

1 History of CLIL

Dana Hanesová

DOI: 10.17846/CLIL.2015.7-16

Objectives

The aim of this chapter is to survey the historical development of CLIL. At first it lists various concepts used for the idea of integrated teaching of content and languages and the theories upon which CLIL was built. Then it presents information about the earliest developments in CLIL, showing examples of how some initiative teachers started to teach content directly in a foreign language (bilingual/immersion programmes) and, later on, how the current form of CLIL developed. The recent history of CLIL is presented via brief data on some countries as well as via activities on European level.

Introduction

CLIL is a methodology of teaching languages in such a way that the main emphasis is not on the 'form', but on the 'content'. In the words of its first promoter, D. Marsh, CLIL is a "language pedagogy focusing on meaning which contrasts to those which focus on form" (Marsh, 2002, p. 49). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, several language initiatives implementing this principle have emerged (e.g. Byrnes, 1998; Brinton, Snow & Wesche (2003); Grabbe & Stoller (1997); Zelenková (2010); Richards & Rogers, 2014):

- CALLA - Cognitive academic language learning;
- CBI - Content-based instruction;
- CBLI - Content-based language instruction;
- CBLT - Content-based language teaching;
- Dual-focused language education;
- EMI - English as a medium of instruction;
- FLIP - Foreign language immersion program;
- LAC - Language across the curriculum;
- LBCT - Language-based content teaching;
- LEE - Language-enriched education;
- LAL - Learning through an additional language;
- MLAC - Modern languages across the curriculum;
- Spanish/English/Finnish as a way of instruction;
- TFL - Teaching through a foreign language;
- TBE - Transitional bilingual education;
- WAC - Writing across curriculum;
- and, of course, CLIL - Content and language integrated learning.

This chapter refers to a lot of resources, namely to a) European documents on language education; and b) studies about bilingual education/CLIL in Europe and beyond (Marsh, Langé, Dale, Maljers, Wolff, Smit, Dalton-Puffer, Mehisto, Frigols, Kovács, Breidbach, Viebrock, Pokrivčáková, etc.).

To better understand the current CLIL methodology, it is important to perceive it as a result of rather complex historical factors typical for each region. According to Dale (2011, p. 19-21), it is a consequence of the influence of bilingualism, second language acquisition theories, cognitive learning theories, and constructivism. Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) emphasize namely bilingual education and immersion, typical for specific regions, as well as content-based language learning/teaching or English as an additional language.

Pre-history of CLIL

Although the word CLIL came into existence only recently (1994), it is not a new educational phenomenon. Some authors even return to the history of the Akkadians around 5,000 years ago. After conquering the Sumerians (the territory of modern Iraq inhabited), the Akkadians started to learn the local Sumerian language by using it as the language of instruction.

Throughout the following centuries, there has been evidence of individuals/ethnic groups living in multilingual territories. Therefore, these groups - especially rich people in more developed regions - used their bilingualism, or even plurilingualism as a survival method. In the end of the 19th century two ways of learning foreign languages were known to wealthy families. Those who could afford it used to send their children abroad to learn a foreign language directly in the target country. Other families would hire a tutor (for boys) or a governess (for girls). The children learned not only grammar rules, but also the necessary vocabulary. Thus many of them acquired languages not only through language instruction, but also thanks to daily appearance among the people.

Bilingual education had a long tradition in countries with more official languages. E.g. in Luxembourg children learnt German (in primary schools) and French (in secondary education) long before the law setting the standards of bilingualism was issued in 1843. This new act ordered French to be taught in primary school.

The principle of learning foreign languages in their real context and their integration with meaningful subject content was emphasized already by two significant pedagogues of Central European region. At first there is a need to mention the well-known pedagogue of Czech origin, J. A. Comenius (1592 – 1670) who paid a lot of attention to effective language teaching (e.g. *Orbis Pictus*, *Janua Linguarum Reserata*). His ideas have been analysed and evaluated in numerous studies.

