Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Diplomová práce

Bc. Blanka Synková

Modely za len ní odborné p ípravy do výuky anglického jazyka

Language and Content Integration Models in ELT

Praha 2014   Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Tomáš Gráf

Pod kování

Cht la bych pod kovat vedoucímu práce PhDr. Tomáši Gráfovi za cenné podn ty a podporu. Mé pod kování pat í i u itel m, kte í poskytli rozhovor pro ú ely této práce.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatn , že jsem ádn citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia i k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 12. srpna 2014

…………………………..

Blanka Synková

Klí ová slova (esky)

Výuka anglického jazyka, integrace jazyka a obsahu, CLIL, ESP, odborná angli tina, EAP, akademická angli tina, EMI, angli tina jako vyu ovací jazyk, vyu ování založené na obsahu, kvalitativní výzkum, mnohonásobná p ípadová studie.

Abstrakt (esky)

Tato diplomová práce z oblasti výuky anglického jazyka se zabývá problematikou integrace jazyka a obsahu v širokém smyslu. Pojednává tedy nejen o CLILu, ale i jiných modelech výuky angli tiny založené na obsahu, zejména ESP (English for Specific Purposes), EAP (English for Academic Purposes) a EMI (English-medium Instruction). V teoretické kapitole jsou tyto modely popsány z hlediska historie, typických rys , u itel , student , jakož i klad a zápor . V empirické ásti se práce zam uje na sou asnou praxi integrace angli tiny a obsahu na eských gymnáziích. Základem výzkumu jsou p ípadové studie p ti u itel , kte í u í r zné p edm ty spadající do této kategorie. V p ípravném výzkumu autorka zjiš ovala, jaké p edm ty tohoto typu nabízejí gymnázia v Praze; nej ast ji se jedná o povinn volitelné seminá e.

Výsledky výzkumu nazna ují, že integrace jazyka a obsahu v rámci povinn volitelných seminá je v sou asnosti pom rn astou praxí, by mnohdy neuv dom lou. U itelé asto postupují spíše na základ své intuice než odborných poznatk z oblasti integrace jazyka a obsahu. Obecn se zdá, že se v t chto seminá ích klade v tší d raz na obsahovou než na jazykovou složku. Výuka angli tiny založená na obsahu m že být pro studenty p ínosná tím, že se nau í používat jazyk v ur ité oblasti, nau í se pracovat s p vodními materiály v angli tin a zlepší si studijní dovednosti, v etn tená ské gramotnosti. V p ípad povinn volitelných seminá je pravd podobné, že se vše bude odehrávat na pozadí obsahu, který studenty zajímá. Mezi hlavní nedostatky sou asné praxe na gymnáziích pat í omezené znalosti teorie didaktiky cizích jazyk u u itel , nezájem vedení školy a nedostatek spolupráce mezi u iteli.

Key words (in English)

English Language Teaching, ELT, Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL, English for Specific Purposes, ESP, English for Academic Purposes, EAP, English-medium Instruction, EMI, Content-based Instruction, CBI, qualitative research, multiple case study

Abstract (in English)

The thesis focuses on the topic of language and content integration in ELT in a broad sense, i.e. it discusses not only CLIL but also other models of content-based teaching, viz. ESP (English for Specific Purposes), EAP (English for Academic Purposes), and EMI (English-medium Instruction). In the theoretical part of the thesis, these models are described as regards their history, typical features, teachers, learners, as well as benefits and negatives. The empirical part of the thesis explores the current practice of language and content integration at Czech general secondary schools ("grammar schools"). The research is based on case studies of five teachers who teach various courses belonging to this category. The preliminary research investigated what courses are currently being offered at grammar schools in Prague; they are mostly elective courses.

Our research findings suggest that language and content integration in the form of elective courses is a rather common practice, although often unconscious. Teachers tend to act on the basis of their intuition rather than their knowledge of theory and practice of language and content integration. Generally, it seems that more emphasis is put on content than language in these lessons. Content-based English lessons may be beneficial for learners for numerous reasons: learners may learn the language of a specific discipline, they may get accustomed to deal with authentic English materials, and they may improve their study skills, including critical reading. In elective courses learners are likely to be interested in the integrated content. The chief obstacles of the current practice at Czech grammar schools are the teachers' limited knowledge of TEFL theories, indifference of the school management, and a lack of teachers' cooperation.

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations

CBI   Content-based Instruction

CEFR   Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CLIL   Content and Language Integrated Learning

EAP   English for Academic Purposes

EFL   English as a Foreign Language

EGAP   English for General Academic Purposes

ELT   English Language Teaching

EMI   English as a Medium of Instruction (or English-medium Instruction)

ESAP   English for Specific Academic Purposes

ESP   English for Specific Purposes

FL   Foreign Language

GE   General English

L1   First Language

L2   Second Language

TEFL   Teaching English as a Foreign Language

1. Introduction

Among the multitude of methods and approaches to language learning that have developed since the beginning of the twentieth century, there have repeatedly emerged ideas that foreign or second language learning is most effective when it is learned through the content of another subject. The benefits of integration of language and content learning are seen in the focus on the meaning, not on the language per se, and in providing natural, non-artificial context for language learning as well as apparent and immediate application of the language, which is believed to increase learners' motivation. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 204-207)

There is a number of models integrating language and content learning. As Dalton-Puffer (2008: 1) observes, a website devoted to this topic, content-english.org, lists more than forty terms for various models, e.g. Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Content-driven English Teaching, Sheltered Subject Matter Teaching, Foreign Language Medium Instruction, Immersion, or English across the Curriculum. Each seems to be connected, at least originally, with specific setting, motives and aims; although many, such as CLIL and Immersion, have become rather international and their understanding has broadened. Some of them were designed to improve foreign or second language knowledge, some focus on the mother tongue (e.g. Language across the Curriculum) or minority languages. Also the language and content ratio seems to differ in various models, as well as in various applications of one model.

There are disputes whether there is a superordinate term for all such approaches. Some suggest that CLIL may be used as an umbrella term, others use CBI in this broad sense. The trouble is that in that case it is difficult to distinguish whether the term was used in a narrow or a broad sense, i.e. whether it refers to a specific methodology or whether it is used as an overreaching concept. To lessen the confusion, I use the phrase *language and content integration*, i.e. purposefully a reversed order from Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), to refer to the general, superordinate concept.

One of the aims of this thesis is to discuss language and content integration in ELT in a broader perspective, i.e. not to focus on one of the models but to view the phenomenon as a whole. The disadvantage of this comprehensive approach is that some compromises need to be made due to the extent of the thesis: thus only four models are

examined, and they can be discussed in less depth than if only one of the models was selected. However, I find this comprehensive approach valuable as it is rather rare, especially in our country.

The theoretical part of the thesis focuses on four most widespread models of language and content integration in Europe: English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and English-medium Instruction (EMI). Other models and concepts, such as Immersion and Bilingual Education, are also briefly addressed. It has recently become a point of criticism that CLIL is often presented idealistically as a perfect solution for all educational settings (Cenoz et al., 2013; Paran, 2013). This thesis aims to provide a detached view on all models of language and content integrated learning, and both their benefits as well as drawbacks are discussed here.

At the same time, the perspective of Czech educational setting is included. The thesis focuses primarily on general secondary schools in the Czech Republic (*gymnázia*; sg. *gymnázium*), often translated into English as "grammar schools" (this translation is used in this thesis, although there are of course differences between British grammar schools and Czech general secondary schools). The purpose of grammar schools in the Czech Republic is primarily to prepare their students to study at university or college. Language and content integrated learning may be a useful approach to ELT at these schools because it may equip the students with English they will need in their future studies or jobs. There are increasing numbers of branches of study where students need to be able to study materials in English. English is a lingua franca in most fields, and new research, studies, textbooks, etc. occur at a faster pace than publishers manage to orientate themselves and translate. University students may want to publish in English or be part of an international research group. Moreover, many students complete part of their studies abroad: even if they do not go to an English-speaking country, many programs for foreign students in many countries are conducted in English. The European Union promotes socio-economic integration by supporting study-abroad programs and migration of employees.

All this supports the idea that general English may not be enough for secondary school students in today's Europe. This need is reflected in the current curricular

documents in the Czech Republic.[1] English and content integrated learning may thus seem as a good option for secondary schools. However, there are many problematic issues. To name just a few, any kind of integration in education is always a very complex problem, requiring cooperation across departments; it has higher demands on the teacher; questions may be raised whether secondary school learners have good-enough English competencies to be able to participate in English and content integrated classes, and whether this is a necessary condition; the effectiveness of the models is sometimes questioned. Moreover, there are often ethical concerns, especially regarding the effect of English on the national language.

The empirical part of the thesis is based on a qualitative research: case studies of Czech grammar schools where English is integrated with content. The aim is to discover what models of language and content integration are being practiced, how and why. The main source of information will be interviews with teachers of English at grammar schools in Prague who have the experience with English and content integrated teaching. The thesis hopes to reveal the context in which these models are used, and what their benefits and obstacles are. The aim of the thesis is not to lament over the scarcity and quality of secondary school syllabi promoting language and content integration but rather to discover and discuss in wider perspective why this is and what conditions seem to be necessary, based on the case studies of schools where some model of language and content integrated learning is practised.

---

[1] Rámcov vzd lávací programy (RVP) (Framework Education Programmes); for grammar schools, "thematic areas and communication situations" are outlined that include e.g. "work area", "educational area", and "public area" (Framework Education Programme for Secondary General Education, 2007: 18). A grammar school student ought to be able to, inter alia: "express and defend his/her ideas, opinions and attitudes using appropriate written as well as oral forms", "comment on and discuss various opinions on non-fiction and fiction texts adequately and using correct grammar", "react spontaneously and using correct grammar in more complicated, less common situations while using appropriate phrases and expressions", "communicate fluently on abstract as well as specific topics in less common or specialised situations, respecting the rules of pronunciation", and "begin, carry on and end conversations with native speakers and join in active discussion on various topics concerning more specialised interests" (Framework Education Programme for Secondary General Education, 2007: 17).

2. Theoretical Background: Possibilities of Integrating Language and Content in EFL Classrooms

As mentioned in the introduction, this thesis explores the possibilities of integrating content and language at Czech secondary schools. It will focus on four basic models for EFL learning in the European area: English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI). For our purposes, these concepts will be viewed separately. However, as many terms in pedagogy and related disciplines, they do not have clear boundaries and their position in ELT, their relationships with each other and with other concepts, as well as their extent is viewed differently by different authors. For example, CLIL is sometimes understood as a very broad concept that includes situations others would consider ESP. The boundaries between general English and the above mentioned models may also be unclear.

2.1. English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

The initialism ESP stands for English for Specific Purposes, an umbrella term for various practices of English language teaching and learning, such as Business English, English for Lawyers, Aviation English, etc. A superordinate term to ESP is LSP: Language for Specific Purposes. There is a number of conceptions of ESP in literature. According to Paltridge and Starfield (2013: 2), "English for specific purposes (ESP) refers to the teaching and learning of English as a second or foreign language where the goal of the learners is to use English in a particular domain". Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 5) define ESP as "an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner's reason for learning". In other words, it is "directed by specific and apparent reasons for learning" (Hutchinson and Waters, 2005: 19). They emphasize that ESP is an "approach", not a "product"; it is not "a particular kind of language or methodology, nor does it consist of a particular type of teaching material". Contrariwise, Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 4) claim that "ESP teaching, especially where it is specifically linked to a particular profession and discipline, makes

use of a methodology that differs from that used in General Purpose English Teaching", e.g. the relationship between the teacher and the students may be different, as the teacher may take the role of a consultant, "enjoying equal status with the learners who have their own expertise in the subject matter".

Many descriptions and definitions of ESP, explicitly or implicitly, compare ESP with General English (GE)[2]; in Basturkmen's (2010: 3) summarizing words, the former is "narrower in focus" than the latter. Elsewhere, Basturkmen (2006: 9) claims that "whereas General English Language teaching tends to set out from point A toward an often pretty indeterminate destination, setting sail through largely uncharted waters, ESP aims to speed learners through to a known destination". Barnard and Zemach (2003: 306-7; in Basturkmen, 2010: 3) argue that the distinction between ESP and GE may be hard to draw in some cases. Therefore, they suggest that "ESP should not be regarded as a discrete division of ELT, but simply an area (with blurred boundaries) whose courses are usually more focused in their aims and make use of a narrower range of topics".

There is a variety of subtypes of ESP. For instance, in an issue of a journal devoted to ESP, *English for Specific Purposes*[3] (2013, Issue 3), articles concern the following subtypes of ESP: Legal English, Business English, English for Engineering and Academic English. According to Ruiz-Garrido et al. (2010: 1) "there are as many specialised languages as there are professions". Several classifications of the subtypes of ESP have been outlined. E.g. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 6-8) distinguish between English for Academic Purposes and English for Occupational Purposes, the latter of which they further divide into English for Professional Purposes and English for Vocational Purposes. Somewhat different classifications are offered by Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 16-18)[4], or Basturkmen (2010: 6)[5]. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 8)

---

[2] Alternative terms are General Purpose English (GPE), and English for General Purposes (EGP).

[3] Formerly named *The ESP Journal*.

[4] Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 16-18) distinguish three subtypes according to the field specialisation: English for Science and Technology (EST), English for Business and Economics (EBE) and English for Social Sciences (ESS). Each of these has two types: "English for academic study", i.e. English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and "English for work", for which there are several terms: English for Occupational Purposes (EOP), English for Vocational Purposes (EVP) or Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL).

[5] Basturkmen (2010: 6) sees ESP as consisting of three "branches": English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Professional Purposes (EPP) and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP); each of these are

point out that all such classifications of ESP are simplistic and do not "capture the essentially fluid nature of the various types of ESP teaching and the degree of overlap between 'common core' EAP or EBP and General English". They also draw attention to the fact that many General English courses, especially those for higher-level students, may contain specialised vocabulary, or focus on similar skills as EAP. Therefore, they argue that another type of schema may be useful, i.e. that of a continuum ranging from English with general focus to highly specialised English, with various degrees of specialisation in between.

Another classification of ESP courses is made with regard to their "timing in relation to work or study experience of learners" (Basturkmen, 2010: 6). Basturkmen (ibid.) distinguishes "pre-experience", "during-experience" and "post-experience" courses. A more complex classification is made by Robinson (1991: 3-4; in Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 6).[6] According to Dudley-Evans and St John (ibid.),

> these distinctions are very important as they will affect the degree of specificity that is appropriate to the course. A pre-experience or pre-study course will probably rule out any specific work related to the actual discipline or work as students will not yet have the required familiarity with the content, while courses that run parallel to or follow the course of study in educational institution or workplace will provide the opportunity for specific or integrated work.

As we may see from the various classifications, there is much diversity in ESP. Definitions and descriptions of ESP cited above include features that seem to apply to ESP generally, while some of the features apply only in certain situations or types of ESP. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 4-5) attempt to define "absolute characteristics" and "variable characteristics" of ESP:

1. Absolute characteristics:
- ESP is designed to meet specific needs of the learner;

---

divided into two "sub branches": general and specific, e.g. English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP).

[6] It divides ESP into English for occupational purposes (EOP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) or English for Educational Purposes (EEP). There are three subtypes of EOP: "pre-experience", "simultaneous" or "in-service" and "post-experience", i.e. the same as Basturkmen distinguishes. The difference is that in this model, there are two subtypes of EAP or EEP: one is EAP/EEP "for study in a specific discipline", that may be "pre-study", "in-study" and "post-study", and the other is EAP/EEP "as a school subject" that may be either "independent" or "integrated".

- ESP makes use of the underlying methodology and activities of the disciplines it serves;
- ESP is centred on the language (grammar, lexis, register), skills, discourse and genres appropriate to these activities.

2. Variable characteristics:

- ESP may be related to or designated for specific disciplines;
- ESP may use, in specific teaching situations, a different methodology from that of general English;
- ESP is likely to be designed for adult learners, either at a tertiary level institution or in a professional work situation. It could, however, be used for learners at secondary school level;
- ESP is generally designed for intermediate or advanced students. Most ESP courses assume basic knowledge of the language system, but it can be used with beginners.

Similarly, Basturkmen (2010: 12) observes there are "constant" and "variable" features of ESP. According to her, constant features of ESP are learners' needs analysis focused on their target work or study situations, need for selection of language issues to be learnt, analysis and description of communication in the target communities and use of texts related to that. Variable features of ESP are the different fields of specialisation that may vary in degrees of generality or specificity, the timing of the course with regard to learners' target situations and the teacher's knowledge of the target community and its discourse.

The concept of ESP developed in the 1960's. The reasons for it are usually ascribed to political and economic dominance of the USA as well as technological and scientific advances and internationalisation of trade after World War Two. As English has started to be the dominant language used in these areas, there emerged the need to learn English to communicate in these spheres for many speakers of other languages (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 19; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987: 6-7). As Dudley Evans and St John point out (ibid.), this is not to say that there had been no need for e.g. commercial English

before[7], only in the 1960's, "various influences came together to generate the need and enthusiasm for developing ESP as a discipline". At first, ESP focused especially on English for Science and Technology (EST) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and gradually, other branches have also gained importance, especially Business English (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 2; Hutchinson and Waters, 1987: 7).

Much about ESP is revealed if we look at it in terms of teacher's roles. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 13-18) suggest that ESP teachers should be rather called ESP 'practitioners', because their responsibility is more than teaching; they recognize the following five major roles: 1) Teacher, 2) Course designer and materials provider, 3) Collaborator, 4) Researcher, and 5) Evaluator. Thus apart from teaching, they are expected to prepare tailor-made syllabi based on the learners' needs analysis, which they may be expected to do, select or make suitable materials and evaluate them. They should work in association with specialists in the field the course is focused on. This may involve mere "cooperation": the ESP teacher consults the subject specialist with regard to the desired goals; or there may be a "collaboration" between the ESP teacher and the subject specialist, which may have the form of e.g. team-teaching or just selecting materials that will be used both in the ESP class, and in the content class or at work. ESP practitioners often need to be researchers in order to do the analysis of learners' needs and typical features of the target discourse. They should also assess the courses, materials and learners' language competencies.

Most scholars agree that being an ESP teachers is a demanding work. Basturkmen (2010: 9) points out that the discourse of the target community may be "outside the communicative repertoire" even of native speakers of English with a different educational background. Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 162-3) note that the policy of separating sciences and humanities in education has led to situation where many teachers of English are educated in humanities and have a very limited knowledge in other fields. However, "the ESP teacher should not become a teacher of the subject matter, but rather an interested student of the subject matter". Therefore, they should primarily have a positive

---

[7] Some trace the origins of ESP to the 16th century, when England became a sanctuary for many Huguenots and Protestants from continental Europe, many of whom needed to learn commercial English to be able to work in their new country (Howatt, 1984; in Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 2). The origins of LSP are sometimes traced back to the Ancient Greece and Rome (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 1).

attitude towards the subject area and should be able to ask learners meaningful questions regarding the subject matter. Another factor that makes ESP teaching demanding is that most teachers have not received education focused on teaching ESP. (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987: 157) Moreover, as Basturkmen (2010: 9) points out, "ESP courses often run for a limited period of time as needs and circumstances change", so it may be necessary for the teacher to teach courses with various specialisation and adapt from one field to another. Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 160) summarize that ESP teacher should have "an open mind, curiosity and a degree of scepticism".

As regards learners, most has been already mentioned. They are seen in terms of their current or future work or study roles (Basturkmen, 2010: 3). They are often adult learners and often form a homogeneous group with regard to the learning goals, but they may have different levels of proficiency (Paltridge and Starfield, 2013: 2). They are usually expected to have some knowledge of English (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 5).

