes linguistic revision of materials prepared by the content teacher (e.g., powerpoint presentations, texts, worksheets for students) as well as teacher and pupil language. Time to prepare for CLIL is a commonly cited cause for concern for teachers (Coyle et al. "Towards an integrated curriculum" 16; Kiely 165; Ludbrook 21-22; Mehisto "CLIL Counterweights" 22). The fact that it is noted over the five years of the project is due to new content and language teachers entering the project each academic year. Even though there is a bank of plans and materials from which these teachers can draw upon, they will still have to adapt them to suit *their* learners as noted in the teachers' written reflections below:

- Looking for and producing materials which help to get the message across contributed to my difficulty in planning – takes more time and requires more forward planning.
- We need time and support to study and work collaboratively, in order to activate knowledge and follow the right path: quality.

Experienced CLIL practitioners within the project also find they want fresh materials and to design new activities.

In the first year of the project, the focus was predominantly on operationalising CLIL lessons. Less attention was paid to assessment procedures although this has progressively

improved in terms of focus, means, and teacher joint assessment procedures. Although data have been collected which provide evidence of pupil satisfaction with CLIL and their academic performance (largely through questionnaires, interviews and focus groups in 2014-2015 and test results) which have been necessary and sufficient to prove that CLIL is being effectively operationalised, there needs to be more structured analysis and interpretation of the extent and quality of pupil activity, in for example, spoken interaction and written work.

The challenges faced by teachers were initially highlighted in data collected from questionnaires in 2014-2015 and lesson observations over the years. These mainly relate to teacher 'ease' or lack of in giving CLIL lessons, balancing cognitive and linguistic demands, and their language use and ability to handle pupils' language errors. Problems of teacher language use is mainly related to non-technical language such as occasional lapses in subject-verb agreement, verb tenses, false friends and pronunciation. It should be emphasised that this is not the case for all content teachers, and where inaccuracies have been pointed out to teachers in lessons and during post-observation feedback discussions with the external coordinator, they have been able to self-correct these mistakes.

4.5.3. *Opportunities*

Over the years, the project has responded to opportunities for dissemination of its findings at conferences in the national context and best practices at an event which the school itself hosted. It has also responded to opportunities for the development of teacher education for its own staff through applications for KA1 Erasmus + programmes for CLIL and English language, and job shadowing, and KA2 for CLIL implementation and practice. These, in turn, have provided further opportunities for the development of teacher education practices at the school which is now used as a centre for a European CLIL course. The growth in confidence which courses of this nature provided teachers led to an inservice CLIL teacher development course being given by the main coordinator in 2016-2017 and one to develop the language abilities of content teachers in 2017-

2018. Furthermore, the initiative to extend networking was taken to another level with the application to be lead partners in a European project and subsequent granting of this in 2016-2017. The project, aptly named 'GoCLIL Europe' has enabled best practices to be shared and developed with partners from Greece, Italy and Romania, thus reaching out to other communities of practice. The extension of the project into the first year of upper secondary level (10th year) within the subject of philosophy is an opportunity to provide continuity of CLIL for students who choose this subject option. It is hoped that this will lead to further content areas being involved across the secondary levels (10th, 11th, 12th), thus allowing for continuity until the end of schooling.

4.5.4. *Threats*

It is fair to say that the most consistent threat to the project is teacher availability. Where there is a shortage of permanent members of staff, there is a reliance on short-term contract teachers. Teacher availability has had a direct consequence on the number of pupils involved in the project. A further consequence of this was the need to introduce a selection procedure for pupils' entry into the project at the beginning of the lower secondary cycle (7th year) in 2016-2017. It was decided that this would be based on pupils' personal motivation and a diagnostic written test to determine English language proficiency and subject content awareness in English. Although a controversial measure (Bruton), it is hoped that it is temporary until further teacher stability is guaranteed. Teacher mobility is challenging for the permanent members of staff who may take on board more CLIL in different year groups or spend more of their time working with new teachers (from within the project or new to it). The fact that the average age of permanent members of staff involved is early 50s also poses a threat to the longevity of the project. Teacher mobility could be counteracted if the stay of non-permanent staff could be extended from the statutory two, to a further four, thus allowing both teacher and school to reap more benefits from teacher development and continuity. In addition, in-service teacher education for permanent members of

staff may instill confidence and motivation to join the project, thus eliminating reliance on non--permanent members.

