TEACHER'S CHANGES
AND CHALLENGES IN CLIL IMPLEMENTATION*

Tran Thi Thu Hien**

*VNU University of Languages and International Studies,
Pham Van Dong, Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam*

Abstract: This study aims at finding out high school English teachers' changes and challenges in content and language integrated learning in Vietnam. Survey questionnaires and in-depth interviews have been chosen to collect data for the study. The results show that teachers have made encouraging changes in lesson planning, material development, lesson delivery and assessment. The challenges encountered by the teachers involve the subject knowledge, teachers' time and effort allowances, learners' motivation and supporting policies. The results of the study can be considered an informative source of reference for future CLIL implementation at schools across our country.

Key words: CLIL, language, content, integrated learning

1. Introduction

Content and Integrated Learning (CLIL) has been becoming a very welcoming educational approach since David Marsh first introduced this term in 1994. In this approach, students learn a subject (content) and either a foreign or a second language at the same time.

So far, CLIL has been considered similar to but distinctive from language immersion and content-based instruction. In other words, it is an educational theory that integrates language teaching and content derived from other subjects. This approach is of great advantage to learners' cognitive development, and is more widely applicable than language immersion, and so is increasingly more appreciated around the world.

In Vietnam, besides English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), CLIL appears to be a new approach that school managers aim at for a new, more holistic way of delivering content, as well as English and cognitive development at the same time.

With its rapid development, many studies related to CLIL have been conducted to gather information about the implementation and experiences in many education systems. (Nikula & Marsh, 1996; Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Lorenzo, 2008; Ruiz de Zarobe & Jimenez, 2009; Yassin et al. 2009). A similar one should be carried out in Vietnam to provide more information for teachers, managers and policy-makers with the hope of creating a better environment for CLIL implementation in our country.

** Corresponding author.
Email address: hienesp@gmail.com

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition of CLIL

Marsh (2002) describes CLIL as an approach which may involve languages, intercultural knowledge, understanding and skills, preparation for internationalization and development of education itself. By that he means subjects are taught through a second or foreign language with "dual-focus aims"; namely, the learning of content happens simultaneously with the learning of a second or foreign language. This receives a big applause from Ball et al. (2015) when they state that CLIL is an advisable way of transferring the content through a second language.

Furthermore, the growth of CLIL approach has proved that it is incredibly innovative. In CLIL, language not only functions as a tool of giving instructions but as the medium of delivering the subject matter as well (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010; Grieveson & Wendy, 2017). This well supports declaration of Eurydice (2006) that CLIL is not restricted to language teaching; it is, nevertheless, a pioneering methodological approach that highlights both content and language.

2.2. Characteristics of CLIL

As an educational approach, CLIL is at times used interchangeably with similar-but-not-identical terms such as immersion program, bilingual education, content-based instruction, or English as a medium of instruction (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010; Heine, 2010; Costa, 2016). These terms, to some extent, resemble but not fully reflect what CLIL is. As Coyle et al. (2010), stated, CLIL and these terms may have some joint basic theories and practices but they are not synonymous. To be more exact, CLIL has distinguished characteristics that differentiate it from other bilingual teaching methods. Regarding CLIL in the context of English teaching, Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlou (2011) have reviewed scholars' ideas and asserted that CLIL has three following prominent features:

(i)   the content is taught through English so that students can grasp the content and foster their second or foreign language at the same time;

(ii) CLIL has altered sociolinguistic and political setting, being consistent from preschools through to higher education, which requires that adaptation is a must to be successfully applied. This is because CLIL makes use of a second or foreign language as a learning tool in a non-language subject and both aims (language and the subject) have a distinguished-but-joint role in CLIL implementation and there is no one-size-fit-all material, guideline or even policy for any particular teaching situation and condition.

(iii) CLIL endorses the development of academic, cognitive, cultural, linguistic, social, and other learning skills (as cited in Mehisto et al., 2008). This is upheld by Pokrivcakova (2015) when she affirms that CLIL is an approach that not only integrates the content and a foreign/ second language but also creates a natural learning context to develop critical learning skills.

