Original Paper

CLIL Approach in Primary Education: Learning about Byzantine Art and Culture through a Foreign Language

Eleni Korosidou[1*] and Eleni Griva[1]

[1] Faculty of Primary Education, University of Western Macedonia, Florina, Greece

[*] Eleni Korosidou, E- mail: koro_elen@hotmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to provide insights into experimental research on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) for developing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) skills and aspects of Byzantine history and culture in the context of Greek primary education. It aims at a) developing a CLIL project with a focus on Byzantine and post Byzantine history and culture for 6th primary school students; b) investigating the effects of CLIL on students' skills performance after a total of 30 teaching sessions intervention; c) identifying whether CLIL instruction develops a more positive attitude towards FL and content learning. A multimodal and multisensory learning environment was created in order to support and enhance language skills and content knowledge. In such a context, students were encouraged to use language creatively through getting involved in communicative, problem-solving and inquiry-based activities. The positive effects of the project were indicated, particularly on students' communicative skills. Also gains were recorded in relation to students' enhancement of content knowledge and skills, as well their positive attitude towards FL and content learning.

Keywords

CLIL approach, foreign language learning, cross curricular project, young learners

1. Introduction

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach has been practiced for the last two decades with proven positive effects on the language skills of second/foreign language (L2/FL) learners (Korosidou & Griva, 2013; Lasagabaster, 2008; Zydatiss, 2007). CLIL approach, mainly focusing on language, content and learning skills (Mehisto, Marsh &Frigols, 2008), can yield successful outcomes when applied both at early language teaching and adult language learning (European Commission, 2006). More specifically, Vallbona, in her study(2009), examined the effects of CLIL on overall language proficiency in primary education. It was indicated that CLIL learners both in the fifth (5th) and sixth (6th) grade outperformed their peers in the non-CLIL group in fluency and lexical diversity.

Moreover, Victori et al. (2010) studied the effects of implementing CLIL on the fifth (5th) and sixth (6th) grade, by comparing the competence in listening, reading and writing of CLIL and non-CLIL primary school students. The results of that study showed higher performance in favour of CLIL learners. Among the benefits that accrue from CLIL implementation, researchers stated holistic language learning, linguistic and cognitive skills development, enhancement of motivation, active participation in learning process, as well as greater confidence in language use (Brewster 1999; Marsh & Langé, 1999).

Despite the fact that CLIL approach has been established as largely influential on teaching and learning practice in mainstream education across Europe, its adoption does not automatically lead to successful teaching and learning. Studies have indicated that productive language skills are not promoted in the CLIL classroom , as inappropriate academic discourse functions, poor academic writing skills and inability to verbalize subject-specific issues in an appropriate way were revealed (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Vollmer, 2008). Some other researchers (Richards & Rogers, 2002; Viebrock, 2006), in an attempt to 'interpret' these results, identified the following 'key' reasons for this ineffective adaptation and implementation of CLIL approach: a) language teachers' inappropriate education in relation to using language as the "vehicle" for teaching content in another cognitive field, b) limited methodological resources and c) limited guidance regarding how to create their own CLIL material, and d) lack of provision of a clear framework and ready- made material.

Towards the direction of individual creation of CLIL material, Coyle (1999, 2006) designed the 4C's-Framework (Content- Cognition- Communication- Culture), offering a theoretical and methodological foundation for planning and implementing CLIL, as well as designing CLIL materials (Coyle, 1999, 2006 in Meyer, 2010).

In such a context, planning a CLIL lesson aims at activating students' content schemata, for acquiring knew content knowledge and developing skills. Teacher should focus on what learners already know and understand in order to engage them in more complex tasks and concepts. It was found that brainstorming ideas as well as presenting information in a multisensory way and multimodal classroom environment (Griva & Semoglou, 2013), mostly by using the new technologies for educational purposes (video clips, power point presentations, web-quests, interactive materials on English websites etc.), could provide students with ample and stimulating input. As Meyer (2010) emphasizes, input should be meaningful, authentic and challenging. Authentic communication in a content-based framework involves an element of cross cultural communication, where students train to be aware of the cultural dimension of what they are learning, as well as focus on how they can use language to communicate with people from various cultural backgrounds (Curtain, 1990). Besides, authentic material enhances motivation on the part of the learner, as it allows for meaningful, interactive and creative learning, as well as dealing with problem solving situations. To exemplify, multi modal material found on websites fosters independent and differentiated learning and gives opportunities to all learners to fully comprehend content and language.