Other threats have been specific to each year. An example was the rapid growth of the project in its second year, which the school responded to with more language and content teachers. This was further added to in 2015-2016 with the exceptional opening of a second educational cycle and the need for teachers involved to adapt to the demands of working with younger learners coming to the school with different levels of ability in the English language. It is notable that threats are fewer and predictable each year which means the school can adequately prepare for them. The school's capacity to respond to threats is also testament to its flexibility and committed, dynamic staff who have invested in the project and truly believe in it, thus guaranteeing its continuity and success.

5. Conclusions

It has been beyond the scope of this article to provide the rich description which befits a case study report of the GoCLIL project. Therefore, the main strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats over its near five-year existence have merely been outlined. From the backdrop of fundamentals for implementing CLIL in schools, it is clear that the project has adhered to these, but not without a fair degree of challenge. It has managed to be sustainable by responding to threats, namely teacher availability, through the provision of teacher education in CLIL both at school and abroad which have helped develop competences and quality practice, as well as boosted teachers' motivation, confidence and belief in the project. Change in education rarely comes easily. It is even more difficult if it involves an educational approach little practiced within a national context and is a grassroots project initiated by a single institution. However, with determination and conviction the risk that drives change can provide the energy that brings about positive results in one context which unites others with a similar need for change. Such has been the reach of GoCLIL since it expanded into a European Erasmus + project involving partners with

varied experience of CLIL, but united in the need to develop quality education within their diverse contexts. With no identifiable detriment to learners' academic performance and a predominantly positive attitude to the approach, the project is set to continue with more in-depth investigation of the phenomenon of CLIL in practice.

Notes

[1] Foreign language learning in Portugal officially begins in the third year of primary school with English which is taught through middle (5th and 6th years) and lower (7th, 8th, 9th) and upper secondary school (10th, 11th, 12th), at least until the penultimate (11th) year. A second foreign language, usually Spanish, French or German is introduced in lower secondary school.

[2] A school cluster may consist of one or more primary, middle and secondary schools within close proximity of each other which are controlled by a single directive.

[3] For more information, see http://www.dge.mec.pt/autonomia-e-flexibilidade-curricular

Works Cited

Almeida, Marta Mateus de, et al. *Evaluation Study on the Effectiveness of the Implementation of the Early Bilingual Education Project – Final Report,* 2014, www.dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/ Projetos_Curriculares/Linguas/Ensino_Bilingue/documentos/final_report_december_2014_en.pdf. Accessed 14 December 2017.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo. "The significance of CLIL/EMILE." *CLIL/EMILE The European Dimension*: *Action, Trends and Foresight Potential*, edited by David Marsh, European Commission, 2002, pp. 24-26.

Bonnet, Andreas. "Towards an Evidence Base for CLIL: How to Integrate Qualitative and Quantitative as well as Process, Product and Participant Perspectives in CLIL Research." *International CLIL Research Journal*, vol. 1, no. 4, 2012, pp. 66-78, www.icrj.eu/14/article7.html. Accessed 27 Jan 2017.

Bruton, Anthony. "Is CLIL so Beneficial, or Just Selective? Re-Evaluating Some of the Research." *System*, vol. 39, no. 4, 2011, pp. 523-32.

Cenoz, Jasone, et al. "Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2013, pp. 243-62.

Costa, Manuela, and Manuela Lopes. "Boas Práticas na Aprendizagem Integrada de Conteúdos e de Língua: Uma Experiência." *Educação Bilingue e Bilinguismo,* organised by ILTEC, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 20-21 Junho, 2011.

Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*, 2001, www.coe.int/lang-CEFR. Accessed 14 December 2017.

Coyle, Do, et al. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge UP, 2010.

Coyle, Do, et al. *Towards an Integrated Curriculum – CLIL National Statement and Guidelines*. The Languages Company, 2009.

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane, et al. "You Can Stand under My Umbrella: Immersion, CLIL and Billingual Education: A Response to Cenoz, Genesse and Gorter (2013)." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2014, pp. 212-18.

Dobson, Alan, et al. *Bilingual Education Project Spain: Evaluation Report.* Ministério de Educación de España and British Council, 2010.