The second pedagogue that we would like to describe in more details is of Slovak origin, called Matthias Bel (1684 – 1749), also known as *the Great Ornament of the Kingdom of Hungary* (Hanesová, 2014 & 2015). Being a secondary teacher as well as headmaster of two grammar schools situated in a multilingual German-Hungarian-Slovak-Czech region, he was eager to facilitate foreign language learning of his students.

For Bel, the language was only a means to mastering the content of the curriculum and thus to become widely educated. Bel's credo was: Teach the *words* by getting to *know the reality – the world around us*. His Latin students had to describe e.g. a trip to Slovak caves with verbal expressions such as “enter the cave, climb it, measure it” in Latin. He strived to prepare age-relevant lessons by using lots of pictures, maps, visualized story-telling, stimulating the learners' vivid imaginations. Concurrently, Bel gave effort to developing communicative competence in all neighbouring languages (German, Hungarian, and Czech). He reduced the number of grammar rules to a minimum and focused on raising students' interest in the cultural context of languages, e.g. by including historical, geographic and legislative texts and their vocabulary. Latin teachers had to help the students to compare them to their own lives and to apply appropriate parts in their own contexts. Bel wrote for them a simple Latin grammar book and several content-integrated textbooks. They focused on teaching language of everyday life, including language used in one's vocation performance (including landlords' instructions for maids, needed for dressing up, preparing and serving daily meals, taking care for the economic issues of households, inviting and welcoming guests, interactions during visits, walks, hunting, etc.).

Moving toward CLIL - the 2nd half of 20st century

Prior to 1970, the need to design language- and content-integrated programmes was a natural consequence of various geographic, demographic and economic issues. This type of instruction was used mainly in some specific linguistic regions (e.g. near national borders or in big cities). The aim was to provide children in those regions with bilingual instruction and to enable them to acquire language skills for authentic communication and understanding with the natives of the area.

Let us start with one of the first programmes of such sort. Around 1965, a group of English-speaking parents living in the French territory of Quebec, **Canada**, desired an educational kindergarten programme for their children that would give them an equal opportunity “a) to become competent to speak, read and write in French; b) to reach normal achievement levels throughout the curriculum, including the English language; c) to appreciate the traditions and culture of French-speaking Canadians, as well as English-speaking Canadians” (Baker, 1993, p. 496). They initiatively addressed their local educational authorities to solve this issue. Consequently, the solution in the form of programmes immersing students in a language other than their mother tongue was developed and implemented also in other schools. On a voluntarily basis, the English-speaking children learnt school subjects in French (e.g. Mathematics or Geography) together with the French-speaking children. In the 1970s and 1980s the term “**immersion**” was used as a synonym of bilingual education.

Later on, immersion programmes designed for teaching the content in the non-native language *without weakening the command of the mother tongue* spread all over Canada, the United States and the rest of the world (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008). From 1960s to 1998, about 300 000 Canadian children participated yearly in such a programme (Marsh, 2002, p. 56). In 2005, “there were 317 dual immersion programs in US elementary schools, providing instruction in 10 languages” (Potowski, 2007, p. 2).

The Canadian idea is a typical example of the one-way immersion of a non-native language. For the sake of completeness of the information on CLIL history, we can mention the existence of an alternative two-way immersion programme. It served the students in Korean-English school in Los Angeles who were studying with both Korean- and English-speaking children in one class.

In 1966 another, so called **LAC movement** emerged in London, **England**. It started with a group of English secondary teachers who met to consider the role of discussion in English lessons. They found it “impossible to confine their study to English lessons alone ... “We found ourselves discussing the relationship between language and thought, how language represented experience, the functions of language in society, different kinds of language and how they were acquired ... the nature of discussion and group dynamics...” (Parker, 1985, p. 173). In this discussion the idea of language across the curriculum was born. “If children were to make sense of their school experience, and in the process to become confident users of language, then we needed to engage in a much closer scrutiny of the way in which they encountered and used language throughout school day”. The first steps of the LAC movement were followed by a lot of action research and theory building. As this idea proved to be a coherent, alternative view of learning through language, it spread through England, Australia and Canada. An informal network has developed in these countries. In the **USA** the idea was used in a limited way, with its primary emphasis on **WAC** - the development of students’ writing skills.