There are also certain problematic issues in ESP. For example, questions have been raised whether ESP courses are effective. As Basturkmen (2010: 9) notes: "given that ESP teaching makes additional demands on teachers and course developers in terms of investigating needs and designing courses that may only run for a relatively short time, it seems legitimate to ask whether teaching ESP is effective". She mentions several studies that ought to support the claim that it is more effective to teach English focused on content, but she admits that such studies are rare as it is difficult to find comparable groups of learners. Theoretically, it is argued that ESP is more effective than GE, because being focused on needs of the learners, it motivates them to learn, and "then learning is more likely to occur". (Basturkmen, 2010: 10-11)

However, there may be problems with the analysis of learners' needs. As Basturkmen points out elsewhere (2006: 19), it may well happen that the learners' objective needs may be rather different from their subjective wants, which may cause demotivation. Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 55-58) suggest that needs analysis should contain six areas: objective and subjective necessities, lacks and wants. They give an example of an ESP course at Agricultural and Veterinary studies, where the course focused on the English needed for their field of study but most of the students wanted to

study medicine and Agricultural and Veterinary Studies were their tail gate. They use this example to illustrate the six entry needs analysis:

	OBJECTIVE (i.e. as perceived by course designers)	SUBJECTIVE (i.e. as perceived by learners)
NECESSITIES	The English needed for success in Agricultural or Veterinary Studies	To reluctantly cope with a 'second-best' situation
LACKS	(Presumably) areas of English needed for Agricultural or Veterinary Studies	Means of doing Medical Studies
WANTS	To succeed in Agricultural or Veterinary Studies	To undertake Medical Studies

Figure 1: Needs analysis according to Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 58)

There is a number of other problems with needs analysis. Basturkmen (2006: 19-20) lists a number of problematic issues collected from various sources. We may summarize them into three main points. First, learners may be unable to communicate what their needs are, as their experience with the target situations may be limited and they may not have the metalanguage to express their needs. Second, needs analysis may be too focused on target situations, so it becomes language training rather than language education. Basturkmen cites Widdowson (1983): "Learners are trained to perform a restricted repertoire of the language rather than developing underlying linguistic competence of the language because they are deprived of the generative basis of language". It is impossible to predict all the target situations and language learners will need to cope with them, so too specialised a syllabus may fail to meet learners' needs from a broader perspective. Third, needs analysis may be biased. It may serve the needs of the institution or socio-economic and political interests of the ruling class. Basturkmen refers to Tollefson's (1991) claim that "language training for specific purposes can be a covert means to channel immigrants into marginal occupations, ensuring that they only have sufficient English to perform specific low-wage jobs and do not have good enough English to be able to move out of these jobs".

The last point started to be a concern in ESP in the 1990's with the emergence of critical approach to ESP that draws attention to political influences on ESP teaching and

its implications for learners and society. Basturkmen (2006: 6) sums up the main concerns of critical ESP:

> Typically, ESP has functioned to help language learners cope with the features of language or to develop the competencies needed to function in a discipline, profession, or workplace. But does this mean that ESP has been a force for accommodation and that by helping learners fit into target discourse communities it has served the interests of the members of those communities? Has it served the interests of linguistically privileged in-groups?

This issue is discussed in more detail in the following section on EAP.

ESP is relevant for vocational and technical secondary schools, but less so for grammar schools, which provide general education. Arguably, it is the task of university or college to equip their students with discipline-specific language. It could be argued that ESP courses at general secondary schools may be justified by specific-to-general principle: that by focusing on language specific to one discipline, students will learn English applicable to most ESP settings, e.g. formal language. At grammar schools with a specialisation, e.g. in humanities, natural sciences or the arts, ESP courses may be more justifiable. However, generally, it is EAP (see the following section) that seems more suitable for general secondary education.

2.2. English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is a type of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) described above. It is discussed here separately for two reasons. Firstly, it is a very important branch of ESP, which differs in many aspects from other types of ESP, and is thus often viewed as a "field in its own right" (Paltridge and Starfield, 2013: 137). Secondly, we view EAP as one of the possibilities of integrating language and content education at Czech secondary schools, next to other types of ESP, and CLIL and EMI.

Paltridge and Starfield (2013: 137) describe EAP as being "concerned with researching and teaching the English needed by those who use the language to perform academic tasks", i.e. both non-native and native speakers of English. According to Hyland (2006: 1), "EAP is usually defined as teaching English with the aim of assisting learners' study or research in that language". He views it as a "broad term covering all areas of academic communicative practice", e.g. writing essays and theses, writing articles for

publication, writing grant proposals, teaching in English, classroom interactions and administrative practice. Hyland (2006: 3) thus considers as learners in EAP not only secondary-school or university students but also teachers who are not native speakers of English but who must use English as a medium of instruction or publish their research in English, and need to improve their English skills to perform these tasks.

Two basic types of EAP are usually distinguished: English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP). In EGAP the focus is on the 'common core', which includes primarily 'study skills' such as listening to lectures or taking notes, etc., and academic register, style and language proficiency. ESAP focuses on "the language needed for a particular academic subject, e.g. economics, together with its disciplinary culture. It includes the language structure, vocabulary, the particular skills needed for the subject, and the appropriate academic conventions." (Jordan, 1997: 4-5)

From organisational point of view, EAP courses may be pre-sessional, i.e. "held before an academic course begins", or in-sessional, i.e. "held during an academic term or semester". The former are often full-time, while the latter tend to be part-time. The length of the courses may vary substantially from short ones, running for about 4-12 weeks, to long ones, running for 6-12 months or longer. (Jordan, 1997: 2)

As with ESP, the spread of EAP goes hand in hand with the growing role of English. Hyland (2006: 2) sketches the developments leading to increasing number of EAP courses as follows: as English became language of global trade, there was a demand for graduates with sufficient knowledge of English. English has also become language of science. Academics need to know English to read up-to-date literature in their field and to present their work to international audience. Moreover, there has been a trend of internationalisation and globalisation of tertiary education: many universities offer places to students from abroad and support student exchanges, which results in much student diversity in terms of native language and ethnicity. Increased international migration has influenced composition of students even in lower education.

Hyland (2006: 2) presumes that the term EAP has first appeared in print in 1977. In 1980 when the journal *English for Specific Purposes* was established, EAP was recognized as one of the main branches of ESP, next to English for Occupational Purposes. At the beginning, EAP focused mostly on practical issues, such as teaching and

curriculum development, only later has there been increasing interest in reflection of these activities, research and theory. (Hyland, 2006: 8) This has led to recognition of "the rich diversity of texts, contexts and practices in which students operate in the modern university" (Hyland, 2006: 16). Hyland (2006: 17-18) points out that with the increasing migration of students, "many of the old certainties about teaching and learning in higher education are slowly being undermined", e.g. classes may be composed from learners with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, EAP is becoming more and more important, and new issues emerge that must be considered, such as "the influence of culture and the demands of multiple literacies on students' academic experiences".

From this point of view,

> English for Academic Purposes is the language teaching profession's response to these developments, with the expansion of students studying in English leading to parallel increases in the number of EAP courses and teachers. Central to this response is the acknowledgement that the complexity and immediacy of the challenges (…) cannot be addressed by some piecemeal remediation of individual error. Instead, EAP attempts to offer systematic, locally managed, solution-oriented approaches that address the pervasive and endemic challenges posed by academic study to a diverse student body by focusing on student needs and discipline-specific communication skills. (Hyland, 2006: 3-4)

We have already hinted at the beginning of this section that there is a variety of EAP situations, especially as regards learners. EAP learners may be both non-native and native speakers of English. According to Jordan (1997: 5), non-native speakers may "already possess study skills to an advanced level in their own language" and thus "they may simply need help to transfer their skills into English and, possibly, to adjust them to a different academic environment" and to improve their style. On the other hand, there are non-native EAP students who have little experience with academic contexts and do need to develop study skills to be able to study effectively. As Jordan emphasizes (1997: 8), study skills do not develop automatically and many native students need help in this respect. Hyland (2006: 1-2) observes that "students, including native English-speakers, have to take on new roles and engage with knowledge in new ways when they enter university" and a special instruction preparing them for these situations is very helpful. As Hyland (2006: 4) summarizes,

There is (…) increasing realization that EAP spans formal education at every level and more attention is now being given to EAP in early schooling years and to postgraduate thesis writing and dissertation supervision (…). Nor should we see EAP courses as exclusively directed at non-native English-speakers. Growing numbers of L1 English-speakers who enter higher education without a background in academic communication skills have made EAP a critical aspect of their learning experiences.

Obviously, EAP teachers may be either native or non-native speakers of English. According to Hyland (2006: 4), most EAP teachers today are non-native speakers. He reports a growing number of ELT courses at universities focused at teaching EAP. The characteristics and roles of an EAP teachers seem to be very similar to those in ESP as described in the previous section.

As ESP, EAP is concerned with analysis of students' needs, designing syllabus and preparation of materials (Hyland, 2006: 1), and also similar problems arise. We will discuss here the issue of specificity, i.e. to what extent should EAP courses reflect specific features of discourse of learners' target communities. We will describe Critical EAP, related to Critical ESP described above, and finally, we will shortly discuss the position of English in science today.

In the section on ESP above, we quoted Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 6) who argue that distinctions between pre-experience and simultaneous courses, etc., are relevant to the choice between general and specific ESP, i.e. also EAP. EGAP might be more useful for pre-sessional courses, while ESAP for in-sessional. However, it depends primarily on the situation analysis, e.g. on learners enrolled in the course and their needs, time available, competencies of the teacher, etc.

Hyland (2006: 9-10) presents EGAP and ESAP as competing approaches to teaching EAP. He assumes that

The issue of specificity (…) challenges EAP teachers to take a stance on how they view language and learning and to examine their courses in the light of this stance. It forces us to ask the question whether there are skills and features of language that are transferable across different disciplines or whether we should focus on the texts, skills and forms needed by learners in distinct disciplines.

He ponders that on the one hand, many university programmes are becoming more interdisciplinary, but on the other hand, "there is (…) still a need to stress students' target goals and to prioritize the competences we want them to develop and these often relate to the particular fields in which they will mainly operate".

Hyland (2006: 10-12) presents six arguments in favour of EGAP, and six against it, i.e. in favour of ESAP. We shall present them here not only for the sake of the discussion whether EGAP or ESAP is better, but also because the arguments reveal many other issues frequently discussed in EAP.

Firstly, it is argued in favour of EGAP that teachers of English do not have sufficient knowledge in the students' fields of study, and thus may "do a disservice to the disciplines and mislead students when they attempt to teach their genres". Therefore, it is better when specific issues are taught by subject teachers. Contrariwise, it is argued that content teachers do not have the time, are not willing or capable to teach language skills. They rarely understand the role of language in education and their discipline.

Secondly, it is sometimes argued that EGAP is more suitable for lower-level students than ESAP, because subject specific issues are too difficult for them. A contrary argument is that according to SLA research,

> students do not learn in a step-by-step fashion according to some externally imposed sequence but acquire features of the language as they need them, rather than in the order that teachers present them. So while students may need to attend more to sentence-level features at lower proficiencies, there is no need to ignore specific language uses at any stage.

Thirdly, it is argued that EGAP is more preferable for the teacher, because "teaching subject-specific skills relegates EAP to a low-status service role by simply supporting academic departments rather than developing its own independent subject knowledge and skills", which leads to marginalisation of EAP at universities. Others claim the opposite. It is EGAP that plays subordinate role in a university curriculum, because it is based on the notion that there is a common language core in all types of discourse and thus various types of specialist discourse do not differ that much. This implies that "academic literacy can be taught to students as a set of discrete, value-free rules and technical skills usable in any situation and taught by relatively unskilled staff in special units isolated from the teaching of disciplinary competences". EAP courses are then used as a "Band-aid

measure to fix up deficiencies". ESAP, on the contrary, recognizes that each field has a different discourse and students must become conscious of the specialist discourse of their field. This can only be done by a professional EAP teacher who is able to analyse the discourse and teach it.

Fourthly, it is argued that unlike EGAP, ESAP does not prepare learners to cope with unknown situations, and it "encourages unimaginative and formulaic essays". Some claim that ESAP is more of a training than an education, because education should promote deeper and broader understanding. On the other hand, it is argued that students can learn the conventions of their discipline only by instruction focused at texts typical of this discipline and their language features.

Fifthly, there is an argument in favour of EGAP that language skills that students need for study are basically the same for all disciplines. These include skim reading, notes taking, delivering presentations, participating in seminar discussions, searching for relevant materials for essays, paraphrasing and summarizing. Proponents of ESAP oppose that each discipline has a different discourse and learners need to be prepared for specific situations they will encounter. They need to have a command of subject-specific language issues and it does not make sense to postpone teaching them.

Sixthly, there are disputes about whether there is a 'common core', i.e. "a set of language forms or skills that are found in all, or nearly all, varieties and which can be transferred across contexts". Advocates of EGAP mostly believe that there are language issues that are common to communication in all disciplines and all students must be taught e.g. 'academic writing', 'oral presentations', or language functions such as 'expressing cause and effect' or 'presenting results'. Advocates of ESAP disagree with the notion of a common core. They admit that it may be possible to identify common grammatical features, but aspects of meaning and use are different for each language variety. The overlaps between the language needed in various contexts may not be great.[8]

As in ESP, there is a critical movement in EAP which attempts to "find ways of understanding and dealing with the social, cultural and ideological contexts of language use" and their implications for EAP (Hyland, 2006: 5). These issues have started to be in focus since the 1990's. The approach adopted by most teachers in the early years of EAP

---

[8] For a more detailed account of the theory of common core and its counter-arguments, see Basturkmen, 2006: 15-18.

is viewed as sheer pragmatism. EAP then had the role "to help novice students acculturate to the expectations of the academy without challenging the *status quo*" (Allison, 1994; quoted in Paltridge and Starfield, 2013: 465). As Morgan and Ramanathan (2005: 156; quoted in Paltridge and Starfield, 2013: 465) put it, critical perspective does not replace but complement the sets of common academic skills. It makes students aware of how to "manage unfamiliar disciplinary content and text types" and at the same time "how academic content 'manages' them". Benesch (2001: xiv) claims that:

> Critical EAP engages students in the types of activities they are asked to carry out in academic classes while encouraging them to question and, in some cases, transform those activities as well as the conditions from which they arose. It takes into account the challenges non-native English speakers (NNES) face in their content classes while viewing students as active participants who can help shape academic goals and assignments rather than passively carrying them out. By encouraging students to consciously engage in academic life, critical EAP aims to increase their participation in the workplace, civic life and other areas.

However, as Paltridge and Starfield (2013: 465-6) highlight, there are also critical voices within the critical approach, who, for example point out that critical approaches create a tension when they are practiced at institutions that change very little if at all. Morgan (2009: 89; in Paltridge and Starfield, 2013: 465) suggests that critical EAP teachers could "inadvertently promote pedagogies of despair and pessimism" by focusing too much on negative issues.

A related issue of controversy is whether EAP facilitates the spread of English in science and education, which is seen as a potential threat to other languages. According to Hyland (2006: 24), the most reputable journals are in English, and in some disciplines, more than 90% of articles in journals are written in English. Thus many students and academics from all over the world are pressed to understand and use English to accomplish their learning, research and career goals. English thus may be seen as a lingua franca that enables sharing findings globally, or as a "Tyrannosaurus Rex" that devours other languages in the world of science (Hyland, 2006: 24). There are concerns that English might replace national languages in the sphere of science and higher education, which would diminish the importance of the national languages and could eventually lead to their loss. This issue is further discussed in the section on EMI.

General EAP could be a suitable model for Czech grammar school learners mainly in view of their future studies. However, it is a question whether it is not the task of universities or colleges to equip learners with the specific language skills they will need to successfully complete the studies. Moreover, many general English textbooks for higher-levels include sections with a similar focus as general EAP courses have, so it may be argued that when learners reach certain level, which may be expected at grammar schools, they will learn many of the EAP skills. This model, however, may be easier to implement at schools than CLIL, as it does not require deep knowledge of other subjects from the teacher, nor is there an extra demand on cooperation at school.

2.3. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

CLIL is an acronym that stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning. There is an abundance of definitions and descriptions of CLIL. According to Dalton-Puffer (2008: 1), "the term Content-and-Language-Integrated-Learning (CLIL) refers to educational settings where a language other than the students' mother tongue is used as medium of instruction". Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010:1) provide the following definition:

> Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) can be described as an educational approach where subjects such as geography or biology are taught through the medium of a foreign language, typically to students participating in some form of mainstream education at primary, secondary but also tertiary level.

Later, they refer to CLIL as "...an umbrella term for many realities of non-language content teaching through an additional language" (2010: 3). Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: xi) define CLIL as "an approach to foreign language learning that requires the use of a second language to practise content". Further, they cite Marsh and Langé (1999, and 2000, respectively, in Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 24-5): "CLIL refers to situations where subjects are taught in a foreign language with two aims: learning content and, at the same time, learning a foreign language" and "CLIL programmes involve learning subjects such as history, geography and others in a language that is not one's own". Coyle et al. (2010: 1; in Cenoz et al., 2013: 2) view CLIL as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language".

Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 2) outline a classification of types of CLIL, arguing that "the fundamental variable (…) seems to be a quantitative one, captured in the question: 'how much foreign language exposure do students get?'". She suggests there may be two axes: duration and intensity. On the axis of duration, CLIL programmes range from short-term to long-term ones, "from a sequence of lessons spanning a few weeks to entire school-years to entire school-careers". On the axis of intensity, CLIL programmes range from low-intensity to high-intensity ones. An example of a low-intensity type of CLIL may be a content lesson where only some materials such as readings are done in the FL; in high-intensity programmes, on the other hand, the FL is used as much as possible. This framework encompasses the various forms CLIL can have,

> such as short-term, high-intensity language showers, medium-term and medium-intensity cross-curricular modules, doing one or two subjects in the foreign language for several school years, forms of double immersion that are long-term and high-intensity and many other variants in between, including the deployment of more than one teacher.

Some scholars (e.g. Banegas, 2012: 117; Paran, 2013: 321-2) suggest that a useful approach to describing and classifying CLIL courses is placing them on an imaginary continuum with language aims at one end ("language-driven" CLIL), and content aims at the other ("content-driven" CLIL), according to how much attention is paid to these aims. The idea of a continuum was taken from Met (1998: 40-1), who conceived the continuum generally to describe programmes integrating language and content learning.

There is a debate concerning the relationship between CLIL and other models of language and content integration, especially content-based instruction (CBI), bilingual education (BE), and immersion programmes. The understanding of this relationship is crucial for defining CLIL and its boundaries. I will first briefly describe these models and then comment on how they may be related to CLIL.

Immersion programmes originate in Canada in the 1960's. They were designed to promote bilingualism in the country with two official languages, English and French. Richards and Rodgers (2001: 206) provide the following definition: "Immersion Education is a type of foreign language instruction in which the regular school c urriculum is taught through the medium of the foreign language. The foreign language is the vehicle for content instruction; it is not the subject of instruction." In case of Canada, it would be

better to talk of second language rather than foreign language. However, immersion education was adopted in other countries around the world, where foreign language is the appropriate term. The goals of immersion programmes are summarized by Richards and Rodgers (2001: 206) as follows: a) learners should gain "high levels of proficiency" in L2/FL; b) they should develop their L1 to a similar degree; c) they should "develop positive attitudes" to the L2/FL speakers and their culture; and d) they are expected to learn the content of subjects in the curriculum. Several types of immersion are distinguished: according to the age of the learners, there are early, mid- and late immersion programmes, and according to the intensity of the L2/FL instruction, there is partial and total immersion (e.g. Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 23).

According to Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: 23-24), CBI and BE have been long practised in the USA. When defining CBI, they quote Brinton et al. (1989):

> CBI is '… the integration of particular content with language teaching aims … the concurrent teaching of academic subject matter and second language skills' (Brinton et al., 1989: 2). CBI approaches 'view the target language largely as the vehicle through which subject matter content is learned rather than as the immediate object of study' (Brinton et al., 1989: 5).

Richards and Rodgers (2001: 204) define CBI as "an approach to second language teaching in which teaching is organized around the content or information that students will acquire, rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus".

'Bilingual education' is the most problematic term, as it is used in a variety of meanings and contexts. According to Thornbury (2006: 25),

> A bilingual school is one where instruction is provided in both the child's first language and another, usually more dominant, one. Some of the curriculum content may be taught in one language and some in the other. Or both languages may co-exist in the same class, where for example the teacher uses the second language but the learners are allowed to use their first. Bilingual schools can help keep alive minority languages, while providing a transition into the use of a dominant one, such as English.

Stern (1972, cited in Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 24) defines 'bilingual education' as "schooling provided fully or partly in a second language with the object in view of making students proficient in the second language while, at the same time, maintaining and

developing their proficiency in the first language and fully guaranteeing their educational development". Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009:24) mention, referring to website of National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), 'bilingual education' may denote "any use of two languages in school – by teachers or students or both – for a variety of social and pedagogical purposes", but it is also used as a term for a movement in the USA promoting approaches that enable children from non-English speaking families to develop literacy both in their L1 and English (Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 24). Thus it seems that the term 'bilingual education' may be used in a very general sense for any type of education involving the use of two languages as a medium of instruction. The term may also refer to particular educational practices in different countries, in various contexts, i.e. the learners may be e.g. children of immigrants, learners whose L1 is a minority language and learners who live in a region where a minority language is spoken (e.g. Welsh-English schools in Wales), learners in countries with more than one official language, bilingual children and learners who wish to be bilingual, or whose parents want them to be.