241

The CLIL approach includes inquiry-based learning activities, where students develop their higher order thinking skills in a curricular context, using context specific language, and being evaluated by demonstrating their knowledge of language and content. The CLIL approach aims at overcoming the limitations created by the traditional curriculum, where each content / subject area is taught separately. It actually succeeds in integrating various contents/ subject areas with learning the target language. Drawing also attention to planning student output, a project adapting CLIL methodology consists of 'discovery-based' tasks, which involve processing language and content. Students are encouraged to use language creatively through participating in communicative problem-solving activities. Being involved in communication and interaction in pairs or groups, they negotiate and make choices and decisions, they produce written texts and present them in class, as well as they participate in role plays, debates and dramatizations.

2. The Project

2.1 Purpose of the Project

Therefore, the present project was introduced to serve the dual aim of:

- Developing a CLIL project with a focus on Byzantine history and culture for primary education students;

- Measuring the effect of the implementation of this CLIL project.

The ultimate aim was to determine the impact of the CLIL approach on the students' performance in English language in terms of aspects such as the range of language used, accuracy, fluency, interaction skills along with their gains in content-based knowledge dealing with several aspects of the byzantine art. More specifically, the learners were engaged in a CLIL project about byzantine art and culture in the specific framework of their historical, byzantine city, Kastoria, a city in the Northern Western part of Greece. As researchers mention, the method allows for a cross curricular approach in foreign language learning (Scot & Ytreberg, 1994), always focusing on students' interests.

2.2 Sample

The project was launched on one sixth (6th) grade primary school classroom in the city of Kastoria, in Northern - Western Greece. The city and the surroundings have a long tradition in byzantine art and include a wealth of byzantine and post-byzantine buildings (two- floored houses, known as "arhontika", and numerous churches), which were easily recognized by the students, who were grown up in this environment.

Twenty (20) Greek-speaking students (aged 12 years), ten (10) boys and ten (10) girls, participated in this small scale intervention. The students' English competency level was A2+ (Elementary Level) according to the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). They had been taught English as a compulsory subject for four years, three (3) hours per week. The teaching approaches adopted before the intervention were rather based on PPP (Presentation-Production-Practice) framework.

242

3. Project Procedure

The CLIL project lasted for almost four (4) months. Thirty (30) teaching sessions took place.

The experimental CLIL syllabus was developed on the basis of criteria for providing successful and sustainable CLIL teaching and learning, as suggested by Coyle's 4Cs-Framework. Among them were the provision of rich, challenging, and authentic input while content, communication, cognition and culture were inextricably linked. Moreover, both scaffolding learning to help students cope with input of all sorts, as well as language learning strategies training received particular attention, along with promoting the development of higher order thinking skills and introducing the intercultural dimension as an educational goal. In addition, the provision of multimodal input allowed for the production of highly differentiated materials to accommodate different learning styles. Implementing a CLIL project can be challenging for children, especially at the beginning of the learning process, presupposing support, appropriate materials, scaffolding depending on the various subjects, authentic environment and constructive feedback on the part of the teacher (Gudjons, 2007).

The project procedure went through two basic stages:

-*Initial stage*, where the researchers conducted a student needs analysis and designed the CLIL project,

-*Main stage*, including the implementation of the project and the evaluation of its feasibility.

3.1 The Initial Stage

3.1.1 Needs Analysis

Before the design and implementation of the project, a needs analysis survey was carried out, recording the needs of the students in the context at issue, in terms of content based and language learning objectives. A 'language biography and content knowledge' instrument was designed, including: a) closed-type questions, such as Likert scale questions, multiple choice questions; b) open-ended questions; c) contingency questions. The instrument was organized into the following parts to provide information in relation to the participants': a) demographic data, b) language skills and strategies, c) preferences in relation to learning and teaching styles, as well as materials and activities, d) knowledge of aspects of byzantine history and culture.