In the United States, “the integration of content and language has had a long tradition both in what is known as CBI and in Bilingual Education Programmes (BE)” (Navés, 2008, p. 3). According to Brinton, Snow et al (1989, p. 2), CBI means “the integration of particular content with language teaching aims”. The content is used as a means for second/foreign language teaching and learning.

News about the success of the above-mentioned programmes soon caught the attention of **Europeans** interested in language policy. It has awakened their awareness of language and content integration. In 1978, the European Commission (EC) issued a proposal aimed at “encouraging teaching in schools through the medium of more than one language” (Marsh, 2002, p. 51). Later, in 1983, the European Parliament challenged the EC “to forward a new programme to improve foreign language teaching” (Marsh, 2002, p. 52). More and more mainstream, i.e. state-funded, schools in Europe began to teach some subjects in a foreign language. Even before the formation of European schools in EU countries, some schools, especially in capital cities, had begun the practice of immersion into target foreign languages.

Due to the development of various teaching methods, but also of other historical, sociological and educational factors within each region, various types of integrated approaches to teaching foreign languages (including CLIL) came into existence (Pokrivčáková 2011, p. 28). The effort to

copy the successful Canadian immersion model into the European CLIL model was not particularly successful. Marsh (2002, 56) comments that the researchers found out that “immersion bilingual education was successful for majority language speakers (e.g. in Quebec) more than for those coming from a minority language background”. European teachers tried to change the ways of their language instruction “with little or no regard for corresponding methodological shift”.

Immersion programmes did not seem suitable for countries such as Slovakia and some others where the use and development of the mother tongue needed to be strengthened (McGroarty, 2001; Králiková, 2013, p. 52). In these countries the idea of CLIL developed with a rather different emphasis on the ratio of native and non-native languages. Here the mother tongue plays its important educational role. This is evident, either by comparing the number of school subjects being taught in a foreign language (e.g. in Hungary – 3 subjects from the school curriculum), or by examining legislation and policies on the role and place of foreign language in CLIL lessons (in Slovakia – the English language is used up to maximum 50% of the lesson time). Thus CLIL in Europe is considered to be a ‘milder’ version of bilingual education

In the last two decades CLIL has mainly been expanded to primary and secondary schools. But also at universities there has been a trend of a growing offer of courses or programmes in English. They have the character of CBI - teaching foreign languages integrated together with teaching a subject from the main curricula in a meaningful context (Zelenková, 2014).

Emergence of CLIL and its recent development (since 90-ties)

The acronym CLIL was coined by David Marsh, a member of a team working in the area of multilingualism and bilingual education at the Finnish University of Jyväskylä in 1994 (Kovács, 2014, p. 48; Marsh, Maljers & Hartiala, 2001). Marsh himself had extensive life experience in multilingual regions, being born in Australia, educated in the UK and working in Finland. He based the concept of CLIL on the experience of Canadian immersion and British LAC programs. The original concept of CLIL was used to designate teaching subjects to students through a foreign language. According to Marsh (2012, p. 1), “the European launch of CLIL during 1994 was both political and educational. The political driver was based on a vision that mobility across the EU required higher levels of language competence in designated languages than was found to be the case at that time. The educational driver, influenced by other major bilingual initiatives such as in Canada, was to design and otherwise adapt existing language teaching approaches so as to provide a wide range of students with higher levels of competence.” During the 1990s, the acronym CLIL became the most widely used term for the integrated content and language education in Europe.

In 2005, Marsh suggested CLIL to be “a general ‘umbrella’ term to refer to diverse methodologies which lead to dual focussed education where attention is given to both topic and language of instruction” (Kovács, 2014, p. 48-49).