Duff, Patricia, and Tim Anderson. "Case-Study Research." *The Cambridge Guide to Research in Language Teaching and Learning*, edited by James Dean Brown and Christine Coombe, Cambridge UP, 2015, pp.112-18.

Duff, Patricia. "How to Carry out Case Study." *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition. A Practical* Guide, edited by Alison Mackey and Susan. M. Gass, Wiley-Blackwell, 2012, pp. 95-116.

Ellison, Maria. *CLIL as a Catalyst for Developing Reflective Practice in Foreign Language Teacher Education.* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Porto, 2014.

---. "CLIL: The Added Value to Foreign Language Teacher Education for Young Learners." *Linguarum Arena*, vol. 6, 2015, pp. 59-69.

---. "(De)Constructing CLIL in the Primary Context: Primary Practice Revisited and Reconsidered." *APPINEP Bulletin*, vol. 22, 2010, pp. 8-11.

Friedman, Debra. "How to Collect and Analyze Qualitative Data." *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition. A Practical Guide*, edited by Alison Mackey and Susan. M. Gass, Wiley--Blackwell, 2012, pp.180-200.

Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe 2012. Eurydice, 2012.

Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe 2017. Eurydice, 2017.

Kiely, Richard. "Understanding CLIL as an Innovation." *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching,* vol. 1, 2011, pp.153-71, www.ssllt.amu.edu.pl/images/ stories/volume. 1/SSLLT_ 11_153-171_Kiely.pdf. Accessed 18 December 2017.

Ludbrook, Geraldine. "CLIL: The Potential of Multilingual Education." *Dos Algarves*, vol. 3, no. 17, 2008, pp. 18-27.

Marsh, David. *CLIL/EMILE the European Dimension*: *Action, Trends and Foresight Potential*. European Commission, 2002.

Marsh, David, et al. *The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education.* European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML), 2010.

Massler, Ute, et al. "Effective CLIL Teaching Techniques." *Guidelines for CLIL Implementation in Primary and Pre-Primary Education*, edited by Sophie Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlos Pavlou, European Commission, 2011, pp. 66-97.

Mehisto, Peeter. "CLIL Counterweights: Recognizing and Decreasing Disjuncture in CLIL." *International CLIL Research Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2008, pp. 93-119, www.icrj.eu/11/article8.html. Accessed 18 December 2017.

---. "Criteria for Producing CLIL Learning Material." *Encuentro*, vol. 21, 2012, pp. 15-33.

Mehisto, Peeter, et al. *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Macmillan, 2008.

Navés, Teresa. "Effective Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Programmes." *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, edited by Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe, Multilingual Matters, 2009, pp. 22-41.

Pavón, Victor, and Maria Ellison. "Examining Teacher Roles and Competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)." *Linguarum Arena*, vol. 4, 2013, pp. 65-78.

Pavón, Victor, and Fernando Rubio. "Teachers' Concerns and Uncertainties about the Introduction of CLIL Programmes." *Porta Linguarum*, vol. 14, 2010, pp. 45-58.

Pérez Cañado, Maria Luisa. "From CLIL Craze to the CLIL Conundrum: Addressing the Current CLIL Controversy." *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2016, pp. 9-31.

Piacentini, Valentina, et al. "Abordagem Holística no Sistema Educativo Português para Desenvolver a(s) Literacia(s) das Ciências Integradas com o Inglês." *Desenvolvimento Curricular e Didática – Indagatio Didactica,* vol. 8, no. 1, 2016, pp. 1975-92.

Simões, Ana Raquel, et al. "The Project English Plus: a CLIL Approach in a Portuguese School." *Desenvolvimento Curricular e Didática – Indagatio Didactica*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2013, pp. 30-51.

Soler, David, et al. "What Makes CLIL Leadership Effective? A Case Study." *English Language Teaching Journal*, vol. 71, no. 4, 2017, pp. 478-90.

Sudhoff, Julian. "CLIL and Intercultural Communicative Competence: Foundations and Approaches towards a Fusion." *International CLIL Research Journal,* vol. 1, no. 3, 2010, pp. 30-37, www. icrj.eu/ 13/article3.html. Accessed 22 January 2018.

Yin, Robert. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Sage, 1994.