As far as students' language competency awareness was concerned, they were asked to evaluate their language ability in relevance to their language level (A2 +) regarding their communication, writing and reading skills. The data collected from the questionnaires showed that the most of the students considered themselves to be competent in reading. Half of them (50%) stated that they could write effectively in English, while only 30% of them considered themselves skilled speakers in English.

Regarding *Language Learning skills Questionnaire,* students were declared fully competent, quite competent or in need of improving a skill. The questionnaire analysis led to the following results (Table 1).

Table 1. Language Learning Skills Questionnaire

Categories	Fully Competent (%)	Quite Competent (%)	Need for Improvement (%)
a.　Reading Comprehension			
1.　I can scan a text	60	20	20
2.　I can read a text for pronunciation purposes	40	40	20
3.　I can read a text for gist	30	50	20
4.　I can read a text with appropriate rate	50	20	30
5.　I can understand unknown/ difficult words in a text	40	40	20
b.　Writing			
6.　I can compose a text	30	20	50
7.　I can write short sentences	30	30	40
8.　I can write a note/ an e –mail	30	40	30
9.　I can write meaningful sentences/paragraphs	40	30	30
10.　I can select the appropriate vocabulary	30	40	30
11.　I can find appropriate ideas	30	40	30
12.　I can write my ideas in a coherent way	30	30	40
13.　I can spell words correctly	30	50	20
14.　I can review my text	30	40	30
15.　I can work with a classmate to write a text	30	40	30
c.　Listening Comprehension			
16.　I can understand the gist of listening text	40	40	20
17.　I can understand basic parts of a listening text	40	40	20
18.　I can listen and take notes	20	30	50
19.　I can understand different varieties of English	10	30	60
d.　Speaking and Communication			
20.　I can take part in role plays	30	30	40
21.　I can ask and answer questions	30	40	30
22.　I can interact in the class	30	40	30
23.　I can give short presentations in the English class	30	30	40
24.　I can talk in English fluently	30	30	40
25.　I can talk in English correctly	30	40	30

Finally, the needs analysis questionnaire also contained questions regarding *Language Learning Preferences and Skills*. The first part consisted of 'Yes' or 'No' questions, where students were asked to state their preferences as far as activities, teaching aids and the teacher's role in the English language classroom were concerned.

Regarding their preferences in relation to their preferred learning / teaching methods and activities, all of the students liked working in groups as well as being involved in role playing activities. Moreover, the great majority of the students (90%) were in favor of participating in projects, watching videos and using a P/C in the English language classroom, and most of the students (80%) preferred attending presentations with visual stimuli or playing various language games in class, or participating in role-play activities (100%). It is worth mentioning that more traditional activities, i.e. grammar and vocabulary activities were preferred by a small number of students. In relation to language mistakes, a great number of students (70%) preferred being provided with feedback after completing their tasks, rather than being immediately corrected by the teacher when making a mistake (30%). Finally, a number of students (70%) showed preference to their needs being identified and recorded by their teachers, from the very beginning of the school year.

Concerning the last part of the instrument, *knowledge of aspects of byzantine history and culture*, students were asked, in open ended questions, to declare their knowledge related to aspects of the byzantine history in general and culture of their own city- Kastoria- during the Byzantine Era. The data revealed that almost half of the students (40%) were familiar with the main topics and historic events from the byzantine history, especially regarding their own byzantine city. Most students (60%) also stated that they had already visited a museum of byzantine art.

The needs analysis data were 'exploited' by the researchers to define the CLIL project goals and decide on the project activities, always taking into account the learners' suggestions, needs and preferences. In more detail, students' preference as regards working in groups revealed that they should be given opportunities to work cooperatively. Also, the need for creating a multisensory and multimodal learning environment was showed. Providing learners with visual and auditory stimuli, as well as using information technologies for educational purposes, as P/C use and video watching and/ or presentation shows in class, were among the most favored students' preferences.