Heine (2010: 2) mentions that CLIL is also referred to as Bilingual Education and insists that it is different from immersion programmes, highlighting that it is a *foreign language* that is used for instruction in CLIL, while in case of immersion programmes, it is a *second language*. Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: 24-5) consider CLIL as an umbrella term that includes immersion programmes, CBI and Bilingual Education. Cenoz et al. (2013: 11-12) observe that scholars have adopted all thinkable stances regarding the relationship between CLIL and immersion programmes. As Heine, some claim that they are totally distinct. Others consider CLIL equivalent to CBI as well as immersion. Some see CLIL as equivalent to CBI, and immersion as a subtype of CBI and thus also of CLIL. And lastly, as Ruiz de Zarobe et al. cited above, some consider CLIL as an umbrella term, a "general construct under which a variety of alternative forms of integrated language and content instruction can be placed, including immersion" (Cenoz et al., 2013: 12). The same opinion is held by Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 23) who claim that CLIL "is employed as an umbrella term to denote European models of bilingual education aimed at foreign, second, minority and/or heritage languages".

According to Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 4), the term CLIL "was coined in the early 1990s (…) in the context of a European expert initiative, most likely with the intention to create a neutral and generally accessible label to facilitate communication among

international experts". It is seen as part of the EU's language policy promoting multilingualism, viz. the idea that each EU citizen should be able to communicate in more than two languages. Before the official adoption of CLIL in EU, many countries already practised some form of bilingual education, especially countries with more than one official languages and with regional or minority languages. It seems they have spread gradually since the World War Two, when many countries officially recognized minor or regional languages and education through them. (Eurydice, 2006: 14-16) Some trace the roots of CLIL as far as the ancient times and the Middle Ages and later, when Latin, not the vernacular languages, was the language of education. And of course, many other examples of what might be called bilingual education in the general sense can be found. (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010: 3) However, it was in the 1990's that most European countries officially adopted CLIL and adapted their legislations accordingly. (Eurydice, 2006: 14)

According to Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 4-5), the spread of CLIL in the 1990's was initiated by both "high-level policy" in the EU, and "grass-roots actions" of teachers and parents in various countries. The former envisaged primarily socio-economic integration within the EU. In Dalton-Puffer et al.'s words,

> A political union of some 490 million citizens, organized into 27 nation states, featuring 23 official languages (plus numerous regional and minority languages) has no choice but to be multilingual and language policy has a crucial role in implementing the EU's 'unity in diversity principle'.

CLIL is thus recommended in EU official documents[9] and large investments have been made both by the EU and several national governments in research and implementation

---

[9] *White Paper on Education and Training: Teaching and Learning - Towards the Learning Society* (1995), p. 47: "It could (…) be argued that secondary school pupils should study certain subjects in the first foreign language learned".

Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006, Section 1, I.2 "Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), in which pupils learn a subject through the medium of a foreign language, has a major contribution to make to the Union's language learning goals. It can provide effective opportunities for pupils to use their new language skills now, rather than learn them now for use later. It opens doors on languages for a broader range of learners, nurturing self-confidence in young learners and those who have not responded well to formal language instruction in general education. It provides exposure to the language without requiring extra time in the curriculum, which can be of particular interest in vocational settings. The introduction of CLIL approaches into an institution can be facilitated by the presence of trained teachers who are native speakers of the vehicular language."

of CLIL at schools. Teachers, parents and students advocating CLIL, on the other hand, were motivated especially by the idea that the young will be able to use L2/FL efficiently and will have a better chance of succeeding on the increasingly international job market. As Heine (2010: 2) emphasizes, "CLIL has in many European contexts emerged as an alternative to the traditional language classrooms, in which not the linguistic structure is in the centre of the syllabus, but its communicative use in authentic learning situations".

CLIL teachers, as follows from the concept of CLIL, should be specialists in two aspects: the content and the language. (Eurydice, 2006: 41) Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: 32) specify the latter as "proficiency in the target language, knowledge of the principles of language acquisition and pedagogical skills specifically adapted for teaching foreign languages to young children". Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 1) presumes that CLIL teachers are mostly non-native speakers of the target language, and are originally content-teachers, not language teachers. According to the survey of Eurydice (2006: 41), some of the teachers have specialisation both in a language subject and a 'content' subject, as in many countries, university programmes for future teachers are double-subject. Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: 32) mention the need for specific training for CLIL teachers, at best a continuous one. An ideal CLIL teacher, according to them, ought to be enthusiastic, committed, and open to change and innovation. They also mention willingness to "start thinking outside their field" (2009: 45). Some researchers claim that well implemented CLIL increases motivation of teachers involved, and present an opportunity for significant professional development; moreover, it has been observed that CLIL may facilitate professional communication and cooperation between teachers and in the school as a whole. (Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 46)

Reportedly, learners' motivation also heightens. Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: 44) assume that "these beneficial effects of CLIL might be due to a range of factors such as increased support for learners, more visual support materials and non-linguistic context, which could serve as a motivator for some learners". They argue that CLIL is thus suitable not only for excelling students but for all kinds of learners. Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 24) see the increased motivation related to that language has "real meaning and authenticity" in CLIL and the fact that learners are treated here as "(efficient) users" rather than "(deficient) novices" as in traditional language classes. According to Cummins (1981; in Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 26), CLIL learners develop two kinds of language

proficiency: "basic interpersonal language skills" and "cognitive academic language proficiency". The former one takes a year or two to develop, the latter from five to seven years. In this way, "CLIL offers a means by which learners can continue their academic or cognitive development while they are also acquiring academic language proficiency." It is often argued that CLIL is beneficial not only to language skills, but also to the content knowledge and development of cognitive skills (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010: 6, and 47). Cummins (1984; in Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 26) thus sees CLIL as a facilitator of learning as it creates the right conditions: it is cognitively challenging but at the same time manageable due to substantial contextualisation. Heine (2010: 186) observes that it is unclear what level of language competence learners must have to be able to participate in CLIL lessons. Her stance is that "it seems justified to promote the use of an L2, even when the learners are not able to produce adequate formulations that contain the whole complexity of their conceptual representation, because the deeper processing occurs nevertheless", but learners must have good-enough language skills to avoid failure in the tasks.

There are many problematic issues regarding CLIL. Cenoz et al. (2013: 4) emphasize that many definitions of CLIL are "overly inclusive". They give an example of an extremely broad understanding of CLIL in Mehisto et al. (2008), who consider even the following situations as a type of CLIL: 'language showers', i.e. short units within a content lesson focusing on foreign language in otherwise L1 medium-instruction, student exchanges, local and international projects, extracurricular activities where L2/FL is used, or work and study abroad programmes. It may be because CLIL has become rather popular in Europe and has become almost a "brand-name" with positive connotations (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010: 3) that very many practices are considered a type of CLIL. As Cenoz et al. (2013: 4) point out, "the possible forms that CLIL can take are so inclusive that it is difficult to think of any teaching or learning activity in which an L2/foreign language would be used that could not be considered CLIL" because there are very few cases, if any, today "where there is exclusive instruction in the target language with absolutely no content as a vehicle for instruction". They argue that although all the activities mentioned by Mehisto et al. "are arguably examples of opportunities to learn language through content", which is a key characteristics of CLIL, "it is otherwise difficult to identify specific characteristics of these learning environments which they all

share and which, thus, make them all equally and uniquely part of CLIL". Heine (2010: 2) also reflects this problem, remarking that "differences in individual programmes are large, even within the same country, [which] makes general statements somewhat difficult".

Cenoz et al. (2013) also criticise the attempts of some advocates of CLIL to separate it from immersion programmes at all costs. They argue that "although CLIL's origins in Europe might make it historically unique, this does not necessarily make it pedagogically unique" (2013: 2). Insisting that CLIL is totally different from immersion means rejecting experience and findings from immersion programmes that could help improving CLIL practices, and the other way around, it prevents generalising findings of CLIL researchers and making them relevant for multilingual and L2/FL education in general. (2013: 16) Cenoz et al. (2013) present common arguments that are used to illustrate the difference between CLIL and immersion, regarding e.g. the goals, accessibility, the target language, the content and language ratio, and prove them invalid or relative.

According to Eurydice survey (2006: 51-54), there may be four obstacles regarding CLIL implementation. Firstly, it is a lack of teachers qualified for teaching both content and language, and a lack of training programmes. Cenoz et al. (2013: 10) presume that "the majority of CLIL teachers are subject specialists without formal qualifications in foreign language and/or general language pedagogy", so it may be difficult for them to teach language and CLIL classes may be very similar to classes taught in L1. According to Ruiz de Zarobe (2009: 44), "teaching content through a foreign language without a change in classroom pedagogy does not raise standards". Secondly, materials may be difficult to find. Ruiz de Zarobe (2009: 33) also notes that there is not much materials that can be used by CLIL teachers and teachers often must create materials themselves. Thirdly, there are higher costs with CLIL, because it requires specific teacher training and development of new materials. Lastly, legislation in some countries is unfavourable to using foreign languages for instruction at schools, especially with younger learners. Moreover, Eurydice reporters notice there are concerns about what impact CLIL may have on the national language. (2006: 51-54)

As noted by Ruiz de Zarobe et al. several times (e.g. 2009: 30-32 and 44-45), CLIL should be part of a larger conception of education at a particular school, which requires involvement not only of one or two teachers, but of the whole school. It requires

cooperation of teachers, cooperation on careful and conscious planning of CLIL as part of the curriculum, support of CLIL teachers both at school and at the national level. Cenoz et al. (2013: 10) have doubts about the extent of cooperation among teachers. Ruiz de Zarobe et al. (2009: 30-32) suggest there may be problems with the long-term planning due to instability of the teaching staff as well as limited insight of authorities, who may interrupt the programme prematurely, not understanding that it may take several years for learners to develop academic proficiency in a foreign language.

Cenoz et al. (2013: 14-15) are also sceptical about the claims of effectiveness of CLIL. Although most researchers claim that the learning outcomes in CLIL are better than in 'traditional classes' both with regard to the language education and the 'content' knowledge, there are a few researchers suggesting the opposite. E.g. Bruton (2011; in Cenoz et al. 2013: 14) insists that CLIL may not necessarily increase learners' motivation and the target language use: contrariwise,

> student motivation might be reduced because of loss of self-esteem when students are required to use a language they do not know, and use of the language might actually diminish if the subject matter is novel and/or complex resulting in reduced language acquisition.

Cenoz et al. insist that there is not enough empirical evidence and thus "fundamental issues about the effectiveness of CLIL remain unexamined". They argue that there is no "clear causal link between integrated language and content teaching and learner outcomes" and if learners have better achievement in the target language in CLIL, it may be due to higher number of contact hours with the language, not due to CLIL itself. Moreover, although it is often claimed that CLIL is not elitist, i.e. not intended only for excelling students, but for all kinds of learners (see e.g. Ruiz de Zarobe et al., 2009: 44), it has been noticed by some that "CLIL can attract a disproportionally large number of academically bright students" (Mehisto, 2007: 63; in Cenoz et al., 2013: 8). The results of research then may be biased in this respect. In Banegas's view (2011: 183; in Cenoz et al., 2013: 14), "a rather evangelical picture" of CLIL is presented that implies that it is almost unproblematic. According to Bruton (2011: 524; in Cenoz et al., 2013: 8), many of the problems that CLIL may present do not emerge because students who take part in these programmes are academically highly motivated and would strive to succeed in any subject. Cenoz et al. (2013: 14) call for a "more balanced reflection on both the strengths

and shortcomings or gaps in our understanding of CLIL and its effectiveness in diverse contexts", and generally, they appeal that "it is time for CLIL scholars to move from celebration to a critical empirical examination of CLIL in its diverse forms to better identify its strengths and weaknesses in different learning contexts" (2013: 16).

CLIL seems to be a good option for integrating language and content at grammar schools in the Czech Republic. Firstly, it is supported by the government and the EU and thus there are a few publications and experts on CLIL that may help teachers and schools with CLIL implementation and practice. Secondly, since many teachers are graduates of double-subject pedagogic programmes, many of them may have English as one of their specialisation, which makes them eligible CLIL teachers. Thirdly, CLIL may develop learners' cognitive processes as well as their ability to deal with information in English, which may be a very good preparation for their future studies.

2.4. English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI)

EMI, i.e. English as a Medium of Instruction, or English-medium Instruction, is a concept that seems to be the least clearly defined and elaborated one from the four possibilities of integrating language and content that are described in this chapter. Most scholars who write about EMI do not define it at all. One of the exceptions is Knapp (in De Houwer and Wilton, 2011: 55), according to whom "English-medium instruction (EMI) is a term that is used for any institutionalised teaching-learning situation in which communication takes place in English, although the majority of participants are non-native speakers of English".

Kling Soren (2013: 4) defines EMI in the context of Danish university education as "teaching that goes on in English where the content is a substantive academic course". She contrasts it with content-based instruction (CBI), which is, as noted in the previous section, sometimes considered as a synonymous term to CLIL: while in CBI, "disciplinary content is used as a means to introduce language learning, (…) the goals of EMI courses parallel (…) traditional L1 content instruction (e.g. transfer of content knowledge, etc.)". Thus the chief difference between CLIL and EMI could be seen in terms of language and content ratio: while language learning and teaching plays a vital

role in CLIL, it seems to be less focused on in EMI. Otherwise, the relationship between EMI and CLIL is rarely considered.[10]

There might be a distinction between CLIL and EMI based on the number of subjects being taught in the L2/FL, where EMI would be a term for whole programmes taught through L2/FL and CLIL as part of a bilingual programme, where only some subjects are taught through the foreign language. However, Doiz et al. (2012: 12) mention "partial EMI programmes" and Dalton-Puffer (2010: 2) suggests a continuum between "low-intensity" and "high-intensity [CLIL] programmes", the latter "aiming for an exclusive use of the target language". There seems to be some similarity between immersion programmes (see the section on CLIL) and EMI: both are often described as focusing less on explicit teaching of language issues. However, any study comparing these concepts is missing.

EMI appears to be used primarily with reference to tertiary education. However, in many postcolonial countries, EMI is an established form of secondary education (e.g. Uys, 2006; Yip, 2003; Sharma and Sharma, 2004). Occasionally, the term is used in connection with secondary education in European contexts, too (see e.g. Kapitánffy; Gentgen, 2012, who use the term for English-mother tongue bilingual high school programmes that may well be called CLIL or immersion programmes by some). In Austria, the term *Englisch als Arbeitssprache* (literarily 'English as a working language', de facto English-medium instruction) is used with reference to primary or secondary education model comparable with CLIL, while EMI refers to tertiary education programmes that use exclusively English (Eurydice Austria, 2005: 3). Especially in the context of primary or secondary school education, superordinate terms are used: second/foreign language instruction (sometimes abbreviated as L2MI) (Uys, 2006; Eurydice Austria; Kapitánffy).

---

[10] Doiz et al. (2012: xiv) mention that EMI "is more than a subset of CLIL". They do not explain explicitly what they mean by it, but it seems that they want to stress that EMI refers specifically to English which has been the dominant foreign language at schools in Europe, and that there are different motives for EMI than for other language and content integrated learning. However, their statement implies that EMI has been or might be considered as a type of CLIL by some. On the other hand, CLIL subjects are mentioned as one of the possibilities of improving students' language competences in EMI programmes (Doiz et al., 2012: 4), which suggests there may be a complementary relationship.

Kling Soren (2013: 2) mentions that EMI has been also called "teaching in an English as a lingua franca (ELF) setting". Knapp (in De Houwer and Wilton, 2011: 55-56) emphasizes that it is not necessarily the case, as English is sometimes used as a medium of instruction even if all learners share the same native language, in hope of improving their L2/FL language skills. Thus we may talk of true ELF-medium instruction in international programmes where students have various linguistic backgrounds. On the other hand, English has become a lingua franca in many fields and it might be argued that universities are trying to prepare students for communicating internationally, i.e. for ELF communication.

Knapp (in De Houwer and Wilton, 2011: 55-56) distinguishes three types of university EMI programmes in Germany, which may be generally applicable: 1) international programmes, 2) English literature and linguistics programmes, and ELT programmes, 3) programmes aimed at local students that prepare them to study abroad and/or to use English in their future professions. Each type has distinctive characteristics and different motives for English-medium instruction. In international programmes, English is the lingua franca as the participants do not share the same L1 and there is a mixture of varieties and accents. There is a cultural heterogeneity, which may impact the communication. The focus of these programmes is, according to Knapp, primarily if not exclusively on the content. In English literature and linguistics programmes and ELT programmes, most participants share the same L1. Some teachers may be native speakers, but they often have some knowledge of the learners' L1, so this language may be occasionally used in the lessons for better understanding. The goal of these programmes is, apart from the subject matter knowledge, improving all language forms and skills (i.e. not just the communication ability, but also grammar and pronunciation). In the third type of EMI programmes, the participants are rather homogeneous as regards their language and cultural background. When there are students from other countries, they usually have a sufficient knowledge of the local language. English is used in order to improve students' ability to communicate in English and thus to prepare them to work or study in an international setting. According to Knapp, in these programmes, improving the English language skills is one of the goals, but of secondary importance. The focus is usually on communicative competence rather than grammatical correctness.

Knapp's description of EMI programmes supports the idea that EMI is less focused at development of language skills and forms than CLIL. With the exception of English linguistics and literature programmes and ELT programmes, where English may be considered as a part of the subject matter knowledge, EMI programmes seem to focus primarily on communicative competencies. Wilkinson (in Doiz et al., 2012: 11) describes two approaches to EMI: a broad approach, where developing of language competences is part of the curriculum, and a narrow approach, where the language education is reduced more or less to teaching academic writing. He reports that at Maastricht University, EMI programmes have tended to develop from broad ones to narrow ones:

> Once a programme has become established, the language competencies of the students enrolling are treated as adequate (i.e. sufficient to succeed in the programme), and thus additional language training can be treated as a luxury and so dispensed with. The support from language staff becomes reduced to the essentials that students do not possess before entry (…): developing academic writing competencies, and occasionally professional skills such as presentations.

Major spread of EMI programmes at European universities is usually dated from around 1990's onward (Doiz et al., 2012: 3). According to Kling Soren (2013: 2-3), it was induced by increasing numbers of international student exchanges, and the Bologna Process, i.e. measures taken in Europe to enable comparability of higher education degrees and thus enabling less complicated migration of students, graduates, teachers, and European citizens in general. In many smaller countries, EMI programmes are motivated by "the desire to prepare local researchers, lecturers, and students to become successful global players in international universities and in their professional lives". Moreover, in many countries, universities have become "viewed as corporations governed by market forces", which has put them into position of competition "for enrolments and tuition money". Doiz et al. (2012: 3-6) see EMI as a means of attracting both foreign and local students. They argue that this trend has been further stimulated by international rankings of universities, where on the top positions are usually British and American universities, and other universities, trying to reach as high position in the rankings as possible, emulate practices of the top-ranking universities, which often includes EMI. Moreover, one of the criteria in university rankings is research, which is, in turn, rated according to how frequently the research studies are cited. Thus, to make

their articles accessible to a wide readership, researchers preferably publish in renowned journals in English. Therefore, some universities offer EMI programmes to "secure the research base by attracting future PhD students" (Doiz et al., 2012: 5). According to Wächter and Maiworm's survey (2008; in Doiz et al., 2012: 5), apart from the above mentioned motivations for EMI, altruistic motives were often mentioned to make their tertiary education accessible for students from Third World countries. Wilkinson (2005 and 2008; in Doiz et al., 2012: 5) classifies motives for EMI programmes at universities into five categories: practical (e.g. to be able to offer courses for international students), survival (e.g. to attract sufficient number of students), financial (e.g. to attract paying students from abroad), idealist (e.g. to promote multilingualism), and educational (e.g. to create new programmes with different perspectives from those in local language). These motives are often interconnected and may change over time.

In order to study in an EMI programme, learners need to have good-enough English, which is often a prerequisite for enrolment in such a programme (Doiz et al., 2012: 13). What exactly this means may be debatable, but Kling Soren (2013: 3) refers to researches suggesting B2 level according to Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). She stresses that they need not only knowledge of general English, but also academic skills and knowledge of subject specific language. According to Doiz et al. (2012: 10), "students may have language weaknesses, and they are unlikely to be familiar with the academic literacies required to successfully achieve their degree". Therefore, they need some kind of a language support. Reportedly, when enrolling on an EMI programme, students expect both to learn the subject matter and to improve their English. They also have demands on the quality of teachers, not only in terms of subject knowledge and pedagogic competencies, but also language proficiency. Doiz et al. (2012: 12) present research that concludes that EMI may have at first a negative impact on understanding, although it seems to diminish during the course of study. It has been even suggested that EMI has "signs of positive effect on the learning process", that may be triggered by "student's increased concentration".

