



**UNIVERSITY
OF TURKU**

Teachers' and Primary School Pupils' Views on Content and Language Integrated Learning: The Model of Helsinki

Marika Holmberg

Minor Thesis

Department of English

School of Languages and Translation Studies

Faculty of Humanities

University of Turku

September 2023

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin Originality Check service.

Minor Thesis

Department of English

Marika Holmberg

**Teachers' and Primary School Pupils' Views on Content and Language Integrated Learning:
The Model of Helsinki**

Number of pages: 42 pages, 13 appendix pages

Abstract

This study focuses on the perceived benefits and disadvantages of content and language integrated learning by teachers and pupils at a primary school in Helsinki, Finland. Another aim was to find out how aware the teachers and pupils are of the CLIL program at their school.

While CLIL has been extensively researched, most of the studies have focused on the learners' academic achievements or the affective evidence from older learners. Primary school aged children have been studied less. In addition, with CLIL being a flexible and versatile term, the studies are rarely generalizable and thus CLIL should be actively researched in its different forms and contexts.

The data in this study were collected through semi-structured interviews and short questionnaires for the pupils. Five teachers and 13 fifth and sixth-graders were interviewed. The data were analyzed using a qualitative content analysis.

The findings suggest most of the teachers and pupils view the CLIL program of their school, language enriching, positively. The benefits found in the study included enjoyment for both pupils and teachers, perceived improvement of the pupils' linguistic skills, increased motivation towards the content subject and encouragement towards using the language. The disadvantages included CLIL sometimes impacting the content learning negatively and lack of time and systematic implementation, which sometimes led to negative feelings. The teachers were aware of the basic principles of CLIL, but not of all of its pedagogical intentions. Some of the pupils were familiar with the concept of CLIL while others were not, which may be because of the perceived scarceness of CLIL lessons mentioned by both pupils and teachers.

While many of the findings are in line with previous studies, the results of this study are not generalizable. Future research ideas might be investigating the differences in the experiences of CLIL class teachers who have a background of teaching English and those who do not, finding out more about the benefits and disadvantages of CLIL in this particular context by including for example learning results in multiple schools, and comparing this program to other CLIL programs to develop it further.

Key words: Content and language integrated learning, CLIL, language enriching

Table of contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Theoretical background	7
2.1	CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning	7
2.2	Teacher Perspectives on CLIL	9
2.3	Learner Perspectives on CLIL	11
2.4	The Model of Helsinki: Language Enriched Teaching and Learning	14
3	Methodology	16
3.1	Research Questions and Hypotheses	16
3.2	Participants and Data Collection	17
3.2.1	Data Collection	17
3.2.2	Background Information	19
4	Analysis and Discussion	20
4.1	Teacher Perspective	20
4.1.1	Language and Content Knowledge and General School Life	20
4.1.2	Affective Factors: The Pupils' Perceived Feelings, Motivation and Attitudes	22
4.1.3	Job Satisfaction	24
4.1.4	Awareness of CLIL	29
4.2	Pupil Perspective	31
4.2.1	Awareness of CLIL	32
4.2.2	Language and Content Knowledge	35
4.2.3	Affective Factors	38
5	Conclusion	41
	References	44
	Appendices	47
	Appendix 1 Interview Questions and the Questionnaire	47
	Appendix 2 Privacy Notice and Consent Forms	49
	Appendix 3 Finnish Summary	52

1 Introduction

Content and language integrated learning, or CLIL, was first introduced in Europe in the 1990s, when there was a growing need for connecting through languages (Coyle 2007). CLIL was seen as a response to this need. As an umbrella term, the details of CLIL can vary considerably depending on the socio-political circumstances of the country, region or school where a CLIL program is implemented – the versatility of CLIL is one of its benefits, as each program is custom-made (Coyle 2007; Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013). The basic principle of CLIL is content being taught through a foreign language, with focus being on both content and language (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010).

Coyle's (2007) 4Cs Framework is one of the central theories behind CLIL. The 4Cs of the framework are content, communication, cognition and culture. The fifth, invisible C that binds all of the other Cs together is context, referring to the contextual variables of each region that guide the implementation of a CLIL program.

CLIL has been researched from different perspectives in Europe and around the world, also in Finland. Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) have developed a portfolio for evaluating CLIL from different perspectives to make researchers' job easier and more cohesive. They suggest there are four measures of success through which a CLIL program can be evaluated: performance evidence, affective evidence, process evidence and material evidence. Most of the studies made have focused on performance evidence, meaning possible benefits to pupils' or students' achievement in content or language subjects (Seikkula-Leino 2007; Lasagabaster 2011; Bulon and Meunier 2020; Lahuerta 2020; Olsson 2021; Beaudin 2022). Process and material evidence have been studied the least, while affective evidence, both from the learners' and teachers' perspective, has recently been focused on more (Lasagabaster 2011; Pappa et al. 2017; Klewitz 2021; Beaudin 2022; San Isidro and Lasagabaster 2022).

This study aims to find out the perceived benefits and disadvantages of CLIL by pupils and teachers in a primary school context in Helsinki, Finland. While perceived benefits and disadvantages of CLIL have been researched before, most of the studies have been made in secondary schools where the vehicular language has been used 25 – 70 % of the time in a certain subject or topic. In Helsinki, the percentage is 10 – 25 %. Another aim of this study is to find out how aware the pupils and teachers are of the CLIL program at their school, called language enriching. The research questions are as follows:

1. a. What benefits and disadvantages do the fifth and sixth-graders and the teachers believe language enriched teaching and learning has?
b. How do their views differ from each other?
2. How aware are the pupils and teachers of what language enriched teaching and learning is?

The participants of this qualitative study are five teachers, three of whom are class teachers and two language teachers, and 13 pupils, seven of whom were in the sixth grade and six in the fifth grade at the time of the data collection. The data were collected through semi-structured interviews and, in the pupils' case, short questionnaires. The data were analyzed using a qualitative content analysis (Dörnyei 2007).

Previous research suggests the perceived benefits of CLIL include learners' enjoyment of CLIL (Hunt 2011; Pappa et al. 2017; Beaudin 2022), their increased motivation towards the content subject (Seikkula-Leino 2007; Lasagabaster 2011; San Isidro and Lasagabaster 2022), perceived improvement in language skills (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Beaudin 2022) and content skills (Lazarevic 2022; Karabassova 2022) and increased autonomy and contentment for the teachers (Pappa et al. 2017; Lazarevic 2022).

Disadvantages seen by teachers and learners include CLIL sometimes being too difficult (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022), lack of time and co-operation (Breibach and Medina-Suárez 2016; Pappa et al. 2017; Minardi 2021; Lazarevic 2022; Fielden Burns and Martínez Agudo 2023), the teachers being unsure of their linguistic competence and unaware of the best ways to implement CLIL (Pappa et al. 2017; Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón 2019) and unawareness of CLIL's pedagogical intentions (Karabassova 2022). This usually has to do with lack of training (Breibach and Medina-Suárez 2016; Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018). The last few disadvantages mentioned also have to do with teachers' awareness of CLIL: Basic principles of CLIL are understood, but deeper understanding is lacking (Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018; Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón 2019; Karabassova 2022). The learners' awareness of CLIL has not been researched in the studies I was able to find.

Previous findings regarding CLIL in general and its perceived benefits and disadvantages from the learner and teacher perspectives are introduced more closely in chapter 2. I will also introduce the CLIL program of the City of Helsinki more closely. After the theoretical background, I will move on to the methodological part in chapter 3. Finally, the analysis and discussion can be found in chapter 4 and the final thoughts and suggestions in the conclusion in chapter 5. The chapters are followed by a list of references and the appendices, which include the interview questions and the Finnish summary.

2 Theoretical background

In this section, I will first focus on the concept of content and language integrated learning. I will then move on to introducing some previous research related to my thesis topic, teacher and student perspectives on the benefits and disadvantages of CLIL and their awareness of it. Finally, I will introduce the CLIL program of Helsinki.

2.1 CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning

Teaching through another language has existed for centuries. In Europe, the European Commission and the Council of Europe started promoting teaching content subjects through a foreign language in the 1990s, as there was a growing need for mutual understanding and connecting, and learning more European languages was seen as crucial to this need (Coyle 2007). Different countries and regions had different needs and socio-political circumstances, which led to varying bilingual education models being developed. Around the same time, in the mid-1990s, the term CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) was adopted by the European Network of Administrators, Researchers and Practitioners (Coyle 2007).

CLIL is a flexible term that may refer to any educational model where content is taught through a foreign language. The details, possibilities and limitations of CLIL vary according to situational and contextual variables (Coyle 2007; Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013). It is often described as a “dual-focused educational approach”, with the focus being on both content and language (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010, 1). CLIL can be included in primary and secondary school, but also in kindergarten, vocational or adult education (Coyle 2007). However, CLIL programs usually start after the learners can read in their mother tongue (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013).

In CLIL, both language and content teaching and learning are seen as equally important, but in different models, the emphasis can be either on language skills or content learning (Coyle 2007). Typically, CLIL teachers are content teachers (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013) and the emphasis is on content with language being simply the medium of teaching (Marongiu 2019). However, every CLIL model is different and there is a lot of variation. The vehicular language in CLIL can be any foreign language, but currently CLIL programs are very much English-dominated (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013). The term “vehicular language” means the language(s) used in content and language integrated learning programs (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010).

Coyle (2007) has developed the 4Cs Framework to conceptualize CLIL. The Cs represent communication, cognition, content and culture. Communication refers to teachers and learners using the Language Triptych: language of learning, language for learning and language through learning. The language of learning encompasses the language needed for learning the content: different concepts that are essential for the topic in question. This may include grammatical concepts as well,

but only those that are needed for accessing and learning the content. Language for learning, according to Coyle (2007), includes the language needed for general learning skills: debating, asking questions, arguing, working in groups or pairs. Language through learning is the language that is learnt from the new content when the learners put into words what they have learnt.

Coyle (2007) emphasizes that the learners need to be actively cognitively engaged in order to be able to produce new language, bringing us to the second C of his framework: cognition. Analyzing the linguistic elements also brings the learner closer to understanding the content, the third C, referring to the subject matter being taught through the vehicular language. The final C of Coyle's 4Cs Framework, culture, underlines the importance of intercultural understanding and global citizenship. As language and culture are inseparable, teaching intercultural awareness is crucial to CLIL (Coyle 2007). Finally, the 4Cs are all connected to contextual variables that affect the way CLIL can be implemented.

Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) have created a portfolio of evaluation measures to help researchers study and evaluate CLIL in different conditions. The first measure of success is the learners' performance evidence. This can mean testing, portfolios of work or informal assessment. This area of CLIL has been quite widely researched, especially concerning linguistic performance. Here are a few examples of the research related to learners' performance: writing accuracy (Lahuerta 2020), the development of academic vocabulary (Olsson 2021), achievement in writing, reading, listening and speaking skills (Lasagabaster 2011), content vocabulary and language forms (Beaudin 2022), and phrasicon (Bulon and Meunier 2020). Most of the results in these studies are encouraging and point to CLIL improving the learners' performance (Lahuerta 2020; Olsson 2021; Lasagabaster 2011; Beaudin 2022), but there are also contradictory results (Seikkula-Leino 2007; Bulon and Meunier 2020). However, as Olsson (2021) points out, there are many contextual variables that may affect the learners' performance. For example, in many CLIL programs, learners or their parents have applied for the program, meaning they may have different backgrounds compared to the mainstream groups. While CLIL is non-elitist in nature, the CLIL programs may attract families that have a higher interest in bilingual education and perhaps learners who are more academically gifted (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013). This may put CLIL learners in a privileged position compared to mainstream learners and show in their performance. Of course, in some schools CLIL is not a separate program and is offered to all pupils or students.

The second measure is affective evidence from both teachers and learners, and in some cases, the learners' families (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010). CLIL is believed to improve the learners' motivation (Lasagabaster 2011) and bring real purpose to learning (Klewitz 2021). I will take a closer look at studies related to affective factors from the learners' and teachers' points of view in sections 2.2 and 2.3, as this is the area my own research is the closest to.

The third measure is process evidence concerning the learning process. This can only be studied with the help of verbal reports from learners, either individually or in groups. Lastly, Coyle,

Hood and Marsh list out task and material evidence, meaning the analysis of different tasks and material used in CLIL. For example Marongiu (2019) has analyzed CLIL materials available in the Italian book publishers' market. The last two measures of evaluation have been researched less (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010).

According to Sylvén (2013), there are factors that predict the success of CLIL. In order to succeed, there should be some official policy documents to define what CLIL entails in a certain country, and it should be researched in those particular conditions. She points out that none of the four countries she studied (Germany, Spain, Sweden and Finland) have made a detailed description of what CLIL is, but there are some guidelines to be found. Another factor, according to Sylvén (2013), is teacher training. In order for CLIL to succeed, teachers need to be proficient in the vehicular language and be able to combine language and content in their teaching in a sensible way.

CLIL is an umbrella term and the details of its implementation vary greatly depending on the context, even within the same country (Olsson 2021). This is why CLIL studies are rarely generalizable (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013). The type of the school, extramural exposure to the vehicular language, educational level, teacher preparation and socioeconomic status are all factors that need to be taken into consideration when evaluating the true effectiveness of CLIL (Pérez Cañado 2018). Lasagabaster (2011) also points out that the results of his study are not generalizable, as there are so many factors that influence the effectiveness of CLIL, including the personality of the teacher, characteristics of the learners, administrative support and the type of the group.

As Coyle (2007) argues, there are definite strengths to CLIL being such a flexible, diverse term, but also weaknesses. While it is a good thing that each country and school may take into account its own socio-political variables and create a "custom-made" model of CLIL, the weaknesses have to do with lack of cohesion and systematic CLIL. The development of systematic and pedagogically strategic CLIL demands a high level of co-operation in schools between teachers as well as both nationally and internationally (Coyle 2007).

2.2 Teacher Perspectives on CLIL

CLIL has been researched quite extensively since the 1990s. As said, there have been studies on learners' proficiency from varying perspectives, on different CLIL models, teachers' perspectives and recently also on learners' perspectives. CLIL has been studied around Europe, also in Finland. All CLIL programs are different, and in the studies about teacher perspectives, the way CLIL has been implemented in that particular context obviously affects the results. There is also the question of whether the teacher is a content teacher or a language teacher. Ideally, content and language teachers work together to reach the best possible outcome (Coyle 2007), and as mentioned, typically CLIL teachers are content teachers (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013). However, different schools and models

have different practices. Next, I will take a look at some of the studies around the world about teachers' experiences about teaching CLIL as well as the perceived benefits and downsides.

Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón (2019) found that primary school EFL teachers in Colombia felt they had the basic knowledge of what CLIL entails, but lacked the means to implement it as well as they wished. Dvorjaninova and Alas (2018) had similar results in Estonia: especially primary school content teachers felt they did not even fully know what CLIL means and would like to have more knowledge and to be trained more. Language teachers felt they had better knowledge. In Finland, CLIL teachers were confused and unsure of whether or not they were doing everything right in their teaching (Pappa et al. 2017), and German and Spanish primary school CLIL teachers wished for more specific training (Breidbach and Medina-Suárez 2016). In Kazakhstan, even though the teachers had participated in CLIL training, they were unsure of its pedagogical intentions (Karabassova 2022). In light of these studies, it would seem that many teachers feel CLIL is something they need training and guidance for before being able to apply it confidently in their teaching.

Another factor affecting the teachers' confidence in teaching through another language is their linguistic competence. Teachers felt they sometimes had difficulties with the target lexicon (Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón 2019) or were otherwise unsure of their language skills (Pappa et al. 2017). There were also teachers who were confident in both their linguistic and pedagogical knowledge (Fielden Burns and Martínez Agudo 2023). On the other hand, some felt the language teachers did not possess enough content knowledge to teach a subject or a topic (Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018). It was made clear by CLIL teachers in Serbia that their main concern in teaching was content, not language (Lazarevic 2022). The same was true for teachers in Kazakhstan: for them, content goals were the clear priority (Karabassova 2022). This is in line with the earlier statement about the emphasis being on content in most CLIL programs (Marongiu 2019).

