# The Challenges in Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning

by Ima Isnaini, Taufiqur Rohmah, Mursid Saleh Abdurrachman Faridi, Sri Wuli Fitriati

# The Challenges in Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning: The Head Teachers' Personal View of Teachers' Professional Development

Ima Isnaini
Universitas Negeri Semarang
isnainiima@ikippgribojonegoro
.ac.id

Mursid Saleh
Universitas Negeri Semarang

Abdurrachman Faridi
Universitas Negeri Semarang

Taufiqur Rohmah
Universitas Negeri Semarang
rimataufiq83@gmail.com

Sri Wuli Fitriati
Universitas Negeri Semarang
wulifit@yahoo.co.id

**Abstract---The Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is unique since the focus is not only in English as instructional language but we have to consider the content as another side of the coin of CLIL. Both aspects must be balance. The objective of the study was exploring the head teacher's personal view of the challenges in implementing CLIL for primary schools students. This study used qualitative case study. The participants of this study were Head teacher and a CLIL teacher in a Private Islamic Schools. The data were gathered through semi-structured interview, and observation. The data were analysed descriptively. The results revealed that teachers' lack of knowledge, lack of teaching experience, unwell teaching preparation is the main challenges that emerged during CLIL implementation. From the result of the study can be concluded that integrating all aspects in CLIL has great influence in gaining the expectation or the goals of CLIL program by the related parties.**

*Keywords: CLIL, personal view, teachers' professional development*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has become a focus of attention in recent years, particularly in the state sector in various countries and on the interface with the private school and university sector. CLIL is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of content and language with the objective of promoting both content and language mastery to predefined levels (Maljers, Marsh, Wolff, 2007).

The overall major challenge, in the development and implementation of a teacher education curriculum in CLIL, is its integrative nature. This is the case at all levels of education primary, secondary, tertiary, vocational and adult. CLIL seeks to teach two subjects in one a content subject and a language. Content subjects, such as mathematics and an additional language, are usually taught separately.

With the exception of primary teachers, other educators are often trained to teach just one subject be that a content subject or a language, as opposed to both. Even where teachers are trained in both a content subject and a language, training in the integration of language and content is not widespread.

Implementing CLIL teaching and learning, consequently demands on teachers' role to make difference in students" live. They are the agent of change in their own classroom (Safari & Fitriati, 2016). Teachers are also required able to teach the subjects such as Mathematics and Science using English. They also have to be able to assess 2 areas, both assessing content subject and students' English proficiency. Those abilities are part of the requirements which are included in the two competences that teachers have to possess (Decree of Ministry of Education and Culture number 20, year 2003). They have to master the contents of their subject matters (professionally) as well as the techniques of teaching them (pedagogically).

Teachers undertaking CLIL will need to be prepared to develop multiple types of expertise: among others, in the content subject; in a language; in best practice in teaching and learning; in the integration of the previous three; and, in the integration of CLIL within an educational institution. CLIL teacher has to be able to articulate CLIL-specific assessment needs and goals, and to develop and implement related assessment tools b) to identify what learners already know  c) to guide learner reflection on previously agreed   upon content, language and learning skills, goals/ outcomes, achievements  d) to guide learners in using portfolio-based approaches (including the European Language Portfolio as tools for fostering learning, teaching and assessment   e) to use formative and summative assessment strategies to support content, language and learning skills development  f ) to use benchmarking in supporting

progress in learning  g) to introduce the concepts of self-assessment and   peer-assessment to support learners in taking greater responsibility for their learning h) to detail the pitfalls of assessment and propose ways of circumnavigating these.

Some previous studies examine CLIL in European countries. For example, Wewer (2013) investigated English proficiency assessment in bilingual content instruction CLIL in Finland. There also some existing studies (Hönig 2010, Serragiotto 2007), as well as research in assessment concerning both language and content knowledge (Huttner, Dalton, and Smit 2013; Lasagabaster and Sierra 2010; Sierra 2007) have mainly focused on secondary or tertiary students in United States. Although, some schools in Asia's context also adopt CLIL in the teaching and learning, but the study in the CLIL area were rare and only between (Fitriani, 2016) and (Rachmajanti et al., 2015). Furthermore, implementing of CLIL viewed from teachers' professional development in the Indonesian context has not so far been investigated at all.

The aim of the research was to explore the head teacher's personal view of the challenges in implementing CLIL for primary schools students. The head master as a supervisor need to analyse the CLIL program which has been implemented and also find out the solution to improve the quality of the program

## II. METHODS

The current research employed a qualitative case study. The qualitative case study considered as a suitable research design since the goal of the study was to find a new phenomenon happen in the research setting. The participant was a head a teacher and a CLIL teacher. Both of them were interviewed to gain the data deals with the challenges they faced during the implementation of CLIL. Semi structured interview were used to gain the data from the head teacher and also the CLIL teacher. The data then analysed using qualitative theme analysis by Creswell (2018). In themes analysis, initially consists of developing a general sense of the data, and then coding description and themes about the central phenomenon.