It seems that many subject matter teachers in EMI programmes are non-native speakers of English who also teach in their L1 (Doiz et al., 2012: 10). They also ought to have a certain level of English in order to teach through English; some researchers suggest C1 level on the CEFR is the minimum, but again, general English knowledge is not

enough, further requirements concern Academic English and subject-specific language (Kling Soren, 2013: 3). Some universities have designed special language tests to ensure the quality of EMI teachers (Doiz et al., 2012: 12). According to Doiz et al. (2012: 10-11), teaching staff in EMI programmes consists of 'content' teachers and language teachers. This may lead to varying degrees of cooperation between the two groups, ranging from "highly integrated team-teaching (…) to parallel or adjunct teaching, where the language support is provided separately from content courses". They claim that teachers of the subject matter rarely consider it their role to develop students' language competency. Moreover, as Hyland (2006: 11) suggests, they may not have "neither the expertise nor the desire" nor the time to do it.

There are many points of controversy regarding EMI. One of the major concerns is what effects increasing numbers of EMI programmes may have on the national languages. It is often formulated as fear of "domain loss" of the national languages, i.e. that the use of English in tertiary education results in limited use of national languages in academic domains, which may gradually lead to a situation, when national languages will not be used in higher education and science at all (Kling Soren, 2013: 3; Doiz et al., 2012: 8). The grimmest scenarios predict that English could gradually oust national languages from other functions and cause their loss. English is thus seen as depleting linguistic diversity (Doiz et al, 2012: 8). It is also argued that the massive use of English in tertiary education, science and business, is at the expense of other languages, which cease to be learned as additional foreign languages (Kling Soren, 2013: 3). Doiz et al. assume that the state of the national language is a concern mostly at the national level, and much less so for universities and students as they are more interested in the practical and financial outcomes. At the national level, there are many questions, such as whether the government should finance educational programmes that may have a negative impact on the national language, and in which a large number, sometimes the majority, of students come from abroad (Doiz et al., 2012: 8-9). Similarly, there is a question if taxpayers agreed with their money being used for funding academic research if they could not read it in their mother tongue (Janssens and Marynissen, 2005; in Doiz et al., 2012: 8). It is also not known what effects EMI has on national and local economy[11] (Doiz et al., 2012:

---

[11] On the one hand, there are major expenses connected with preparing the programmes and creating the conditions for foreign students and teachers; on the other hand, incoming students and teachers may

13). Doiz et al. suggest (ibid.) that political and social implications of EMI programmes, such as elitism and ghettoization, should be considered.

Further, it is questionable whether EMI is as advantageous for students as is often imagined. Doiz et al. (2012: 12) point out that "for many students it is not necessarily the case that their English competences improve during their studies" and they face the "risk of language fossilisation". Moreover, English may not be the most lucrative option as the market becomes saturated with graduates fluent in English from various parts of the world. Graduates of EMI programmes may also have difficulties working in their L1 as their ability to use the L1 in specialist discourse may be limited. Kling Soren (2013: 3) mentions there are concerns about what effects EMI has on the quality of education. Doiz et al. (2012: 10) observe that the English proficiency both of the students and the teachers may not be ideal. Teachers may have pronunciation difficulties, and be unable to improvise or paraphrase effectively. Kling Soren (2013: 20-21) notices that although there are language tests designed to ensure quality of EMI teachers, research has revealed teachers are often insensitive to nuances in the language, are unable to be precise, use much less humour and storytelling than in their L1, talk more slowly and with less redundancy. Doiz et al. (2012: 10) assume that insufficient linguistic competence of teachers may lead to ineffective implementation of EMI courses, but may be averted by using suitable pedagogic approaches, such as student-centred, problem-based and collaborative learning. Later, Doiz et al. (2012: 12) claim that EMI "seems to have a slight negative impact on the academic teacher's quality" and cost teachers more time and energy, but this does not, reportedly, affect students' achievements. However, some universities have reported students' complaints about teachers' English: "students' attention is drawn to the teacher's lack of linguistic fluency and flexibility and above all to pronunciation: relatively minor pronunciation problems (according to educational experts) can elicit strong negative reactions from students" (ibid.). The impact of students' limited English proficiency on the quality of learning is not discussed in Doiz et al. (2012) nor in Kling Soren (2013). Doiz et al. (2012: 10) only imply that students' English may stabilise on a level most of the other students and teachers have, and Kling Soren (2013: 3) mentions "student drop-out rates and exam results" as one of the concerns

---

contribute significantly to local economies. On the one hand, many of graduates may start working abroad and never come back, on the other hand, many students from abroad may stay. (Doiz et al., 2012: 13)

regarding EMI. Ibrahim (2001: 125-6) points out that EMI may complicate the learning process both in terms of cognitive and affective conditions and may lead to inefficient learning, and eventually to academic failure.

EMI seems to be the least applicable model in the context of Czech secondary education. Some universities in the Czech Republic do offer EMI programmes, but they are not as common as e.g. in the Netherlands or Denmark. There are also a few English-medium or Czech-English bilingual schools, but otherwise, using English as a medium of instruction for a large part of the curriculum seems rare.

2.5. Conclusion

There is a number of models integrating language and content, and many terms are used to designate them. They are often bound to a specific region and linguistic context, and it seems that many of the terms substantially overlap. This may be because on the one hand, some countries insist on uniqueness of their situation and thus invent a new term and seemingly new methodology; on the other hand, as some of the models gain on popularity, they are transferred to new contexts, and thus the understanding of the model and its term broadens, so it becomes in some of its forms, very similar to another already existing model. Ultimately, the term may be viewed as an umbrella term for various other models. The popularity of a term seems to be connected to political powers, and support given to the term by authorities.

A useful approach to description and classification of models of language and content integration seems to be a continuum with models that focus on content at one end, and model that focus on language at the other, as suggested by Met (1998: 40-1). Placing the models on this continuum would enable us to have a better understanding where they overlap and would make discussions on language and content integration more transparent and intelligible.

In the European region, the most common terms referring to models of integrating English and content are English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and its branch English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and English-medium instruction (EMI). This thesis focuses on general secondary schools for which the most suitable models seem to be EAP and CLIL, as these comply with the general educational goals, prepare learners for later study, both in terms of getting used

41

to dealing with academic content in a foreign language, and developing general academic skills and presumably cognitive skills in general. However, all the models induce questions regarding their effectiveness, especially in terms of price-output ratio, as they place special demands on the teacher. Moreover, there are concerns about the growing role of English in education, science, and business, and its implication for other languages.

3. Methodology

The aim of the empirical part of the thesis is to find out how and why language and content is integrated at Czech secondary schools. The main research question was divided into the following sub-questions:

1. What is taught in the course? What model (CLIL, ESP, EMI) does it seem to be? What are the aims of the course?
2. Why is the course taught? Who initiated it?
3. What can be said about the teachers who teach such courses?
4. What can be said about students who attend the course?
5. What challenges and drawbacks are there?
6. What benefits are there?

After a careful consideration, multiple case study research design was chosen to answer the research questions, the focus of case study being *how* or *why* a *current* phenomenon, over which we have *limited control*, occurs (Šva í ek, Še ová et al., 2007: 101; after Yin, 2003: 9). The original intention was to base the case studies on observations in lessons integrating English and content, which were meant to be complemented by interviews with teachers and possibly students. In the end the case studies are based predominantly on in-depth interviews with teachers, because it enables me to describe more cases within the extent of this thesis. If observations and interviews with students were also included, the case studies would be more detailed and exact, but it would be possible to focus only on one or two cases. After initial survey of schools where some form of 'specialised' English was taught, I found that there is a variety of courses offered, and I wanted to capture the variety. Therefore, I decided for a less complex description of the cases and did an interview with five teachers, teaching various kinds of courses integrating English and content. The research thus provides primarily the teachers' view, which is undoubtedly in some ways biased. The data are treated with respect to this fact. Where available, additional documents were used, e.g. curricular documents of the school[12], course descriptions, information from school websites.

---

[12] *Školní vzd lávací plán* (School Educational Programme); for an overview of curricular documents in the Czech Republic, see Framework Education Programme for Secondary General Education (Grammar Schools), 2007: 5-6.

As mentioned above, the research is based on in-depth interviews with five teachers who teach courses integrating English and content. As the focus of the thesis is on general secondary education, they all teach at a grammar school.[13] The search for cases was further restricted to Prague and to state-funded schools, i.e. not private, the former for reasons of accessibility of respondents, the latter to focus on representatives of the majority strand in Czech educational system.

Here is an overview of procedures taken to conduct the research, described in more detail below:

- Preliminary research: making a list of grammar schools in Prague, searching for e-mail addresses, sending e-mails to enquire about courses in English, searching for courses at school websites, making a list of courses offered
- Contacting teachers eligible for the interviews
- Making a list of topics and questions for the interviews, modifying them for each of the interviews
- Trial interview
- Pilot interview
- Recording
- Searching for appropriate software tools
- Transcribing
- Coding

The first step taken to find the respondents was making a list of grammar schools in Prague. I used the official register of the Czech Ministry of Education (*Rejstřík škol a školských zařízení*, http://rejskol.msmt.cz/) and filtered out schools according to the mentioned criteria. I found 43 state-funded grammar schools in Prague, 41 of which I contacted via e-mail to ask whether they offer any 'specialised English' course, e.g. CLIL, ESP or EAP. I did not contact two of the grammar schools, because I knew teachers there

---

[13] There are three types of grammar schools (*gymnázium*) in the Czech Republic: 8-year, 6-year, and 4-year grammar schools. The longer their programme is, the earlier the pupil enrols, i.e. pupils apply for an 8-year grammar school in their fifth year of primary education, two years later (7th class) for a 6-year grammar school, and for a 4-year grammar school in the last grade (9th class). This thesis focuses on secondary education, therefore only courses taught at the 4-year grammar schools or the upper stage of 8-year and 6-year grammar schools were taken into consideration because lower stage of the latter two types of grammar schools correspond to elementary school.

and could easily ask them personally. Unfortunately, the register does not contain e-mail addresses, so I had to seek them on the school websites. Where e-mail addresses of teachers were available, I decided to contact teachers of English, where possible heads of English or foreign language departments (*p edseda p edm tové komise*). This was rather time-consuming but necessary because many schools do not have information about courses taught at the school on their websites. I received responses from 19 schools, out of which 9 indicated that they do some form of English and content integration. I also knew that the two grammar schools that I did not contact offered several elective English seminars. This initial step in the research was done in May and June 2013.

In February 2014, after finishing the theoretical part of the thesis, I contacted several teachers, and prepared topics and questions for the interviews. In March I did a trial interview, shortly followed by a pilot interview with a teacher whom I know personally. Some teachers consented to be interviewed but in the end were too busy to meet me. This made me seek further on websites of schools that had not replied to my e-mail to find more teachers. I tried to get as much variety as possible. In the end I managed to interview five teachers from four grammar schools. They are introduced below, under different names:

Eva

Eva teaches English and Math at a grammar school with a reputable image. She has several years' experience with teaching an elective seminar for last-year students aimed at American Literature. She is about fifty years old and has been teaching for more than twenty-five years. She has been working at the current institution for more than ten years. She studied Mathematics at university and later she decided to earn a degree in TEFL. I had known Eva personally before the research. I studied at the grammar school where she teaches and I attended her seminar; I have been in touch with her after leaving the school. She is very kind, vivacious and communicative.

Anna

Anna teaches English and a seminar British and American History in English at a grammar school in Prague. She has a degree in English and History from faculty of education in the Czech Republic. She had taught History in Czech but she prefers teaching English, considering it "more creative". She is in her forties

and has a teaching experience from both grammar schools and private language school for adults. Anna seemed a very kind and laid-back person.

Simona

Simona teaches English and Czech language and literature at a grammar school in Prague. She has a degree in English and Czech philology in Prague and took several courses in translation. She is in her early thirties. She has a one-year experience with teaching a seminar focused on English writing skills and a two-years' experience with a translation seminar. Simona was very kind and humble. Her being not much older than myself and having a similar education background, I felt as if we were fellow students at university.

Tereza

Tereza teaches English at the same schools as Simona. I estimate her to be about forty years old. She studied chemistry. She says she has always been interested in English and has participated in many international camps, where she could experience teaching methods used by American teachers. She used to teach Chemistry and English, but has chosen to teach only English at the school. She invented most of the English seminars taught at the school. Apart from regular English classes, she teaches English writing skills, translation seminar (both in co-operation with Simona), Business English and a seminar of Anglophone cultures that prepares students for the *maturita* exam. She is very straightforward.

David

David is in his late twenties. He comes from an international family and is bilingual, one of his native languages being English. He has lived in the Czech Republic for about a year. He has a BA degree in History and Philosophy from a university abroad and a TEFL certificate. He has a teaching experience from two other European countries. He teaches a foreign language (not English), and, as he says, whatever he is asked to teach, so this year he teaches a cross-curricular subject at a grammar school in Prague. At our meeting, David was very helpful, and enthusiastic about sharing his experience.

Interviews were always conducted in the teacher's mother tongue: in four cases, it was Czech, in one case English. With the respondent's consent[14], each interview was audio-recorded. All the interviews were based on the same set of topics. The questions were similar in each of the interviews but it was impossible to ask exactly the same questions, because the experience of each of the teachers was different and the topic occurred in different order. The aim was to cover all the topics rather than to follow a standardized set of questions.

Each interview was transcribed[15] and analysed as soon as possible, with one exception before the next interview, so that I could always improve the questions or include questions that had not occurred to me before. Transcriptions are almost unedited, i.e. contain hesitation features, informal endings in Czech, fillers. However, minor changes were made: excessive amounts of hesitation features or fillers were reduced, some of my words of affirmation or encouragement were ignored in the transcript not to interrupt visually the respondent's utterance where unnecessary. All names of teachers and secondary schools mentioned in the interview were erased or replaced. Transcriptions of the interviews are available separately on a CD, i.e. are not in the printed appendix, to ensure as much anonymity to the interviewees as possible. Table 1 presents basic data about the interviews.

Table 1: Interview metadata

School	Teacher	Recording time (in minutes)	Transcription length (word count)	Language of interview
Grammar school A	Eva	76	12 656	Czech
Grammar school B	Anna	33	4 855	Czech
Grammar school C	Simona	70	9 398	Czech
	Tereza	38	5 120	Czech
Grammar school D	David	54	6 212	English

In the qualitative analysis of the interviews, the method of open coding was used.[16] Subsequently, the data were organised by the method of thematic coding (as described by Švaříek, Šeďová et al., 2007: 229-230, after Flick, 2006), i.e. the case studies are described separately but following one set of categories. The categories were tentatively

---

[14] Interviewees signed an informed consent with participation in the research (see Appendix I).

[15] I used SoundScriber, a simple transcribing software written by Eric Breck from the University of Michigan.

[16] I used a software designed for analysis of qualitative data, a free edition of QDA Miner: QDA Miner Lite 1.2.2. See Appendix II for an excerpt from the analysis.

formed on the basis of research questions and the first case study and were subsequently slightly modified with each following case study. Quotations from the interviews are used rather sparingly in the descriptions of case studies not to exceed the extent of the thesis too much[17]. Avid readers can consult interview transcriptions enclosed on a CD.

---

[17] Gillham (2001b: 73) recommends that quotations from interviews should form about a third of the text but other authors do not set any rule (Šva í ek, Še ová et al., 2007; Flick, 2006).

4. English and Content Integration
at Czech Grammar Schools: Five Case Studies

This chapter describes the findings of qualitative research whose procedures are described in the previous chapter. Its main focus are case studies of five teachers from four grammar schools who teach a course that can be viewed as an instance of language and content integration. Before we delve into the case studies, I would like to present an overview of what courses integrating English and content were found in the sample of Prague state-funded grammar schools. Please note that the list below may not be exhaustive, because not all schools replied to my e-mail and/or have information about courses they teach on their websites. Most of the courses are so called elective seminars which are usually offered to senior students so that they can accommodate their timetable to their interests and university plans. These courses are often filtered through a selection process and only those with a certain number of students are realised. Some of the courses listed below may not have been realised or will be realised in the following academic year. This inaccuracy is given by the fact that many school websites present elective seminars that they offer but often do not provide information whether they were realised in the end or not.

As I expected, many grammar schools offer seminars aimed at Anglophone literature, history, or culture in general. These often have the aim to prepare students for the *maturita* exam[18]. I found schools offering the following courses:

- English culture, history and literature (2x, compulsory at one school)
- Anglophone literature (5x) – mostly British and/or American
- History of Anglophone countries (2x) – British and/or American

However, I found many other courses integrating English with various other fields of study:

---

[18] Exam taken in the last year of study at secondary schools at about the age of 18 or 19. Grammar school students choose four subjects for this exam, the selection of which depends partly on their own will, partly there are certain rules which change over time (e.g. Czech language and literature is compulsory, Math used to be compulsory but currently is not, one world language is compulsory). *Maturita* exam in foreign languages, including English, has been traditionally based on both the knowledge of the language but also the ability to discuss given topics, including literature, history and culture of the country or countries where the language is spoken. Since 2011, the *maturita* exam in the Czech Republic has two parts: one common to all secondary schools, which is dictated by the Ministry of Education, and another part designed by each school. While the state *maturita* exam in English is based on language skills, the school-specific exams tend to test also knowledge of Anglophone cultures.

- Business English (5x)
- Public speaking and discussion (2x)
- English in professional settings (2x) – both offered only once
- Current issues
- Social English
- World in context – compulsory at one school (see the last case study)
- Talk music
- Visual arts
- Natural sciences (conversation)
- Politics
- Geography – will be realised in the following academic year
- English for Academic Purposes – will be realised in the following academic year
- Academic Writing – offered for the following academic year

As can be seen from the list above, there is a variety of courses offered. Surprisingly, Business English is offered at five schools. Academic English, on the other hand, is rare. I focus on five courses in detail in the case studies that follow. Apart from these courses, several schools have cooperated with a Comenius assistant[19] and thus most likely have experience with short-term CLIL or 'CLIL showers'. However, this type of English and content integrated learning is not represented in the case studies below. There are also teachers who occasionally use English materials in their non-language lessons such as Geography or Math, mostly because they find these materials convenient but they have not been translated into Czech. This type of experience is not examined here, as it is a rather marginal instance of language and content integration.

4.1. Grammar School A

Eva: American Film and Literature

From the four models described in the second chapter, this course could be labelled as CLIL for there are both language and content aims, and the teacher seems to focus also

---

[19] A teacher or prospective teacher from an EU country (or several other European countries) who participates in Comenius programme. The programme is part of EU Lifelong Learning Programme and among others enables schools to host a visiting teacher. For more information, see e.g. the website of National Agency for European Educational Programmes, http://www.naep.cz/index.php?a=view-project-folder&project_folder_id=337&.

on developing students' general study skills. It is a one-year elective course for senior students with the time allocation of two lessons per week. It has been running for more than seven years. It was the teachers' idea to offer such a course and the school policy on elective seminars enabled that. The seminar is designed and taught by the teacher alone: there is no cooperation with other teachers, there are no requirements or restrictions dictated by the school management.

Eva declares that the aims of the course are mainly focused on literature rather than language, i.e. she sees content aims as predominant. She wants to broaden students' knowledge of American literature: students should get to know several authors in more detail than in literature classes, learn about the context in which selected pieces of literature were created and get acquainted with a variety of genres. This ought to be achieved primarily by reading and discussion. Reading is partly done in class, partly assigned as homework. It usually involves one or two shorter novels, several short stories and samples from other genres: drama, public speech and poetry. Readings are discussed in the class and students write an in-class essay on one of the novels. Students also read a book of their own choice (the only limit being that it must fit within the category of American literature) which they present in the second half of the school year to the class. The presentation includes excerpts from the book which are read and discussed by the whole class. In-class essays and presentations form the basis of assessment. Films watched in the seminar are mostly adaptations of famous literary works that are related to topics covered in the seminar. The course should prepare students for the school part of the *maturita* exam in English, but it is not the main focus of the seminar. After all, as the teacher says, there are only a few exam topics concerning American literature at their school but students sometimes find it helpful while studying for their exam in Czech Language and Literature.