The lack of collegial support and co-operation was brought up in many different studies (Breidbach and Medina-Suárez 2016; Pappa et al. 2017; Minardi 2021; Lazarevic 2022; Fielden Burns and Martínez Agudo 2023). Many teachers felt this was because there was not enough time for planning together (Pappa et al. 2017). Lack of time also prevented some teachers from having CLIL lessons as often as they wished: they felt CLIL lessons took up more time (Minardi 2021) and that some of the contents required by the curriculum were too complicated to teach through another language (Lazarevic 2022).

In some schools, teachers wished there were more materials for CLIL and more administrative support (Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018; Fielden Burns and Martínez Agudo 2023). However, autonomy was also seen as a benefit in CLIL: some teachers felt they were confident in their work and were able to be the teachers they wanted to be because of the versatility offered by CLIL (Pappa et al. 2017). Being professionally challenged by CLIL also proved satisfactory for some teachers (Lazarevic 2022).

In Finland, teachers were quite hopeful for the future and felt it was normal to experience some difficulties (Pappa et al. 2017).

Interestingly, while teachers in Estonia were somewhat keen to know more about CLIL and believed it would improve the learners' language skills as well as some content knowledge, many of the teachers were quite reluctant to teach CLIL. The study was made before the implementation of CLIL at the school. Around half of the language teachers wished to teach a subject in English, while the percentage was notably lower for content teachers. The reasons for the reluctance were the ones mentioned above: concerns about the lack of time, training and knowledge. (Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018) The possible reluctance of a teacher can, of course, affect the teaching and learning process quite a lot.

Some teachers worried for low achievers (Pladevall-Ballester 2015) and felt some of the learners had trouble understanding the more academic language (Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón 2019; Minardi 2021). In Minardi's study in Italy, the teachers suggested CLIL might work better if it focused on more informal language instead of academic language. However, others felt that the use of the vehicular language did not affect learning negatively (Lazarevic 2022) and that most learners understood the language well (Pladevall-Ballester 2015). Interestingly, Alcaraz-Mármol (2018) found that the teachers who were trained for CLIL felt it was efficient for both language and content learning, while non-trained teachers believed content learning might not be as efficient through another language. Both groups of teachers felt, however, that CLIL may be challenging for some learners.

Despite the challenges, most of the teachers in different schools felt CLIL had definite benefits for learners. They believed learners liked CLIL and performed well (Pappa et al. 2017), and improved both their language and content knowledge (Karabassova 2022; Dvojarninova and Alas 2018; Lazarevic 2022). Teachers also felt CLIL had real purpose and prepared the learners for further studies (Lazarevic 2022). It was seen as an innovative method that required open-minded teachers (Breidbach and Medina-Suárez 2016).

2.3 Learner Perspectives on CLIL

As with the studies on teacher perspective, the contextual variables in studies about pupil or student perspective are different in every study. Most of the studies concerning learners' perspectives have been done in schools where CLIL has been implemented 25-70 % of the time, either in all subjects or a chosen subject or topic (Seikkula-Leino 2007; Roiha 2019; Zaroni 2021; Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022). In addition, most of the learner participants have been on secondary level. Primary school pupils have been studied, but considerably less (Seikkula-Leino 2007; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022).

Overall, in these earlier studies about the benefits of CLIL from the learners' perspectives, the results have been mainly positive. Learners have found CLIL enjoyable (Beaudin 2022), believed it to be useful for their future higher education or employment (Zanoni 2021), they have been more motivated towards the subject (Lasagabaster 2011; San Isidro and Lasagabaster 2022), their confidence has developed (Coyle 2013; Roiha 2019), they believe their English proficiency has improved (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Beaudin 2022) and learning English through CLIL has been seen as useful and relevant (Hunt 2011; Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015). There have also been some less positive results, where the CLIL learners' motivation has not been higher (Hunt 2011) or some learners have found CLIL too difficult (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022).

Next, I will take a closer look at some of the studies about the learner perspective. Lasagabaster (2011) studied secondary school students in a bilingual community in Basque Country, meaning that English as the vehicular language was L3 for the participants in this study. Through questionnaires, he found there to be a strong link between motivation and CLIL: CLIL students recognized the importance of learning English and were more motivated to learn if compared to the EFL group. San Isidro and Lasagabaster (2022) did another study in a Spanish, bilingual community where they studied the learners' motivation in a 2-year longitudinal study. CLIL learners (and their parents) were more positive and motivated than the other group. However, San Isidro and Lasagabaster point out that motivation and attitudes improved for everyone during the two years and that the CLIL group's parents had higher socio-educational background, which may have affected the results.

Interestingly, in Seikkula-Leino's (2007) study in Finland, primary school pupils in the CLIL program were slightly more motivated than the regular group, but showed more self-criticism in their self-evaluation. In their CLIL program, 40–70 % of the teaching was in English.

Another study about learners' attitudes and motivation was made in Taiwan: Beaudin (2022) found that primary school pupils liked CLIL very much, enjoyed learning new vocabulary and were motivated to continue with CLIL. In addition, they felt their English proficiency had improved. In Beaudin's study, the pupils participated in CLIL for the first time when an 11-week CLIL program about insects was implemented in their school. They also reported enjoying the content very much.

According to Coyle (2013), CLIL was also seen as a positive thing by secondary school students in England and Scotland. They found CLIL to be useful, fun and confidence boosting. Some, however, found it to be too difficult. There were 11 schools in Coyle's study, and the vehicular language was either French, Spanish or German.

In Barrios and Acosta-Manzano's (2022) study about primary school pupils in Spain, they had similar results about learner perspectives: most viewed CLIL as positive, but some had experienced difficulties.

In Belgium, primary and secondary school CLIL learners were slightly more motivated compared to mainstream learners (De Smet et al. 2023). In their study, some of the learners had English as their vehicular or foreign language, and others had Dutch. Regardless of their program – CLIL or mainstream – attitudes towards English were more positive than towards Dutch: English was seen as more attractive and as having a higher task value. The results underline the fact that the status of the vehicular language outside the school context also matters.

In her study about the perspectives of last year high school students in four schools in Italy, Zanoni (2021) also found that most of the CLIL students were positive towards CLIL and believed it to be useful for their future education and employment. However, CLIL did not increase interest towards the content subject. In one of the schools studied, students felt that CLIL lessons were over simplified and their teacher was not competent enough in English.

Primary school pupils in Catalonia also felt CLIL was useful for them in Pladevall-Ballester's (2015) study: they felt CLIL had a real purpose and liked English. They, as well as their parents, believed their English proficiency had improved, but some found CLIL lessons too difficult. Pladevall-Ballester's study was longitudinal and included the implementation of CLIL at the beginning of the 2-year study.

In Hunt's (2011) study about secondary school students in England, the students felt CLIL was fun, different, exciting and interactive. They felt they had to concentrate more and they understood the learning objectives. However, in Hunt's study, the students only participated in individual CLIL lessons taught by trainee teachers. This may have had an effect on the students' experiences.

Roiha (2019) studied former CLIL learners' perspectives in Finland. They had studied in the CLIL program for nine years and were adults at the time of the interviews. Approximately 25 % of their teaching and learning was in English, and Roiha himself was one of the former students. He found that most of them had positive memories about CLIL, especially from primary school, and that it had benefited their vocabulary and speaking skills. Many wished CLIL had been more systematic in secondary school. Again, some learners had found it difficult, but still viewed it as a positive thing. Some felt it had also affected their content learning positively and had a positive effect on their English language self-concept.

According to Dalton-Puffer and Smit, the beliefs of learners, teachers and parents should be studied in different institutions as “social changes are intricately linked to how they are constructed by those concerned” (2013, 549) and are not something that can be seen from the outside. They point out that as CLIL programs are diverse in nature, the contextual variables need to be taken into account.

2.4 The Model of Helsinki: Language Enriched Teaching and Learning

The City of Helsinki has prepared a handbook for what they call language enriched or English-enriched teaching and learning (Kohl et al. 2019). The term is quite fitting – according to Dalton-Puffer and Smit, CLIL “can be seen as a foreign language enrichment measure” (2013, 2). According to the handbook, English-enriched teaching and learning in Helsinki aims to improve the learners’ language skills in both Finnish and English, develop their academic achievement in content subjects, deepen their cultural and inter-cultural understanding and appreciation, and build learners’ confidence in using English.

English-enriched teaching and learning began in Helsinki in 2016-2017, which is when the process of writing the handbook started (Kohl et al. 2019). At the moment, there are 11 schools in Helsinki that offer English-enriched teaching, where 10–25 % of the teaching is in English (City of Helsinki, 2023). The handbook was created by class teachers, language teachers and bilingual specialists (Kohl et al. 2019). It states that English-enriched teaching and learning should be done by class teachers, language teachers and possibly subject teachers together, but class teachers are ultimately responsible for “building an English-enriched learning environment in their class and co-operating with subject and language teachers” (2019, 5).

The handbook includes an annual clock for teachers of English-enriched teaching and learning, some key vocabulary for each topic and ready-made speaking and writing frames. It is made for primary school teachers (grades 1–6) and there are also separate handbooks for teachers of grades 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 5 and 6. These handbooks are slightly more detailed compared to the original one. The categories for each grade are “This is me”, “Me as a scientist” and “Me as an artist”. The categories include topics from natural sciences, mathematics, arts, crafts, music and social sciences for older learners. For every topic, the handbook lists both content and language outcomes. The emphasis is clearly on natural sciences and math.

The content outcomes are from the Finnish National Curriculum. In addition, the content outcomes include the development of lower and higher thinking skills that are, according to the handbook, based on Bloom’s taxonomy. Language outcomes are related to the development of language for learning, language of learning and language through learning, terminology familiar from Coyle’s (2007) 4Cs Framework for CLIL.

The handbook was created to standardize English-enriched teaching and learning in Helsinki and help teachers in their planning process by offering tools, examples, ideas and guidance for what contents to teach through English (Kohl et al. 2019). It includes planning advice and a checklist for good pedagogical practices at the end of each period of the annual clock and is also supposed to increase co-operation across the curriculum.

The handbook was published in 2019 and the teachers in Helsinki had access to draft versions some time before that. However, the current sixth-graders have started primary school in 2017, well

before there was any standardization in English-enriched teaching and learning in Helsinki, and have been in the third grade in the autumn of 2019.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study is about fifth-graders and sixth-graders and five teachers' perceptions about the benefits and disadvantages of CLIL in a school in Helsinki, and the teachers' and pupils' awareness of CLIL. The CLIL model of Helsinki defines CLIL ("English-enriched teaching and learning") as 10–25 % of the content subjects being taught in English. In this particular school, the percentage is 13–15 %. This differs considerably from the CLIL models that use English 25–70 % of the time in a certain topic. It will be interesting to see whether the pupils and teachers in this school have experienced similar benefits or disadvantages to those who have studied or taught in schools where CLIL has a more dominant role. As the model of Helsinki differs from the most CLIL models studied, I believe it is beneficial to study the perceptions of the teachers and learners in these particular conditions.

My research questions are as follows:

1. a. What benefits and disadvantages do the fifth and sixth-graders and the teachers believe language enriched teaching and learning has?
 - b. How do their views differ from each other?
2. How aware are the pupils and teachers of what language enriched teaching and learning is?

Reflecting on earlier studies, my hypothesis is that the results of my study may be similar in some sense: the benefits experienced by the fifth and sixth-graders and their teachers will likely have a connection to the benefits found in earlier studies, such as enjoyment (Beaudin 2022), usefulness (Zanoni 2021; Lazarevic 2022) or perceived improvement of language skills (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Karabassova 2022). Likewise, the disadvantages may also be similar, such as experiencing difficulties (Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022), or, in the teachers' case, lack of sufficient training or collegial support (Breibach and Medina-Suárez 2016; Pappa et al. 2017)

However, as each CLIL model is different and in this model of English-enriched teaching and learning the vehicular language is used only for about 13–15 % of the time, the benefits and disadvantages are likely to be less obvious. I believe the teachers may have a more structured idea of the benefits and disadvantages of CLIL compared to the pupils.

As for the awareness of the CLIL program, my hypothesis is that the pupils will have a general idea about learning through another language, as they have been in on the program for almost five or six years, depending on their grade. The fifth and sixth-graders are not expected to demonstrate a deeper understanding of CLIL. In their case, it will be interesting to see whether all of them are even aware of a CLIL program taking place at their school. However, I cannot base my hypothesis on existing studies, as in none of the studies I found, the learners' awareness was researched.

The teachers, on the other hand, reported confusion and not fully understanding what CLIL is (Pappa et al. 2017; Dvojarninova and Alas 2018). I believe the teachers may again have a more structured idea of what language enriched teaching and learning entails compared to the pupils, but may also be more aware of not being fully knowledgeable about all aspects of CLIL.

3.2 Participants and Data Collection

The participants were 13 fifth and sixth-graders and five teachers who had taught CLIL for a minimum of three years. The data were collected by conducting semi-structured interviews. In addition, the pupils filled out short questionnaires. I will now cover the data collection process and then move on to introducing the participants more closely.

3.2.1 Data Collection

In semi-structured interviews the interview questions are prepared in advance, but their wording and order may change, and the interviewees are allowed to elaborate their answers and discuss the matters more freely compared to structured interviews (Dörnyei 2007). According to Dörnyei, semi-structured interviews are a good method when the interviewer already has an understanding of the topic and does not wish to limit the participants' answers. It is also important to start the interview by questions that invite the interviewees to reflect on their own experiences and share their thoughts (Galletta and Cross 2013). The teachers were interviewed individually, while some of the pupils were interviewed in pairs and others individually. The interview questions for both pupils and teachers can be found in the appendices.

Six of the pupils were fifth-graders at the time of the interviews and seven were sixth-graders. The pupils chose to participate in the study themselves. 11 of the pupils' interviews were done in Finnish and later transcribed and translated into English. Two interviews were conducted in English as per the pupils' wishes and then transcribed. One of the pupils spoke English as her first language and the other was a Finnish as a second language pupil who was not proficient in Finnish. They were able to elaborate more on their answers in English than they would have been in Finnish. The pupils were given pseudonyms – letters from A to M – to anonymize them.

The pupils also filled out short questionnaires where they were asked to choose the adjectives describing language enriched teaching and learning, choose the subjects in which they felt language enriched teaching and learning was included and fill out background information concerning their grade and mother tongue.

The teachers' interviews were conducted in Finnish and later transcribed and translated into English. The teachers were given pseudonyms LT1, LT2 (language teachers), and CT1, CT2 and CT3 (class teachers) to anonymize them. In addition, the teachers are referred to as "they" in this thesis instead of "she" or "he" to protect their identities. Both the pupils' and the teachers' interviews took

place in April 2023 at the school in question. One of the teacher interviews (LT1) was done on the phone.

The data were analyzed by using a qualitative content analysis. Conducting the interviews is already the first step in the analysis of qualitative data (Galletta and Cross 2013). In a qualitative content analysis, the resulting themes and categories derive from the data and are not predetermined (Dörnyei 2007). After conducting the interviews, the data were transcribed and then translated into English. As I was not studying linguistic elements, I did not include pauses, hesitations or other nonverbal aspects of the interview in my transcript. The transcripts are not included in this thesis, but copies of them are available by contacting me. I then started coding my data. As Dörnyei (2007) explains, I started the coding process by reading, re-reading and reflecting on my data, and eventually moving on to grouping and labelling the categories that emerged. I colour-coded highlights of the interviews that I felt belonged to the same categories and grouped them together. My findings are presented in chapter 4, Analysis and Discussion.

A special feature of this study is that I, as the researcher, work as a teacher at the school where the data were collected. Interviews where the interviewer has a previous relationship with the interviewees are called acquaintance interviews (Garton and Copland 2010). Of course, in this case, the nature of my relationship with the interviewees varied: some were colleagues who I have worked with together, and whom I knew personally on some level as well. Others were pupils. Some of them I have taught at some point during their school years, and some were only familiar faces.

In an acquaintance interview, both the interviewer and the interviewee must negotiate a new role compared to the one they are used to having with each other, which can be challenging (Garton and Copland 2010). However, previous identities are usually invoked during the interview, which can lead to data that would normally not be available without the shared experiences and background (Garton and Copland 2010). Thus, I hope our shared knowledge of school life made it easier for the pupils to be interviewed. I also hope the teachers, as my colleagues, felt they could talk about the topic more freely and unreservedly.

My working at the school also made it possible for me to reach out to the parents using Wilma, the website used by schools to communicate with the parents. I recognize that my own experience as a CLIL teacher at this particular school may impact my analysis, but will strive to focus only on the data and disregard my own presuppositions.