The above marking features are the ones teachers should note and apply in order to successfully implement CLIL as a teaching approach at their schools and classes.

2.3. Types of CLIL

There have been many CLIL programmes around the world and they vary from one another. It can be 45-minute (or even shorter) subject lessons or full immersion in curriculum in which the subjects may be taught by either subject specialists or by language teachers or co-work of both. Depending on the ways CLIL

lessons are delivered, Bently (2010) suggests three following typical models of CLIL:

(i) Soft CLIL: Topics from the curriculum are taught as part of a language course.

(ii) Modular CLIL: A subject such as Science or Art is taught for a certain number of hours using the target language.

(iii) Hard CLIL: Almost half the curriculum (or even above) is taught in the target language.

Figure 1

Models of CLIL (Bently, 2010)

Soft CLIL	Types of CLIL	Time	Context
↑	Language-led	45 minutes, once a week	Some curricular topics are taught during a language course.
	Subject-led (modular)	15 hours during one term	Schools or teachers choose parts of the subject syllabus which they teach in the target language.
↓ Hard CLIL	Subject-led (partial immersion)	About 50% of the curriculum	About half of the curriculum is taught in the target language. The content can reflect what is taught in the L1 curriculum or can be new content.

Definitely, teaching content along with English is challenging for both subject and language teachers (Cambridge ESOL, 2011). For subject teachers, they need to transfer the subject knowledge clearly and correctly, provide students with vocabulary and structures used with the subject contents while using proper classroom language to explain, raise questions, and check their students' English progress. For language teachers, they have to discover the students' learning styles, find suitable teaching techniques, accurately answer the students' questions related to the learning material and simultaneously extend and enrich their students' language and skills. Importantly, both of these teachers are expected to constantly provide their students with help when CLIL is being employed.

2.4. The CLIL Framework

The CLIL framework was first developed in the 1990s by Coyle and some other researchers in order to promote recognition of CLIL components and

support teachers' teaching (Straková, 2013). The framework consists of 4Cs including content, communication, cognition and culture.

Content means concepts, facts, themes, etc. related to the subject. It, however, should not be viewed in isolation or just as the acquisition of knowledge, skills or understanding of a field, but as part of a cognitive development and intercultural perception process, in which the learners obtain, transfer and create their own subject knowledge along with developing learning skills (Coyle, 2015).

> Content refers to *"the subject matter, theme, and topic forming the basis for the program, defined by domain or discipline according to knowledge, concepts, and skills (e.g. Science, IT, Arts)."* (Coyle, 2006, p. 9)

Communication is another key aspect of CLIL. In CLIL, "language is used to learn, to communicate and to externalize and internalize understanding" (Coyle, 2015, p. 90). In that way, communication

embeds the language that is utilized to build up knowledge through interaction in the learning context. In this case, language is regarded as a learning vehicle, a tool of communication. In other words, using language to learn and learning to use language at the same time is a clear mode to reflect the concept of communication in CLIL. When describing communication in CLIL, Coyle et al. (2010) call for the attention to the language triptych with three vital dimensions consisting of language of learning (vocabulary and structures that are necessary to learn specific content knowledge), language for learning (language needed for performing successfully in a learning environment) and language through learning (new language students access for themselves when they use the language in order to support, enrich learning and apply what they have already leant).

> Communication means *"the language used to create and communicate meaning about the knowledge, concepts, and skills being learned (e.g. stating facts about the sun, giving instructions on using software, describing emotions in response to music)."* (Coyle, 2006, p. 10)

Cognition corresponds to the cognitive level of the learning in CLIL, which is based on the constructivist idea of knowledge. It signifies the progress of students' learning, thinking, critical and creative skills, in such a way that they are able to create their own knowledge, while progressively enhancing their cognitive capability in a momentous learning process.