Eva claims that language is much less the focus of the course. She thinks of 'language' in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and analysis of poetry. She reveals she does not want to include much grammar not to discourage the students. From what she says it seems she wants the students to get acquainted with non-standard forms, and obsolete language, which are usually shocking to them. The teacher says she corrects grammatical mistakes in essays and sometimes in presentations, but language accuracy does not seem to be that important in the seminar: she claims she always appreciates more original thoughts than language correctness. A greater emphasis seems to be on vocabulary needed for assigned reading. Students are also asked to include in their presentations of

the book of their own choice vocabulary that they found important. It seems that there are more language aims than the teacher says. Implicitly, the seminar offers a ground for practicing all language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing).

The teacher mentioned several times examples of aims focusing on development of general study skills (without labelling them as such). She teaches students how to write essays and adopts (perhaps intuitively or on the basis of her own experience) a process approach: she asks students to hand in their in-class essays with all the preparations, which should include brainstorming, outline and draft. Some attention is also paid to presentations. Apart from essays and presentations, Eva mentions several other aims focussing on study skills. She emphasizes that she wants the students to engage with the text, manage to work out the meaning even if the text is difficult for them, and think about what they read. She also finds it very important that students get used to reading books in a foreign language. From what Eva said it seems to me that she deems study skills more important than the content knowledge but has not thought much about it nor about how study skills could be taught effectively.

It seems that Eva tries to integrate some topics from Personal and Social Education in the course.[20] Generally, the teacher's attitude to the course is that it ought to be pleasant for the students. She feels that there are certain things that the students need but are not particularly popular. Thus she tries to find a balance between demanding and pleasant activities. She uses a variety of materials for her lessons. Many of them are materials she got from an American teacher.

As it was mentioned, the seminar was Eva's idea and work. She says that she decided to offer the seminar for three reasons: first, she stayed in the USA for some time and could see how literature was taught at high school there. She brought some materials with her and decided to try something similar here. Second, she had excellent students and wanted to offer them something more. Third, she felt that there was not much time in regular English classes for literature. The main impulse must have been Eva's interest in American literature, although she did not mention it during our interview.

---

[20] *Osobnostní a sociální výchova*. One of the cross-curricular subjects currently prescribed in Framework Education Programme (FEP) for grammar schools (*Rámcov vzd lávací program pro gymnázia*), called "Moral, Character and Social Education" in English translation of FEP (2007). It can be realised as a separate course, or its topics may be integrated in other subjects or school activities, which is the case at most schools (Valenta, 2013: 77).

Eva has a university degree in Mathematics and English. She says she drew her inspiration for this seminar partly from what she could see during her stay in the USA, partly from her own experience as a grammar school student at a school where they had literary seminar in English. She says that the latter experience did not inspire her as far as methodology is concerned, but it helped her understand how students may benefit from such a course. There seem to be two primary reasons why Eva continues teaching the seminar: firstly, she enjoys working with students who are interested in literature. She seems to welcome that students who attend the seminar in most cases choose it because of their interest. Secondly, she says she enjoys the fact that there is no pressure about what she needs to do with the students, there is more freedom regarding the content and time which she finds enjoyable:

> *V normálních hodinách lov k má ur itou povinnost ty studenty dotáhnout na ákou úrove , nejenom kv li maturit a p ijíma kám, ale v bec kv li… tomu, co si odnesou do života, že jo, protože dneska bez tý angli tiny se holt prost lov k už n kdy nechytá. Ta literatura je troši ku nadstavba, takže já tam nad sebou nemám tenhleten bi , že bych je musela n kam dotáhnout, n co povinn splnit, o to je to p íjemn jší, je to trošku voln jší.*

Eva is obviously proud of the seminar. She mentioned several times successes she had had with the seminar, e.g. that students thanked her after their *maturita* exam that they did well because of what they did in the seminar or that in some years, two parallel seminars were realised to satisfy students' interest. Eva is interested in international educational projects. It may imply that she seeks new experience but this may hold only in some ways because she does not seem to innovate the seminar much: after a few years she found out what worked with the students and does not change the content of the seminar too much. On the other hand, the course may be somewhat different each year due to students' presentations of books of their own choice. Eva admits she likes to vary activities and is afraid of monotony. Therefore, she prefers one-year seminar to two-year seminars which are also offered at their school.

In Eva's view, there are three types of students regarding their motivation to attend the course. The first type are students interested in literature. It may not necessarily be their main interest or intended direction of study: according to Eva, each year a few students take the course who are going to read natural sciences, mathematics or engineering. The second type are students who select this course because they want extra English lessons. They are students generally interested in languages who are keen to use

the language for any purpose and would probably choose any other English seminar that would be offered. Sometimes there also students who studied in an Anglophone country for some time and want to be in contact with the language. Eva thinks that the students often realise that they have an opportunity to practice their English for free when they are at high school. The third group of students are those who enrol for the seminar because they do not know what else to choose or who thought it would be relatively easy for them.

According to Eva, the students' levels of English vary. Mostly students with good English enrol but there are weaker students too. Anybody can attend the course, there are no requirements, although certain level of English is recommended. Generally, Eva thinks that students now have better English than students several years ago but they have worse study skills, e.g. they have problems with writing essays, in English as well as in Czech. She complains about their being too performance oriented.

From what Eva says in the interview, it emerges that there is a number of challenges and obstacles. We may classify them tentatively into three groups. First, there is a number of obstacles on the school level regarding organisation. Most notably, there is little cooperation among the teachers and in the school as a whole. School management allows the seminars but there does not seem to be any conception. Teachers do not cooperate, anyone interested can create their own seminar, but they do not seem to plan what would be useful for the students. Eva mentions that she could not offer the seminar one year because it would exceed the standard work load of 21 lessons per week and school management does not allow teachers to teach more. Sometimes, Eva has to give up the seminar so that she can teach compulsory subjects, sometimes she must choose between this seminar and Math seminar that she also likes to teach.

Second group of challenges concern the teacher. It seems that Eva does not realise fully the potential of integrating language and content. She thinks of the seminar as a literature seminar and although she frequently mentions what she would like to achieve with students regarding general study skills, she does not seem to realise it fully and think about in which ways these aims could be achieved. Her approach is intuitive, very little supported by theoretical knowledge. Rather than needs analysis, it seems the approach here is needs *guesses*.

Thirdly, there are several challenges regarding the students. One of the challenges for the teacher is the mixed levels of students' English or their mixed abilities in general. She says that this was problem especially during the first years of her experience with the course when students with very low level of English as well as students with high level

of English attended the course. It seems she had not anticipated the problem and later it was recommended that students should have certain threshold level of English to attend the seminar. This seemed to be rather an organisational problem which was fixed later. However, the teacher must cope with students with mixed abilities anyway: there may not be such extremes but differences are still notable. While for common English classes at this school, students from three or four classes (each having about 30 students) are divided into six to eight groups according to their level of English, in elective seminars students from various groups meet, though presumably not from the lowest ones. There is a test on the basis of which students are divided into GE classes, but there is no testing in the case of elective seminars. Eva complains about having several lower-level students in the class this year who seem to be weak students generally.

> *…letos to celkem d e, že jsou tam lidi z nižších skupin t eba, jazykovejch, oni to možná pochopili špatn , že si cht li áký hodiny ješt doplnit k tomu svýmu normálnímu rozvrhu, ale tohle nejsou klasický hodiny, tam oni nedokážou s tou svojí slovní zásobou vždycky úpln adekvátn reagovat na to, co se po nich chce, nedokážou ani písemn , ani ústn vyjád it po ádn myšlenku; na druhou stranu, když se jich lov k zeptá t eba i, jak bys to teda vyjád il esky, tak kolikrát taky nev di. Takže tam nebude úpln vždycky jenom problém jazykovej, ale takovej ten problém um t se nad tím dílem opravdu zamyslet, soust edit se na to, co d lám, kdo je kdo, jo, a tak dále…*

On the other hand, she remembers students whose English was rather poor but whom she enjoyed working with because of their fresh and original thoughts. Eva mentions that higher level students, on the other hand, may be disappointed about the course not being as challenging as they hoped. Sometimes, students have rather different knowledge in literature, which mainly depends on their Czech Language and Literature teacher. Students also may be used to different style of work from their English teacher. The teacher seems to be able to cope somehow with all the differences. Reportedly, students rarely give up the course. Apart from the challenges concerning mixed abilities, Eva also mentions that motivation may be a problem. On the one hand, most of the students seem to be interested in the course because they selected it themselves, but on the other hand, students do not take it as seriously as compulsory subjects and instrumental motivation is thus very low.

The most notable benefits of the course seem to be that students may develop both content and language knowledge, and general study skills, which they are lacking,

according to the teacher. The course goes beyond preparing students for the *maturita* exam. It aims to teach students to deal with difficult texts, to think about what they read, to write essays, to express themselves. All this is done on meaningful content that most students enrolled in the seminar are interested in. The teacher can balance between the challenging and the pleasant, to include recent literature and films to attract the students and to broaden their knowledge beyond the school curriculum. The course involves many cross-curricular links, drawing together knowledge from other curricular subjects, mostly from Czech Language and Literature, English, History, and Social Sciences.

4.2. Grammar School B

Anna: British and American History

This course mostly resembles EMI, its focus being on content knowledge. Very little attention is paid to language. It is a one-year elective seminar for senior students with the time allocation of two lessons per week. It is the second time this year that it has been realised. Offering this course was the headmasters' idea and Anna consented to teach it but she does not seem to be very enthusiastic about it.

The main objective of the course is to prepare students for the school-specific part of *maturita* exam in English that is designed at this school so that it tests students' knowledge of Anglophone literature and history. The topics of the course are identical with history topics in the school-specific *maturita* English exam. The course consists of lectures with visual support: PowerPoint presentations prepared by the teacher and projected on the board. There are no language aims. The only language instruction students receive is when a difficult word occurs in the lecture: Anna says that in these cases she provides synonyms or translations. She thinks that no special vocabulary instruction is necessary, because most of the vocabulary is recurrent, so students will learn it in time. It seems that Anna uses the same methods she would use in History classes taught through Czech. There seems to be very little interaction with the students. The teacher says she wanted to include discussions but gave up because students are not interested enough and do not take part in the discussions. She also mentions she thought about preparing work sheets for the students but there is not enough time in the seminar to manage anything else than the lectures. However, she would not prefer a two-year seminar, thinking it would be a waste of time for the students. Assessment has the form of multiple-choice tests every time after a couple of topics is covered. Regarding

materials, Anna uses mostly one book she bought in London specifically for this course, and occasionally consults additional books if necessary. She does not want to use internet sources: according to her, students may use internet sources but the teacher should not (thus there is at least one tacit non-content aim based on observational learning, i.e. that books are more acceptable sources than internet encyclopaedias). Generally, the teacher thinks that the course should be demanding and only for students who are interested in Anglophone cultures.

Offering the course was the headmaster's idea. The school decided that the school-designed part of the *maturita* exam in English ought to be demanding and chose to base it on knowledge of Anglophone literature and history. Therefore, it was logical that courses should be offered to prepare students for the exam: there is thus one course on British and American History, and one on British and American Literature. According to Anna, the headmaster had long intended to offer courses in English, because parents tend to ask about it and because it is attractive for many potential students.

Anna studied English and History at a Faculty of Education. She prefers teaching English to teaching History, considering English more creative. She teaches the course because her education perfectly matches the required combination for this course, but she does it only because the headmaster asked her. Although she says she enjoys teaching it, it does not sound very convincing.

According to Anna, majority of students attend the seminar to prepare for the *maturita* exam. In Anna's view, only a few of them are interested in history. The teacher complains that students are passive in the lessons, that they did not take part in discussions when she tried to introduce some. This may, of course, be caused by lack of students' interest in the subject matter but a contributing factor might be the techniques used in the seminar. Language barrier might be at play too: the recommended level of English is B2, so students should be independent users of the language, but they may lack the vocabulary and structures needed for this discipline, especially at the beginning of the course. Moreover, Anna admits that students in the seminar have sometimes lower level than B2. Generally, she thinks that students' English is better now than it was several years ago. Unlike Eva (see 4.1.), she does not observe any decline in students' study skills; (this may be caused by the fact that perhaps not many study skills are required in her lessons but we would need to know more about her style of teaching in general English classes).

Several challenges emerge from the interview. The major problem seems to be the lack of theoretical knowledge about language and content integration. The teacher

presumably uses the same methods as she used in her History lessons taught in Czech. She does not seem to consider the role of language in the learning process, she does not find it necessary to teach students vocabulary, and does not seem to take the possible language barrier into account. The course did not emerge from her own interest and she does not seem to be very enthusiastic about it. The headmaster seems to have a vision, which appears to focus on school image, but does not seem to know much about using a foreign language as a medium of instruction. There is little cooperation among teachers. English teachers prepared the topics of the school-designed *maturita* exam in English, it was decided who will teach seminars preparing students for the exam, but no more attention seems to be paid to the seminars. The conception of the seminar seems rather confused. On the one hand, Anna says it should prepare students for the *maturita* exam, on the other hand she says that students who attend the seminar only because of the exam must feel miserable because of the demands on the content knowledge.

> *...tím, že je to v té angli tin , tak je to pro všechny tak ák stejn t žké, takže ty co maj o to v tší zájem, co to zajímá, myslim si, že t ch informací tam dávam docela hodn ... jakoby že to není úpln jenom po povrchu, takže ty co... ty co jsou tam jenom proto, aby u ály školní maturitu, tak chudáci moc nestíhaj nebo netušej moc, o em je e , kolikrát a je to hodn práce, ale tohlencto chci, nebo chceme asi všichni, aby ti studenti si zvykli, protože ono samoz ejm se to, žejo, roznese se... eknou si, jaký to je, jak to vypadá, tak aby asem se ustálilo opravdu, jo, je to náro ný, je to t žký, je to jenom pro toho, kdo o to má zájem.*

Moreover, the assessment in the seminar is based on multiple-choice tests where little if any language production is required. However, the *maturita* exam for which it ought to prepare is an oral exam, so students may actually have the content knowledge but may lack the language competence to express it. It seems that a number of problems could be solved if there was a clearer conception and appropriate methods were chosen. On the other hand, there does not seem to be any troubles with students with different levels of English, though there are most likely differences among students in the course.

The benefit of this course – apart from the obvious deepening students' knowledge in cultural background of English-speaking countries – might be that students have the chance to experience English-medium instruction and may thus feel more confident on a study-abroad programme where no language instruction is likely to be included in common lectures. (However, it prepares students only for a small number of study skills:

listening to lectures, note taking, studying for tests and coping with multiple-choice tests in English; while other key study skills are not addressed, e.g. essay writing, critical reading, discussion, and oral presentations.)

4.3. Grammar School C

This grammar school offers a number of elective courses in English: English-Czech Translation Seminar, English History and Culture, Writing in English (described below), Business English (described below), English and Films (offered last year, not realised), Reading in English and Anglophone Literature (offered for the following school-year). They are elective seminars for senior students with the time allocation of two lessons per week. The fact that the school offers such a variety of English seminars is given by two circumstances: firstly, it is a result of an initiative of one of the teachers, Tereza, who finds it important that the school equip students with practical skills, help them to find and develop their talent, and support their creativity. Secondly, it is given by the school's benevolent policy on elective courses: according to the school curricular documents, almost half of the curriculum in the last grade is formed by elective seminars which students choose according to their interest and plans for future studies and careers. I interviewed two English teachers from the school who teach several of the courses listed above, Simona and Tereza. I decided to describe here a seminar that they run together, Writing in English, and briefly also a course of Business English taught by Tereza.

Simona and Tereza: Writing in English

This course focuses on various aspects of writing: creative writing and academic writing. It is rather difficult to pigeonhole it into one of the categories described in the theoretical chapter. It could be viewed partly as EAP because about half of the syllabus is devoted to academic essays. It could fit within the category of CLIL because both content and language issues are addressed. It could be even considered as EMI, as a course focused on creative writing might be very similar for native speakers of English. This is the first year the course has been realised but it was offered already the year before.

According to what Simona and Tereza say, content aims receive more attention in the course. In the first half of the year, they focused on creative writing, mostly short stories, partly also film scripts. Tereza involved students in an international project that has the ambition to publish a collection of students' short stories. The second part of the

syllabus is focused on essay writing. The aim is to prepare students for writing opinion essays in state-assigned part of the *maturita* exam and in FCE or CAE. Simona aims further: to teach the students to write research essays and thus prepare them for their university studies.

Language aims seem to be of secondary importance. Occasionally, certain language issues are addressed, such as punctuation or common expressions in opinion essays and research essays, i.e. they focus on practical skills that are of immediate use and would be presumably very similar in a course for native speakers of English [cf. EMI, and EAP for native speakers (e.g. Jordan, 1997: 8; Hyland, 2006: 1-2 and 4)]. Mistakes are corrected but not much attention is paid to them. Simona says that students are frequently asked to send their assignments to her; she corrects them electronically so that it cannot be seen what was corrected and she prints out the corrected texts which are then discussed in class. She said that when she had not corrected the texts or when she had corrected them with a red pen, students always discussed grammar mistakes, and did not focus on what she wanted them to discuss. Thus she says it is the student's responsibility to compare their original version with version corrected by the teacher.

Further, according to Tereza, the course ought to help students to discover and develop their talent, support their creativity, and raise their self-confidence in writing. Simona focuses on study skills such as cultivating argumentation or finding and appropriately using sources.

Various modes of work seem to be used in class: individual work, pair work, group work, whole-class discussions. According to what Simona says, students are often asked to write their assignments at home. Lessons are devoted to discussing students' older assignments or improving certain skills, such as how to open a short story, or discovering differences between film script and literary work. Assessment is based mainly on students handing in assignments, rather than on language correctness or quality of work. Teachers select materials from various sources, often specialised books for university students. It seems some of the materials need to be altered to fit the needs of this class. Sometimes they use materials in Czech (e.g. on film script writing). However, it seems that written materials are not used every lesson, some lessons are based only on discussing students' writings and practicing some aspect of writing.

This is the first year this course has been realised. It was first offered two years ago when the school's policy on elective courses changed and elective seminars started to form a substantial part of the curriculum for last year students. This seminar, as many

other English seminars at the grammar school, was Tereza's idea. She asked Simona to cooperate with her, being friends and having an experience of teaching together an English-Czech Translation seminar.

Tereza studied at the Institute of Chemical Technology but she says she has always been interested in English. She taught Chemistry for some time but decided to teach only English, finding it more enjoyable. She mentions she was influenced by taking part several times in English Camps where most of the teachers were Americans who obviously embraced methods of Communicative Language Teaching. She clearly inclines greatly herself to Communicative Method, considering fluency more important than accuracy (cf. e.g. Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 153-174). She emphasizes development of practical skills for students' future university studies and careers. Generally, she is very well aware of what her seminars may be useful for and writes very skills-oriented advertisements for them. Her other great concern is creativity. She says about herself that she is a very creative person and tries to give her students opportunity to develop their creativity. According to Simona, Tereza has good organising skills and often involves students in various projects. She seems proud of her work and her students, considering them very clever people and trying to promote their growth. It appears her primary motivation for teaching the seminar is the fact that there is more time to do what she considers important.

Simona studied English and Czech philology and teaches both English, and Czech Language and Literature. She teaches the course because Tereza involved her and she enjoys it. A great advantage appears to be her education in language and literature. She says she enjoys teaching elective courses because the lessons are longer and they can thus delve deeper into the topics. Her approach seems rather different from Tereza's. She appears to be concerned primarily with academic writing. She wants to prepare students for the *maturita* exam or other exams such as FCE, but she aims further: she thinks students should learn how to write research essays to be prepared for university studies. The latter stems from her own experience at university: nobody taught her how to write research essays and suddenly she was asked to produce them. She seems to be concerned much more with the language than Tereza and her teaching style appears to be rather eclectic regarding the methods. She does not like using textbooks in GE classes and prefers tailor-made syllabi. She seems capable of self-scrutiny regarding her work.

Students enrol in the seminar for various reasons. According to Simona, the majority of them want to be prepared for the *maturita* exam, i.e. practice writing opinion

essays and improve their English. Some of the students are interested in literature and wish to try creative writing. A few are interested in learning to write argumentative essays to be able to produce persuasive texts. In Simona's view, there are both zealous students and students who attend the course only because they had to choose something and this seemed to be the most acceptable option. Students with various levels of English attend the seminar; there is no level specifically recommended. Generally, Tereza observes that nowadays students enter the grammar school with a relatively good English and therefore need something more challenging than GE textbooks. Simona thinks they are often rather self-centred and unable to think critically.