In 2006, the Eurydice reported that CLIL was available in the majority of European member states. The way how CLIL worked in 2007 in 20 European countries was presented in *Windows on CLIL* (Maljers, Marsh & Wolff, D., 2007). Most of the approaches discussed in *Windows* had been implemented in secondary schools, with only a few countries running “early education programmes – Austria, Finland, Hungary, and Spain” (Kovács 2014, p. 51).

The last decade has witnessed a boom of research in CLIL, although it has focused more on the linguistic than the non-linguistic elements of CLIL (Marsh, 2012, p. V.). Thanks to multi-disciplinary research done by linguists, educators, psychologists, neurologists, etc., the model of dual language and content aims has been gradually supplemented by a third strong research focus and CLIL pillar – emphasis on student’s learning strategies and thinking skills (Coyle et al, 2010; Mehisto et al., 2008).

Examples of CLIL development in selected European countries

Finland and the Netherlands are the countries with the highest level of implementing CLIL in primary and secondary schools (Pokrivčáková et al., 2008, p. 8).

The Netherlands

According to Pokrivčáková (2008, p. 8), the Netherlands was the first country to respond positively to the Maastricht's Agreement and it began to implement the idea of development of European plurilingualism and bilingual education in 1992. In 2007 up to 300 schools belonged to the category of bilingual schools.

Finland

Finland was also among the first nations to respond to the challenge of CLIL, specifically inside its city of Jyväskylä. The ministry of education has recommended the expansion of CLIL since 1989. But the first experiences were collected during an experiment already in 1990. Due to its positive results and new education legislation, this kind of teaching has continued. In 1992, Finland introduced Swedish immersion classes. In 1993, some schools offered French content-based classes, followed by German and Russian language classes a year later. In 1996 CLIL programmes had been launched in 251 Finnish schools (179 primary and 72 secondary schools). The legislation allows the schools to choose freely how they will apply CLIL.

Hungary

The history of bilingual education and CLIL in Hungary has been carefully observed by J. Kovács (2014): The first experience with teaching subjects via means of a foreign language goes back to 1987 when the first secondary bilingual programmes started as a top-down initiative from the educational authorities). But already in 1989 the primary school teachers and parents took bottom-up initiative. They desired for their children to learn languages in a meaningful context of some school subjects, so they started to develop primary CLIL programmes. At that time, primary CLIL was in its infancy in Europe as well (except of the international schools). In the 1990s, a team of ELTE staff in Budapest was established to promote a curriculum for bilingual primary education and the first bilingual primary course books.

In 1991 the Association for Bilingual Schools was founded. In 1997 the government issued a regulation stating that a CLIL school had to offer at least three subjects via English (total compulsory number of lessons devoted to foreign language was 5 lessons/week), create a specific language syllabus and employ at least one English-speaking native teacher. In 2001 there were 25 primary CLIL programmes in Budapest and 60 in the countryside, 6% of all the primary schools in Hungary. The year 2003 was given over to designing materials for CLIL, including primary course books and teachers' guides. In 1998 the first CLIL curricula were prepared for CLIL teacher training. In 2001 the first CLIL pre-school and primary team-teaching programme was launched. In 2004 the nation-wide in-service teacher training courses for CLIL teachers started. The academic year 2006-2007 was the first year of pre-service undergraduate CLIL teacher training courses at ELTE, Budapest.

Czech Republic

The importance of the existence of both bottom-up teachers' initiatives and top-down ministerial directive leading to the current form of CLIL was emphasized by Benešová in her study (2015) on CLIL in the Czech Republic. The evolution of CLIL idea started in the 1990s through initiatives of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports; the National Institute for Education; and the National Institute for Further Education. In accordance with the *EU Action Plan on Languages* (2004 – 2006), the Czech national plan for education included an offer for every teacher to get educated in CLIL either through pre-service training at universities or in-service training organized by ministerial institutions. The National Institute for Education supported CLIL by producing online material (*Foreign languages across the primary curriculum*) which appeared in 2006.