> Cognition refers to *"the ways that we interact and engage with knowledge, experience, and the world around us; socially (e.g. social conventions for expressing oneself in the target language), pedagogically (e.g.*

> *classroom conventions for learning and classroom interaction), and/or according to discipline (e.g. scientific conventions for preparing reports to disseminate knowledge)."* (Coyle, 2006, p. 10)

Culture is an indispensable element of CLIL since it interlinks the three other Cs by setting the context for learning in CLIL. This element embeds two other Cs of CLIL, namely citizenship or community (Coyle, 2015). Developing culture in CLIL means developing plurilingual competence for students which includes fostering pluricultural awareness so as to prepare them to learn, communicate and work successfully in diverse contexts in the future.

> Culture means *"the ways that we interact and engage with knowledge, experience, and the world around us; socially (e.g. social conventions for expressing oneself in the target language), pedagogically (e.g. classroom conventions for learning and classroom interaction), and/or according to discipline (e.g. scientific conventions for preparing reports to disseminate knowledge)."* (Coyle, 2006, p. 11)

In short, the 4Cs Framework implies that the ful practice of all the four components ensures the success of a CLIL lesson in which students learn to use language appropriately while using language to learn effectively.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Setting

In 2019, a CLIL training course was organized at a university in Hanoi. There were 40 high school teachers of English participating in this course as a part of their professional development. All of the teachers were key personnel at their schools. This was the first time they worked with the

concept of CLIL in their teaching. After the training course, these teachers were expected to apply CLIL in their teaching and, in the next few years, prepared for CLIL implementation in their workplace.

The training course was in blended learning mode with 90 online class hours and 90 face-to-face class hours. Studying online, the trainees were introduced to CLIL with its key terms, concepts and history. They discussed cases of implementing CLIL all over the world to find out the similarities and differences to their teaching contexts and draw lessons for their own situations. In on-site training part, the trainee-teachers practised how to plan a CLIL lesson, adapt materials, deliver the lessons and assess students during and after CLIL lessons.

After the training program, the teachers were expected to apply what they had learnt about CLIL to their teaching of English at their schools with the hope of changing their own way of delivering English lessons as well as raising the attitude of change for other teachers including both English teachers and subject teachers at their schools.

3.2. The Participants

Although there were 40 teachers participating in the aforementioned CLIL training program, four of them still worked with the old version of English textbooks and were too busy so only 36 teachers who were teaching students with the new English textbooks joined this study.

Among 36 teachers taking part in the study, three are male teachers aged from 38 to 43 while 33 female teachers are at the age of 26 to 42. All of the teachers have at least 4 years teaching English at high schools and are either heads, deputy heads or key teachers of the English divisions at their schools.

Obviously, in this particular context, with these language teachers, CLIL does not mean teaching another subject and English at the same time. The training program is just a trigger that could activate the teachers to explore and apply CLIL step by step in the future. The teachers are encouraged to apply "*soft CLIL*" in their teaching, reflect their teaching, observe the students learning and work with subject teachers as much as possible. The study, therefore, has been conducted to find out changes and challenges in aspects the teachers have been trained about CLIL regarding lesson planning, material development, lesson delivery and learning assessment.

3.3. Objectives of the Study

The study aims at finding out the changes made by the teachers after the CLIL training program and the challenges coming upon to them during the CLIL trial at their schools.

3.4. Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- What changes have the teachers made after the CLIL training program?
- What are the challenges encountered by the teachers during their application of CLIL at their schools?

3.5. Research Method

The research has been mainly conducted under the light of qualitative and quantitative method. Data from questionnaires and interviews have been collected and analyzed to find out answers for the research questions.

3.6. Data Collection Instruments

In this study, a questionnaire has been designed as the main instrument to find

out the teachers' changes and challenges in the CLIL implementation. Apart from some questions related to the participants' demographic information, the main part of the questionnaire with 48 statements seeks for information about teachers' changes in lesson planning, material adaptation and development, lesson delivery and assessment as well as challenges they encountered during the CLIL implementation. The questionnaire uses Likert scale ranging from one to five, moving from strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively and ends with two open-ended questions at which the participants could add more information about their changes and challenges, give details or more explanations of what they have stated in the above 48 statements.