As the pupils who were interviewed were under 15 years old, permission was asked from their parents to participate in the study. The parents received a written consent form with information about the study and the researcher's contact information. The consent forms for parents of underage children were made with the help of Kajala et al. (2011). All of the pupils who participated in the study turned in signed consent forms from their parent(s) and gave their own consent orally. The teachers also signed written consent forms and received information about the study beforehand. It was made clear to the pupils, teachers and parents that participating in the study was voluntary and that the consent

could be withdrawn at any time. It was also made clear to them that their voice would be recorded, but other personal information would not be collected. The consent forms can be found in the appendices.

3.2.2 Background Information

I will now briefly introduce the pupils' linguistic backgrounds and the teachers' roles at the school. The pupils' mother tongues, their grade, subjects in which they felt CLIL was included and adjectives they used to describe language enriching either in the questionnaire or the interview can also be found in Table 1 in section 4.2. Nine of the pupils spoke Finnish as their mother tongue and four (G, F, K and M) something else. One pupil (F) spoke English as their mother tongue. All except one (G) were fluent in Finnish. For these reasons, F and G were interviewed in English.

In general, judging by the pupils' responses to how they used English in their free time, they were quite proficient in English. F, naturally, spoke English at home with her family. M also spoke English at home as they had several languages in the family, but nobody's mother tongue was English. Three pupils (D, I, J) mentioned speaking English with their friends or relatives who did not live in Finland. Eight pupils (A, B, C, D, E, I, J, H) mentioned playing online games where they communicated in English or watching videos, movies or shows in English. Two Finnish-speaking pupils (A, I) said they sometimes spoke English at home with their (Finnish-speaking) parents. G, who was not proficient in Finnish, mainly spoke English with her friends and classmates in Finland. Seven other pupils (A, B, E, F, I, L, M) mentioned sometimes speaking English with their friends at school, either because they felt it was fun or natural, or because some of their classmates were more fluent in English than in Finnish. Six pupils, four of whom had Finnish as their mother tongue (D, E, I, K, L, M), brought up that they sometimes forgot words in Finnish during a conversation and replaced them with English words. In addition, four pupils (A, B, F, G) mentioned that some of the terminology used at school was easier to understand in English.

Two of the teachers were English language teachers and three were primary school class teachers with a background of teaching English. The fifth and sixth-graders were all taught by the three class teachers, while the language teachers taught pupils from other grades. At this particular school, the language teachers worked together with the class teachers who did not feel confident or competent enough to teach CLIL lessons themselves. When working together, the language teachers took care of most the teaching through the vehicular language while the class teachers focused on teaching in Finnish. In my study, I chose to include the teachers who had the most experience about language enriching. Interestingly, one of the class teachers interviewed was part of the group of teachers who prepared the handbook for language enriching (Kohl et al. 2019).

4 Analysis and Discussion

In this section, I will present the results of my qualitative content analysis. I will start by focusing on the teachers' interviews and then move on to the pupils' perspectives. After each section, I will discuss my findings in relation to the theoretical framework and draw conclusions. I will also compare the answers of the pupils and the teachers in section 4.2, Pupil Perspective. I will include translated quotations from the interviews in my analysis.

4.1 Teacher Perspective

I interviewed five teachers, two of whom were language teachers and three were class teachers with a background of teaching English. All five teachers had, at the time of the interviews, taught CLIL for a minimum of three years. The teachers are labelled as LT1 and LT2 (language teachers) and CT1, CT2 and CT3 (class teachers). CT1 and CT2 taught the sixth grade while CT3 taught the fifth grade. CT3 had also been involved in the making of the handbook of the City of Helsinki as one of its writers.

Based on the content qualitative analysis, three categories relating to the perceived benefits and disadvantages of CLIL emerged from the data: factors relating to language and content knowledge and general school life, the pupils' feelings, attitudes, and motivation (affective factors) and factors relating to job satisfaction for the teachers, including their own feelings and attitudes. I will present the analysis based on these categories and bring out the perceived benefits and disadvantages mentioned in each category. After this, I will answer my second research question of how aware the teachers are of CLIL.

4.1.1 Language and Content Knowledge and General School Life

Overall, the teachers felt CLIL affected school life positively. Four of the teachers, all except LT2, believed CLIL had had a positive impact on the pupils' linguistic knowledge. They believed the pupils were already generally speaking very proficient as English had a strong presence in their lives outside school, but CLIL, in their opinion, had also contributed to their language skills at least in some ways.

Linguistic knowledge has maybe, has improved. I would hope. (CT1)

Of course the speaking -- and then vocabulary has expanded. (CT3)

The areas of linguistic knowledge mentioned by the teachers were vocabulary (LT1, CT1 and CT3), fluency and speaking (CT3), and everyday language use (CT2). One of the class teachers felt CLIL had had an effect on the pupils' capacity to learn languages and to receive information in foreign

languages, through which it was easier for them to start learning Swedish as a foreign language in the sixth grade:

It has brought a kind of maybe like like a routine to like listening and understanding.
(CT1)

One teacher brought up that as CLIL included some content vocabulary that could be quite challenging, the pupils who were very proficient in English, or who even spoke it at home, got to learn new vocabulary as well and got to challenge themselves.

English is actually pretty hard, the English in natural sciences. -- So maybe there's like an opportunity to just like positively challenge them. (LT1)

As for the content knowledge, the teachers did not bring up benefits related to that. However, they believed CLIL did not harm the pupils' learning as it was the teachers' job to always ensure the content got understood in Finnish if not in English. All teachers were quite clear on their priority being the teaching of the content during CLIL lessons and believed they had also succeeded in making sure the pupils' learning was not disrupted because of the vehicular language.

You have to be careful that like it doesn't become a situation where no one like understands anything properly in any language. So you have to avoid that. (LT1)

I don't think that it has prevented them from learning. Like we always make sure -- that the content matter is understood. (CT1)

Two teachers felt a slight disadvantage of CLIL was that some of the pupils wished to do everything in English, neglecting the studying of Finnish. While CT2 believed that it was a good thing for their Finnish as a second language pupils to have the option to answer in English, the language they were more proficient in, they wondered if it had a negative impact on their Finnish skills:

For certain Finnish as a second language pupils, it's a bit of a free pass, speaking English -- That they don't even try to speak Finnish at some point. (CT2)

CT3 simply pointed out that some pupils wished to study all topics in English, and that they sometimes had to remind the pupils of Finnish being the primary language of teaching.

Other positive factors relating to school life in general were participating in daily routines through CLIL (LT1), having a "brain workout" because of language switching (LT1) and bringing

school English closer to the pupils' lives outside school (CT2, CT3). This is in line with previous studies, where teachers have felt CLIL has more of a real purpose than English language lessons (Lazarevic 2022).

All of the teachers pointed out that the pupils' English proficiency in general was very good, making the use of English at school very natural for them. However, one teacher (LT2) felt the continuous presence of English was sometimes too much.

The findings about the development of the pupils' language knowledge are in line with earlier studies about teachers' perspectives (Karabassova 2022; Dvojarninova and Alas 2018; Lazarevic 2022). Vocabulary was the area of linguistic knowledge that the teachers believed CLIL impacted the most, as is also seen in previous research (Lazarevic 2022), as is the learners' perceived good performance (Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Pappa et al. 2017). However, in this study, the teachers emphasized the pupils' previous knowledge of English and the role of the language outside school, and believed that had affected their proficiency more than CLIL. This might be a reflection of the fact that English has a very dominant role in Finland, but then again, English has a strong presence in many other countries as well. The teachers may also feel that the amount of CLIL that is included in language enriching is not enough to explain the pupils' level of proficiency. In many of the other studies (Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Lazarevic 2022), the topic or subject of CLIL was more defined than in the model of Helsinki, perhaps making it easier to observe the learners' development in vocabulary and other areas of linguistic knowledge.

Teachers have previously expressed the belief that also the learners' content knowledge has improved through CLIL (Karabassova 2022; Dvojarninova and Alas 2018; Lazarevic 2022). In this study, however, none of the teachers felt the learning of the content was much impacted by CLIL. This, again, might be due to the fact that the vehicular language is only used for 13–15 % of the time in this program. However, they also felt CLIL in no way harmed the learning of the content, which may be a benefit of the language being used relatively little, as CLIL teachers have worried about the learners' sufficient understanding of the content before (Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón 2019; Minardi 2021).

4.1.2 Affective Factors: The Pupils' Perceived Feelings, Motivation and Attitudes

When asked if they believed CLIL motivated the pupils more than lessons in Finnish, all five teachers believed it did, but also pointed out it was not true for everyone. Out of the five teachers, LT1 was the most careful in their thinking, only mentioning CLIL had proved a good motivation for those with an English background or otherwise a high level of competence. They, along with two other teachers (LT2 and CT2), felt CLIL was an opportunity for those pupils "to shine". CT2 mentioned one pupil in particular, a special needs pupil who they felt was not good at much else at school besides English:

They've had the chance to shine in those situations and they get asked for advice.
(CT2)

LT1 also believed that the pupils' motivation was more down to the teachers' enthusiasm and the activity at hand than anything else. However, the other teachers, especially the three class teachers, felt language enriching itself had proved motivating for most pupils and that most or some of the pupils liked CLIL itself very much. CT3 believed CLIL to be helpful and motivating even when the topic itself was of little or no interest to some pupils.

You can like sense it and see from the child's eyes -- Through that you can like like motivate the pupils more for something. (CT3)

The pupils have liked it. -- It's like all in all like sort of like affects like school positivity. For the majority. (CT1)

The class teachers believed CLIL also encouraged the pupils to use English more, both in school and in their free time. They felt that bringing English closer to the pupils' everyday life and focusing more on communication than perfection had contributed to them using the language more boldly.

They've said that they've like been encouraged with friends too to speak more. (CT2)

The language teachers believed encouraging pupils to speak English was certainly a goal of CLIL, but did not give their opinion on whether or not it was true for their pupils. All of the teachers were also aware of the strong presence of English in the pupils' lives outside school. Some of them pointed out that their pupils had never been shy to use the language in the first place and that using English in games or on social media improved the pupils' language skills and encouraged them to use it more.

Young people spend a lot of time on social media and that has made it easier too, that there as well they understand and then they have the courage to be like in touch in English with someone who's interested in the same same thing. (CT1)

CT1 felt CLIL had also contributed positively to some of their pupils' self-esteem and self-image. They believed through CLIL they had had positive experiences about being able to express their meaning.

That there's like a feeling of ability. That you're able and you can. (CT1)

None of the teachers mentioned any negative effects or disadvantages of CLIL relating to this category. Interestingly, the class teachers came up with notably more benefits of language enriching relating to affective factors than language teachers. This might be due to the fact that class teachers spend more time with the same pupils than language teachers, who teach several different groups in a day. This may make it easier for class teachers to get to know their pupils, observe their behavior and recognize the possible effects in them.

Pappa et al. (2017) also found, in their study in Finland, that teachers believed their pupils primarily liked CLIL, as was the case in this study. However, most of the previous research on teachers' perspectives has focused more on the learners' linguistic performance and the teachers' own views about teaching CLIL. The teachers in this study believed CLIL encouraged the pupils to speak English and even brought on a feeling of ability (CT1). These results are very positive, and in line with the goals of language enriched teaching and learning listed in the handbook (2019): building the pupils' confidence in using English. While the teachers did not believe CLIL affected the pupils' academic achievement in content subjects, another goal of language enriching in the handbook, they did believe it increased their motivation. Increased motivation may, of course, also have a positive impact on performance.

4.1.3 Job Satisfaction

In this category, I will include the teachers' comments about how teaching CLIL impacted their job satisfaction: how they felt about teaching CLIL and how it had affected their workload.

All teachers mentioned they usually had to prepare in advance for CLIL lessons, and most also brought up that planning CLIL lessons took up more time than planning regular lessons. The reasons had to do with preparing or finding the material suitable for CLIL and making sure they had enough knowledge of the key vocabulary of the topic in question.

You have to do like preparatory work like what is for example water cycle and frog spawn and -- those kind of terms. (LT1)

It has notably affected my language proficiency. I mean like all of these, I don't like know any mathematical terms at all myself. (LT2)

However, as seen from the example above, LT2 felt the extra planning had also had its benefits, as their own vocabulary had expanded through finding out the correct terms for the pupils. While searching for materials and the lack of ready-made materials were mentioned as a disadvantage by two teachers, most felt that the material was easy to find and that there was quite a lot of it. The handbook was also mentioned as a good thing by four teachers: it seemed to be a helpful tool in planning CLIL

lessons. As mentioned before, the handbook was published in 2019, when the current sixth-graders were in the third grade and the fifth-graders in the second grade. As the class teachers in this study had taught the current fifth and sixth-graders since the first grade, they had had to start language enriching without the guidance of the handbook. This was mentioned by CT1 and CT2, who felt the handbook came out too late for them, but believed it to be a good resource in the future.

Like when we started to look at the goals for our grade, we had like so much that we hadn't done from the previous grades, that we basically should have started from like those tasks for the lower grades -- We didn't have those exact topics in those subjects anymore and then the topics for our grade were too difficult. (CT2)

I think it will make it easier for the future language enriching teachers who will start in the first grade for example the handbook, it makes it a lot easier, that you can look up the things quickly. (CT1)

As mentioned, CT3 was one of the writers of the handbook. They reported having found teaching CLIL very natural from the start. They felt writing the handbook and being a part of the group had definitely affected their teaching as well, as they had had the chance to reflect more than the average teacher and hear from other teachers' experiences. CT1 and CT3 brought up sharing ideas and co-operating with colleagues. CT1 felt it was crucial to have a shared plan of CLIL with teachers of the same grade in the same school. CT3 mentioned sharing their ideas and experiences with the handbook writing group, but not really with their colleagues who worked at the same school. They felt, however, that sharing was very important for CLIL teachers on a general level.

We've shared those ideas and, that someone is doing this and someone is doing that, like you always come back and think about how you could do it with your own group -- What's important is that you get to share those ideas and materials and such. (CT3)

CT2 did not talk about co-operation explicitly, but often mentioned their colleague who taught the other sixth grade and talked about their shared experiences. LT1 and LT2 mentioned working together with the class teachers, sometimes teaching the class together with the class teacher and sometimes by themselves. They did not share their feelings about the co-operation, but LT2 pointed out that the implementation of the CLIL lessons was quite dependent on the class teacher, and felt it was simpler and they could use more English when they were alone with the class rather than together with the class teacher.

It depends a little on like maybe who you're working with -- I'm with like a Finnish speaking teacher then it may be like that that it's pretty much in Finnish -- If I get to teach the whole lesson -- It was kind of really easy then because then it was clear that it was in English. (LT2)

CT1 and CT2 felt they had not reached the goals they had wished and that they had started CLIL when it was still very experimental and in the early stages. They were the first ones to start the language enriching at this school and felt their teaching was the "pioneering stage" (CT2). After realizing the contents in the handbook were unrealistic for their pupils, according to CT2, the whole system started to crumble and they were not able to keep up with CLIL as much as they would have liked. However, CT2 believed they had learned a lot during these years and would do better in the future.

We didn't have the energy to put so much effort into it that we would have for example made the materials and organized other things ourselves -- there are a lot of thoughts about what what I want to do better next time, like I've learned from this. (CT2)

Partly, they also blamed the lack of time. This was a sentiment echoed by the other teachers as well: as the content was the priority, it was sometimes hard to find the time for CLIL, not just for planning it but for teaching it as well. As content teaching is primarily the class teachers' responsibility, LT2 felt the lack of time did not really concern her, but they were aware of the time pressure from the class teachers' perspective.

Especially now in the sixth grade when there's been, there's so much content in the sixth grade. So I realize with such a bad conscience like oh my goodness, we haven't done it again. (CT1)

At least from the class teacher's perspective, it's hard to find the time for everything in Finnish, let alone. (LT2)

CT1 brought up having a bad conscience about not having included CLIL in their teaching often enough. Other negative feelings about CLIL included not feeling completely aware of its goals or not quite believing in its usefulness. These sentiments were only expressed by the language teachers. LT1 believed CLIL could have many benefits, but felt the implementation was lacking: They felt there was not enough time and the teaching was not systematic. They also brought up feeling CLIL was very experimental and that they were still finding their way. LT2, on the other hand, questioned the

usefulness of CLIL by Finnish teachers, feeling that the English dominant world around the pupils contributed more to language enriching than the lessons.