3.1.2 Design of the CLIL Project

A CLIL project course in the form of a multidimensional mini syllabus was designed after having taken into consideration the students' perceived needs (Moon, 2000). Creating a game based learning environment (Tuan & Nguyen, 2010. Haldfield, 1999), where rich input was provided in ways that could motivate and engage learners in the learning process was also of great importance in the design process. As studies have indicated, games in the language class enhance interaction (Swain, 1993), activate multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999) and provide opportunities for social skills development (Orlick, 2006).The mini syllabus consisted of ten units based on the following broad thematic areas:

    a) Byzantium – Historical Framework

Aspects of people's origin and religion

The Ottoman Empire during the post byzantine period

     b) Kastoria in the Byzantine Era

Kastoria's geographical position in the Byzantine Empire

Aspects of culture, daily life and domestic economy

     c) The byzantine art in the Kastorian Framework

Architecture (the town's wall, church architecture)

Byzantine hagiography painting

     d) Kastoria in the post byzantine period

Domestic economy, royal families

The role of religion in the post byzantine society

Post byzantine architecture

Post byzantine religious art

In this framework, the expected learning outcomes involved the development of:

     a) Cognitive skills, through engaging students in numerous inquiry based activities, where their multiple intelligences could be developed and they could be actively involved in problem solving and decision making.

     b) Communication skills, though role plays, presentations, dramatizations and participation in activities where students were asked to gather information, as well as ask for clarifications and negotiate meaning.

     c) Cultural sensitivity and awareness, through engaging students in content based activities that enhance historical and cultural understanding.

3.2 Implementation of the CLIL Project

The project included 30 intervention sessions focused on the above mentioned thematic areas. It is worth mentioning that: a) one of the researchers was also the English language teacher of the class, who cooperated with the teacher of the history subject, so as to create modern and appropriate interdisciplinary ways in relation to content and specific language teaching (see Marsh, 2002); b) since the very beginning of the project, the students were informed that they should work in teams, so as to achieve the goals set.

The project procedure was carried out in three stages:

a) Pre-stage

The basic purpose of this stage was to activate students' background knowledge and to introduce them to the topic and task in a multisensory learning environment (eg. using stories, ppt, video clips, songs). The students were engaged in activities related to the specific vocabulary of the topic and the content of the reading text in a multisensory context, taking into consideration multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999). Multimodal material was used to arouse their interest, though PowerPoint presentations and relevant audiovisual material. Moreover, it was used to create a framework where students could

246

enhance their interest and participation, practice the target language and learn the content-aspects of Byzantine history, art and culture-in a natural way (Short et al., 1996).

b) Task-circle

In the main stage of the session, the students were put in the center of the learning process and were given opportunities to communicate and interact in order to process multimodal material (produce posters, brochures, concept maps etc.). Students in groups had to work together on a common group task, helping each other, interact with each other during "problem-solving in order to perform a task. Attention was paid on learners having chances to use the language for authentic and communicative purposes, as well as on maximizing opportunities for meaningful interaction though cooperation and inquiry based learning (Scott &Ytreberg, 1994). After the completion of the task, the members of each group reported on their work and presented it in class, explaining the various aspects of it in the target language.

The participants were engaged in game – based learning activities, such as role play, debate activities and dramatizations. Moreover, students were engaged in inquiry-based, out of school activities such as the 'Treasure Hunt' game (see Appendix 3): the students were asked to fill in task sheets with information gathered after having visited an old, byzantine neighborhood of their city. Then, each group presented the information in class and shared their records and experiences with the other groups.

During that phase students also participated in creative activities and produced the following own "art crafts":

- A byzantine map, made of plasticine (see Appendix 1);

- Drawings of authentic Kastorian, byzantine icons, with descriptive labels in the target language;

- A product of an authentic byzantine mosaic, made of play mais (see Appendix 2);

- Posters with pictures and brief texts in English describing them;

- Creation of a model depicting Kastoria's wall with labels describing its main parts.

c) Follow-up stage

During the follow up stage, the teacher gave feedback on the content and reviewed what was presented, while students voted and chose their preferred task. They were also assessed by the teacher through their portfolios (writings, notes, artwork produced from the beginning of the project until its completion), as well as through their participation and language competence during activities, e.g. role plays. Role play can be an enjoyable way of 'informal' assessment that could be used effectively within a content-based curriculum (Kelner, 1993).