The researcher also conducts in-depth interviews with teachers to clarify their opinions on the stated changes and challenges. The results found are believed to support data collected from the questionnaire.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Demographic Information

Table 4.1

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	below 30	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	31-35	13	36.1	36.1	38.9
	35-40	14	38.9	38.9	77.8
	above 40	8	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2

Teaching Experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	below 5 years	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	6-10 years	2	5.6	5.6	8.4
	11-15 years	14	38.8	38.8	47.2
	16-20 years	17	47.2	47.2	94.4
	above 20 years	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

As can be seen from Table 4.1, three fourth of the teachers are from 31 to 40 years old while 22.2 percent of them are in their early forties (aged 41 - 43) and there is only one teacher (aged 26) who is at the initial stage of the teaching career. A majority of the teachers have taught English from 11-20 years (86%) while two teachers have six to ten years teaching experience and another two have more than 20 years teaching English (as shown in Table 4.2).

Table 4.3

Teaching Location

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	rural	13	36.1	36.1	36.1
	suburb	9	25.0	25.0	61.1
	urban	14	38.9	38.9	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

The numbers of participants teaching English in rural and urban districts are relatively the same (36.1% and 38.9% respectively) while the number of teachers from suburb is slightly lower, accounting for 25 percent.

4.2. Teachers' Changes in CLIL Implementation

Table 4.4

Changes in Lesson Planning

Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1 I state the learning outcomes clearly.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
2 I start planning the lessons from language base.	36	3	5	4.08	.439
3 I choose content that allows for learning to be active.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
4 I differentiate content-obligatory and content-compatible language.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
5 I work with subject teachers.	36	2	5	3.36	1.018
6 My lesson adds at least 2 Cs.	36	4	5	4.08	.280
7 My lesson have a good balance of content and language.	36	2	5	3.31	.980
Valid N (listwise)	36				

Note. 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree, 5 strongly agree.

In the first, third, fourth and sixth statements, the means are from 4.06 to 4.08. It means that the majority of the teachers agree that they state the learning outcomes clearly, choose the content that allows learning to be active, differentiate content-obligatory and content-compatible language and add at least 2 Cs in each lesson. The means of statements numbered 5 and 7 are 3.36 and 3.31 respectively. Accordingly, most of the teachers are neutral as to whether they work with subject teachers or not, and they are not sure about the good balance of content and language in their lessons. The mean of the second statement is 4.08, which indicates a tendency of teachers to start planning their lessons from language base. In the interviews, teachers share that they are aware of the fact that in preparing a CLIL lesson, they should start from the content but in their cases they cannot follow this CLIL guideline as their lessons are just a part of the whole curriculum and what they prepare and teach should aim at achieving objectives of English subject not the content subjects.

Table 4.5

Changes in Material Development and Adaptation

	Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
8	I make changes on materials taken from CLIL resources before using in my class.	36	2	5	3.86	.593
9	I use more videos in my lessons.	36	2	5	3.86	.593
10	I use graphic organisers to support understanding of input.	36	2	5	3.86	.593
11	I use more relia in my lessons.	36	2	5	3.86	.593
12	I create my own CLIL materials (worksheets, presentations) in English to be used in class.	36	2	5	3.08	.874
13	I provide different sorts of input to help understanding.	36	3	5	4.06	.475
	Valid N (listwise)	36				

Most of the statements in Table 4.5 show great agreement of teachers on material development and adaptation toward the CLIL approach with means ranging from 3.86 to 4.06. Correspondingly, they agree that they make changes on materials taken from CLIL resources before using in their class, use more videos, graphic organisers, relia from different sorts of input to support understanding. Only statement numbered 12 shows the central tendency of teachers deciding that they are neutral as to whether they create their own CLIL materials or not. In the in-depth interviews, teachers explain that they usually take materials from CLIL resources on the Internet and make changes before using them. In many cases, after the altering process, the new versions of teaching materials are totally different from the original ones. They mostly take advantage of terms from the original materials and design the new tasks to match their lesson objectives.