So it's a little like unclear to me like the actual goals in like language enriching -- I have been to multiple education days but that it feels like everyone is kind of doing it differently in different schools and even within the school. (LT1)

I don't have a native-like accent like in any language so then it feels like it sounds like, then I go there and say *I like birds*¹ and then the pupils are like *I like birds* and, like, where's the use in that. (LT2)

The class teachers felt very positively towards CLIL. All of them found teaching CLIL enjoyable and felt it was a positive addition to their work, regardless of the lack of time mentioned above.

For me personally, I think it has been fun. (CT1)

I like the fact that like this language enriching is a part of this. (CT3)

It's very enjoyable and in my opinion it's sensible and good and like important, too. (CT2)

CT2, however, also mentioned negative feelings that were related to their experiences of not reaching their goals for CLIL and not being able to implement it the way they had wished.

Like because of the circumstances it's maybe a bit dysfunctional -- I've experienced it, because of the aforementioned reasons, as frustrating as well. (CT2)

LT2 was quite positive about CLIL as well as they felt there were really no downsides for them personally, but they were more careful about expressing their contentment, having a more neutral attitude. LT1, on the other hand, was more sceptical and did not mention finding CLIL enjoyable or positive, mainly focusing on the negative sides of feeling unsure.

As mentioned earlier, LT1 brought up the fact that CLIL was taught differently by different teachers, even within the same school. This was mentioned by CT2 and CT3 as well, but they saw the autonomy of the teachers as a more positive thing and did not bring up any hopes for a more

¹ Cursive parts said in English

systematic CLIL. CT3 especially felt it gave the teachers freedom to implement it as they best saw fit for their pupils.

Everyone can like focus most of the language enriching on some certain thing, and less on something else and then of course when you know your own pupils then you can a little like think about that. (CT3)

LT2 brought up they had worried about the high goals of CLIL mentioned in the handbook before, but that after having had some more training they had realized the standards had to be lowered and that it was not realistic to expect the pupils to be proficient enough in English to fully participate in a natural sciences lesson, especially if their CLIL lessons had previously been in some other subject. CT2 also brought up having made their peace with the unmet goals.

Co-operation in CLIL has been seen as crucial by teachers in previous research as well (Breibach and Medina-Suárez 2016; Pappa et al. 2017; Minardi 2021; Lazarevic 2022; Fielden Burns and Martínez Agudo 2023). In this study, the class teachers felt positive about co-operation and apparently happy with the way things were. Language teachers expressed more discontent. As LT2 said, the class teacher's views affect the implementation of CLIL in that particular class more than the language teacher's. Autonomy was mentioned as a benefit of CLIL both in this study and in previous research (Pappa et al. 2017), but as a language teacher who is dependent on the class teacher's decisions, the autonomy is quite restricted. This may be one of the reasons why class teachers felt more positive towards CLIL.

While the teachers in this study mentioned having to prepare for CLIL classes and study the terminology themselves, none of them were unsure of their own linguistic proficiency. LT2 questioned the usefulness of CLIL in their Finnish accent in an English-dominant world, but did not question their knowledge of the language. Feeling unsure of their own language skills affected their confidence in teaching CLIL for many teachers (Pappa et al. 2017; Cuesta-Medina and Torres-Rincón 2019). In this study, however, all of the teachers who participated were very competent in English and had a background of teaching the language. Their background has likely made it easier for them to start planning and teaching CLIL lessons compared to class teachers with no education or experience in language teaching.

Lack of time, lack of materials and feeling unsure of the goals of CLIL and ways to implement it "correctly" were all familiar sentiments from previous research (Pappa et al. 2017; Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018; Minardi 2021). However, as LT1 was the only one to express feeling unsure of the goals or implementation, the results were surprisingly positive. This, again, may have to do with the fact that these particular teachers had a background suitable for teaching CLIL – especially the class teachers, who were experienced in teaching both content and language before, although separately. As seen previously, these teachers also emphasized the role of content in CLIL (Karabassova 2022).

All in all, the class teachers' positive attitudes towards CLIL were slightly unexpected. While teachers have reported feeling confident and positively challenged in previous studies (Pappa et al. 2017; Lazarevic 2022), the negative sides seem to have been more dominant. Here, the negative sides were certainly visible, but the positive attitudes seemed to prevail. Lack of training and feeling unsure of one's own competence are certainly factors that may well prevent the positive feelings from occurring, so perhaps the absence of those issues for most of these teachers contributed to their positive views. According to Alcaraz-Mármol (2018), teachers with CLIL training were more confident about CLIL being a good way to teach both content and language than the teachers who were not trained for CLIL. While this has more to do with the teachers' perceptions of benefits related to language and content learning than their feelings about teaching CLIL, it underlines the fact that sufficient training affects the teachers' experiences.

4.1.4 Awareness of CLIL

In this chapter, I will take a look at how the five teachers defined the CLIL program of their school and what they felt it entailed. The teachers were all asked what they thought language enriching meant.

Three teachers felt the term "enriching" was especially good, as it described how a topic was enriched with another language instead of the whole content being in English. They were quite clear about Finnish not being replaced as the primary language of teaching and saw language enriching as something that added to the regular teaching.

Like enriching like not just like replacing or like changing -- So I think that the term enriching somehow describes it well. (CT2)

I'm sure it's telling that you enrich the teaching like with another language. (LT2)

Three teachers brought up that there was not that much English in their CLIL program compared to for example language immersion. As to how they described using English in language enriching, one teacher felt it was simply teaching a subject in another language (CT1), one described it as teaching subjects and including the language in other situations (LT1), one described it quite broadly as using the language in all kinds of situations and events as little bits (CT2) and one felt that the core idea of language enriching was the presence of English in all situations, more or less (CT3). LT2 defined language enriching as deepening a subject in another language and introducing for example some content vocabulary. The teachers were careful not to define language enriching as only English-enriching.

They all agreed on content being the primary concern when teaching. LT1 was the only to explicitly address the matter, but everyone mentioned making sure of the pupils' understanding of the content or emphasized that Finnish was the primary language through which the content was taught.

The most important part is that they get the actual content, that it's taught clearly and they learn the basics of the content. (LT1)

As for the subjects, the teachers were quite unanimous about math and natural sciences being the primary subjects where language enriching was included. CT1 and CT2 admitted they had not reached their goal of including CLIL in natural sciences at least in the later years, but felt it should be a part of it. The language teachers, who were specifically asked to teach certain lessons, said they had been involved in teaching math and natural sciences. CT3 mentioned they had also included CLIL in physical education, arts and crafts, but mostly in math and natural sciences. CT1 and CT2 had also included CLIL in physical education and arts in the early years.

In addition to subjects being taught through another language, the teachers felt language enriching included the use of English in other situations during the school day. Three of them mentioned it in their definition of CLIL, but the other two also brought it up. CT1 and CT2 felt their English-speaking pupils contributed to language enriching, as they made sure English was present in all kinds of situations and encouraged the others to speak English and learn new words. The teachers felt everyday situations where English was used was also a part of language enriching, planned or not. CT2 also brought up that the pupils had a choice of using English in most situations.

Everything like greetings and such so called small talk that occurs. And that comes again, that comes somehow so naturally then through these pupils who who then speak speak English. (CT1)

The teachers were not asked about who, in their opinion, should or could teach CLIL, but CT1 brought up that in their opinion all teachers in Finland, regardless of their education, would be able to teach CLIL. They felt most teachers without a background of teaching English felt they were not good enough, but emphasized that they thought perfect pronunciation or flawless knowledge were not required to teach CLIL in the first years of primary school.

There's somehow a lack of belief in their own abilities abilities to do English-enriched teaching. Which I don't believe at all. I believe that everyone I think like Finnish, Finnish teachers, I'm sure have the language proficiency that they're -- able to like in the first and second grade for sure and even in the third grade to teach it. (CT1)

In the teachers' responses, it was made clear that language enriching was a "light" version of CLIL, and the definitions focused on teaching content subjects partly through another language. The teachers' responses are in line with the handbook (2019), where language enriching is seen primarily as teaching content subjects through English. The handbook's emphasis on natural sciences and math can also be seen in the teachers' responses. According to the handbook, CLIL teachers also use English in their everyday language. This was seen more in the class teachers' responses than the language teachers', which may be explained by the fact that class teachers, again, spend more time with the pupils and have more opportunities to use everyday English outside CLIL lessons.

While language and content were mentioned multiple times, what was not seen in the teachers' definitions was the cultural side of language enriching. According to the handbook, one of the goals of language enriching is to add to the pupils' cultural appreciation both for their own and for other cultures. It is also one of the pedagogical intentions behind CLIL in general, culture being one of the four Cs of the 4Cs Framework (Coyle 2007). Earlier studies have suggested teachers are not always fully aware of the goals and intentions behind CLIL (Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018; Karabassova 2022). Out of these teachers, only one (LT1) felt their knowledge was lacking, but perhaps more training is needed to clarify the cultural element of CLIL.

Another aspect missing from the teachers' definitions of CLIL was the learners' active cognitive involvement, cognition being another C of the framework (Coyle 2007). However, one might perhaps argue that as learners' active cognitive involvement and participation in all subjects is a crucial element in the Finnish curriculum (Opetushallitus 2023), the teachers may not see it as a speciality of CLIL.

4.2 Pupil Perspective

Very similar categories were found by analyzing the pupils' interviews: affective factors and factors related to language and content learning. I will first discuss the pupils' awareness of CLIL. As I believe their level of awareness likely affected their perceived benefits and disadvantages of CLIL, I will answer the second research question first in my analysis. I will then present my findings in the aforementioned categories and focus on the perceived benefits and disadvantages. The pupils' grades, mother tongues, the adjectives they used to describe CLIL and the content subjects they felt CLIL was included in can be found in Table 1.

Table 1.

The pupils' grades, mother tongues, adjectives for CLIL and content subjects they felt included CLIL.

PUPIL	GRADE	MOTHER TONGUE	ADJECTIVES THAT DESCRIBE CLIL	CONTENT SUBJECTS THAT INCLUDE CLIL
-------	-------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

A	5	Finnish	useful, fun	math, natural sciences
B	5	Finnish	useful, ok	math, natural sciences, arts, music
C	5	Finnish	useful, fun, interesting, important	math, natural sciences
D	6	Finnish	useful, difficult, boring	math, music
E	6	Finnish	useful, ok	math
F	6	English + other	fun, interesting	math, natural sciences, history
G	6	other	easy	-
H	6	Finnish	fun, easy, ok, useless	math, social sciences
I	5	Finnish	useful, fun	math, natural sciences
J	5	Finnish	useful, fun	math, natural sciences, arts, music, social sciences, history
K	5	other	useful, fun, ok, difficult	math, natural sciences, history
L	6	Finnish	useful, fun, ok, difficult	math, music
M	6	other	fun, ok, boring	music, arts

4.2.1 Awareness of CLIL

The pupils' level of awareness of CLIL in their school varied. In all of the interviews, the pupils were asked to tell what they thought language enriched teaching and learning meant. Eight of the thirteen pupils (A, B, C, E, I, J, K, L) defined language enriching as using English (or some other language) in another subject's lesson. Interestingly, six of these eight pupils were fifth-graders, meaning that all of the fifth-graders were aware of the basic principle of language enriching, while only two of the sixth-graders knew the meaning of the term.

Like that you have for example math then there, like for example I have this, English that, so then like you add other languages to that subject. (J)

Well like that when you get like multiple like languages or like for example in some subject for example, not English, and for example like math, so there as well we like speak another language or like, that we practice another language at the same time. (K)

That there is something in like multiple subjects not just in a language subject. (L)

The other five sixth-graders all believed language enriching had something to do with knowing and speaking different languages, perhaps feeling it was something similar to multilingualism.

Well it's that like there are like different like languages, like you know different languages. (H)

Well that you can speak many languages and, it's hard to explain. Well exactly like to speak another language. (D)

Before continuing with the interview questions, the pupils who did not know what language enriching meant were explained the meaning of the term. They were then able to reflect on their own experiences and answer the rest of the questions. Most of the pupils felt language enriching was mostly present in some different subjects. All except one (G) said English was used in math lessons, and seven pupils mentioned natural sciences as a CLIL subject. Four pupils named music, three pupils named arts, three mentioned history and two mentioned social sciences (Table 1). As was evident from the interviews, the pupils had had the option to choose an English version of their math book instead of the Finnish one, which is probably one of the reasons math was mentioned by most pupils.

The pupils gave some examples of what kind of CLIL activities they remembered. They mentioned videos in different lessons and for example listening to English music in music lessons, as well as the English math book and learning the terminology in math and natural sciences in English.

For example in English lessons we just mostly practise like that sort of vocabulary like clothes and such, how to order food. When for example in a math lesson we have like math terms. (M)

They were also asked how they felt English language lessons and language enriched lessons differed from each other. Mostly, as in the example above, the pupils felt the difference was in the content vocabulary that they were learning. It was clear from the comments that the emphasis on CLIL lessons was on the content, as was in the teachers' responses. One pupil (H) felt that English was not really studied in language enriched lessons, it was simply spoken. The majority also brought up that there was not as much English in language enriched lessons as in English language lessons.

Then in math you study math and then during English lessons you study like English. (E)

Language enriched lessons are a little like, that you don't study English as much, but it's studied like as a minor subject. (C)

Six pupils (A, C, F, E, K, M) felt language enriching was also included in other moments besides lessons. They mentioned greetings or using English in some other moments such as asking the class to quiet down.

For example like if like there's a lot of like noise and such, then for example the teacher like says like in English that be quiet or quiet. (K)

Well then in those like greetings, like we always say *good morning teacher*² in the morning. (E)

However, all of the pupils felt there was not very much English included in either content lessons or other moments by the teachers. Especially the sixth-graders felt they had had more language enriching when they were younger, which is in line with their teachers' comments (CT1 and CT2).

The majority of the sixth-graders brought up that English was used in situations where some of the pupils were not able to follow the instructions in Finnish. Rather than using English with the whole class, the sixth-graders felt this was where English was most used by the teachers. However, they felt there was an atmosphere where using English was allowed and it was seen as an option to Finnish. One pupil (M) mentioned doing a group work in English because her classmates in the group did not speak Finnish well.

I don't think it even matters if you do it in English like. I don't think it's forbidden in any way. (L)

Like, if she if Jack or anybody that doesn't speak Finnish like needs help with English. But usually with me personally she talks in Finnish because I know how to speak Finnish.³ (F)

The pupils' experiences of math and natural sciences being the subjects where language enriching was mostly included reflected both the teachers' answers and the handbook's (2019) guidelines. They felt, as the teachers did, that language enriching mostly meant teaching subjects partly through another language and using some everyday English. Another similarity with the teachers' responses was that the pupils felt language enriching was sometimes quite scarce and that there was not that much English included in their school days.

² Said in English

³ Interview in English, not translated

The pupils, as their teachers, did not mention anything about the cultural aspect of CLIL. However, taking into consideration their age, they were hardly expected to be aware of the pedagogical intentions behind CLIL.

The difference in the sixth-graders' and fifth-graders' level of awareness is interesting. While the fifth-graders were very aware of what language enriching meant, the sixth-graders were mostly not. The fifth-graders also felt there was more language enriching than the sixth-graders, some of whom felt it had existed before but not so much anymore. This may explain the difference in their awareness of the concept. The fifth-graders' teacher, CT3, was also one of the writers of the handbook, which may have contributed to their pupils being more aware of CLIL.

The pupil who was the least aware of a CLIL program taking place at their school was G, who was not fluent in Finnish. She felt English was only used when somebody, herself included, did not understand Finnish. Of course, as she herself used primarily English at school at all times, she may not have paid that much attention to the situations in which the others used English as well. Her lack of awareness of language enriching affected her not seeing its benefits or disadvantages very well either, as seen in Table 1 and the upcoming sections. However, she was able to answer the questions based on how she felt using English at school affected her.

In earlier studies about the learner perspective, their awareness of the presence of CLIL has not been researched. However, as in many of these studies the amount of CLIL has been 25–70 % of the teaching and learning, the learners' awareness of them studying in a CLIL program has perhaps been inevitable.