One of the challenges of the course is that it is obviously rather time-consuming for the teachers. This is because they need to frequently correct students' assignment, give them feedback, customize the syllabus, find appropriate materials, and discuss their ideas together. It will presumably get better in later years if they continue teaching the course. However, neither of the teachers considers it more time-consuming than preparations for any other lessons. Simona complains there is not enough time to prepare everything the way she would want to and sometimes they do not have the time or energy to discuss with her colleague what they are going to do the following lesson. According to Simona, they prepared a basic syllabus before the course began; during the year, they usually make short-term plans for about 4 weeks ahead but sometimes they do not have the time to prepare it and just do what immediately occurs to them before the lesson.

What may hinder the quality of the course is the fact that the teachers have a limited theoretical knowledge about what they do, i.e. about integrating content and language, teaching Academic English, TEFL methodology in general, and creativity. Their approach is intuitive and based on their own experience. They obviously counterbalance the lack of theoretical grounding by their zealousness and commitment.

Interestingly, although there seem to be students with different levels of English, the teachers do not find it challenging. Simona says she does not mind and thinks anybody can benefit from the course in some way if they want to.

The primary benefit of the course lies at the heart of integrating content and language: both content and language can be addressed at the same time. The content part of the course is what receives little attention elsewhere in the curriculum. Students seem to be treated as knowing and capable, which may have a positive effect on their motivation and learning [cf. Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010: 23) who claims learners in CLIL

lessons are treated as "(efficient) users", whereas learners in GE classes as "(deficient) novices"]:

> *Tereza: …oni jako nabudou takhle i sebev domí, že když napíšou t eba dv t i povídky v angli tin a my ekneme 'dobrý', nebo co zlepšit a tak dále a ne ekneme jim 'špatn , špatn , špatn !' Ten seminá je spíš, aby se nau ili psát, vylepšili si to, je tam na to as, klid...*

Tereza: Business English

Just as the seminar of writing in English, Business English is an elective course for senior students at the grammar school. It is the first time it has been realised. Although generally, Business English is a typical example of ESP, where there tend to be very few if any content aims, here it resembles CLIL as both language and content aims are present and seem rather balanced.

The content aims are for students to learn the basics of financial and business education. Introduction to economy and finances is a compulsory part of the curriculum (see section "Man and the World of Work" in Framework Education Programme, 2007: 47-50). It is also known under the term 'financial literacy' (*finan ní gramotnost*), which developed independently but was later incorporated to the curriculum (Finan ní gramotnost ve výuce, 2011: 7; Systém budování finan ní gramotnosti na základních a st edních školách, 2007). Some schools have a specialised seminar devoted to financial literacy where it is studied in more detail. Here some issues from financial literacy seem to be integrated with English. The teacher mentions that various topics are covered, such as money, banks, loans, or business strategy.

Language aims focus on developing students' basic vocabulary in the sphere of finance. The teacher mentions expressions such as *buy in bulk*, *pay in cash*, *pay by credit card*. Further, all language skills are to be practiced in the business context, with a stronger emphasis on speaking and comprehension than writing. The approach to language teaching seems to be strongly influenced by Communicative Language Teaching: fluency is deemed more important than accuracy, the teacher wants the students to react and speak quickly, and she seems to like using authentic materials, such as articles from business magazines.

There are additional aims, which seem to be very important to the teacher. She wants to support students' creativity and raise their self-confidence in enterprise. The teacher also claims she focuses on soft skills.

According to Tereza, a typical lesson starts with reading an article or watching a video. This is usually a starting point for introducing new vocabulary and for discussions. Students do not have any textbook, the teacher selects materials from a variety of sources; occasionally, students are asked to find some information themselves. Discussions include current world affairs and their impact on economies. The course is partly inspired by project-based learning: students are divided into small groups and are asked to conceive their own fictional businesses. Then they conduct various tasks related to their businesses, mainly connected to aspects of business strategy.

> *...studenti si vytvo ili takové týmy, ve t ech t eba lidech, nebo ty ech, n kdy, maximáln , a vytvo ili si svojí firmu, t eba My Dream Weddings, nebo (nesrozumitelné) nebo Health Care áká... No, a te se museli u it, jak s tou firmou žít, museli si vytvo it takové, co se u í všude v zahrani í na tom Business Englishu: mission, vision, core values, pak si musí ud lat n jaký rozpo et, jo, aby jako troška, jako co to je budget, aby se nau ili k tomu sloví ka, který... Jo, takže aby s tim pracovali....*

In the middle of the school year, a special event was organised where the fictional businesses were selling certain goods to students and teachers at the school. It was a fundraising activity to support a school-girl in Africa. Assessment is based on active participation in the lessons and in projects, as well as vocabulary tests.

The motive for offering this course is very similar to the seminar of writing in English, described above. There was a change in the school curriculum due to which more elective courses could be realised. Just as important was the teacher's willingness and competence to design and teach such a course. The main teacher's motive is to provide students with opportunities to develop practical skills they may need in their future studies or careers which are often marginalised in traditional grammar school curricula. For more details about the teacher, see the section on Writing in English above.

According to the teacher, students have basically three types of motivation to enrol in the course. Firstly, some students are interested in economy and plan to study it at university. Secondly, some students take it as extra English lessons where they may improve their English for free. Thirdly, there are students who are enterprising people and consider setting up their own business in the future. Although Tereza does not mention

it, there may be a fourth type of motive, i.e. that students (and their parents) may be attracted to the course because of its prestigious sound. Tereza's colleague Simona mentions this is probably the case with some students who enrol in the translation seminar they teach together. In Tereza's experience, students enjoyed working on the projects although it was difficult for them in the beginning as they were not used to it. She says that even students who were rather passive in lessons proved very active in the projects.

One of the challenges of the course seem to be materials selection. There are many Business English textbooks but they are not designed for grammar school purposes and they mostly include much more material than can be covered during a one-year course with two lessons per week. The teacher hesitates whether to use one: on the one hand, it would be convenient for her; on the other hand, it would not be cost-effective for the students as the books are rather expensive and they would not manage to cover the whole book.

Similarly as with the English Writing course described above, the approach seems very intuitive. There seems to be limited theoretical and methodological grounding, which may hinder the course.

Most of the benefits of the course have been already mentioned. Issues that receive little attention in the school curriculum can be addressed here. The teacher fosters students' creativity. Learners have a sense of a hands-on experience with enterprise which may have a positive effect on their motivation. As regards language, students have a 'real' context where they can use English and they are exposed to a variety of activities where language skills can be practiced in a natural way. They also broaden their language competence to economy- and finance-related topics.

4.4. Grammar School D

David: World in Context

This course arose from an attempt to implement CLIL at this school. It is a cross-curricular subject taught in English, where more attention is paid to the content than to the language. This grammar school has a 4-year programme as well as an 8-year programme. The course is a compulsory subject for two last grades, and for two grades in the lower stage of the 8-year programme that corresponds to the second stage of elementary school. It has a time allocation of two lessons once a fortnight, i.e. one lesson per week. The course was not David's idea: he was asked to teach it by the school

management. This is the first year he has taught it, as well as his first year in the Czech Republic. According to my investigation, the teacher who created the conception of the course is on maternity leave, and the teacher who had taught it before David, left the school. Another teacher teaches the course at the lower grammar school. Currently, there is no cooperation between the teachers and each has a different conception of the course. It seems that no-one at the school was particularly concerned about how a new teacher would teach the course. David says he had to specifically ask for more information about the course before he started teaching it: he was given an article written by the teacher who came with the idea. He also asked if he could see the other teachers' lesson. He learned from both of the sources that language is not the focus of the lessons, mistakes are not corrected and students are not assessed on the basis of their English.

In David's conception the course seems to have three types of aims: content, language, and study skills. Content aims seem to receive most attention but English and study skills seem to be considered in the approach too. The content of the course is partly based on students' interests. Inspired by the other teacher, David asked students to write down what they were interested in and what they would like to do in the lessons. It was a variety of topics ranging from arts to biology. When deciding the topics of the lessons, David says he combines what the students said they were interested in, and what he finds important. For this reason, he calls the course "eclectic" (sic). From what he says it appears he wants the students to learn about current issues, be it world affairs, economy, or social trends. The course ought to offer new perspectives on students' knowledge from other subjects, in David's conception mostly from History, Geography, and Social Sciences. It seems that it often includes issues that are marginal or that are not included in the curriculum of the school; e.g. David mentions that students did not know Charlie Chaplin's films, or the concept of social alienation.

The topics are mostly addressed through articles from newspapers or magazines and subsequent discussions. David says he also frequently uses videos, e.g. interviews, parts of films, lectures. For a business topic, he made use of company slides that were the starting point for discussions. Students often work in groups. During the school year, a few lessons are devoted to students' projects. The general topic is given by the teacher, the concrete realisation is up to the students: e.g. students were asked to choose a country from a list and compare its political situation and economy at one point in the modern history and now. Assessment is based on active participation in the lessons, handing in

short opinion essays after each lesson, and making and presenting the project. Language is not part of the assessment. Mistakes are not corrected.

Very little attention is paid to language in the course. David says he explains difficult vocabulary that occurs in materials that he uses, and asks students to write down the meanings, but they are not asked to learn the vocabulary. The focus is on getting the message across rather than on accuracy. Students' language is not assessed, mistakes are not corrected. However, this does not mean that there are no language aims. The approach seems akin to Communicative Language Teaching (indeed, CLIL has been viewed by some scholars as an extreme version of Communicative Language Teaching; see e.g. Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 3; Graddol, 2006: 86 in Paran, 2013: 318): students should improve their English by using it, communicating the message is more important than language correctness (cf. e.g. Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 153-174). The language aims thus seem to consist in developing practical skills. Firstly, students should improve reading skills: they should manage to understand key points in an authentic text which in most cases exceeds their level of English. Similarly with comprehension of spoken language: students must manage to understand the teacher and grasp the message from an audio-visual material. Secondly, students ought to get used to expressing their thoughts on various academic-related topics in English, both in spoken and written form. It follows that it includes development of study skills, such as expressing an opinion, coping with difficult texts, finding relevant information on the internet, and preparing presentations.

The course must have been a result of cooperation between several teachers and the school management. It appears that CLIL was promoted at the grammar school by one of the teachers who focused on the topic in her PhD thesis. According to her article which David was given, this course was part of a larger strategy to promote cross-curricular links, which was triggered by the curricular reform. Teachers cooperated to prepare syllabi that addressed related topics at the same time in different subjects. This course was designed to further support interdisciplinary learning. It was conceived from the beginning as a course whose content would differ each year according to students' interests, which is confirmed in the official school curriculum.

David applied for a position of a foreign language teacher (not an English teacher) at the school and apart from foreign language lessons, he was offered to teach this cross-curricular course. He is bilingual, one of his mother tongues being English. He studied History and Philosophy at a university abroad. He is young and does not have much experience with teaching or much education in pedagogy but he is very zealous and

clearly enjoys teaching. He seems to have a considerable scope of knowledge, which is definitely an advantage (if not a precondition) for a teacher of a cross-curricular subject. He has a TEFL degree but his experience with teaching English seems limited. Communicative Language Teaching methodology which is at the heart of the course, seems to suit him well (it appears to be an intuitive inclination rather than a knowledgeable choice). He says he enjoys teaching the course, especially because he is free to choose any topics and materials that he finds important, interesting, or useful to the students, and he can make frequent use of multimedia.

The course is compulsory for all students and thus students with various levels of English attend it. Moreover, it is likely that they are interested in different topics. David does not seem to know much about the students.

A number of problems occur with this course. Firstly, there seems to be currently a lack of cooperation at the school. The course was designed as a cross-curricular link between various subjects and presupposed coordination with teachers of other subjects. It seems that after one or two teachers committed to the course left the school, cooperation has been virtually non-existent. It appears that no-one was concerned to ensure continuity when a new teacher was to take over the course, which is the more surprising in a situation where the teacher is a foreigner with no experience with the Czech educational system. According to David, he had to ask himself to get any materials and see his colleague's lesson.

Secondly, being a native speaker of English ought to be an advantage for a teacher of such a course, but it brings also several disadvantages. As it was mentioned, David has little experience with teaching in general and even less so with teaching in the Czech educational setting. Moreover, he has little experience with teaching English. Thus assessing difficulty of materials both in terms of language and content is challenging for him:

> *It is difficult, because sometimes the vocabulary isn't that difficult, but there are a lot of concepts that the students just don't know. So sometimes the vocabulary is fairly simple but they just don't know a lot of political information and I have to... and I see that I'm putting too much time into explaining a lot of things that I thought they knew. And other times, there might be complex vocabulary but the subject is relatively simple, for example the Facebook article - it wasn't written in simple English, but they were able to understand it because it was a subject that they knew about.*

Thirdly, a major challenge for the teacher of the course is the fact that it is a mixed ability class par excellence: according to David, there are students with very low level of English as well as students who are fluent. Moreover, it is likely that students have different interests. Thus choosing materials and activities for these classes must be rather challenging.

> *There were some students who could speak fluently and there were... two students in one class and... three or four students in the other class that were almost mute - it was very very difficult to have them speak and even to understand sometimes. And then I didn't know what to do; because of the stronger students I didn't want to find very... superficial texts to encourage them to speak... so I always have to balance between weaker and stronger students.*

According to David, the differences lie in the level of English, not in students' cognitive abilities in general. He would find it much easier to teach either lower-level or higher-level student than this mixture. David says that it is difficult for him to make all students speak. In one of the classes he teaches, many students are rather passive. While originally, he wanted them to express their opinions on the reading material, gradually his main strategy became "to force them to do something". Students' passivity may be caused by various factors; apart from the language barrier and inappropriate level of difficulty (too easy or too demanding materials and tasks regarding the language or the content), it may be governed by the groups dynamics (David finds one of the classes more active than the other), cultural differences (David mentions students were reluctant to express their opinion, saying they do not know enough about the topic to have an opinion), or students may be unaccustomed to David's teaching style. David admits that he changed his policy with regard to students' native language: while at the beginning, he did not want the students to use Czech, later he allowed them sometimes to discuss materials in Czech so that he could see whether they were willing to discuss the topic and so that weaker students could catch up. He then persuades students to sum up what they have carried out the discussion in groups, arguing that if they discussed in Czech, they can try to say it in English. Some students were obviously annoyed about the course and complained about the level of English being too difficult for them or, on other occasion, that they do not see the point of the course. Possibly, not only Czech teachers are not used to cross-curricular teaching (see e.g. Hesová, 2011; Vališová, Kasíková, et al., 2007: 148) Hesová (2011) mentions that Czech teachers are not used to cross-curricular teaching but the same

probably holds for Czech students. Kasíková (2001: 116-117) discusses this problem with regard to cooperative learning but it may also be applied to cross-curricular learning: it takes time for students as well as teachers to accustom to it and students must believe in the benefits of the approach.

The benefits of the course, obviously, is its potential to contextualise students' knowledge from several disciplines traditionally realised as separate subjects in Czech schools. Enough space may be provided to topics that receive little attention in the curriculum. As regards English, the course presumably prepares students for future studies where English would be required. Rather than equipping students with specific language forms, it should leave students with the positive feeling about what they can do (c.f. Communicative Language Teaching). It may give them confidence that they are able to cope with difficult materials and deal with substantial content in English.

Table 2: Overview of case studies, research questions 1 and 2

		Eva: American Literature and Film	Anna: British and American History	Simona and Tereza: Writing in English	Tereza: Business English	David: World in Context
model of language and content integration		CLIL	EMI	CLIL / EAP / EMI	CLIL / ESP	CLIL
aims	a) content	deepen Ss' knowledge of American literature and about various genres	preparation for *maturita* exam	1) creative writing (preparation for maturita exam, FCE/CAE, and university) 2) academic writing	basics of financial and business education	various cross-curricular topics according to Ss' interests and T's judgement
	b) language	vocabulary, marginally grammar; non-standard and obsolete language; all skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) practiced	none or very few	practical language skills that are of immediate use (e.g. punctuation, common expressions in opinion and research essays)	business-related vocabulary, practicing all language skills	developing Ss' ability to deal with academic content in English
	c) other	1) study skills (coping with difficult texts, thinking skills, essay writing, presentation skills) 2) topics from Personal and Social Education	none or very few	1) creativity and self-confidence in writing 2) study skills - essay writing, finding and using sources, argumentation	creativity and self-confidence in business; soft skills	study skills
	> error correction	yes; in essays and presentations	none or very little	yes (but no feedback)	?	none
activities		varied - in-class reading, home reading, watching films, discussion, essay writing, presentations	lectures	varied - in-class writing, home assignments, discussions of students' writings, adressing specific issues related to writing	varied - reading articles, watching videos, discussions, projects (fictional businesses)	varied - reading articles, watching videos, discussions, presenting projects
assessment		in-class essay, presentation	multiple-choice tests	handing in assignments	work on projects, vocabulary tests	active participation, project and its presentation
materials		T selects various materials from various sources but mainly materials she brought from the USA	T prepares PowerPoint presentations from books on history	Ts select (and occasionally alter) materials from various sources	T selects from various sources	T selects from various sources
impulse		1) T's interest 2) T's experience from the USA 3) Excellent Ss 4) not enought time for literature in GE classes	Headmaster's will (to improve the school's image)	1) Tereza's initiative 2) school's benevolent policy on elective courses		1) a CLIL-enthusiast at the school managed to persuade the school management 2) curricular reform promoting cross-curricular teaching

Table 3: Overview of case studies, research questions 3 - 6

		Eva: American Literature and Film	Anna: British and American History	Simona and Tereza: Writing in English	Tereza: Business English	David: World in Context
teacher	education	Math (Faculty of Mathematics and Physics), English (Faculty of Education)	English and History (Faculty of Education)	**Simona:** English Language and Literature, Czech Langauge and Literature (Faculty of Arts)	**Tereza:** Chemistry (Institute of Chemical Technology)	History and Philosophy (BA from a university abroad)
	why s/he teaches the course	1) enjoys working with students who are interested in literature 2) likes the freedom of content and time-management	1) the headmaster asked her 2) she has the qualification	**Simona:** 1) her colleague asked her 2) she finds it interesting and enjoys the fact that the lessons are longer and thus they can delve deeper into the topics	**Tereza:** there is more time than in other classes to do what she deems important: developing students' practical skills and creativity	1) the school management asked him to 2) he seems to be the choice for a teacher of a cross-curricular course in English: he is an English native speaker and seems to have a considerable knowledge in various disciplines
	other characteristics	- proud of the seminar - likes to participate in international projects - enjoys variety, does not like monotony	- does not enjoy teaching History, prefers teaching English - does not seem to be thrilled about teaching History in English	**Simona:** - zealous teacher - capable of self-scrutiny	**Tereza:** - proud of her work and her students - good organising skills - inclined to communicative methodology	- zealous teacher - inclined to communicative methodology
students	motivation	a) interested in the content b) interested in the language (extra lessons for free) c) most acceptable choice/least effort	a) preparation for *maturita* exam b) (rarely) interested in the content	a) preparation for *maturita* exam b) interested in creative writing, or in persuasive writing c) most acceptable choice/least effort	a) interested in economy or enterprise b) interested in the language (extra lessons for free) c) it sounds prestigious	it is compulsory
	level of English	mostly rather good	ought to be B2	varied	varied	varied
	study skills	need to improve	?	need to improve	?	?
challenges		1) cooperation and organisation 2) limited theoretical knowledge about integrating language and content 3) mixed abilities 4) lack of instrumental motivation	1) cooperation 2) limited theoretical knowledge about integrating language and content 3) T's attitude towards the course 4) language barrier	1) time-consuming for Ts 2) limited theoretical knowledge about integrating language and content	1) materials selection 2) limited theoretical knowledge about integrating language and content	1) cooperation 2) limited theoretical knowledge about integrating language and content 3) mixed abilities 4) T's lack of knowledge of Czech educational setting
benefits		1) development of study skills 2) cross-curricular links 3) practicing English on attractive material	hands-on experience of studying through English	1) addressing topics that receive little attention in the curriculum 2) development of study skills and creativity 3) possible positive effects on motivation and learning (treating Ss as knowing and capable)	1) addressing topics that receive little attention in the curriculum 2) broadenig Ss' language competence 3) meaningful context for practicing English	1) addressing topics that receive little attention in the curriculum 2) cross-curricular links 3) getting used to dealing with academic content in English

4.5. Conclusion

This chapter presented case studies of five teachers who teach a course integrating English and content. Tables 2 and 3 provide an overview of answers to our research questions (see Chapter 3). Four of the five are elective seminars, one is a compulsory course. All of them have a relatively limited time allocation: two lessons per week (Grammar schools A, B, and C) or per fortnight (Grammar school D). It is often difficult to tell which model of language and content integration the course represents. Only in one case, a specific model has been adopted by the course designers; however, the current teacher has a limited knowledge about it (David, Grammar school D). In other cases no specific approach has been consciously adopted. The difficulty to pigeonhole comes out especially when describing courses taught at Grammar school C, where several approaches seem to be combined. In a sense, all models described in the theoretical chapter are represented in the case studies, although some of them marginally: there is no 'pure' example of EAP and ESP, they are blended with CLIL. Presumably, the label CLIL could be applied to all of the courses described here, which confirms its broadness. However, it is disputable in the case of Grammar school B, where language aims are virtually non-existent and thus EMI seems to be the more appropriate label. All other courses have both content and language aims, all are designed for learners of English as a foreign language and thus could be described as CLIL.