In 1998 – 2001, as a result of a Socrates project called TIE-CLIL – Trans-language in Europe, CLIL, five modules presenting general information on CLIL, its methodology, practical tips and specifications of language demands for both CLIL teachers and pupils were produced. They were summed up in *Guidelines for Teachers* (2001), *TIE-CLIL Professional Development Course* (2002) and a paper written by Marsh *Using languages to learn and learning to use languages* introduces

CLIL to parents. This successful project was followed by an international CLIL project Getting Started with Primary CLIL (2006–2009). Its outcome, Getting Started with Primary CLIL, is a guidebook for CLIL lecturers educating future primary teachers in CLIL practices. Approaches to CLIL in lower secondary education, its methodology and materials became the focus of several CLIL projects (2009-2012). In 2014 a nation-wide project Foreign Languages for Life systematically disseminating CLIL idea into all types of schools was launched.

Germany

The history of implementation of CLIL in German schools goes back to the first bilingual German-French programmes in the 1960s. Similarly to other European countries, CLIL programmes in English languages started to spread in the 1990s and fully developed after 2000.

Poland

In Poland but also other countries (e.g. Hungary) “the implementation of CLIL practice in education has been adopted under the name bilingual education” (Papaja, 2014, p. 15). Its foundations were laid in the 1970s but it became even more popular after the revolution in 1990. The first schools with bilingual programmes were higher secondary schools. Due to the new Educational Reform in 1999, CLIL started to be implemented also in lower secondary schools.

Slovakia

According to Lojová & Straková (2012), CLIL in Slovakia started to develop in a context of positive teachers’ responses to the ITV (Integrated Thematic Teaching) programme promoted by Kovaliková’s Foundation (1996). Though ITV, originally from the USA, did not involve languages, it became a good training of the teachers’ skills of integrating the subject disciplines.

The first kind of teaching subject content via a foreign language (English, German, French, and Spanish) in Slovakia started in the form of bilingual education. Because teaching ‘bilingually’ at bilingual schools meant teaching at least 3 school subjects exclusively in a foreign language, it was too demanding for all schools and all their learners. So, “to bring benefits of bilingual instruction to as many learners as possible, a method of CLIL was developed in Slovakia shortly after 2000. Instead of teaching the entire content of the subjects in foreign languages, in Slovak tradition, the teaching time in a target language is usually limited to a maximum of 50%” (Pokrivčáková, 2013, p. 16).

In 2008 the Slovak National Institute for education started a 5-year experiment with CLIL called *Didactic Effectiveness of CLIL in Teaching Foreign Languages in Primary Education*. It investigated the possibility of implementing CLIL into the primary level starting in the first grade. It confirmed the feasibility of this approach and revealed some positive as well as negative outcomes that need refining.

Milestones in the recent European history of CLIL

The following chart gives an overview of the main movements in CLIL’s recent history in Europe:

When	Who/What	Comments/explanations
1990	Lingua Programme launched by the European Commission (EC)	Promoting opportunities for university students to combine their main discipline with the study of a foreign language
1993	Council for Cultural Co-operation Council of Europe	Language Learning for European Citizenship: International Workshops for Language Teaching and Teacher Training (report <i>Bilingual Education in Secondary Schools: Learning and Teaching Non-language Subjects Through a Foreign Language</i>).