4.2.2 Language and Content Knowledge

In the questionnaire, eight out of the 13 pupils circled the adjective “useful” to describe language enriching. In addition, out of the five pupils who did not, three brought up that language enriching was somehow beneficial to their learning in their interview.

Mostly, the pupils focused on benefits to their language learning, as did the teachers. They felt they had learnt new vocabulary through language enriching (C, D, E, F, I, J, K, L), or just felt it had improved their language proficiency on a general level (A, B, C, I, L). One pupil (I) felt language enriching had improved his writing and pronouncing, and two pupils (C and D) brought up it affected their speaking of the language. Two pupils (L and M) felt that the fact they had had more English made it easier for them to study other foreign languages, such as French that they were both studying. E brought up that as English would not have started for them until the third grade if they hadn't had language enriching, they had the chance to start learning the language earlier. This affected only the

sixth-graders, as the City of Helsinki added English to the curriculum for all first-graders in 2018, when the fifth-graders started school (Opetushallitus 2023).

You can learn like so much about another language, so you should definitely definitely be in on language enriching. (A)

Well language enriching, well, you learn new words, and then like it helps for example if you like speak English, it helps to make maybe in English even like conversation like we for example shop conversations. (C)

Well in math all of these terms that are not like, I've learnt them from the math book as it's in English. (J)

What I remember is we were taught in geometry that 'pinta-ala' is *area* and then this 'tilavuus' is *volume*⁴. (E)

Two pupils (G and H) could not see any benefits to their learning from language enriching. G felt her English knowledge was already so good that school in Finland had not really added to that. She mentioned having had school books in English in her former school in another country. However, she did admit that studying in English had "refreshed her memory" in some parts. Interestingly, F, whose mother tongue was English, felt she had still learnt new vocabulary at school about animals.

The animals' names for me, like I memorized them. And I know how to say animals in English.⁵ (F)

H felt the vocabulary used at school was "pretty basic", so he had not learnt any new words or new things about the language.

As for the content knowledge, four pupils (G, F, I, K) felt they sometimes or always learnt the content better if it was taught partly through English. This was very natural for G, as she was not proficient in Finnish, and for F, whose first language was English. However, three pupils (D, K, L) circled the adjective "difficult" in their questionnaire to describe language enriching, and in addition to that, three pupils (C, E, H) brought up in their interviews that they felt it had sometimes made their content learning more difficult. E mentioned having had the English math book before, but giving it up because her parents were not able to help her at home if she was absent from school as they did not

⁴ Cursive parts said in English

⁵ Interview in English

understand the terminology. C felt CLIL could sometimes be confusing, if it was not systematic enough. H and K mentioned it was sometimes more difficult for them to understand some contents in English than in Finnish.

Well I guess it's a bit more difficult if we're talking about a Finnish thing. It's a bit harder to understand like in English. (H)

But then if it starts to get a little too confusing then for example in math if you have for example the English book and you don't know something, they're not taught properly, then it can maybe like affect the learning in math. (C)

The other pupils did not find language enriching difficult or affecting their content learning negatively. Mostly, they felt it did not make a difference to their content learning. A few were aware that it might be difficult for other pupils who were less proficient in English. J brought up that CLIL might be challenging for Finnish as a second language pupils, who did not speak either English or Finnish well. Three Finnish-speaking pupils (D, E, I) felt that learning more English sometimes affected negatively to their Finnish skills. E, however, felt it was more because of English used everywhere than just language enriching.

Well maybe like for me the only downside is that I start to when I start to learn English better then I always forget more Finnish so speaking Finnish is harder. Sometimes it can be, it's like I'm bad at Finnish and good at English. (I)

And yeah I've noticed that sometimes I have to think about what it was in Finnish. Which in my opinion is a little annoying as Finnish is my first language. (E)

E felt CLIL took time from the lessons, and L brought up doing homework in English might be more time consuming than doing them in Finnish. Three pupils (A, B, F) did not see any disadvantages to language enriching to themselves or anyone else.

The pupils' perceptions of benefits to their language knowledge, especially vocabulary, are in line with previous research, where learners have reported they have felt their language proficiency has improved (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Beaudin 2022). The pupils' feelings of the usefulness of CLIL are also similar to the findings in previous studies (Hunt 2011; Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015). The minority felt CLIL sometimes felt difficult and impacted their content learning negatively. It seems that in most studies about the learner perspective on CLIL, there are always some learners who find it difficult (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019, Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022). This is not surprising, considering that learners' English (or any other

vehicular language) proficiencies and backgrounds vary greatly, as does their learning in both content and language subjects.

The experience of forgetting words in their first language because of the presence of English was not mentioned in any previous studies. However, the role of English seems to be constantly stronger both in Finland and around the world, and even young learners communicate in English on social media and for example in online games. The English used at school during lessons likely differs considerably from the English the pupils used in their free time. Especially the vocabulary is different which is likely one of the reasons the pupils felt that was the area of their language knowledge school had affected the most. However, both school and free time combined, the pupils' exposure to English is considerable.

C's wish for a more systematic CLIL was also mentioned by some former CLIL students in the study by Roiha (2019). While C was the only pupil to have mentioned this explicitly, the others brought up the scarceness of CLIL and none of the pupils mentioned any routines or systematic forms of language enriching. Neither did the teachers – although they all mentioned they needed time for planning CLIL, they did not have any systematic ways of implementing it and admitted they did not always have time for it. LT1 explicitly stated they felt the implementation of CLIL was not very systematic. Co-operation on all levels is needed to create a systematic and pedagogically strategic CLIL program (Coyle 2007). While the teachers reported working together with each other, it was clear from their responses that different teachers included CLIL in their class in different ways. In the handbook (2019), the class teacher is given the responsibility of implementing CLIL in their classroom, together with the other teachers. While the idea of co-operation is clearly supported by theoreticians, the City of Helsinki and the teachers alike, perhaps some concrete measures are needed for it to actually take place more systematically.

The pupils' perceptions of the benefits and disadvantages of CLIL to their language and content learning were very much the same with the teachers' perceptions. Language knowledge was seen as having developed the most, especially vocabulary. Both the pupils and the teachers believed language enriching did not affect content knowledge very much, but may have been challenging for some particular pupils. Even CT1's view of language enriching being useful when learning other languages was repeated in two of the sixth-graders' answers (L and M).

4.2.3 Affective Factors

The pupils' attitudes and feelings towards CLIL were either positive or neutral. Twelve pupils, all except G, came up with something positive related to how they were feeling about language enriching. Five pupils (C, I, J, K, H) had circled the adjective "fun" in their questionnaire, and in addition, four pupils (A, F, L, M) agreed it was fun in their interviews, meaning that overall, the pupils seemed to

like language enriching. Two pupils (D and H) mentioned they would like to have more language enriching.

Two pupils (C and F) circled the word interesting in their questionnaires. However, in the interviews, six other pupils (A, I, J, K, L, M) felt the content subject became a little more interesting to them if they were learning partly through English. While most of them did not know whether or not it affected their learning, they recognized sometimes feeling more positive towards the lesson and topic if there was English involved.

A little. It depends of course on the content that's in English, but if there's like already content in Finnish that interests me a little, it becomes like more interesting to me at least when it's in English. (L)

If it's only in Finnish then it can be a bit boring, but if some other languages are mixed into it then it can be a little more interesting. (A)

Another positive feeling some of the pupils recognized was being encouraged to speak English more because of CLIL. Five of the pupils (A, D, E, I, M) felt they had been encouraged by language enriching to use English more in their free time. A gave an example of school affecting her using the language at home as well sometimes.

But it's like, I use it like more. Because English is spoken at school. (M)

For example if I see for example my mum then I'm just to my mum sometimes like 'Can we speak English today?' Then I then we're just like we speak English with mum. (A)

There were few less positive affective factors to be found. Two pupils (D and M) had circled the word "boring" in their questionnaires. However, both of them also expressed positive feelings towards CLIL. H felt language enriching was quite easy and wished to have more of it, as mentioned above, but still felt discouraged to actually speak English. This was of course not a disadvantage of CLIL, but meant it had not succeeded in encouraging him to communicate.

When you really like understand it, but you don't really want to speak it -- For me it's not really, the accent, it's a bit like hard for me to speak. (H)

G was the only pupil who did not express any positive feelings or attitudes towards language enriching. However, she also did not bring up any negative emotions. As mentioned, G was not aware

of a CLIL program taking place at the school, but answered the questions based on herself using primarily English at school. As her Finnish was not fluent, for her, English was usually the only option. This may have affected the fact that she did not have any positive or negative feelings towards it. She mentioned having tried to learn Finnish, but felt it was hard to understand.

All in all, regarding affective factors, the benefits seemed to outweigh the disadvantages, as the pupils felt either neutral, slightly positive or very positive towards CLIL. This reflects the results of previous research, where learners have had a positive attitude towards CLIL, having both enjoyed it and felt encouraged to use the language more (Coyle 2013; Roiha 2019; Beaudin 2022). Higher motivation towards the content subject has also been seen as a benefit of CLIL before (Lasagabaster 2011; San Isidro and Lasagabaster 2022), although not for all (Hunt 2011).

Around half of the pupils in this study were not motivated through CLIL or did not feel encouraged to use English more. This may be due to both the vehicular language being used so little and the pupils' reports of using English so much outside school that they had not needed any extra encouragement.

All of the pupils in this study were taught by the class teachers (CT1, CT2 and CT3). The pupils' positive feelings are perhaps partly a reflection of the class teachers' positive attitudes. All in all, concerning affective factors as well, the pupils' and teachers' responses are in line with each other. Both felt language enriching increased the motivation for some pupils, was enjoyable to most and encouraged some pupils in language use. The teachers, too, recognized that these benefits were not true for all pupils.

5 Conclusion

As mentioned in the beginning, content and language integrated learning has been researched quite extensively from different perspectives. However, numerous different CLIL programs around the world make it worth studying in different contexts and finding out even more about its benefits and disadvantages. In this study, the emphasis was on perceived benefits and disadvantages by both pupils and teachers in a Finnish primary school context, as stated in the first research question.

The pupils felt they had most benefited from CLIL by gaining new vocabulary and otherwise improving their language knowledge. This view was shared by the teachers, who believed CLIL had mostly affected the pupils' language skills. CLIL was also seen as fun and enjoyable by both the pupils and the teachers, especially by the class teachers, and as something that increased the pupils' motivation towards the content subject. Some of the teachers and pupils felt CLIL had encouraged the pupils to speak English more at school or even in their free time. The teachers, especially the class teachers, felt they were able to teach and plan CLIL lessons and could usually find the material for it. CLIL was also seen as positively challenging to those pupils who were very proficient in English.

As for the disadvantages, teachers and pupils alike agreed that CLIL could sometimes impact content learning negatively for pupils who were less proficient in English. However, the general view was that CLIL did not impact content learning. A few of the pupils felt indifferent towards CLIL. A wish for a more systematic CLIL was expressed by one pupil and one teacher, and many pupils and teachers felt there was not as much of it as there perhaps could or should have been. Teachers felt planning CLIL was quite time-consuming, but most of all it was hard to find the time for CLIL lessons as they had to make sure all the contents in the curriculum were learnt in Finnish. Some teachers and pupils felt CLIL contributed negatively to using or learning Finnish.

The pupils' and teachers' perceptions on the benefits and disadvantages were very similar. Of course, the teachers demonstrated more maturity in their thinking, and their answers were more contemplative and multi-dimensional. Leaving out the differences related to age and education, however, the essence was very much the same. Especially the class teachers and the pupils agreed with each other in viewing CLIL in a very positive light but admitting it was sometimes quite scarce.

I was correct in assuming in my hypothesis that the benefits and disadvantages of CLIL would be similar to previous findings despite the contextual differences. Enjoyment, usefulness and the perceived improvement of language skills are all benefits of CLIL that have come up in multiple studies (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Zanoni 2021; Beaudin 2022; Lazarevic 2022). As for the disadvantages, it has also been found in several studies that the minority of the learners find CLIL difficult (Coyle 2013; Barrios and Acosta-Manzano 2022). However, relating to job satisfaction, the teachers in this study seemed to be more confident and happier with CLIL than in previous studies (Breibach and Medina-Suàrez 2016; Pappa et al. 2017). As said, this likely has to do with the fact that these teachers, especially the class teachers, had experience about teaching both content and

language before they became CLIL teachers, and therefore were more prepared for what CLIL meant. It would be interesting to study class teachers who teach in a similar CLIL program without a background of teaching the vehicular language and see how the results would differ. Another factor impacting these results may be the fact that the percentage of the use of the vehicular language is very low in language enriching compared to many other CLIL programs. This means the teachers have more freedom in choosing the contents they wish to teach in English.

While the low percentage of the vehicular language may restrict the perceived disadvantages of CLIL, it also restricts the benefits. Almost all of the pupils brought up the fact that language enriching does not in fact happen very often, as did some of the teachers. Judging by especially the pupils' positive attitudes, adding language enriching might affect their motivation and other affective factors very positively. However, it would likely also add the perceived difficulty of some CLIL contents.

As for my second research question of awareness of CLIL, the teachers all knew the basic principles of CLIL, as expected. Their answers differed somewhat in their focus: some emphasized the teaching of content subjects through the vehicular language while others took on a broader view of using English in all kinds of situations. Only one, LT1, brought up feeling they did not understand the goals of language enriching. However, the cultural aspect of CLIL was missing from their answers. While co-operation was mentioned by all of the teachers, the ideal version of CLIL as a systematic, cohesive program did clearly not exist at this school. Karabassova (2022) found teachers were aware of CLIL on a general level, but did not understand all of its pedagogical intentions. Perhaps there is something similar in these results, as all elements of CLIL were not mentioned. However, the teachers were also not specifically asked about the cultural side of CLIL.

The pupils' awareness of CLIL varied. Most knew of its basic principles, but the majority of the sixth-graders believed language enriching to be somehow related to multilingualism and defined it as knowing multiple languages. The fifth-graders were more aware than the sixth-graders, which may have to do with either them having more CLIL lessons or their teacher having been involved in writing the handbook (2019). The pupils and teachers agreed on math and natural sciences being the subjects where CLIL was included in the most, in line with the handbook's suggestions.

What was brought up by all teachers and pupils was the strong presence of English in the pupils' lives outside school. CT3 saw English being used at school as a natural continuum to the pupils' free time, while LT2 questioned the need for language enriching as English was already used everywhere. One of the perceived disadvantages, CLIL impacting the pupils' Finnish skills negatively, was seen as a consequence of both language enriching and exposure to extramural English. It was also clear the pupils' overall English proficiency was very good. While unsurprising, the dominance of English in the pupils' lives is certainly thought-provoking. It's surely a good thing to contribute to the pupils' language knowledge at school by teaching the more academic side of the language and preparing them for their future adult life as world citizens. However, as English is already heard and

used everywhere, should school focus only on making sure the pupils possess good Finnish skills, both academic and informal? Even the Finnish-speaking pupils reported sometimes forgetting words in Finnish and finding some things easier to understand or say in English, but as CT2 mentioned, being allowed to study in English may prevent some Finnish as a second language pupils from even trying to learn Finnish. Another perspective to consider, as CT1 mentioned, is to change the CLIL programs from English-dominant to something else, and enrich our children through languages and cultures that would not otherwise be learnt. However, the usefulness of CLIL is of course one of its benefits, and as seen in De Smet et al. (2023), the status of the vehicular language affects the perceived usefulness. The future of CLIL can, still, be looked at from many perspectives and perhaps we will end up with some more variation to the vehicular language.

Getting back to the results of this study, it would seem that what is needed for a more successful CLIL program at this school, is more time for implementing CLIL, more time for planning together for a more systematic approach, and more training about the cultural aspect for the teachers in order for CLIL to live up to its potential. It would be interesting to find ways for a more systematic CLIL in Helsinki. While the handbook is certainly a step in the right direction, perhaps it would also be easier for the teachers to find the time for including CLIL lessons in the classroom with the help of a more cohesive program. They would not have to spend as much time planning and CLIL would not be as easily forgotten. Common practices would also ensure the pupils would receive an equal amount of CLIL lessons regardless of their grade or teachers.