In all of the cases, the content part of the syllabus focuses on issues that receive little attention elsewhere in the curriculum and are largely optional. Naturally, this has much to do with the fact that most of the courses are elective seminars for last-year students. However, it also holds for the cross-curricular course at Grammar school D, which is compulsory. Language seems to be treated differently than in GE classes in most of the courses. The focus is on communicative competences and unlike in GE classes, grammar mistakes are not assessed, in some cases even not corrected. Thus all of the courses are related to Communicative Language Teaching, although the teachers seem largely unconscious of that. The courses often seem to have further aims: mostly developing students' study skills, in some cases topics from cross-curricular subjects as described in current curricular documents are covered.

Four of the five courses described in this thesis include project work of some kind: research and presentation on a favourite book, or a country, writing a short story to be

published in an anthology, or making up a fictitious business. Approaches to assessment vary greatly, but generally, the focus is on content knowledge or skills, or active participation, not on language accuracy. Materials are always selected by the teachers themselves. In none of the courses textbooks are used. This seems partly because in some cases there are no textbooks covering the intended syllabus designed for grammar school students, partly teachers seem to prefer different kind of approach than in GE classes and abandon the idea of having a course textbook quite happily. Often it seems they do not seek any and prefer selecting authentic materials (newspaper articles, unabridged literature or video materials), or specialised materials, e.g. university textbooks. Generally, students are exposed to authentic materials where they encounter non-simplified English.

The fact that courses integrating language and content are offered at grammar schools seems mostly dependent on teacher enthusiasm. Three of the courses described in this thesis are taught by teachers who invented it and are enthusiastic about teaching it. One of these teachers, Tereza, persuaded her colleague Simona to cooperate with her. Simona is very happy to teach in a team. The question is whether Simona would initiate the course herself. David seems also quite happy to teach the course but probably would not initiate it himself; he took over somebody else's conception. Only one of the courses is taught by a teacher who does not seem to be very enthusiastic about it: Anna at Grammar school B. There the course was initiated by the headmaster, who, however, does not appear to be interested in language content integrated learning as an educational technique but means of attracting potential students and their parents.

Teachers interviewed for the purpose of this thesis have various educational backgrounds. They mostly seem to really enjoy teaching the courses, with the exception of Anna who seems rather indifferent. It appears that the other four teachers enjoy the fact that the courses are different from other courses they teach. They generally seem to enjoy the freedom of choice of topics and materials. Eva and Simona seem to enjoy working with students who are interested in the subject and delving deeper into the topics than in GE classes. Anna says she also expected this but was disappointed to see that there are only a few students who are genuinely interested.

There are four types of motivation why students choose to attend the course when it is elective. Firstly, students may be interested in the content of the course, e.g. literature, creative writing, or business. Secondly, many students appreciate the opportunity to have extra English lessons. Students at grammar schools usually have three or four lessons of

English per week; these seminars are two extra lessons where they can practice and improve their English. Some students seem to be motivated rather instrumentally, by parents or their idea about the future, on the other hand, some students seem to enjoy learning English or languages in general. Thirdly, some students attend the course to be prepared for the *maturita* exam. Some of the courses are designed for this purpose (Grammar schools B and C). Lastly, there always seem to be several students who choose the course for convenience. They are not particularly interested in the content or the language but they hope they will manage it relatively easily compared to other elective courses they could have chosen.

Two of the courses are designed for students with a higher level of English (Grammar schools A and B). Three of them are designed for students with various levels of English. While David (Grammar school D) finds it difficult to work with mixed levels, Simona and Tereza (Grammar school C) do not mind. Two of the teachers, Eva and Simona, think that students need to improve their study skills, such as essay writing and critical reading.

There are two major challenges concerning the courses. Firstly, there is often little cooperation at the schools. At Grammar schools A, B and D the cooperation is very limited both between teachers and with the school management. Both seem to work at Grammar school C. Secondly, all teachers interviewed for the purpose of this thesis seem to have a very limited theoretical knowledge about integrating language and content, and about approaches and methods in ELT generally. They seem to be governed mainly by intuition and their experience with other courses. I am certain that all of the courses are beneficial to the students but the teachers' knowledge of theory of ELT and language and content integration could improve the courses significantly, e.g. by helping them to predict and overcome common obstacles.

For some teachers, classes with students with mixed abilities present a challenge. Interestingly, it seems that students with different levels of English attend all of the courses described here, but it is viewed as a challenge only by some of the teachers. David is presumably in the most difficult situation as there is no selection of students and thus both high-level students and low-level students attend the course. Eva also mentions problems with having to deal with mixed abilities, but it seems that her classes are much more homogenous. It may depend on the style of work in lessons, because neither Anna, nor Simona and Tereza see it as a problem, although especially in the latter case the classes undoubtedly are mixed levels.

While in the literature it is often mentioned that one of the challenges of language and content integration is the fact that it is very time-consuming for the teachers (see Chapter 2), teachers interviewed for the purpose of this thesis rarely complain about that. They mostly admit that it is time-consuming, but generally not much more than other courses they teach. There may be several reasons for that. Firstly, all of the courses may be viewed as something additional to the curriculum, i.e. not entirely compulsory, not controlled by the authorities. Thus some of the teachers seem to have the attitude 'I will see what I can manage' and do not plan ahead too much. Secondly, one of the most time-consuming things in integrating language and content seems to be the fact that it should often entail cooperation between teachers, e.g. subject specialists and language specialists. Except for Grammar school C, there seems to be very little or no cooperation. Thirdly, teachers may subjectively view it as less time-consuming than it actually is, because they enjoy doing it: they can have the feeling that it is 'their course', they may select the content of the course themselves according to their interests, and it is a new experience for most of them, which may have a positive effect on their motivation.

One of the benefits of the courses are the extra English lessons for the students. However, this could be achieved by any other English course. Thus the main question is what the benefits of integrating language and content are. Naturally, it differs from course to course, but some generalisations can be made. Firstly, topics that receive little or no attention elsewhere in the curriculum can be covered in these courses, be it finance (Tereza, and David), creative writing (Simona and Tereza), or current world affairs (David). Moreover, the syllabi often have the potential of drawing the students' attention to cross-curricular connections. The course at Grammar school D was designed specifically with this idea in mind, but the courses at Grammar schools A and C also seem to draw together students' knowledge from various disciplines.

Secondly, most of the courses present a perfect opportunity for improving students' study skills in a systematic way, e.g. teaching them how to write essays of various kinds, how to make a presentation, teaching them different kinds of reading (critical reading, skim reading, etc.). Two of the teachers think that students lack them. Study skills as such may be considered language non-specific, i.e. mostly the same in Czech-medium as well as English-medium education, but it may be of a great advantage for the students to learn the basics of academic English and study skills at the same time. It is also possible that not enough attention is paid to study skills in the school curricula.

Thirdly, researchers mention that CLIL as well as other forms of language and content integration may have a positive effect on students' motivation (see Chapter 2). It seems that the courses examined here definitely have the potential. In many cases it appears that students are interested in the content of the course, be it literature, creative writing, business, or history. They may also gain a positive feeling that they can manage a substantial content in English, i.e. that they can deal with original materials written for native speakers of English, not just materials in textbooks for EFL learners. This may be supported by communicative methodology as in the case of courses taught at Grammar school C.

5. Conclusion

The theoretical part of this thesis described four most common types of language and content integration in Europe, viz. ESP, EAP, CLIL and EMI. The empirical part described five courses taught at Czech grammar schools where English and content are integrated. Each of the models described in the theoretical chapter was represented in the empirical part, though only marginally in some cases.

Generally, it proved difficult to pigeonhole courses into one of the categories. There are two reasons for that. Firstly, the course designers and teachers rarely seem to adopt consciously a specific methodology. The courses are based mainly on their intuition and previous experience, seldom grounded in theory, and thus they may have a variety of features that may not necessarily make the course fit within one specific model. Secondly, there are problems with defining the models. As it was explained in Chapter 2, ideas to integrate language and content occurred in various settings, some rather independently, some inspired by a particular model and transformed to different educational settings. As a result, there is a multitude of models and terms applied to them, multitude of definitions and descriptions of them, but only a few attempts to delimit them from one another. It is thus disputable where the boundary is e.g. between CLIL and EMI, CLIL and ESP, or any type of language and content integration and GE classes. As it has been suggested by several scholars (Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998: 8; Met, 1998: 40-41; Paran, 2013: 321), language and content integration is better conceived as a continuum than a set of discrete categories.

As far as it can be told, most of the courses described in the empirical part could be labelled as CLIL. This is more or less what was expected in the theoretical part of the thesis. However, there seem to be surprisingly few courses focused on Academic English. This may be because some issues from Academic English, such as essay writing, are included in GE syllabi at some grammar schools. Moreover, many issues can be addressed in CLIL classes, too.

It seems that all of the courses are nearer to the content end of the continuum than to the language end, i.e. in terminology based on Met (1998) they are mostly content-driven[21]. This is probably given by the fact that they are complementary courses to GE

---

[21] Met applied the disction between language- and content-driven teaching on whole programmes, not individual courses within a programme.

classes where language is definitely the main focus. Moreover, the courses are intended for senior students, whose level of English is generally rather good. Thus teachers, knowing that language skills have been catered for elsewhere, can focus on something else. There is a considerable diversity regarding the content of the courses: courses focusing on Anglophone literature, history and culture seem the most common and have the longest tradition as learning foreign languages at grammar schools traditionally includes also learning about the countries where the language is spoken; however, there is a variety of other courses, such as Business English, public speaking, job skills, natural sciences, and many more (see Chapter 4). According to our research, it seems that the content is mostly the teachers' area of interest.

Let us outline the key factors that seem to contribute to the fact that courses integrating English and content are realized at Czech grammar schools, and what influences their success. Firstly, the courses depend heavily on the teachers, not only their education and experience but also their enthusiasm. It is often noted in literature on language and content integration that there is not enough competent teachers who have both sufficient knowledge of the content and good language skills (see Chapter 2). This was not a problem in the courses we examined in this thesis. This is partly because teachers in the Czech Republic are often educated in more than one disciplines, partly because teachers interviewed for the purpose of this thesis are mostly free to choose the topics to be covered in the courses themselves and thus they are likely to choose areas they understand. Our research suggests that teachers of English and content integrated classes are mostly teachers of English. Thus their level of English ought to be good and they should also understand how languages are learnt and be able to use this knowledge in their lessons. According to our research, the latter could be improved: teachers seem to have limited theoretical knowledge about language learning. However, they mostly seem to have good-enough knowledge and experience to teach successfully. David's case (see 4.4.) suggests that experience with teaching English is very important for a teacher in English and content integrated classes: it helps them to assess the level of their students' English, select appropriate materials, to pre-teach unfamiliar language, and to effectively segment the learning.

Apart from the teachers' content and language knowledge, their enthusiasm for the course is crucial. It seems that in most cases, it is the teachers who come up with the idea, who design the course and decide if they are going to continue teaching it. This can only happen when the teacher is enthusiastic. It also works the other way around: teachers

seem to be more enthusiastic for the course when they teach it from their own will and when they can select the content of the course themselves. This is evident in Anna's case (see 4.2.), where the contrary holds: Anna was persuaded to teach the course by the headmaster whose primary motivation to offer the course seems to be to improve the school's image; Anna does not enjoy teaching History and teaching it in English does not seem to make much difference for her. This must have an impact on the course. It is interesting to compare Anna's case with Simona's (see 4.3.) and David's (see 4.4.) cases: neither of the teachers invented the courses they teach, but Simona and David are keen on the content of the course which they could select or significantly modify themselves.

The second factor necessary for courses integrating language and content at grammar schools is the organisational possibility to offer such courses at the school. This mostly depends on the school management. It would be ideal if the school management supported teachers' initiatives. At some schools, it seems that language and content integration is tolerated rather than supported. This appears to be especially the case at Grammar school A (see 4.1.): the school management have no objections to an elective seminar taught in English but they do not seem to care much or appreciate the teacher's initiative. However, teacher enthusiasm seems more important than school support, although ideally both should be present. This emerges from a comparison of Eva's case (Grammar school A, see 4.1.) and Anna's case (Grammar school B, see 4.2.): at Grammar school A, Eva is enthusiastic about the course but the school management is indifferent; at Grammar school B, the headmaster is interested in having courses taught in English at the school and persuaded Anna to teach one, but Anna seems far from excited. As far as it can be told from the interviews, Eva's course appears more valuable to the students that Anna's course as the former provides language support and develops all language skills and forms, while the latter provides very little language support and is very monotonous. A sufficient condition is when the school enables a teacher to realize a course integrating language and content. This condition should be satisfied at most grammar schools as they have to offer elective courses for two last grades so that students can modify their schedule according to their interests and plans (see *RVPG*, 2007: 82-3). It appears from our research that there tend to be little restrictions from the school management concerning these courses. If a teacher is willing to design and teach a course and a sufficient number of students enrols in it, it may mostly be realised. There may be no support or recognition from the school management but at the same time no objections and little restrictions.

The third factor that seems to contribute to the fact that English and content integrated courses are realized at Czech grammar schools is that students have a sufficient knowledge of English. Although higher level of English is not a necessary precondition of English and content integrated learning (see Chapter 2), it is definitely an advantage. Besides there may be more efficient approaches to teaching lower level students. There is an increasing tendency to teach English as a foreign language at elementary schools (see e.g. Sladkovská, 2010)[22] and presumably most learners already have a decent knowledge of English when they enter the grammar school. According to experienced teachers interviewed for the purpose of this thesis (Eva, Anna, and Tereza), first year students now generally have a better English than their predecessors several years ago. Moreover, the vast majority of courses integrating English and content at grammar schools seem to be offered to senior students (mostly the third and fourth grade) who ought to have a good level of English.

The fourth contributing factor is the fact that language education in the Czech Republic has traditionally included learning about the geography and culture of the country or countries where the language is spoken. Thus learning content through a foreign language is definitely not new in the Czech Republic. (cf. Paran, 2013: 321-2) However, the content in English and content integrated courses is nowadays not limited to literature, history and geography of English speaking countries (although they still seem to prevail): there are courses focused on Business English, job skills, media, and many others (for more details, see Chapter 4).

As it has been mentioned, most of the courses integrating English and content at Czech grammar schools are realised as elective seminars. This has a number of advantages. Since they are not compulsory subjects, there is less pressure on what ought to be addressed. Thus if the tempo is slower, the teacher does not need to be stressed that they will not manage to cover everything in the syllabus. As they are mostly one-year courses, teachers can modify the syllabus and soon see the results. They can try many different things. Cooperation with other teachers is not essential, although it would be undoubtedly beneficial.

Another advantage lies in the fact there is a selection process: learners select a given number of courses from a list according to their interests and plans as well as their

---

[22] Moreover, since September 2013, two foreign languages must be taught at most elementary schools (see Opat ení MSMT-2647/2013-210). There is a very high probability that one of them is English at most schools.

abilities, in this case their English skills. This ensures ultimate optionality and selectivity, which is sometimes argued to be one of the features of successful bilingual education (see e.g. Paran, 2013: 325-6; de Zarobe et al., 2009: 29). Most of the students in the class thus ought to have the level of English required by the teacher and they should be motivated to take the course for some reason, be it to improve their English, to pass an exam, or because they are interested in the content. At Grammar school D the course is compulsory, which seems to present much greater problems to the teacher as there are great differences in the levels of students' English and presumably also their motivation.

Generally, it seems that realizing courses integrating language and content as elective seminars at common grammar schools (i.e. non bilingual) is less problematic than designing it as a compulsory course. This is suggested by the numbers of schools where this is the practice. It is also confirmed by what emerged from the interview with Eva: the school management at Grammar school A have no objections to elective seminars based on CLIL but they were against the idea to participate in a project of international exchange of teachers, which would entail having several lessons of compulsory courses taught in English by a hosting teacher, fearing that weaker students and their parents would complain. Elective language and content integrated courses answer needs and wants of some students and parents but does not force those who are not interested to participate.

On the other hand, there may also be some disadvantages in realizing language and content integrated courses as elective seminars. Primarily the question is whether two lessons per week are enough. Moreover, elective courses are sometimes taken less seriously than compulsory courses, both by the teachers and the students, which may have negative effects on the quality of the learning.

On the basis of our research, we can assume that English and content integrated learning is not uncommon at Czech grammar schools but they mostly have a limited understanding of what they are doing. The courses described in this thesis emerged out of the teachers' interests and experiences and are rarely grounded in theory. It seems that official propagation of CLIL by the EU and the Czech Ministry of Education has not influenced Czech grammar schools in Prague much, perhaps because it aimed more at elementary schools, or different regions of the Czech Republic (Šmídová, 2013).

It seems likely that English and content integration is going to be more and more common at Czech grammar schools. On the assumption that the students' level of English will be further improving, schools will need to reconsider English curricula. CLIL classes

may answer the needs for more challenging English lessons, and address students' needs in other spheres, especially academic skills and critical reading.

The question is which form English and content integrated learning will take. There are several possibilities: it may remain in the domain of elective courses, it may be part of GE classes (which is the case at some grammar schools, firstly because of the tradition to include cultural topics in language classes, secondly because many textbooks now include CLIL sections), or it can be realised as a compulsory course, such as at Grammar school D. All of these options are feasible. However, it is not likely that English would be massively integrated with traditional content classes, such as Geography, History or Math, in the nearest future. This would require teachers' deeper theoretical knowledge, greater awareness of educational authorities and the public, cooperation of teachers and the school management, and an elaborate conception that would cater for students' motivation, their achievements and native language skills.

This thesis attempted to describe current attitudes to language and content integration both from a global point of view with an emphasis on the European area, and from a local point of view of general secondary education in the Czech Republic. The research conducted for the purpose of this thesis could be extended to include quantitative research of tendencies in the whole of the Czech Republic. The qualitative research could be extended to other types of schools, or to include not only the teachers' perspectives but also those of the students and headmasters. Observations in classes would be very valuable to learn more about methods and techniques that are currently used in English and content integrated classes. It may also be interesting to repeat the qualitative research conducted for the purpose of this thesis after several years to see in which direction English and content integration is evolving.

Résumé (česky)

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá problematikou integrace jazyka a obsahu při výuce anglického jazyka. Pohlíží na tento fenomén ze široka: nezahrnuje tedy pouze CLIL, ale i další modely. Modelů integrace jazyka a obsahu jsou desítky a vztahy a hranice mezi nimi jsou často nejasné. Každý z modelů vznikl v nějakém konkrétním vzdělávacím kontextu, ovšem některé se rozšířily do jiných částí světa a pozměnily se pro účely místního vzdělání, což vedlo k tomu, že se mnohé modely překrývají. V teoretické části práce jsou popsány čtyři modely integrace angličtiny a obsahu, které můžeme považovat za nejčastější v evropském regionu: Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English for Academic Purposes (EAP) a English-medium Instruction (EMI). Jednotlivé modely jsou popsány z hlediska typických rysů, vzniku a vývoje, studentů a učitelů a v neposlední řadě kladů i záporů.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) neboli *angličtina pro specifické účely* či též *odborná angličtina* je zastřešující pojem pro výuku angličtiny zaměřenou na konkrétní oblast, např. angličtinu obchodní, právnickou či angličtinu pro cestovní ruch. Kurzy ESP se obvykle zaměřují na konkrétní jazykové dovednosti v konkrétní oblasti. Výuka odbornému jazyku je zřejmě tak stará jako výuka cizích jazyků sama, nicméně ESP se jako směr ve výuce angličtiny ustanovilo v 60. letech 20. století a spojuje se především s globalizací trhu. Ve srovnání s kurzy obecné angličtiny obvykle trvají kratší dobu. Je proto často nutné pečlivě volit učivo s ohledem na potřeby frekventantů kurzu. Vytváření sylabu kurzu odborné angličtiny tedy obvykle zahrnuje analýzu potřeb účastníků kurzu, analýza diskurzu cílové komunity a výběr vhodných materiálů, autentických i autenticky působících. Práce učitele odborné angličtiny se často liší od práce učitele angličtiny obecné: výuka odborné angličtiny obvykle klade vyšší nároky na hledání či vytváření vhodných materiálů, seznámení se s jazykem cílové komunity, spolupráce s odborníky z cílové komunity aj. Frekventanti kurzu obvykle mají znalosti oboru, často se jedná o dospělé. Tvrdí se, že ESP může mít pozitivní vliv na motivaci studentů k učení, zejména proto, že studenti jasně vidí účel výuky a možnosti využití toho, co se naučili. Mezi problematické body výuky odborné angličtiny patří zvýšené nároky na učitele a vytváření sylabů. Analýza potřeb může být z několika důvodů zavádějící: 1) studenti často nejsou schopni posoudit své potřeby; 2) jejich potřeby se mohou lišit od toho, čemu se skutečně chtějí věnovat; 3) do obsahu kurzu může významným způsobem zasahovat zadavatel a mohou pak převážit jeho záměry nad potřebami frekventantů kurzu, což vede k

závažným etickým otázkám, které daly v 90. letech vzniknout hnutí ‚Critical ESP'. Byť se výuka odbornému jazyku spojuje především s odborným vzděláním, i ve všeobecném vzdělání může mít své místo, zejména na základě předpokladu, že skrze konkrétní, tj. jazyk konkrétního oboru, se lze naučit obecnému, tj. např. formálnímu jazyku.