## III. RESULTS ND DISCUSSION

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL), mostly implemented in English (Dalton-Puffer, 2010), is regarded despite some reservations (Briggs, 2008) as an innovative oralternative approach to communicative language teaching (CLT). Stakeholders, researchers and other actors involved in teaching foreign language embrace CLIL in the hope that deficiencies in foreign language learning can be overcome so as to meet new socioeconomic needs (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010;

Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). However, CLIL is not only about benefits.

In this section, I will first outline some of its challenges and drawbacks—particularly in reference to teachers and teacher development, since other difficulties may be rooted in how teachers are prepared to respond to the new issues that CLIL seems to raise. In other words, training teachers should be a priority (Hillyard, 2011). Based on the result of interview with the headmaster, we notes that one of the issues to address in CLIL implementation is the lack of knowledge of the stakeholders have with regard to aims. As it was stated by the headmaster:
"*Most of the teacher do not understand the aims and also how was CLIL to be implemented*" (interview, 20/04/2019).

In order for administrators to implement CLIL programs responsibly, serious needs analysis (Butler, 2005, p. 233-236; Ruiz-Garrido and Fortanet-Gómez, 2009) must be carried out before any actions actually begin. This lack of awareness or knowledge among administrators is intimately linked to those who are in charge of implementing CLIL teachers. Teachers sometimes do not know what it is expected from them, especially when CLIL means putting content and foreign language teachers working together. As stated by the headmaster:
"*Some teachers were do not understand what actualy expected to be gained by the student through CLIL program*" (interview, 20/04/2019).

It was in line with Mehisto (2008) who found out that those CLIL classes which were only taught by content teachers featured second language support mostly through unnecessary translation. This supported with the result of interview with the CLIL teacher who stated that
"*As a CLIL teacher sometimes, I was trapped in the traditional paradigm of teaching*" (interview, 24/04/2019)

The statement also led to the discovery that teachers saw themselves as either content teachers or language teachers, a view which affected team teaching or a full integration of components. This reticence was found even in teachers' unwillingness to incorporate materials coming from content or language classes. Overall, the author suggests that team teaching is one of the major drawbacks in CLIL (also Cammarata, 2009, p. 569-574; Coonan, 2007; Coyle, 2007; Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 44; Feryok, 2008; Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008; Yassin et al., 2010).

More teacher-related concerns are reported in Pena Díaz and Porto Requejo (2008), whose research project followed the implementation of bilingual-CLIL programs in 150 primary schools in Madrid. In order to understand the factors that impinge on CLIL teachers' practices in this setting, an unspecified number of teachers were interviewed

with structured questionnaires. Results showed that teachers believed their practices could be enhanced should they develop a more proficient command of English, a concern also reported in Pavón Vázquez and Rubio (2010, p. 51) and in Butler's (2005, p. 236) study, which adds that teachers' lack of content and language knowledge affects CLIL success.

In other words, teachers may equate CLIL success to their own level of English and curricular content understanding. Surprisingly, given the fact that the participants in Pena Díaz and Porto Requejo (2008) lacked formal training on bilingual education methodologies, they nevertheless did not consider that they needed theoretical training on such methodologies. They expressed a reliance on working with content teachers and the practical knowledge, not defined in the article, of their subjects. Put simply, another concern that recurs across contexts is how to organize pre-service and in-service teacher education programs that could also contemplate CLIL settings as possible sources of employment for future teachers

## IV. CONCLUSION

Needless to say, CLIL models and pedagogies are initially based on the very same principles as are communicative language teaching and task-based learning. The difference is that contents/topics acquire a more prominent role, particularly in content-driven CLIL such as bilingual education. In this sense, teacher educators may either developing a CLIL module or deepening the bridges between theory and practice through their own practices. The challenge the former poses is that in order to lead a CLIL module, teacher educators themselves need to be qualified to teach CLIL at higher education level.