While some of the results of this study are clearly in line with previous research, the results are not in any way generalizable. This is a qualitative study with only five teachers and 13 pupils as its participants in very particular conditions. One limitation of this study is also the fact that the pupils who participated chose to do so themselves, meaning they may have been pupils with a more positive attitude towards CLIL and school in general compared to all pupils. This may have affected the results. However, this was perhaps not true for all of the participants, as some of the pupils were not even completely aware of what language enriching meant at the start of the interview.

I believe it was useful to study this particular program, as it gave us more information about implementing CLIL in yet another context. The results are very encouraging. In the future, it would be beneficial to study the model of Helsinki more closely to get a better grasp of the benefits and disadvantages in this context. While this study has focused mostly on affective factors and learner and teacher perspectives, it would be important to also study the learners' performance in both content and language subjects to find out how language enriching affects learning. This could perhaps mean a mixed-methods study in multiple schools that participate in language enriching. Finally, it would be beneficial to compare those results to other CLIL programs and use that information to develop the program further.

References

- Alcaraz-Mármol, Gema. 2018. "Trained and Non-Trained Language Teachers on CLIL Methodology: Teachers' Facts and Opinions About the CLIL Approach in the Primary Education Context in Spain." *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning* 11, no. 1: 39–64.
- Barrios, Elvira, and Irene Acosta-Manzano. 2022. "Primary Students' Satisfaction with CLIL and Perceived CLIL Linguistic Difficulty." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 43, no. 7: 665–678.
- Beaudin, Curt. 2022. "A Classroom-Based Evaluation on the Implementation of CLIL for Primary School Education in Taiwan: 臺灣小學實施CLIL教學之課堂評估." *English Teaching & Learning* 46, no. 2: 133–156.
- Breidbach, Stephan, and José Medina-Suárez. 2016. "Teachers' Perspectives on CLIL and Classroom Innovation in a Method Based on Drama Games." *Estudios Sobre Educación*, no. 31: 97–116.
- Bulon, Amélie, and Fanny Meunier. 2020. "Comparing CLIL and Non-CLIL Learners' Phrasicon in L2 Dutch: The (expected) Winner Does Not Take It All." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 26, no. 5: 590–613.
- City of Helsinki. 2023. "English-enriched Education." *Childhood and Education*. Accessed 10 June 2023. <https://www.hel.fi/en/childhood-and-education/basic-education/enrolling-and-applying-to-school/weighted-curriculum-and-basic-education-in-different-languages/english-enriched-education>.
- Coyle, Do. 2007. "Content and Language Integrated Learning: Towards a Connected Research Agenda for CLIL Pedagogies." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10, no. 5: 543–562.
- . 2013. "Listening to Learners: An Investigation into 'Successful Learning' Across CLIL Contexts." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16, no. 3: 244–266.
- Coyle, Do, Philip Hood, and David Marsh. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuesta Medina, Liliana Marcela, and Juan Carlos Torres Rincon. 2019. "Situated Practice in CLIL: Voices from Colombian Teachers." *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal* 18, no. 18: 109–141.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane, and Ute Smit. 2013. "Content and Language Integrated Learning: A Research Agenda." *Language Teaching* 46, no. 4: 545–559.
- De Smet, Audrey, Laurence Mettwie, Philippe Hiligsmann, Benoît Galand, and Luk Van Mensel. 2023. "Does CLIL Shape Language Attitudes and Motivation? Interactions with Target Languages and Instruction Levels." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 26, no. 5: 534–553.

- Dvorjaninova, Anna, and Ene Alas. 2018. "Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Estonia: Subject and Language Teacher Perspective." *Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Ühingu Aastaraamat* 14: 41–57.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fielden Burns, Laura V., and Juan de Dios Martínez Agudo. 2023. "CLIL Realities through the Lens of English and Content Teachers." *TESL-EJ* 26, no. 4: 1–24.
- Galletta, Anne, and William E Cross. 2013. *Mastering the Semi-Structured Interview and Beyond: From Research Design to Analysis and Publication*. Vol. 18. New York: NYU Press.
- Garton, Sue, and Fiona Copland. 2010. "I Like This Interview; I Get Cakes and Cats!': The Effect of Prior Relationships on Interview Talk." *Qualitative research: QR* 10, no. 5: 533–551.
- Hunt, Marilyn. 2011. "Learners' Perceptions of Their Experiences of Learning Subject Content through a Foreign Language." *Educational Review* 63, no. 3: 365–378.
- Kalaja, Paula, Riikka Alanen, Hannele Dufva, and Paula Kalanti. 2011. *Kieltä tutkimassa: tutkielman laatijan opas*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura,
- Karabassova, Laura. 2022. "Teachers' Conceptualization of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Evidence from a Trilingual Context." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25, no. 3: 787–799.
- Klewitz, Bernd. 2021. *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Ibidem Verlag,
- Kohl, Jenni, Aapo Marjanen, Hanna-Kaisa Rautio, Janne Rusama, Riikka Räisänen, and Riikka-Liisa Salomaa. 2019. *Handbook for English-enriched Teaching and Learning. Grades 1–6*. Helsinki: Helsinki Education Division.
- Lahuerta, Ana. 2020. "Analysis of Accuracy in the Writing of EFL Students Enrolled on CLIL and Non-CLIL Programmes: The Impact of Grade and Gender." *Language Learning Journal* 48, no. 2: 121–132.
- Lasagabaster, David. 2011. "English Achievement and Student Motivation in CLIL and EFL Settings." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 5, no. 1: 3–18.
- Lazarevic, Nina. 2022. "CLIL Teachers' Reflections and Attitudes: Surviving at the Deep End." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25, no. 2: 571–584.
- Marongiu, Maria Antonietta. 2019. "Teaching Materials and CLIL Teaching." *Linguae &* 18, no. 2: 81–104.
- Minardi, Silvia. 2021. "Languages for Learning: The Role of CLIL Teachers." *Language Problems & Language Planning* 45, no. 3: 309–330.
- Olsson, Eva. 2021. "A Comparative Study of CLIL Implementation in Upper Secondary School in Sweden and Students' Development of L2 English Academic Vocabulary." *Language Teaching Research* 0: 0.

- Opetushallitus. 2023. "Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014." *ePerusteet*. Accessed 10 June 2023. <https://eperusteet.opintopolku.fi/#/fi/perusopetus/419550/tiedot>.
- Pappa, Sotiria, Josephine Moate, Maria Ruohotie-Lehty, and Anneli Eteläpelto. 2017. "CLIL Teachers in Finland." *Journal of Applied Language Studies* 11, no. 4: 79–99.
- Pérez Cañado, María Luisa. 2018. "CLIL and Educational Level: A Longitudinal Study on the Impact of CLIL on Language Outcomes." *Porta Linguarum* 29: 51-70.
- Pladevall-Ballester, Elisabet. 2015. "Exploring Primary School CLIL Perceptions in Catalonia: Students', Teachers' and Parents' Opinions and Expectations." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18, no. 1: 45–59.
- Roiha, Anssi. 2019. "Investigating Former Pupils' Experiences and Perceptions of CLIL in Finland: A Retrospective Analysis." *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy* 5, no. 2: 92–103.
- San Isidro, Xabier, and David Lasagabaster. 2022. "Students' and Families' Attitudes and Motivations to Language Learning and CLIL: a Longitudinal Study." *Language Learning Journal* 50, no. 1: 119–134.
- Seikkula-Leino, Jaana. 2007. "CLIL Learning: Achievement Levels and Affective Factors." *Language and Education* 21, no. 4: 328–341.
- Sylvén, Liss Kerstin. 2013. "CLIL in Sweden - Why Does It Not Work? A Metaperspective on CLIL Across Contexts in Europe." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16, no. 3: 301–320.
- Zanoni, Francesca. 2021. "Students' View on CLIL: Perceived Benefits and Limitations." *Educazione Linguistica Language Education* 10, no. 2.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Interview Questions and the Questionnaire

Interview questions for the pupils:

1. What do you think language enriched teaching and learning means? / Mitä kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen sinun mielestäsi tarkoittaa?
2. What do you think language enriched teaching and learning is like? / Millaista kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen sinusta on?
3. In which subjects have you learnt new words or other things the most? / Missä oppiaineissa olet oppinut eniten uusia sanoja tai muita asioita?
4. Does using English during lessons affect how interested you are in the topic? (Why?) / Vaikuttaako englannin käyttäminen tunnilla siihen, kuinka kiinnostavalta aihe sinusta tuntuu? (Miksi?)
5. Do you think you learn more or less, if English is used during a lesson? (Why?) / Opitko asian mielestäsi paremmin tai huonommin jos tunnilla käytetään englantia? (Miksi?)
6. Is English used outside lessons at school? When? / Käytetäänkö englantia koulussa muissa tilanteissa kuin oppitunneilla? Millaisissa?
7. Do you think you have learnt "everyday English" at school? / Oletko mielestäsi oppinut arkienglantia koulussa?
8. When and how do you use English in your free time? / Milloin ja miten käytät englantia vapaa-ajalla?
9. Has language enriched teaching and learning encouraged you to use more English at school or in your free time? / Onko kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen kannustanut sinua käyttämään enemmän englantia koulussa tai vapaa-ajalla?
10. Has language enriched teaching and learning encouraged you to read or watch movies or shows in English? / Onko kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen kannustanut sinua lukemaan tai katsomaan elokuvia tai sarjoja englanniksi?
11. Do you feel like you're better at English because of language enriched teaching and learning? / Tuntuuko sinusta, että olet parempi englannissa kielirikasteisen opetuksen ja oppimisen ansiosta?
12. Do you think that language enriched teaching and learning has benefited you in any other way? How? / Uskotko, että kielirikasteisesta englannista on ollut sinulle muuta hyötyä? Mitä?
13. Do you think language enriched teaching and learning has any downsides? / Luuletko, että kielirikasteisuudella on jotakin haittapuolia?
14. How do you think English language lessons and language enriched lessons differ from each other? / Miten englannin kielen tunnit ja kielirikastetut tunnit eroavat toisistaan sinun mielestäsi?

Questions in the pupils' questionnaire:

1. Which words in your opinion describe language enriched teaching and learning? / Mitkä sanat sinun mielestäsi kuvaavat kielirikasteista oppimista ja opetusta?
 - interesting/kiinnostava, useful/hyödyllinen, easy/helppo, fun/kiva, OK/ok, motivating/innostava, boring/tylsä, useless/turha, difficult/vaikea, own choice/omavalintainen sana
2. In which subjects do you think language enriched teaching and learning is included? / Missä oppiaineissa sinun mielestäsi on mukana kielirikasteista oppimista ja opetusta?
 - matematiikka/math, ympäristöoppi/environmental sciences, liikunta/P.E., kuvataide/arts, käsityöt/crafts, historia/history, yhteiskuntaoppi/social sciences, musiikki/music, uskonto/religion, elämäkatsomustieto/ethics
3. What is your mother tongue? / Mikä on äidinkielenesi?
 - suomi/Finnish, englanti/English, muu/other

Interview questions for the teachers:

1. What do you think English enriched teaching and learning means? / Mitä kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen sinusta tarkoittaa?
2. What has language enriched teaching and learning been like for you? / Millaista kielirikasteinen oppiminen ja opettaminen on sinusta ollut?
3. In which subjects do you use English? / Missä oppiaineissa käytätte englantia?
4. What kind of “everyday English” do you use at school? / Millaista “arkienglantia” käytätte koulussa?
5. Do you think that English enriched teaching and learning motivates the pupils? / Luuletko, että kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen motivoi oppilaita?
6. Does English enriched teaching and learning affect the difficulty of the subject? How? / Vaikuttaako kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen oppiaineen haastavuuteen? Miten?
7. Do you think that English enriched teaching and learning encourages the pupils to use the language in their free time? / Luuletko, että kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen kannustaa oppilaita kielen käyttöön vapaa-ajalla?
8. Do you believe that English enriched teaching and learning has had an effect on the pupils’ English proficiency? / Uskotko, että kielirikasteinen opetus ja oppiminen on vaikuttanut oppilaiden englannin kielitaitoon?
9. Do you believe that the pupils benefit from English enriched teaching and learning? How? / Uskotko, että oppilaat hyötyvät kielirikasteisuudesta? Miten?
10. Do you there there are any disadvantages to language enriched teaching and learning? / Luuletko, että kielirikasteisuudella on mitään haittavaikutuksia?

Appendix 2 Privacy Notice and Consent Forms

HUOLTAJAN SUOSTUMUS: LAPSEN OSALLISTUMINEN TUTKIMUKSEEN

Tutkimuksen suorituspaikka:

Tutkimuksen tekijä: Marika Holmberg (marika.holmberg@edu.hel.fi)

Tutkimusaineiston säilyttäjä: Marika Holmberg

Tutkimuksen ohjaaja: Pekka Lintunen

Tutkimusta tekevä yliopisto ja laitos: Turun yliopisto, Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

Tässä tutkimuksessa tutkitaan viides- ja kuudesluokkalaisten oppilaiden sekä opettajien käsityksiä kielirikasteisen opetuksen hyödyistä. Oppilaiden ja opettajien käsityksiä kielirikasteisuuden hyödyistä verrataan keskenään ja suhteessa aiempiin tutkimuksiin. Tutkimuksessa kerätään aineistoa lyhyellä kyselylomakkeella oppilaille sekä haastatteluilla oppilaille ja opettajille. Haastattelut nauhoitetaan. Tutkimukseen osallistutaan koulupäivän aikana. Tutkimukseen osallistuminen tai sen tulokset eivät vaikuta oppiaineiden arviointiin.

Tutkimusta varten kerätty aineisto käsitellään niin, että osallistujan henkilöllisyys ei paljastu. Tutkimuksessa ei kerätä oppilaiden nimiä, vaan osallistujat numeroidaan. Nauhoituksen, äidinkielen ja luokka-asteen lisäksi oppilaiden muita henkilötietoja ei kerätä. Tutkimuksessa puhutaan helsinkiläisestä, kielirikasteisesta koulusta, mutta koulun nimeä ei mainita. Henkilötietojen käsittely on tarpeellista tieteellisen tutkimuksen toteuttamista varten. Henkilötietoja ei luovuteta EU:n ulkopuolisille tahoille tai muille tutkimukseen liittymättömille tahoille. Tietoja ei käytetä automaattiseen päätöksentekoon tai henkilöiden profilointiin.

Kyselyyn vastaamisen jälkeen paperiset lomakkeet hävitetään tietoturvallisesti ja kyselyiden vastaukset siirretään tutkimuksen tekijän henkilökohtaisiin tiedostoihin. Kyselylomakkeiden vastaukset sekä haastatteluiden äänitiedostot säilytetään salasanalla suojatuissa tiedostoissa tutkimuksen teon ajan ja hävitetään sen jälkeen. Tutkimukseen osallistujalle kuuluu oikeus saada pääsy hänestä kerättyihin tietoihin, oikaista tietoja, rajoittaa tietojen käsittelyä ja vastustaa henkilötietojen käsittelyä.

Tutkimukseen osallistuminen on vapaaehtoista. Suostumuksen voi peruuttaa milloin vain ottamalla yhteyttä tutkimuksen tekijään (sähköpostitse tai Wilmassa). Lapsen suostumusta kysytään suullisesti.

Suostun siihen, että lapseni täyttämään kyselylomaketta käytetään nimettömästi osana tutkimusta. Suostun siihen, että lapseni osallistuu haastatteluun, joka äänitetään ja jota käytetään nimettömänä osana tutkimusta.

oppilaan nimi: _____

huoltajan allekirjoitus ja nimenselvennys: _____

paikka ja aika: _____

Tämä suostumuslomake palautetaan tutkimuksen tekijälle. Osallistuja saa kopion suostumuslomakkeesta. Alkuperäinen suostumuslomake hävitetään tutkimuksen teon jälkeen.

SUOSTUMUS TUTKIMUKSEEN OSALLISTUJAKSI

Tutkimuksen suorituspaikka:

Tutkimuksen tekijä: Marika Holmberg (marika.holmberg@edu.hel.fi)

Tutkimusaineiston säilyttäjä: Marika Holmberg

Tutkimuksen ohjaaja: Pekka Lintunen

Tutkimusta tekevä yliopisto ja laitos: Turun yliopisto, Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

Tässä tutkimuksessa tutkitaan viides- ja kuudesluokkalaisten oppilaiden sekä opettajien käsityksiä kielirikasteisen opetuksen hyödyistä. Oppilaiden ja opettajien käsityksiä kielirikasteisuuden hyödyistä verrataan keskenään ja suhteessa aiempiin tutkimuksiin. Tutkimuksessa kerätään aineistoa lyhyellä kyselylomakkeella oppilaille sekä haastattelulla oppilaille ja opettajille. Haastattelut nauhoitetaan.