In addition, participants were also asked to evaluate peers as well as themselves (peer- and self-assessment). Self/peer - assessment provides teacher with accurate judgments of students' linguistic abilities, weaknesses and improvement (McNamara & Deane 1995). Self- assessment was a part of the learning process, as students kept recording their progress, by stating what they knew, what they learned and what they would like to learn next week. This procedure, which was done with the

247

teacher's support, motivated learners to set and achieve their personal goals together with the project's goals.

Concerning teacher's role during the three stages, the teacher- researcher was the facilitator and coordinator of students' work, creating opportunities for students' active participation in a relaxed and playful learning environment and helping them overcome problems arising during group work (Griva & Semoglou, 2013). Using scaffolding by exemplifying, paraphrasing, asking additional questions to ensure understanding of complex concepts related to the subject matter, as well as using a variety of visual and audio visual aids were some of the teaching techniques employed.

3.3 Evaluation of the Project

An evaluation process, both summative and formative with a major focus on the formative process, was conducted in order to record the feasibility of the project by using the following instruments:

a) Teacher – researcher's journal

Journal entries were kept by the teacher-researcher after the completion of every one of the thirty hour sessions during which the project took place. The journal was employed as a reflective tool of the implementation of the CLIL project offering a systematic appreciation of it (Farrell, 2008). The journal is easy to be used and allows for great flexibility in the process of documenting classroom events and teaching situations (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

b) Students' interviews

Insights into the students' attitudes towards the TL and the implementation of CLIL were identified through the structured interviews upon the completion of the project.

4. Results

a) Teacher- researcher Journal

The qualitative analysis of the journal entries led to the creation of four typologies: a) teaching process, b) teacher's role, c) student's attitude and d) overall evaluation of the pilot intervention encompassing a number of categories and subcategories (see Table 2).

Table 2. Journal Records

Typologies	Categories	Subcategories
A) Teaching Process	1.Goals	i. development of linguistic skills
		ii. development of social skills and strategies
		iii. time management
	2. Techniques	i. inquiry-learning activities
		ii. dialogue
		iii. discussion/ debate
		iv. brainstorming
		v. teaching with multimedia
	3.Aids	i. posters, maps
		ii. books
		iii. information technologies
		viii. materials (plasticine, colorful cardboard)
	4.Work in class	i. pair work
		ii. group work
		iii. working individually
		iv. cooperation between teacher-class
B) Teacher'sRole	5. Communication in class	i. use of mother tongue (L1)
		ii. use of second language (L2)
		iii. nonverbal communication
	6. Providing Assistance	i. encouragement
		ii. instructions for the activities
		iii. scaffolding
		iv. organizing students' work according to their interests
		v. differentiated activities
		vi. creative activities
C) Student's Attitude	7. Students' Behavior	i. learning as a pleasurable experience
		ii. interest for inquiry learning activities
		iii. participation during teamwork
	8. Participation	i. participation in creative activities (handicrafts)
		ii. participation in experiential activities
D) Overall Evaluation	9. Problems Encountered	i. cooperation problems

	among students	
	ii. students' difficulty regarding receptive skills	
	iii. students' difficulty regarding productive skills	
10. Learning Outcome	i. use of target language for communication	
	ii. acquiring context-specific vocabulary	
	iii. socialskillsdevelopment	
	iv. inquiry skills development	
	v. self- and peer- assessment skills development	
	vi. use of information technologies during learning	
	vii. pleasurable learning	

b) Interviews

The researchers encouraged students to feel free to answer the following questions, upon the completion of the project:

1)   What did you like most about the project?

2)   What was that made you encounter difficulties during the project?

3)   What do you think could be done in a different way?

4)   Which were the benefits of the project in relation to FL learning?

The qualitative analysis of the interview data, conducted with the students revealed a generally positive attitude towards the CLIL project (see Table 3).