1994	D. Marsh, University of Jyväskylä, Finland	CLIL refers to situations where subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with dual-focused simultaneous aims: learning of content and of a foreign language.
1995	EC Resolution (1995) on improving and diversifying language learning and teaching within the education systems of EU	“The Resolution refers to the promotion of innovative methods and, in particular, to the teaching of classes in a foreign language for disciplines other than languages, providing bilingual teaching’. It also proposes improving the quality of training for language teachers by encouraging the exchange with Member States of higher education students working as language assistants in schools, endeavouring to give priority to prospective language teachers or those called upon to teach their subject in a language other than their own.” (Eurydice Report, 2006, p. 8)
1995	White Paper of EC: Teaching and Learning – Towards the Learning Society	Emphasise on plurilingual education in Europe – especially on the importance of innovative ideas and the most effective practices for helping all EU citizens to become proficient in 3 European languages: “... it could even be argued that secondary school pupils should study certain subjects in the first foreign language learned, as is the case in the European schools” (p. 47).
1996	EuroCLIC Network UniCOM – Finnish University of Jyväskylä	The term CLIL implemented: Learning and teaching non-language subjects through a foreign language with double aims: learning content and a foreign language. CLIL – an umbrella term for all existing approaches (content-based instruction, immersion, bilingual education) (Marsh & Langé, 2002)
2000 - 2006	European Grant Programmes by EC	Comenius, Erasmus and Socrates Programmes – financial provision for activities of ‘teaching staff of other disciplines required or wishing to teach in a foreign language’.
2001	European Year of Languages CLIL compendium	Suggestion for the promotion of language learning and linguistic diversity to be achieved through a wide variety of approaches, including CLIL type provision – a comprehensive typology of European CLIL.
2002	EC publication CLIL/EMILE: The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential	“CLIL (EMILE) refers to any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language, thus not usually the first language of the learners involved, is used as a medium in the teaching and learning of non-language content.” (Marsh, p.2)
2003	Council of Europe. Language Policy Division	Bilingual policy issues
2004	EC: Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan	CLIL expected to make a major contribution to the EU’s language learning goals. A set of actions suggested to promote the integrated learning of content and language.
2005	EC Publication	<i>Special Educational Needs in Europe - The Teaching and Learning of Languages</i>
2005	Eurydice report	CLIL – enriched with teaching any language that is not the first language.
2006	Eurydice Report:	CLIL covers: “All types of provision in which a second

	CLIL at School in Europe	language is used to teach certain subjects in the curriculum other than the language lessons themselves.” (ER, 2006)
2007	Slovak Ministry of Education, : The Conception of teaching foreign language in primary and secondary schools)	CLIL has its role in the current philosophy of language teaching in Slovakia.
2008	Mehisto, Marsh, Frigols	CLIL – umbrella term for a whole variety of approaches
2008	Experimental testing of CLIL at Primary level	<i>Didactic Efficiency of the CLIL Methodology at the First Level of Basic Schools in Teaching Foreign Languages – approved by the Ministry of Education of Slovakia</i>
2010	<i>CLIL Teachers’ Competence Grid</i>	A document necessary for professional development of future CLIL teachers
2011	<i>European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education</i> (Frigols Martin, Marsh, Mehisto, & Wolff)	A framework for the professional development of CLIL teachers

Acknowledgement

The research presented in this study was supported by the project Mobility - Enhancing Research, Science and Education at the Matej Bel University – Activity 4 - ITMS code: 26110230082, under the Operational Program Education co-financed by the European Social Fund.

References

- A brief history of CLIL and CLIL in Jyväskylä*. Retrieved 23 July 2015 from:
http://peda.net/veraja/jyvaskyla/clilteaching?m=viewpresentation&m_id=1819774&p_id=1344&slide=1
- BAKER, C. & JONES, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- BENEŠOVÁ, B. (2015). CLIL Projects in the Czech Republic. In Hanesová D. (Ed.), *Learning Together to Be a Better CLIL Teacher* (p. 40–48). Banská Bystrica: PF UMB.
- BERTAUX, P., COONAN, C. M., FRIGOLS, M. J., & MEHISTO, P. (2010). *The CLIL Teacher’s Competence Grid*. Retrieved 14 June 2015 from:
<http://lendtrento.eu/convegno/files/mehisto.pdf>
- BREIDBACH, S. & VIEBROCK, B. (2012). CLIL in Germany: Results from Recent Research in a Contested Field of Education. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(4), 1-16. Retrieved 03 August 2015 from: <http://www.icrj.eu/14/article1.html>
- BRINTON, D. M, SNOW, M. A. & WESCHE, M. B. (1990). *Content-based Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- CHAMOT, A. U. & O’MALLEY, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publ. Company.
- CLIL in Finland: History of the CLIL and immersion language classes*. Retrieved 11 June 2015 from:
<http://www.kieliluokat.fi/gb/history2.php>
- Council of Europe (2003). Language Policy Division. In Ó Riagáin, P. & Lüdi, G. (Eds.), *Bilingual education: some policy issues*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved 14 June 2015 from:
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Educ_bilingue_EN.doc
- Council of Europe. (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Europe. European Commission Survey. Eurydice Report*. Retrieved 25 June 2015 from:
http://www.eurydice.org/ressources/eurydice/pdf/071EN/012_references_071EN