Tutkimusta varten kerätty aineisto käsitellään niin, että osallistujan henkilöllisyys ei paljastu.

Tutkimuksessa ei kerätä nimiä, vaan osallistujat numeroidaan. Tutkimuksessa käy ilmi, että osallistujat ovat tiettyjen luokka-asteiden opettajia helsinkiläisessä, kielirikasteisessa koulussa, mutta koulun nimeä ei mainita. Henkilötietojen käsittely on tarpeellista tieteellisen tutkimuksen toteuttamista varten.

Henkilötietoja ei luovuteta EU:n ulkopuolisille tahoille tai muille tutkimukseen liittymättömille tahoille. Tietoja ei käytetä automaattiseen päätöksentekoon tai henkilöiden profilointiin. Äänitiedostot säilytetään tutkimuksen teon ajan salasanalla suojatuissa tiedostoissa ja hävitetään sen jälkeen.

Tutkimukseen osallistujalle kuuluu oikeus saada pääsy hänestä kerättyihin tietoihin, oikaista tietoja, rajoittaa tietojen käsittelyä ja vastustaa henkilötietojen käsittelyä.

Tutkimukseen osallistuminen on vapaaehtoista. Suostumuksen voi peruuttaa milloin vain ottamalla yhteyttä tutkimuksen tekijään.

Suostun siihen, että haastatteluni nauhoitetaan ja sitä käytetään nimettömänä osana tutkimusta.

allekirjoitus ja nimenselvennys: _____

paikka ja aika: _____

Tämä suostumuslomake palautetaan tutkimuksen tekijälle. Osallistuja saa kopion suostumuslomakkeesta. Alkuperäinen suostumuslomake hävitetään tutkimuksen teon jälkeen.

Appendix 3 Finnish Summary

Tässä sivuainetutkimuksessa tutkittiin viides- ja kuudesluokkalaisten oppilaiden sekä opettajien näkemyksiä CLIL-opetuksen hyödyistä ja haitoista sekä heidän käsityksiään siitä, mitä heidän koulunsa CLIL-ohjelma, kielirikasteisuus, tarkoittaa.

CLIL tulee sanoista content and language integrated learning, ja se tarkoittaa löyhästi ilmaistuna vieraskielistä opetusta. Termille ei ole suoraa suomenkielistä vastinetta. CLIL-menetelmässä osa sisällön opetuksesta toteutetaan vieraalla kielellä ja pääpaino voi olla joko sisällön tai kielen oppimisessa, mutta menetelmän tarkoitus on huomioida molemmat (Coyle 2007; Coyle, Hood ja Marsh 2010).

Vaikka kaksikielinen opetus on ollut olemassa jo kauan, termiä CLIL alettiin käyttää ensimmäisen kerran 1990-luvulla Euroopassa, kun tarve keskinäiselle ymmärrykselle ja kommunikaatiolle kasvoi ja CLIL nähtiin keinona kehittää nuorten eurooppalaisten kielitaitoa (Coyle 2007). CLIL-opetuksessa vieraana kielenä voi olla mikä tahansa kieli, mutta tällä hetkellä englantia on kielistä suosituin (Dalton-Puffer ja Smit, 2013). CLIL-ohjelmia on monia erilaisia, ja niiden yksityiskohdat vaihtelevat suuresti. Opetuksen toteutukseen ja onnistumiseen vaikuttavat mm. maan, alueen ja koulun sosioekonominen tilanne, koulun tyyppi, opettajien koulutus, hallinnollinen tuki sekä koulutusaste (Lasagabaster 2011; Pérez Cañado 2018). Yhtenä CLIL-menetelmän hyötynä nähdään sen monipuolisuus ja joustavuus: jokaisen koulun on mahdollista luoda itselleen sopivin CLIL-ohjelma. Joustavuudessa on kuitenkin myös haittapuolensa, sillä se hankaloittaa systemaattisen ja yhtenäisen CLIL-menetelmän kehittämistä (Coyle 2007). Coylen mukaan CLIL-ohjelman tulee olla systemaattinen ja yhteistyössä suunniteltu ollakseen toimiva.

Coyle (2007) on kehittänyt CLIL-menetelmän keskeisiä käsitteitä kuvaavan teorian (4Cs Framework), joka koostuu neljästä eri käsitteestä. Käsitteet ovat sisältö (content), kommunikaatio (communication), kulttuuri (culture) ja kognitio (cognition). Lisäksi Coyle muistuttaa kontekstista, joka sitoo neljä edellä mainittua käsitettä yhteen ja luo CLIL-ohjelmalle reunaehdot. Coyle, Hood ja Marsh (2010) ovat lisäksi luoneet CLIL-tutkijoiden avuksi arviointiportfolion, jonka avulla CLIL-menetelmien tehokkuutta ja toimivuutta on helpompi arvioida. Heidän mukaansa CLIL-menetelmissä tulee arvioida oppilaiden suorituksia, affektiivisia tekijöitä, oppimiseen liittyviä prosesseja sekä CLIL-opetuksen materiaaleja. Oppimisprosesseja ja materiaaleja on tutkittu vähiten, kun taas oppilaiden suorituksia on tutkittu selvästi eniten. Viime vuosina myös affektiivisia tekijöitä on tutkittu paljon sekä oppilaiden että opettajien näkökulmasta.

Oppilaiden suorituksia tutkittaessa on todettu, että CLIL parantaa oppilaiden kielitaitoa (Lahuerta 2020; Olsson 2021; Lasagabaster 2011; Beaudin 2022). Monien tutkimusten mukaan CLIL on kuitenkin myös osoittautunut haastavaksi joillekin oppilaille (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Barrios ja Acosta-Manzano 2022).. Affektiivisia tekijöitä kartoittavissa tutkimuksissa on huomattu, että CLIL on lisännyt oppilaiden motivaatiota oppiaineeseen

(Lasagabaster 2011; San Isidro ja Lasagabaster 2022), oppilaat ovat nauttineet opetuksesta (Beaudin 2022) ja CLIL on lisännyt oppilaiden itseluottamusta (Coyle 2013; Roiha 2019). Joissakin tutkimuksissa CLIL ei ole vaikuttanut oppilaiden motivaatioon (Hunt 2011). Sekä oppilaat että opettajat ovat kokeneet CLIL-menetelmän hyödylliseksi tulevaisuutta ajatellen (Zanoni 2021; Lazarevic 2022). Opettajien näkökulmasta CLIL on lisännyt vaikuttamismahdollisuuksia omaan työhön ja tuonut onnistumisen tunteita (Pappa et al. 2017; Lazarevic 2022). Toisaalta monet opettajat ovat kokeneet CLIL-opetuksen haastavaksi: he ovat olleet epävarmoja omasta kielitaidostaan tai siitä, osaavatko opettaa CLIL-tunteja oikein (Pappa et al. 2017; Cuesta-Medina ja Torres-Rincón 2019). Lisäksi negatiivisia tuntemuksia on syntynyt ajan, yhteistyön, riittävän koulutuksen ja materiaalien puutteesta (Breidbach ja Medina-Suárez 2016; Pappa et al. 2017; Minardi 2021; Lazarevic 2022; Fielden Burns ja Martínez Agudo 2023).

Osa opettajista on kokenut, ettei ole varma menetelmän tavoitteista tai sisällöstä (Dvorjaninova ja Alas 2018). Opettajat ovat tienneet menetelmän peruseriaatteet, mutta eivät ole olleet tietoisia kaikista siihen sisältyvistä pedagogisista ratkaisuista (Karabassova 2022). Oppilaiden tietoisuutta CLIL-menetelmästä ei ole tutkittu.

Vaikka CLIL-ohjelmia on tutkittu paljon, on tarve uusille tutkimuksille yhä olemassa. Koska CLIL on terminä niin laaja, tutkimustulokset ovat harvoin yleistettävissä, ja jokaisessa tutkimuksessa on huomioitava erilaiset olosuhteet ja muut muuttujat (Dalton-Puffer ja Smit 2013; Pérez Cañado 2018). Oppilaiden käsityksiä on viime aikoina tutkittu enemmän, mutta suurin osa tutkimuksista on tehty yläasteikäisten tai sitä vanhempien parissa. Ala-asteikäisten käsityksiä on tutkittu vähemmän. Lisäksi suurin osa tutkimuksista on tehty kouluissa, joiden CLIL-ohjelmassa vierasta kieltä käytetään 25–70 % tietyn aineen tai aiheen opetuksesta (Seikkula-Leino 2007; Roiha 2019; Zanoni 2021; Barrios ja Acosta-Manzano 2022). Helsingissä, jossa tämä tutkimus tehtiin, vieraan kielen osuus on 10-25 prosenttia (Kohl et al. 2019). Tämän vuoksi koin, että tälle tutkimukselle on paikkansa.

Helsingin CLIL-ohjelmaa kutsutaan kielirikasteiseksi oppimiseksi ja opetuksi. Tällä hetkellä kielirikasteisia kouluja on Helsingissä 11. Helsingin kaupunki on tehnyt kielirikasteisen oppimisen ja opetuksen käsikirjan, jonka tarkoituksena on yhtenäistää kielirikasteisuutta kaupungissa (Kohl et al. 2019). Käsikirjassa kerrotaan, että kielirikasteisuuden tavoitteita ovat mm. oppilaiden kielitaidon ja sisältöosaamisen kehittyminen, oman ja muiden kulttuurien arvostuksen kasvaminen sekä itseluottamuksen lisääntyminen. Käsikirja sisältää vuosikellon jokaiselle luokka-asteelle ensimmäisestä kuudenteen luokkaan. Vuosikelloon on listattu kyseiselle luokka-asteelle sopivia sisältöjä ja esimerkkejä niihin liittyvästä sanastosta englanniksi. Sisällöt on poimittu kansallisesta opetussuunnitelmasta. Kuten todettu, käsikirjassa kerrotaan kielirikasteisen opetuksen osuuden kaikesta opetuksesta olevan 10-25 prosenttia. Koulussa, jossa tutkimus tehtiin, kielirikasteisuuden opetuksen osuus on rajattu 13-15 prosenttiin. Käsikirja ilmestyi vuonna 2019, jolloin tutkimukseen osallistuneista oppilaista osa oli toisella ja osa kolmannella luokalla. Kielirikasteinen oppimien ja opetus oli kuitenkin käynnistynyt jo heidän ensimmäisestä kouluvuodestaan alkaen.

Tutkimukseen osallistui 5 opettajaa ja 13 oppilasta. Opettajista kaksi oli kielenopettajia ja kolme luokanopettajia. Kaikilla oli kokemusta CLIL-opetuksesta vähintään kolmen vuoden ajalta, ja myös luokanopettajilla oli tausta englannin kielen opettajina jo ennen kielirikasteisuutta. Oppilaista seitsemän oli kuudennella luokalla aineiston keruun aikaan ja kuusi viidennellä luokalla. Oppilaista yhdeksän äidinkieli oli suomi, yhden äidinkieli oli englanti ja kolmen jokin muu. Kaikki paitsi yksi puhuivat sujuvaa suomen kieltä. Aineistonkeruu toteutettiin puolistrukturoiduilla haastatteluilla. Lisäksi oppilaat täyttivät hyvin lyhyen kyselylomakkeen. Puolistrukturoidussa haastattelussa kysymykset on laadittu etukäteen, mutta niiden järjestys ja sanamuoto saattaa muuttua, ja haastateltaville annetaan tilaa kertoa vapaammin omista kokemuksistaan myös mahdollisten lisäkysymysten avulla (Dörnyei 2007). Haastattelut käytiin pääosin suomeksi, mutta kahden oppilaan kohdalla englanniksi heidän omista toiveistaan ja kielitaidostaan johtuen. Kaikki opettajien haastattelut toteutettiin yksilohaastatteluina, mutta osa oppilaista haastateltiin pareittain. Haastattelut tehtiin koulussa lukuun ottamatta yhden opettajan haastattelua, joka tehtiin puhelimitse. Haastattelut nauhoitettiin ja sen jälkeen litteroitiin sekä käännettiin englanniksi. Oppilaille ja opettajille annettiin nimimerkit, jotta he eivät ole tunnistettavissa. Oppilaat nimikoitiin kirjaimilla A-M ja opettajien lyhenteet olivat seuraavanlaiset: LT1, LT2 (kieltenopettajat) sekä CT1, CT2 ja CT3 (luokanopettajat).

Kyseisessä koulussa kielenopettajat opettavat kielirikasteisia tunteja niiden luokanopettajien puolesta, jotka eivät koe itse olevansa siihen kykeneviä tai päteviä. Tällöin opetuksen toteutus suunnitellaan yhdessä, ja useimmiten luokanopettaja vastaa suomenkielisestä opetuksesta, kun taas kielenopettaja vastaa englanninkielisestä opetuksesta. Tutkimukseen osallistuneet luokanopettajat opettivat itse luokkiensa kielirikasteiset tunnit. Analyysimenetelmänä oli laadullinen sisällönanalyysi. Sisällönanalyysissä aineiston teemoja ei ole etukäteen päätetty, vaan ne nousevat aineistosta. Sisällönanalyysi aloitettiin tutustumalla aineistoon rauhassa, lukemalla se useampaan kertaan sekä ryhmittelemällä aineistosta nousevia kohtia erilaisiksi teemoiksi (Dörnyei 2007; Galletta ja Cross 2013). Tutkimuskysymykset olivat seuraavanlaiset:

1. a. Mitä hyötyjä ja haittoja viides- ja kuudesluokkalaiset ja opettajat uskovat kielirikasteisella oppimisella ja opetuksella olevan?
 - b. Miten oppilaiden ja opettajien näkemykset eroavat toisistaan?
2. Kuinka tietoisia oppilaat ja opettajat ovat siitä, mitä kielirikasteinen oppiminen ja opettaminen on?

Koska tutkimukseen osallistui alle 15-vuotiaita lapsia, suostumusta kysyttiin kirjallisesti heidän huoltajiltaan. Lisäksi oppilaiden omaa suostumusta kysyttiin suullisesti. Jokainen tutkimukseen osallistunut oppilas palautti huoltajansa allekirjoittaman suostumuslomakkeen, jossa kerrottiin tietoa tutkimuksen tavoitteista ja aineistonkeruusta. Heille kerrottiin, että haastattelut nauhoitetaan. Myös opettajat allekirjoittivat suostumuslomakkeen, jossa kerrottiin samat tiedot. Oppilaille, huoltajille ja

opettajille tehtiin selväksi, että tutkimukseen osallistuminen oli vapaaehtoista ja että osallistumisen voi keskeyttää milloin tahansa.

Yksi tämän tutkimuksen erikoisuus on se, että työskentelen itse opettajana koulussa, jossa aineisto kerättiin. Haastatteluissa, joissa haastattelija ja haastateltava tuntevat toisensa jo entuudestaan, molempien pitää orientoitua uudenlaiseen rooliin haastattelun aikana – toisaalta yhteiset kokemukset saattavat vaikuttaa haastatteluun esimerkiksi niin, että haastattelussa kerrotaan asioita, joita ei välttämättä kerrottaisi vieraille haastattelijalle (Garton ja Copland 2010). Toivon, että opettajakollegani pystyivät haastattelussa puhumaan vapaasti ja rennosti aiheesta, ja että oppilailla oli matalampi kynnyks osallistua haastatteluun ja vastata kysymyksiin. Osan oppilaista tunsin paremmin ja toiset olivat lähinnä tuttuja kasvoja koulun käytäviltä, joten tilanne oli kunkin kohdalla erilainen. Analyysia tehdessäni pyrin tietoisesti välttämään sitä, että omat kokemukseni vaikuttaisivat analyysin kulkuun tai johtopäätöksiini.

Oppilaiden äidinkielet, luokka-asteet, adjektiivit joita he käyttivät kuvaamaan kielirikasteisuutta sekä oppiaineet, joissa he kokivat kielirikasteisuutta olevan mukana, näkyvät taulukossa 1.

Taulukko 1.

Oppilaiden luokka-asteet, äidinkielet, adjektiivit kielirikasteisuudesta sekä aineet joissa he kokivat kielirikasteisuutta olevan mukana.