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) neboli *angličtina pro akademické účely* nebo také *akademická angličtina* se považuje za odnož odborné angličtiny a má s ní mnoho společných rysů. Zaměřuje se na dovednosti potřebné pro studium v angličtině, nejčastěji vysokoškolské: např. psaní seminárních prací, jazyk potřebný pro komunikaci ve třídě i pro administrativu. Ustanovení EAP jako směru ve výuce anglického jazyka se datuje přelomem 70. a 80. let. Význam výuky akademické angličtiny roste přímo úměrně rozšíření angličtiny jako dorozumívacího jazyka v mnoha oborech. Rozlišuje se angličtina pro obecné akademické účely (EGAP), kde se vyučují dovednosti společné všem studijním oborům, a angličtina pro specifické akademické účely (ESAP), která se zaměřuje na konkrétní obor. Názory na to, který z těchto přístupů je výhodnější, se liší. Studenty EAP mohou být jednak mluvčí, pro něž je angličtina druhým či cizím jazykem, jednak rodilí mluvčí angličtiny. Podobně jako u ESP je problematickou otázkou, čí zájmy jsou ve výuce sledovány, zda zájmy studentů či institucí, případně státu. Další palčivou otázkou je, jestli EAP neslouží jako nástroj k šíření angličtiny jako jazyka vzdělání a vzdělávání na úkor ostatních jazyků. V kontextu českého školství může být výuka akademické angličtiny zařazena na vysoké škole, ale obecně zaměřená akademická angličtina (EGAP) by mohla být vhodnou součástí všeobecného středního vzdělávání. Mnohé dovednosti z této oblasti jsou ovšem zařazeny v učebnicích obecné angličtiny, zvláště v učebnicích určených pro pokročilejší studenty.

CLIL je akronym vzniklý z **Content and Language Integrated Learning**; do češtiny se překládá nejčastěji jako *integrace obsahu a jazyka*. CLIL má mnoho pojetí a definic – obecně se má za to, že CLIL je výuka, která má dva druhy cílů: jazykové (výuka cizího nebo druhého jazyka) a obsahové (výuka odborných znalostí a dovedností), někdy se navíc zmiňují i cíle kognitivní. Důležitost těchto cílů se může lišit, v některých pojetí se klade větší důraz na jazyk (*language-driven CLIL*), v jiných na obsah (*content-driven CLIL*); někdy se usiluje o vyváženost obou složek. Různé verze CLILu se mohou lišit intenzitou výuky cizího/druhého jazyka: může se jednat např. o výuku odborných předmětů vedenou v cílovém jazyce nebo o krátké jazykové moduly zařazené do běžné výuky odborného předmětu v mateřském jazyce (tzv. *language showers*), případně mnoho různých mezistupňů mezi těmito krajními podobami. Mnohost pojetí CLILu

85

s sebou nese neshody ohledn   vztahu CLILu k dalším model m integrace jazyka a obsahu, zejména kanadských program   Immersion (n kdy se používá p eklad *imerzní programy*), bilingvní výuce (Bilingual Education, BE), a CBI (Content-based Instruction; n kdy se p ekládá jako *výuka založená na obsahu*). CLIL se etabloval jako sm r ve výuce jazyk v 90. letech a je podporován Evropskou unií. CLILu se p i ítá spousta pozitivních ú ink , zejména na motivaci student a rozvoj jejich kognitivních schopností. Mezi problematické body pat í materiální a personální zajišt ní výuky. Z povahy CLILu vyplývá, že u itel musí mít solidní znalosti jazyka i nejazykového p edm tu, krom toho by m l být proškolen v teorii a metodologii CLILu. CLIL je také asov náro n jší než tradi ní zp soby výuky a vyžaduje spolupráci celé školy. N kte í zpochyb ují výzkumy poukazující na efektivitu CLILu a jeho aplikovatelnost mimo elitní vzd lávací instituce. Pro eská gymnázia by mohl CLIL mohl být vhodný, jelikož se jedná o výb rové školy, p i emž výb rovost je n kdy považována za jeden z klí ových rys úsp šné implementace CLILu. Studenti by pomocí CLILu mohli efektivn rozvíjet jazykové, oborové i studijní kompetence.

English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) ili *angli tina jako vyu ovací jazyk* nebo také *vyu ování v angli tin* je pom rn rozší eným modelem integrace jazyka a obsahu, zejména na univerzitách. A koliv se o EMI poslední dobou asto diskutuje, nikdo nev nuje p íliš pozornosti vymezení tohoto p ístupu ani porovnání s p ibuznými modely, nap . CLILem a imerzními programy. Zdá se, že ve v tšin p ípad se v EMI v nuje mén pozornosti jazykovým cíl m než v ostatních zde popisovaných modelech. Angli tina jako vyu ovací jazyk se na univerzitách za al rozši ovat v 90. letech. D vod je n kolik a asto jsou provázané: jednak se argumentuje tím, že se studenti mohou lépe p ipravit na komunikaci v mezinárodních sférách, a už profesních i v deckých, jednak je to pro univerzity ekonomicky výhodné, protože jsou tyto programy atraktivní pro studenty. Velkou roli hraje i snaha univerzit umístit se na co nejlepších místech v mezinárodních hodnocení škol, kde se mnohdy zohled uje po et zahrani ních student a výzkumná innost, která se obvykle hodnotí na základ po tu citací lánk akademik – ti jsou tak motivováni publikovat své lánky v renomovaných, asto citovaných asopisech, které zpravidla p ijímají lánky pouze v angli tin . N které školy se tak pomocí program v angli tin snaží zajistit si budoucí doktorandy, kte í budou publikovat v angli tin . Mezi hlavní negativa EMI pat í potenciální neblahé dopady na národní jazyky. Podle nejtemn jšího scéná e by angli tina mohla pomalu vytla it národní jazyky z oblasti vzd lání a vzd lávání. Poukazuje se také na to, že studijní programy v angli tin

nemusí mít pro studenty mnoho výhod: jejich kompetence v cizím jazyce mohou ustrnout na určité úrovni, v budoucnu jim může chybět schopnost vyjadřovat se ve svém oboru v mateřském jazyce a kvalita odborných znalostí může být menší než u programů v mateřském jazyce. To do značné míry záleží na kvalitě studijního programu a vyučujících. V ČR univerzity zpravidla nabízí některé programy v angličtině, ale nejde o tak masivní jev jako např. v Nizozemí. Existuje také několik soukromých středních škol s výukou v angličtině, ale na státních středních školách je EMI zcela ojedinělým jevem.

Praktická část diplomové práce je založena na kvalitativním výzkumu. Hlavní výzkumnou otázkou je, jak a proč se využívá integrace jazyka a obsahu ve výuce anglického jazyka na českých gymnáziích. S ohledem na cíle výzkumu byl zvolen výzkumný design mnohonásobné případové studie. Po předběžném zmapování situace na pražských gymnázií bylo vybráno pět učitelů ze čtyř gymnázií, kteří mají zkušenost s výukou založenou na integraci angličtiny a odborného obsahu. Důraz byl kladen na co největší diverzitu vzorku z hlediska integrovaného obsahu (americká literatura a film, dějiny Velké Británie a USA, psaní v angličtině, obchodní angličtina a společenskovědní témata se zaměřením na mezipředmětové vztahy). Podařilo se zajistit i znatelnou různorodost z hlediska věku, vzdělání a zkušenosti učitelů, jakož i zázemí a přístupu vedení školy. Případové studie jsou založeny na hloubkových rozhovorech s učiteli. Rozhovory byly zpracovány metodou otevřeného kódování a následně uspořádány pomocí tematického kódování (podle Švaříčka, Šeďové a kol., 2007), což umožnilo porovnat všechny případy podle stejných kategorií.

Na základě předběžného průzkumu lze usuzovat, že integrace angličtiny a obsahu je na gymnáziích poměrně častým jevem. Nejčastěji se jedná o povinně volitelné semináře s poměrně omezenou časovou dotací dvou hodin týdně. Z hlediska obsahu je nabídka pestrá. Nejvíce je seminářů zaměřených na kulturu anglicky mluvících zemí, ale nabízí se i semináře zaměřené např. na obchodní i pracovní angličtinu, argumentační dovednosti, světové události i přírodní vědy.

Čtyři z pěti popisovaných předmětů jsou realizovány jako povinně volitelné, jeden jako povinný. Pouze jeden předmět byl vytvořen na základě vědomé volby konkrétní metodologie, o které má ovšem stávající vyučující pouze mlhavou představu. Ostatní předměty vytvořili učitelé angličtiny intuitivně na základě svých předchozích zkušeností. Někdy je obtížné určit, o jaký model integrace jazyka a obsahu se jedná, jelikož učitelé někdy nevědomky kombinují více různých přístupů. Nejčastěji předměty vykazují znaky CLILu. Obecně se zdá, že učitelé v těchto předmětech kladou větší důraz na obsahovou

než na jazykovou složku, což je zřejmě dáno tím, že se jedná o doplňkovou výuku k hodinám obecné angličtiny. Integrovaný obsah obvykle vybírá učitel podle svého zájmu a mnohdy se jedná o témata, kterým se nevěnuje moc pozornosti jinde. Často se využívá projektové výuky. V žádném z popisovaných předmětů se nepoužívá učebnice, učitelé materiály vybírají sami a nezřídka sahají po materiálech autentických.

Podle provedeného výzkumu se v současnosti předměty integrující angličtinu a obsah vyučují díky následujícím činitelům: 1) vzdělání a nadšení vyučujícího – ten totiž obvykle předmět vymyslí, naplánuje a realizuje; 2) škola musí být nakloněna takovéto výuce (gymnázia se obvykle nebrání výuce v angličtině v rámci povinně volitelných seminářů); 3) dostatečná jazyková úroveň studentů; 4) výuka cizích jazyků v ČR tradičně zahrnuje i literaturu a reálie zemí, kde se daným jazykem mluví.

Pro školy je v současnosti zřejmě výhodné uskutečovat integrovanou výuku angličtiny a obsahu v rámci povinně volitelných seminářů. Učitelé zde mají možnost zkoušet, co uznají za vhodné, a obvykle nejsou vystaveni tlaku, co musejí stihnout studenty naučit, tudíž se nemusí obávat pomalejšího tempa výuky. Studenti si semináře vybírají na základě svého zájmu a schopností, takže je pravděpodobné, že je bude výuka zajímat. V této formě výuky se lze obejít i bez pečlivého celoškolního plánování výuky, spolupráce s jinými učiteli a podpory školy.

Integrace angličtiny a obsahu na gymnáziích představuje možnost, jak pokročilejším studentům poskytnout dostatečně náročnou výuku, která by je bavila. Umožňuje také rozvíjet jejich studijní dovednosti, včetně kritického čtení. Je proto pravděpodobné, že se tento trend bude dále rozšiřovat.

Bibliography

Allison , D. (1994) "Comments on Sarah Benesch's 'ESL, Ideology, and the Politics of Pragmatism': A Reader Reacts…". *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 618 – 23.

Banegas, D. L. (2012). "Integrating content and language in English language teaching in secondary education: models, benefits, and challenges". *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 2 (1), 111-136.

Basturkmen, H. (2006) *Ideas and Options in English for Specific Purposes*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Basturkmen, H. (2010) *Developing Courses for ESP*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barnard, R. and D. Zemach (2003) "Materials for Specific Purposes" in B. Tomlinson (ed.) *Developing Materials for Language Teaching,* pp. 306–23. London: Continuum.

Benesch, S. (2001) *Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, Politics, and Practice*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brinton, D., M. A. Snow, and M. B. Wesche (1989) *Content-Based Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House.

Cenoz, J., F. Genesee and D. Gorter (2013) "Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward". *Applied Linguistics*, DOI: 10.1093/applin/amt011.

Coyle, D., P. Hood, and D. Marsh (2010) *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1981) *Bilingualism and Minority Language Children*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cummins, J. (1984) *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008) *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Dalton-Puffer, C., T. Nikula and U. Smit (eds) (2010) *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

De Houwer, A., and A. Wilton (eds) (2011) *English in Europe Today: Sociocultural and Educational Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dudley-Evans, T. and M. J. St John (1998) *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

English for Specific Purposes (2013), Issue 3.

Eurydice (2005) *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe: Austria, National description – 2004/05*. Available online from http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/content-and-language-integrated-learning-clil-at-school-in-europe-pbEC3212399/ (accessed: 15 October 2013).

Eurydice (2006) *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Available online from http://ec.europa.eu/languages/documents/studies/clil-at-school-in-europe_en.pdf (accessed: 10 October 2013).

Flick, U. (2006) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research.* London: SAGE.

Gentgen, K. (2012) *Assessing English-medium instruction in German grammar schools: A Survey of Teachers' and Students' Responses*. GRIN.

Gillham, B. (2000a) *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.

Gillham, B. (2000b) *The Research Interview*. London: Continuum.

Graddol, D. (2006) *English Next*. British Council.

Heine, L. (2010) *Problem Solving in a Foreign Language*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hesová, A. (2011) "Integrace ve výuce". *Metodický portál RVP*. Available online from http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/o/z/12039/INTEGRACE-VE-VYUCE.html/ (accessed: 15 June 2014).

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984) *A History of English language teaching*. Oxford: University press.

Hutchinson, T. and A. Waters (1987) *English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2006) *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge.

Ibrahim, J. (2001) "The Implementation of EMI (English Medium Instruction) in Indonesian Universities: Its Opportunities, its Threats, its Problems, and its Possible Solutions". *K@ta* 3 (2), 121 – 138. Available online from http://puslit2.petra.ac.id/ejournal/index.php/ing/article/view/15479/15471 (accessed: 22 July 2013).

Janssens, G. and A. Marynissen (2005) *Het Nederlands Vroeger en Nu [Dutch in the Past and Now]*. Leuven: ACCO.

Jordan, R. (1997) *English for Academic Purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kapitánffy, J. (unknown publication year) "A foreign language as a medium of instruction in a secondary school in Hungary". Available online from http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/ensemble/results/Kapitanffy.htm (accessed: 17 October 2013).

Kasíková, H. (2001) *Kooperativní u ení a vyu ování: Teoretické a praktické problémy*. Praha: Karolinum.

Kling Soren, J. (2013) *Teacher Identity in English-Medium Instruction: Teacher Cognitions from a Danish Tertiary Education Context*. PhD Thesis, University of Copenhagen. Available online from http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00863816/en/ (accessed: 7 October 2013).

Marsh, D. and G. Langé (eds) (1999) *Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning. A Research-Driven TIE_CLIL Foundation Course Reader*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Continuing Education Centre, University of Jyväskylä on behalf of TIE-CLIL (European Lingua Project).

Marsh, D. and G. Langé (eds) (2000) *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. Jyväskylä, Finland: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä on behalf of TIE-CLIL.

Mehisto, P, D. Marsh, and M. J. Frigols (2008) *Uncovering CLIL*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Met, M. (1998) "Curriculum Decision-making in Content-based Language Teaching", in J. Cenoz and F. Genesee (eds) *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*, pp. 35–3. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Morgan, B. (2009) "Fostering transformative practitioners for critical EAP: Possibilities and challenges". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 8: 86–99.

Morgan, B. and V. Ramanathan (2005) "Critical literacies and language education: Global and local perspectives". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 25: 151–69.

MŠMT (2013) *Opat ení MSMT-2647/2013-210*. Available online from http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/zakladni-vzdelavani/upraveny-ramcovy-vzdelavaci-program-pro-zakladni-vzdelavani (accessed: 20 July 2014).

MŠMT (unknown publication year) *Rejst ík škol a školských za ízení*. Version 2.29. Available online at http://rejskol.msmt.cz/ (accessed: 9 April 2013).

MŠMT, MF, and MPO (2007) *Systém budování finan ní gramotnosti na základních a st edních školách: Spole ný document Ministerstva financí R, Ministerstva školství, mládeže a t lovýchovy R, Ministerstva pr myslu a obchodu R vypracovaný na základ usnesení vlády . 1594 ze dne 7. prosince 2005.* Available online from http://www.nuov.cz/uploads/SBFG_finalni_verze.pdf (accessed: 14 July 2014).

NAEP (unknown publication year) "Comenius", http://www.naep.cz/index.php?a=view-project-folder&project_folder_id=337& (accessed: 14 July 2014).

Paltridge, B. and S. Starfield (eds.) (2013) *Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Paran, A. (2013) "Content and Language Integrated Learning: Panacea or Policy Borrowing Myth?" *Applied Linguistics Review* (4) 2, 317–342.

Richards, J. C. and T. S. Rodgers (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. and R. M. Jiménez Catalán (eds) (2009) *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Ruiz-Garrido, M. F., J. C. Palmer-Silveira and I. Fortanet-Gómez (eds.) (2010) *English for Professional and Academic Purposes.* Rodopi: Amsterdam.

Sharma, R. N. and R. K. Sharma (2004) *Problems of Education in India.* Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.

Sladkovská, K. (2010) "Další cizí jazyk v eských základních školách". *Metodický portal RVP.* Available online from http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/c/z/9557/DALSI-CIZI-JAZYK-V-CESKYCH-ZAKLADNICH-SKOLACH.html/ (accessed: 20 July 2014).

Stern. H.H. (1972) "Introduction", in M. Swain (ed.) *Bilingual Schooling: Some Experiences in Canada and the United States*, pp. 1–6. Toronto: OISE Press.

Šmídová, T. (2013) "Projekty CLIL v R" *Metodický portal RVP.* Available online from http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/c/z/17445/PROJEKTY-CLIL-V-CR.html/ (accessed: 20 July 2014).

Šva í ek, R., K. Še ová et al. (2007) *Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických v dách.* Praha: Portál.

Šva í ek, R. and K. Še ová (2013) "Jak psát kvalitativn orientované výzkumné studie. Kvalita v kvalitativním výzkumu". *Pedagogická orientace* 23 (4), 478–510.

Thornbury, S. (2006) *An A-Z of ELT*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991) *Planning language, planning inequality*. New York: Longman.

Uys, A. H. C. (2006) *A Proposed Model for Training English Medium of Instruction Teachers in South Africa*. PhD Thesis, North-West University. Available online from http://dspace.nwu.ac.za/handle/10394/1033 (accessed: 8 October 2013).

Vališová, A., H. Kasíková et al. (2007) *Pedagogika pro u itele*. Praha: Grada.

Valenta, J. (2013) *Didaktika osobnostní a sociální výchovy*. Praha: Grada.

Výzkumný ústav pedagogický (2007) *Framework Education Programme for Secondary General Education (Grammar Schools)*. Availbale online from http://www.nuv.cz/file/161 (accessed: 30 October 2013).

Výzkumný ústav pro vzd lávání (2011) *Finan ní gramotnost ve výuce: Metodická p íru ka*. Praha.

Wächter, B. and F. Maiworm (2008) *English-taught programmes in European higher education. The picture in 2007*. Bonn: Lemmens (ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education).

Widdowson, H. G. (1983) *Learning purpose and language use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: SAGE.

Yip, D. Y. (2003) *The Effects of the Medium of Instruction on Science Learning of Hong Kong Secondary Students*. PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham. Available online from http://etheses.nottingham.ac.uk/2247/1/251347.pdf (accessed: 10 October 2013).