Table 3. Interviews' Record

Thematic strands	Categories	%
Students' preferences	making artworks	60
	Learning in a relaxed environment	90
	Integration of language & content	40
	Authentic tasks/activities (Role plays, Treasure Hunt)	70
	Interesting approach to subject matter	80
	Working in a team	60
Difficulties encountered during the project	Artwork creation	20
	Inquiry-based activities	20
	Specific vocabulary	40

Benefits from the project	Developing content knowledge	80
	Developing FL skills	60
	Wider perspective on the FL	60
	Active engagement in tasks/activies	90
Suggestions	No changes	60
	More artworks	20
	More audiovisual aids	30
	Material	

Regarding the first question, most students (90%) stated that working on a CLIL project meant learning in a relaxed environment, where they had the opportunity to participate in various activities, most of which were game based. They mentioned that *"Learning English was fun. We made mosaics and other artwork"* and *"I liked it.. I wasn't used to learning English in that way."* More than half of the participants (60%) said that they liked doing artworks. They especially indulged in creating an authentic mosaic. Learning about the Byzantine Era was also mentioned by many students: *"I liked learning about the history of my city, Kastoria, during the Byzantine period. I used English to talk about History"*. Most of the students declared that they a) particularly liked roles plays and/ or the treasure hunt activity, b) really liked working in teams: *"I liked the fact that I worked in a team with my friends. They helped me to write texts"*.

As far as the second question is concerned, most students (40%) found dealing with unknown vocabulary difficult. They said that *"Online texts were difficult. I had difficulty in understanding some words"* and *"Texts were long, containing a lot of information and unknown words"*. It is also worth mentioning that taking part in inquiry-based activities and making artwork were difficult for some learners (20%), although they found these tasks interesting.

Regarding the benefits of the project, as they were perceived by the participants, the great majority of the students (90%) mentioned their active engagement in tasks as well as the opportunity they had to develop content knowledge (80%). In more detail, they considered the lesson to be *"different from what I was used to"* in the sense that they were given opportunities to do a variety of activities; *"I could not imagine that I can play and learn English and learn about History in English"* and *"I took part in activities and games. My friends helped me, we learned together"*. Moreover, students stated that they considered learning English to be "fun". Most of the participants declared that they liked the project the way it was done, while some of them (30%) also added that they would like to have access to more audiovisual material or to make more artworks; *"I would like to view more PowerPoint presentations"* and "*I would like to have more opportunities to watch videos and read texts online"*.

5. Discussion

In this paper, the pilot CLIL project was implemented in an EFL primary school classroom with the purpose to enhance students' knowledge about aspects of Byzantine art and culture as well to develop foreign language skills. In such a context, young learners practiced language and content in a natural way, dealing with multi-modal literacies (Short et al., 1996).They were also given stimuli and opportunities for creativity and participation in a game-based context, where they realized that learning a foreign language can be more than a boring process (see Korosidou & Griva, 2013).

The findings indicated the positive impact of CLIL instruction on EFL learners' performance and mastery of certain aspects of the target subject - matter. In other words, the students exposed to the CLIL intervention benefited from being provided with rich, meaningful input, efficient in developing both their linguistic skills and content knowledge. Multi modal material proved to be essential in the CLIL class as it enhanced interest and participation (e.g. students produce posters, brochures, videos) and took into consideration multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999; Amstrong, 1994).

It was recorded that students mainly used the target language for communication purposes, during their within group interactions and the presentations of their work in class. The results of the study revealed a significant language skills improvement, mainly on oral communicative skills. Students were able to use a high number of specific vocabulary at the end of the project and performed significantly better in their verbal communication and interaction. The results of the present CLIL implementation seem to confirm previous studies, where benefits in fluency, vocabulary range and overall English competence were revealed (Victori et al., 2010; Valbona, 2009). They are also in vein with Admiraal's findings (2006) that indicated the positive impact of CLIL projects on students' oral performance in EFL, as well as Mewald's (2007) and Várkuti's (2010) studies that revealed the positive impact of CLIL on students' lexicon.