- Council Resolution of 31 March 1995 on improving and diversifying language learning and teaching within the education systems of the European Union, *Official Journal C 207* of 12.08.1995, p. 8. (2006). In *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Eurydice EU. Retrieved 15 August 2015 from: [http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw file/eurydice/CLIL EN.pdf](http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/eurydice/CLIL_EN.pdf)
- COYLE, D., HOOD, P. & MARSH, D. (2010). *CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- DALE, L., Van Der ES, W. & TANNER, R. (2011). *CLIL Skills*. Leiden: European Platform (Internationalising education).
- DALTON-PUFFER, CH. & NIKULA, T. (Eds.) (2006). Current research on CLIL". Special issue of *VIEWS (Vienna English Working Papers)*, 15/3.
- ET-LINGUA - Action programme to promote foreign language competence in the European Community (LINGUA), 1990-1994. CORDIS: Community Research and Development Information Service. Retrieved 1 June 2015 from: http://cordis.europa.eu/programme/rcn/489_en.html
- European CLIL Milestones. (CLIL Matrix – 2nd Medium-term programme 2004-2007. Brussels: Council of Europe. Retrieved 14 July 2015 from: [http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/clilmatrix/EN/CLIL_milestones EN.htm](http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/clilmatrix/EN/CLIL_milestones_EN.htm)
- European Commission. (2002). Directorate-General for Education and Culture; Marsh, D. *CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning / EMILE – Enseignement d'une Matière par l'intégration d'une Langue Etrangère. The European Dimension. Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential*. Jyväskylä: UniCOM. Retrieved 3 July 2015 from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/lang/doc/david_marshall-report.pdf
- European Commission. (2003). Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee of the Regions, COM(2003) 449. Retrieved 4 July 2015 from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act_lang_en.pdf
- GRADDOL, D. (2006). *English Next*. London: British Council Publications. Retrieved 27 July 2015 from: www.britishcouncil.org/learning
- HANESOVÁ, D. (2003). *Odborná angličtina na pedagogických fakultách*. Banská Bystrica: Trian.
- HANESOVÁ, D. (2014). Pedagogická koncepcia Mateja Bela. *Pedagogika*, 5(4), 273-289.
- HANESOVÁ, D. (2015). Plurilingualism – an educational challenge: The case of Slovakia. *JoLaCE*, 3(2), p. 111–131.
- KLEČKOVÁ, G. (2012). Kompetence učitele vedoucí k úspěšné realizaci metody CLIL. In Král'ová, Z. (ed). *CLIL – Nová výzva* (p. 37-51). Ústí nad Labem : Univerzita J. E. Purkyně.
- KOVÁCS, J. (2014). CLIL – Early competence in two languages. In Kovács, J. & Benkó, É. T. (Eds.), *The World at Their Feet: Children's Early Competence in Two Languages through Education* (p. 15–97). Budapest: Eötvös József Könyvkiadó.
- KRÁLIKOVÁ, I. (2013). *Anglický jazyk na primárnom stupni ZŠ (so zameraním na metodiku CLIL)*. (Dizertačná práca). Banská Bystrica: PF UMB.
- LIGHTBOWN, P. M. & SPADA, N. (1997). *Ako sa učíme jazyky*. Bratislava: SAP.
- LOJOVÁ, G. & STRAKOVÁ, Z. (2012). *Teoretická východiská vyučovania angličtiny v primárnom vzdelávaní*. Bratislava: UK.
- MALJERS, A., MARSH, D. & WOLFF, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Windows on CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning in the European Spotlight*. Graz: ECML.
- MARSH, D. (1994). *Bilingual Education & Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Paris: International Association for Cross-cultural Communication, Language Teaching in the Member States of the European Union (Lingua), University of Sorbonne.
- MARSH, D. & LANGÉ, G. (2000). Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages. In Marsch, D. & Langé G. (Eds.) *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. Jyväskylä: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä on Behalf of TIECLIL.