OPPILAS	LUOKKA-ASTE	ÄIDINKIELI	ADJEKTIIVIT KIELIRIKASTEISUUDESTA	AINEET, JOISSA ON MUKANA KIELIRIKASTEISUUTTA
A	5	suomi	hyödyllinen, kiva	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi
B	5	suomi	hyödyllinen, ok	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi, kuvataide, musiikki
C	5	suomi	hyödyllinen, kiva, kiinnostava, tärkeä	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi
D	6	suomi	hyödyllinen, vaikea, tylsä	matematiikka, musiikki
E	6	suomi	hyödyllinen, ok	matematiikka
F	6	englanti + muu	kiva, kiinnostava	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi, historia
G	6	muu	helppo	-
H	6	suomi	kiva, helppo, ok, turha	matematiikka, yhteiskuntaoppi
I	5	suomi	hyödyllinen, kiva	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi

J	5	suomi	hyödyllinen, kiva	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi, kuvataide, musiikki, yhteiskuntaoppi, historia
K	5	muu	hyödyllinen, kiva, ok, vaikea	matematiikka, ympäristöoppi, historia
L	6	suomi	hyödyllinen, ok, kiva, vaikea	matematiikka, musiikki
M	6	muu	kiva, ok, tylsä	musiikki, kuvataide

Kerron seuraavaksi tutkimuksen tuloksista aloittaen ensimmäisestä tutkimuskysymyksestä, jossa pyrittiin kartoittamaan kielirikasteisuuden hyötyjä ja haittoja opettajien ja oppilaiden näkökulmasta. Yhtenä teemana aineistosta nousivat kielitaitoon ja sisältötietoon liittyvät hyödyt ja haitat. Oppilaat ja opettajat kokivat, että kielirikasteisuus vaikutti positiivisesti oppilaiden kielitaitoon, erityisesti sanavaraston karttumiseen. Muutama mainitsi myös muita kielitaidon osa-alueita kuten puhumisen. Oppilaat kokivat kielirikasteisuuden hyödylliseksi. Oppilaat ja opettajat olivat yhtä mieltä siitä, että kielirikasteisuudella ei juuri ollut vaikutusta sisällön oppimiseen. Neljä oppilasta oli sitä mieltä, että englanninkielisiä käsitteitä oli helpompi ymmärtää kuin suomenkielisiä, ja osa toi esille, että englannin kieli saattoi joskus vaikeuttaa sisällön oppimista. Suurimmaksi osaksi opettajat ja oppilaat kokivat, että kieli ei vaikuttanut sisällön oppimiseen. Opettajat muistuttivat, että heidän tehtävänsä oli varmistaa sisällön ymmärtäminen tarvittaessa suomeksi. Osa opettajista koki, että kielirikasteisuus tarjosi sopivasti haastetta niille oppilaille, joilla oli hyvin vahva englannin kielen taito. Toisaalta taas CT2 toi esille, että hänen mielestään osa suomi toisena kielenä -oppilaista ei edes yrittänyt opetella suomea, kun englannin käyttäminen koulussa oli sallittu vaihtoehto. LT2 kyseenalaisti kielirikasteisuuden hyötyarvon englannin ollessa muutenkin vahvasti läsnä oppilaiden elämässä.

Seuraavana teemana hyödyissä ja haitoissa olivat affektiiviset tekijät. Oppilaat suhtautuivat kielirikasteisuuteen joko positiivisesti tai neutraalisti. Kaikki yhtä lukuun ottamatta keksivät jotakin positiivista kielirikasteisuudesta. Yhdeksän oppilaan mielestä se oli kivaa ja monen mielestä myös lisäsi motivaatiota oppiaineeseen. Viiden mielestä kielirikasteisuus vaikutti rohkaisevasti kielen käyttämiseen. Muutama oppilas mainitsi kielirikasteisuuden olevan tylsää kyselylomakkeissaan, mutta myös he keksivät siihen liittyen positiivisiakin asioita. Opettajat olivat samoilla linjoilla oppilaiden kanssa siitä, että he uskoivat oppilaiden nauttivan kielirikasteisuudesta ja uskoivat sen lisäävän heidän motivaatiotaan. Erityisesti luokanopettajat olivat tätä mieltä.

Affektiivisiin tekijöihin liittyen yksi opettajien haastatteluissa esiin noussut teema oli työtyytyväisyys, eli kielirikasteisuuden vaikutus esimerkiksi työmäärään ja työssä viihtyvyyteen. Erityisesti luokanopettajien mielestä kielirikasteisuus oli pääosin erittäin positiivinen asia. He kokivat opettamisen mielekkääksi ja tärkeäksi. Kieltenopettajat olivat neutraalimpia. LT2 ei keksinyt, mitä haittaa kielirikasteisuudesta olisi hänelle henkilökohtaisesti, mutta ei myöskään kokenut sitä erityisen positiivisena asiana. LT1 sen sijaan painotti pääasiassa negatiivisia tuntemuksia: hän koki, että

kielirikasteisuus oli kokeellista ja hieman sekavaa eikä ollut varma sen tavoitteista. Opettajat kokivat, että kielirikasteisten tuntien valmistelu vaati hieman tavallista enemmän aikaa, ja sitä oli välillä vaikea löytää. Materiaaleja oli kuitenkin saatavilla. Lisäksi heidän mielestään oli vaikea löytää aikaa itse opetukselle, sillä jo suomeksi asioiden läpi käyminen aiheutti kiirettä. Kuudesluokkalaisten opettajat kokivat myös, että koska käsikirja (2019) ilmestyi liian myöhään heidän tarpeisiinsa nähden, eivät he olleet päässeet opettamaan kielirikasteisuutta toivomallaan tavalla. He kertoivat, että kielirikasteisuus oli hieman jäänyt sen jälkeen, kun käsikirja ilmestyi, ja he huomasivat siinä olevien tavoitteiden olevan epärealistisia heidän luokalleen heidän ollessaan jo kolmannella luokalla. Kuudesluokkalaisten opettajat kokivat kuitenkin, että tulevaisuudessa he pystyisivät hyödyntämään käsikirjaa uusien luokkien kanssa.

Kaikki opettajat kertoivat tekevänsä jonkinlaista yhteistyötä kielirikasteisuuteen liittyen: saman luokka-asteen opettajat toistensa kanssa, kielenopettajat yhdessä sen luokan opettajan kanssa, kenen luokkaa opettivat, ja kolmas luokanopettaja yhdessä käsikirjatyöryhmän kanssa. Hän oli ollut mukana kirjoittamassa Helsingin kaupungin käsikirjaa kielirikasteisesta oppimisesta ja opetuksesta.

Oppilaiden ja opettajien näkemyksen kielirikasteisuuden hyödyistä ja haitoista olivat hyvin samankaltaisia. Sekä oppilaat että opettajat näkivät kielitaidon kehittymisen, erityisesti sanavaraston osalta, kielirikasteisuuden päällimmäisenä hyötynä. Tämä on näkynyt myös aiemmissa tutkimuksissa (Coyle 2013; Pladevall-Ballester 2015; Roiha 2019; Beaudin 2022; Karabassova 2022). Kielitaidon lisäksi oppilaat ja opettajat uskoivat, kuten myös aikaisemmissa tutkimuksissa on todettu, että CLIL-ohjelma lisää motivaatiota oppiaineeseen ja vaikuttaa rohkaisevasti kielen käyttöön (Seikkula-Leino 2007; San Isidro ja Lasagabaster 2022). Oppilaat kertoivat suurimmaksi osaksi pitävänsä kielirikasteisuudesta, mihin myös opettajat uskoivat. Lisäksi erityisesti luokanopettajat kertoivat itse nauttivansa kielirikasteisesta opettamisesta. Aiempiin tutkimuksiin nähden luokanopettajien positiivinen suhtautuminen on hieman poikkeavaa. Tämä saattaa hyvinkin liittyä luokanopettajien taustaan sekä luokan- että kielenopettajina. Heillä on ollut hyvät lähtökohdat alkaa opettaa kielirikasteisuutta, sillä kokemusta sekä sisältöaineiden että kieliaineiden osalta on jo ollut. Monissa aiemmissa tutkimuksissa soveltuvan koulutuksen puute, epätietoisuus ja epävarmuus omasta pätevyydestä tai kielitaidosta ovat vaikuttaneet opettajien kokemuksiin negatiivisesti (Pappa et al. 2017; Dvorjaninova and Alas 2018; Cuesta-Medina ja Torres-Rincón 2019).

Toisena tutkimuskysymyksenä oli opettajien ja oppilaiden tietoisuus siitä, mitä kielirikasteisuus on. Opettajat olivat tietoisia CLIL-menetelmän peruseriaatteista. Osa määritteli kielirikasteisuuden enemmän oppiaineiden opettamisen kautta ja osa laajemmin, mieltäen kielirikasteisuuden olevan läsnä monenlaisissa tilanteissa koulupäivän aikana. Vain yksi opettaja, LT1, koki epätietoisuutta kielirikasteisuuden merkityksestä ja tavoitteista. Huomioitavaa on, että opettajien vastauksissa ei tullut esille kielirikasteisuuden kulttuurinen ulottuvuus, vaikka se määritellään sekä Coylen (2007) teoriassa että käsikirjassa (2019), joka perustuu Coylen neljään käsitteeseen. Toisaalta opettajilta ei myöskään suoraan kysytty juuri kulttuurin merkityksestä kielirikasteisuudessa.

Oppilaista suurin osa tiesi kielirikasteisuuden perusidean. Mielenkiintoista kyllä, kaikki viidesluokkalaiset tunsivat termin ja olivat tietoisia kielirikasteisuuden olemassaolosta heidän koulussaan, mutta kuudesluokkalaisten vain kaksi oli tietoisia kielirikasteisuudesta. Tämä saattaa liittyä siihen, että viidesluokkalaisten opettaja oli mukana käsikirjahankkeessa, tai esimerkiksi siihen, että kuudesluokkalaisten opettajat myönsivät kielirikasteisuuden jääneen vähemmälle viime vuosina. Oppilailta ei odotettu syvempää tietämystä kielirikasteisuuden tavoitteista tai ulottuvuuksista.

Oppilaiden tietoisuutta CLIL-ohjelmasta tai sen olemassaolosta koulussa ei ole aiemmin tutkittu. Toisaalta, koska aiemmissa tutkimuksissa vieraan kielen osuus opetuksesta on ollut huomattavasti suurempi kuin kielirikasteisuudessa, on voitu ehkä olettaa oppilaiden olevan siitä tietoisia. Opettajien osalta aikaisemmissa tutkimuksissa on todettu heidän olevan tietoisia CLIL-menetelmästä perustasolla, mutta kaikki menetelmän hyödyt tai pedagogiset perusteet eivät ole olleet opettajien tiedossa (Cuesta-Medina ja Torres-Rincón 2019; Karabassova 2022). Tämä tutkimus viittaa samaan – kulttuurinen puoli jäi uupumaan opettajien vastauksista, eivätkä he myöskään painottaneet kielirikasteisuuden systemaattisuutta, vaikkakin se on olennainen osa onnistunutta CLIL-ohjelmaa (Coyle 2007).

Eräs haastatteluissa voimakkaasti esiin noussut asia oli englannin kielen vahva asema oppilaiden arkielämässä. Sekä oppilaat että opettajat toivat esille, että oppilaat käyttivät englantia paljon vapaa-ajalla esimerkiksi kavereiden kanssa jutellessaan, peleissä, erilaisissa sovelluksissa ja englanninkielisiä elokuvia ja sarjoja katsomalla. Monet kokivat, että vaikka kielirikasteisuus oli saattanut vaikuttaa positiivisesti joihinkin osa-alueisiin, suurin osa kielitaidosta oli kehittynyt vapaa-ajan käytössä. Oppilaiden englannin kielen taito oli selvästi erittäin hyvä. Oppilaista osa toi myös esille, että suomenkieliset sanat välillä unohtuivat, vaikka äidinkielenä oli suomi. Vaikka englannin kielen voimakas läsnäolo oppilaiden elämässä ei ole yllättävää, herättää se silti paljon ajatuksia. Voisiko kielirikasteisuuden kielenä ollakin jokin muu, jolloin oppilaat oppisivat enemmän sellaisesta kielestä ja kulttuurista, joka ei muuten tulisi tutuksi? Toisaalta on nähty, että CLIL-kielen status koulun ulkopuolella vaikuttaa koettuihin hyötyihin (De Smet et al. 2023). Entäpä olisiko parempi, että peruskoulussa keskityttäisiin pelkästään suomen kielen opettamiseen ja vahvistamiseen, kun englantia opitaan jo kaikkialta ja sen jatkuvan läsnäolon koettiin joskus heikentävän suomen kielen osaamista? Toisaalta taas on hyväksi, että koulussa opitaan englannin kielen akateemیسempaa puolta. Erityisesti sanavaraston koettiin kehittyneen koulussa, mikä todennäköisesti liittyy siihen, että koulussa käytetty sanasto eroaa vapaa-ajan sanastosta huomattavasti.

Kaiken kaikkiaan tulokset ovat rohkaisevia erityisesti kielirikasteisuuden koetun mielekkyyden ja motivaation lisäämisen suhteen. Kielirikasteisuuden vähäisyys on todennäköisesti vaikuttanut siihen, että hyötyjä ei ole koettu kovin suuriksi. Suunta on kuitenkin hyvä, ja ehkäpä vieraan kielen osuuden hienoisella kasvattamisella kielirikasteisuudesta voisi saada enemmän irti. Toisaalta vieraan kielen pieni osuus on vaikuttanut myös siihen, että kielirikasteisuudella ei ole koettu olevan voimakkaita haittapuolia. Näyttäisi myös siltä, että opettajien koulutusta erityisesti

kielirikasteisuuden kulttuurisesta ulottuvuudesta voitaisiin lisätä ja tarjota enemmän mahdollisuuksia tiiviimpään yhteistyöhön ja systemaattisemman kielirikasteisuuden kehittämiseen. Tämä voisi osaltaan vaikuttaa myös siihen, että kielirikasteisuudelle olisi helpompi löytää aikaa oppitunneilta, eikä se veisi niin paljon yksittäisten opettajien suunnittelu-aikaa.

Vaikkakin tämän tutkimuksen tulokset ovat suurimmaksi osaksi linjassa aiempien tutkimustulosten kanssa, on muistettava, että tuloksia ei voi yleistää. Tässä laadullisessa tutkimuksessa oli mukana vain viisi opettajaa ja 13 oppilasta, ja tutkimus tehtiin hyvin tietynlaisissa olosuhteissa. Lisäksi tutkimuksen tuloksiin saattoi vaikuttaa se, että tutkimukseen osallistuneet oppilaat olivat itse valinneet osallistuvansa. Voi olla, että tutkimus houkutteli enimmäkseen oppilaita, joilla oli keskivertoa positiivisempi suhtautuminen kielirikasteisuuteen ja kouluun ylipäänsä. Toisaalta osa oppilaita ei haastattelun alussa tiennyt, mitä kielirikasteisuus tarkoittaa. Koen kuitenkin, että tutkimus antoi arvokasta tietoa kielirikasteisuudesta näissä nimenomaisissa olosuhteissa.

Jatkossa olisi mielenkiintoista tutkia CLIL-menetelmää tässä kontekstissa laajemmin. Tämä voisi tarkoittaa esimerkiksi tutkimusta, johon otettaisiin mukaan useita helsinkiläisiä kouluja, joissa kielirikasteisuus on osa opetussuunnitelmaa. Näin saataisiin lisää tietoa sekä kielirikasteisuuden toteutuksesta että sen hyödyistä ja haitoista nimenomaan näissä olosuhteissa. Tutkimukseen kannattaisi sisällyttää myös oppilaiden oppimistuloksia sekä sisältö- että kieliaineissa, jotta kielirikasteisuuden vaikutuksesta oppimiseen saataisiin lisää tietoa. Tuloksia olisi hyvä verrata muihin CLIL-ohjelmiin ja tätä kautta kehittää menetelmää entisestään. Lisäksi olisi mielenkiintoista tutkia lisää sellaisten CLIL-opettajien näkemyksiä, joilla ei ole taustaa kieltenopettajina tai kokemusta vieraan kielen käytöstä opetuksessa.