Moreover, the findings of the present pilot study are in line with previous studies confirming that content-based projects foster students' positive attitudes towards second/foreign language learning (Kemp, 2003; Lasagabaster & Sierra 2009), since they seem to motivate students to learn the target language in real-life settings (Naves, 2009). As Met emphasized (1999: 48) "content serves as a powerful mechanism for promoting communication in the newlanguage". Activities (e.g. to take part in debates, role plays and problem solving situations) were the core of the present project, where students were participated actively, using the target language as a means to an end. As it was also previously mentioned, activity - based learning favors learners' communicative ability (Gower, Phillips & Walters, 1995; Griva & Semoglou, 2013). Creative and experimental activities also made the learning process more pleasurable, offering opportunities for cooperation. In addition, interaction was the key factor to social skills development (Cameron, 2001; Bloor, 1991).

Through the analysis of journal entries and interviews records, it was revealed that teaching with multimodal material, as well as using information technologies in class motivated learners and enhanced their positive attitude towards the target language. Previous studies have indicated that using

a variety of activities and focusing on different topics can foster different learning styles and allow for differentiated learning (Enright & McCloskey, 1988), which was also recorded in the CLIL project.

It is worth mentioning that students encountered some difficulties related to comprehending content-based texts because of the specific vocabulary. However, being reinforced and encouraged from the part of the teacher as well as being guided to employ a number of helpful strategies, students managed to a certain extent to participate in the learning process in a supportive environment.

In effect, the findings provided support for the efficacy of CLIL and suggest that such a project could be extensively introduced in the context of primary education. Nevertheless, given the limited number of the target population and the restricted context of conducting this study, the results of CLIL project implementation cannot be regarded conclusive. For this purpose, further research in primary education, overcoming the limitations observed, is needed to confirm the results obtained.

References

Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G., & de Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 12*(1), 75-93.

Armstrong, T. (1994). *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Brewster, J. (1999). Teaching English through Content: supporting good practice. In C. Kennedy (Ed.), *Innovation and Best Practice* (pp. 83-95)*.* London: Longman

Bloor, M. (1991).The Role of Informal Interaction in Teaching English to Young Learners. In C. Brumfit, J. Moore, & R. Tongue (Eds.), *Teaching English to Children*. Harper Collins Publishers.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: University Press.

Coyle, D. (2007). *The CLIL Quality Challenge* (pp. 47-60).

Coyle, D. (2006): Content and Language Integrated Learning – Motivating Learners and Teachers. *The Scottish Language Review 13*, 1-18. Retrieved from http://www.strath.ac.uk/scilt/slr/iss/2006/13

Curtain, H. A. (1990). ERIC Digest: *Foreign Language Learning: An Early Start.* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resources/archive/digest/1990early.html

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning(CLIL) Classrooms*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Enright, D., & McCloskey, M. (1988). *Integrating English: Developing English Language and Literacy in the Multilingual Classroom*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Esrock, E. J. (1994). *The Reader's Eye: Visual Imaging as Reader Response.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eurydice Report. (2006, Aug). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at school in Europe.* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eurydice.org/index.shtml.

Farrell, T. (2008, October). *Reflective practice in the professional development of teachers of adult English language learners*. CAELA Network Brief, CAL, Washington, DC.

253

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century.* New York: Basic Books.

Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (1995). *Teaching Practice Handbook.* Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Griva, E., & Semoglou, K. (2013). *Foreign Language Learning through Games: Implementing Creative Physical Activities at Early Years* (In Greek). Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Editions.

Gudjons, H. (2007). *Frontalunterricht – neu entdeckt: Integration in offene Unterrichts formen.* Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkardt.

Hadfield, J. (1999). *Intermediate Vocabulary Games.* Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Kelner, L. B. (1993). *The Creative Classroom: A Guide for Using Creative Drama in the Classroom, PreK-6.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kemp, K. S. (2003). *Simulation and Communicative Language Teaching in the Spanish Classroom* (Master's Project). University of Toledo.

Korosidou, E., & Griva, E. (2013). "My Country in Europe": A Content-based Project for Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Young Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* Academy Publisher, Finland.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language Attitudes in CLIL and Traditional EFL Classes. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(2), 4-17.