- MARSH, D., MALJERS, A. & HARTIALA, A.-K. (2001). *Profiling European CLIL Classrooms – Languages Open Doors*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- MARSH, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE – The European Dimension: Actions, Trends & Foresight Potential*. Brussels: European Commission.
- MARSH, D. (2012) *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). A Development Trajectory*. Córdoba: University of Córdoba.
- FRIGOLS MARTÍN, M. J., MARSH, D., MEHISTO, P. & WOLFF, D. (2011). *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education*. Graz: CML. Retrieved 13 July 2015 from: <http://www.ecml.at>
- McGROARTY, M. (2001). Bilingual Approaches to Language Learning. In Celce-Murcia, M. *Teaching English as a Second or a Foreign Language*. 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- MEHISTO, P., MARSH, D. & FRIGOLS, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- MENZLOVÁ, B. & FARKAŠOVÁ, E. (2011). Teoretické a praktické perspektívy metódy CLIL. Inštrument na podporu cudzích jazykov. In *Aplikácia metódy CLIL vo vyučovaní na základnej škole* (p. 40-46). Martin: BŠ Martin.
- NAVÉS, T. (2009). Effective Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Programmes. In Ruiz De Zarobe, Y. & J. Catalan, R. M. (Eds.) *CLIL: evidence from research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- PAPAJA, K. (2014). *Focus on CLIL : A Qualitative Evaluation of CLIL in Polish Secondary Education*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- PARKER, R. (1978). The Language Across the Curriculum Movement: A Brief Overview and Bibliography. In *College Composition and Communication*, p. 173 – 177.
- POKRIVČÁKOVÁ, S. & LAUKOVÁ, D. (2008). Čo je CLIL? In Pokrivčáková et al., *CLIL – plurilingvismus a bilingválne vzdelávanie*. Nitra: ASPA.
- POKRIVČÁKOVÁ, S. (2011). CLIL na Slovensku (2005 – 2010). In *Aplikácia metódy CLIL vo vyučovaní na základnej škole*. Martin: BŠ Martin.
- POKRIVČÁKOVÁ, S. (2013). *CLIL Research in Slovakia*. Hradec Králové: Gaudeamus.
- POKRIVČÁKOVÁ, S. (2015). Research Implications for the Training of CLIL Teachers in Slovakia. In Hanesová D. (Ed.) *Learning Together to Be a Better CLIL Teacher*. Banská Bystrica: PF UMB, 24-29.
- POTOWSKI, K. (2007). *Language and Identity in a Dual Immersion School*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- RICHARDS, J. C. & RODGERS, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- SMIT, U. & DALTON-PUFFER, Ch. (Eds.), (2007). Current research on CLIL 2. Special issue of *VIEWS (Vienna English Working Papers)* 16(3).
- SNOW, M. A., & BRINTON, D. M. (eds.) (1997). *The Content-based Classroom*. New York: Longman.
- ŠMÍDOVÁ, T., TEJKALOVÁ, L. & VOJTKOVÁ, N. (2012). *CLIL ve výuce: Jak zapojit cizí jazyky do vyučování*. Praha: NÚVŠPZZDV.
- THÜRMAN, E. & HELFRICH, H. (2003). *Language Learning for European Citizenship: new-style*. International Workshops for Language Teaching and Teacher Training : Report on Workshop 12A. *White Paper on Education and Training - Teaching and Learning - Towards the Learning Society*. COM (95) 590 final, 29 November 1995.
- ZELENKOVÁ, A. (2014). New Trends in the Teaching of Specific English in Tourism Studies. In *Folia Turistica No. 4*. Banská Bystrica: EF UMB.