Any innovation presents both benefits and challenges. What is important in implementing CLIL as an innovation is that it should be part of a negotiated enterprise amongst administrators, curriculum planners, and teachers—and it is this last group that will be responsible for the success of CLIL implementation. This may show that top-down decisions need to be carefully engineered so that changes and decision-making processes begin by addressing teacher development first rather than last in the educational system

## REFERENCES

[1] Butler, Y.G. (2005). Content-based instruction in EFL contexts: Considerations for effective implementation. *JALT Journal, 27*(2), 227-245

[2] Briggs, M., Woodfield A., Martin C., Swatton P., (2008) *Assessment for Learning and Teaching*, Learning Matters, Exeter

[3] Cammarata, L. (2009). Negotiating curricular transitions: Foreign language teachers' learning experience with content-based instruction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des la langues vivantes, 65*(4), 559-585

[4] Coonan, C. (2007). Insider views of the CLIL class through teacher-selfobservationintrospection. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*(5), 625646

[5] Coyle, D. (2007). The CLIL quality challenge. In D. Marsh & D. Wolff (Eds.), *Diverse contexts–Converging goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang

[6] Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Coyle, D., P. Hood & D. Marsh (2010). *CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: University Press

[7] Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative approaches to research* 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/ Pearson Education

[8] Dalton-Puffer, C., Hʼuttner, J., Jexenflicker, S., Schindelegger, V., & Smit, U. (2010). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins

[9] Decree of Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia Number 20 Year 2003

[10] Hillyard, S. (2011). First steps in CLIL: Training the teachers. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 4*(2): 1-12. Available from http://journals.sfu.ca/laclil/index.php/LACLIL/article/view/62

[11] Hönig, Ingrid (2010). *Assessment in CLIL: Theoretical and Empirical Research*. Saarbrucken: VDM Verlag

[12] Hüttner, Julia. Dalton-Puffer Christiane & Smit Ute (2013). The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (3): 267-284

[13] Fitriani, Ika. (2016) *Grass root's Voices on the CLIL Implementation in Tertiary Education*. Dinamika Ilmu . 16 (2s): 211-220

[14] Lasagabaster, David & Sierra, Juan Manuel (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: more differences than similarities. *ELT Jounal* 64 (4): 367-375

[15] Maljers, A., D. Marsh & D. Wolff. (2007). Windows on CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in the European Spotlight. Alkmaar, the Netherlands: Ter Burg Offset

[16] Feryok, A. (2008). The impact of TESOL on maths and science teachers. *ELT Jounal, 62*(2), 123-130. Feryok, A. (2008). The impact of

TESOL on maths and science teachers. *ELT Journal, 62*(2),123-130

[17] Rachmajanti, S., Zen, E.L., & Apriana A. (2015). *Using English In Science Class As An Attempt To Maximizing Input In Second Language Learning*. Vietnam: TESOLConference2015.Retreivedfromhttp://www.vnseameo.org/TESOLConference2015/Materials/Fullpaper/Dr.%20Sri%20Rachmajanti%20+%20Ms.%20Evynurul%20Laily%20Zen%20+%20Ms.%20Aulia%20Apriana.pdf.

[18] [18] Pavón Vázquez, V. & Rubio, F. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes. *Porta Linguarum, 14*, 45-58.

[19] Safari, M.U.K & Fitriati, S.W. (2016). Learning Strategies Used by Learners with Different Speaking performance for developing Speaking Ability. *English Education Journal*. 6 (2): 87-100

[20] Serragiotto, Graziano (2007). Assessment and evaluation in CLIL. In D. Marsh & D. Wolff (eds). *Diverse Contexts – Converging Goals.*

*CLIL in Europe* (pp. 271-283). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

[21] Sierra, Cecilia (2007). Assessing CLIL at primary school: a longitudinal study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10 (5): 582-602

[22] Wewer, Taina (2013). English language assessment in bilingual CLIL instruction at primary level in Finland: Quest for updated and valid assessment methods. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht* 18 (2): 76-87. Retrieved November 22, 2013 from http://zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/jg-18-2/beitrag/Wewer.pdf

[23] Yassin, S.M., Tek, O.E., Alimon, H., Baharom, S., & Ying, L.Y. (2010). Teaching science through English: Engaging pupils cognitively. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(3), 46-59.

# The Challenges in Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | www.eric.ed.gov<br>Internet Source | 2% |
| 2 | download.atlantis-press.com<br>Internet Source | 2% |
| 3 | Submitted to Universitas Negeri Semarang<br>Student Paper | 2% |
| 4 | procesbolonski.uw.edu.pl<br>Internet Source | 1% |
| 5 | repository.ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id<br>Internet Source | 1% |
| 6 | Submitted to Hanoi National University<br>Student Paper | 1% |
| 7 | Submitted to University of Aberdeen<br>Student Paper | 1% |
| 8 | Submitted to Universidad Distrital FJDC<br>Student Paper | 1% |
| 9 | etefmgu.blogspot.com<br>Internet Source | 1% |

| 10 | studentsrepo.um.edu.my<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
|---|---|---|
| 11 | zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 12 | "International Perspectives on Motivation", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2013<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 13 | eprints.uad.ac.id<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 14 | laclil.unisabana.edu.co<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 15 | www.cambridge.org<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 16 | hdl.handle.net<br>Internet Source | <1 % |

| Exclude quotes | On | Exclude matches | Off |
|---|---|---|---|
| Exclude bibliography | On | | |