Lasagabaster, D. (2008): Foreign Language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Lingustics Journal, 1*, 31-42.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Foreign Language Research. Methodology and Design.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marsh, D., & Langé, G. (Eds.) (1999). Implementing content and language integrated learning. *A Research-Driven TIE-CLIL Foundation Course Reader.* Jyväskyla: University of Jyväskyla.

Marsh, D. (2002). Content and Language Integrated Learning: *The European Dimension Action, Trend and Foresight Potential.* Retrieved from http://europa.eu.int/comm/education /languages/index.html

McNamara, M. J., & Deane, D. (1995). Self-Assessment Activities: Toward Language Autonomy in Language Learning. *TESOL journal*, *5*(1), 17-21.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education.* Macmillan: Oxford.

Met, M. (1999). Curriculum Decision-making in Content-based Language Teaching. In J. Cenoz, & F. Genesse (Eds.), *Beyond Bilingualism. Multilingualism and Multilingual Education.* Clevelond: Multililngual Matters.

Mewald, C. (2007). A comparison of oral language performance of learners in CLIL and in Mainstream Classes at Lower Secondary Level in Lower Austria. In C. Dalton-Puffer, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Empirical Perspectives on CLIL Classroom Discourse.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

254

Meyer, O. (2010): *Towards Quality CLIL: successful planning and teaching strategies*. In Pulso: Revista de Educación (Bd. 33 (2010). - S. 11-29.ISSN 1577-0338.

Meyer, O. (2010). Towards quality CLIL: successful planning and teaching strategies. *Pulso: revista de educación (Madrid, Alcalá de Henares),* 33, 11-29.

Mokhtar, I. A., Majid, S., & Foo, S. (2008). Teaching information literacy through learning styles The application of Gardner's multiple intelligences. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 40*(2), 93-109.

Moon, J. (2000). *Children learning English*. N.Y: Macmillan.

Naves, T. (2009). Effective Content and Language Integrated Programmes (CLIL). In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, & R. M. Jimenez Catalan (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 22-40). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Orlick, T. (2006). *Cooperative Games and Sports: Joyful Activities for Everyone*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Scott, W., & Ytreberg, L. H. (1994). *Teaching English to Children*. London: Longman.

Short, K. G., Harste, J. C., & Burke, C. L. (1996). *Creating Classrooms for Authors and Inquirers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50*, 158-164.

Tuan, L. T., & Doan, N. T. M. (2010). Teaching English Grammar Through Games. *Studies in Literature & Language, 1*(7), 61-75.

Vallbona, A. (2009). Implementing CLIL Methodology in Primary Education. *A Case Study*. MA thesis, Bellaterra: UAB.

Várkuti, A. (2010). Linguistic Benefits of the CLIL Approach: Measuring Linguistic Competences. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(3), 67-79.

Victori, M., Vallbona, A., & Bret, A. (2010). *Implementing CLIL in a Primary School, Results and Influential Factors*. Paper presented at the CLIL 2010 Conference, Eichstätt.

Viebrock, B. (2006). SubjektivedidaktischeTheorienzumbilingualenErdkundeunterricht: ErgebnisseeinerempirischenStudie. In H. Angela, & K. Friederike (Eds.), *SprachenschaffenChancen. Dokumentationzum 21.Kongress fórFremdsprachendidaktik der DGFF* (pp. 163-173). Mónchen: Oldenbourg.

Vollmer, H. J. (2008). *Constructing tasks for content and language integrated learning and assessment* (pp. 227-290).

Zydatiss, W. (2007). *Deutsch-Englische Zóge in Berlin (DEZIBEL). Eine Evaluation des bilingualenSachfachuterrichtsanGymnasien. Kontext, Kompetenzen, Konsequenzen*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Appendix

Appendix 1.Pictures 1 & 2, Students creating a map of the Byzantine Empire with plasticine.

Appendix 2.Picture 3&4.Students working on the creation of an authentic mosaic.

Appendix 3.Pictures 5 & 6, Students playing the 'Treasure Hunt' game.