Table 4.6

Changes in Lesson Delivery

	Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
14	I usually set the classroom up (seating, posters, resources) to support communication.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
15	In my lessons, language is a vehicle to do things (role plays/tasks etc.)	36	3	5	4.03	.446
16	I review the key vocabulary and key content concepts.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
17	I allow students to discuss or work on content concepts in their mother tongue.	36	2	5	3.53	.910
18	I provide learners with key terms and structures on the CLIL topic.	36	3	5	4.03	.446

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
19	I formulate different questions to promote lower-order and higher-order thinking skills.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
20	I use clear instructions for assignments and activities.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
21	I check the understanding of task instructions.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
22	I use different types of activities.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
23	I use a range of thinking skills.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
24	I use task-based learning.	36	3	5	4.19	.577
25	I reduce teacher's talking time and increase student's talking time.	36	3	5	4.08	.368
26	I assign the students different roles.	36	3	5	4.22	.540
27	I gradually hold back my help to the students.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
28	I create a supportive and stress-free atmosphere.	36	4	5	4.08	.280
29	I get the students collaborate on activities and share experiences.	36	4	5	4.08	.280
30	I usually support students in carrying out activities and help them to solve problems.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
	Valid N (listwise)	36				

Table 4.6 reveals that all of the statements have means of at least 3.53. This shows great agreement of teachers on changes in lesson delivery toward CLIL including setting up the learning environment, delivering content and language, implementing tasks, helping the students, etc. This result also corresponds with the interview in which teachers affirm that they have tried their best to apply what they have learnt during the CLIL course to create a sense of CLIL in their lessons and motivate their students, who love learning science and find English a hard subject.

Table 4.7

Changes in Assessment

	Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
31	I assess the students' learning basing on the outcomes.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
32	I usually use high-order questions to check if the students understand what has been taught.	36	3	5	4.03	.291
33	I assess students through the tasks that require them to understand taught knowledge or skills to complete.	36	3	5	4.03	.446
34	I inform students about the objective of each lesson and ask them to tell me if they can achieve the objectives at the end of the lesson.	36	3	5	4.06	.333
35	I provide constructive feedback.	36	4	5	4.19	.401

	Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
36	I let students comment on their friends' work.	36	4	5	4.17	.378
	Valid N (listwise)	36				

All statements in Table 4.7 have means from 4.03 to 4.19 which hints the teachers agreement on assessing activities as assessing the students' learning basing on the outcomes, using high-order questions to check if the students understand what has been taught, assessing students through the tasks that require them to understand taught knowledge or skills to complete, informing students about the objectives of each lesson and ask them to assess if they can achieve the objectives at the end of the lesson, providing constructive feedbacks and let students comment on their friends' work. Among them, the last two statements have a slightly higher level of agreement than the others. In the interviews, teachers affirm that they now assess their students more during their lessons than they used to.

4.3. Teachers' Challenges in CLIL Implementation

Table 4.8

Teachers' Challenges in CLIL Implementation

	Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
37	I have to read a lot to gain knowledge about CLIL.	36	4	5	4.17	.378
38	I sometimes get lost.	36	3	5	4.08	.554
39	Integrating content in an English lesson takes time.	36	4	5	4.22	.422
40	My students find it hard to learn content and language at the same time.	36	2	5	4.06	.630
41	My students like learning other subjects rather than English.	36	4	5	4.19	.401
42	My students are willing to prepare for the lessons.	36	2	5	3.97	.810
43	Some of my students need more help than the others.	36	3	5	4.11	.523
44	Some subject teachers are unwilling to collaborate.	36	3	5	4.11	.523
45	I am overwhelmed with workload.	36	4	5	4.39	.494
46	I cannot work much with CLIL as I wish because I have to cover the lessons as stated in the syllabus.	36	3	5	4.11	.523
47	I do not have enough support from the school managers.	36	4	5	4.28	.454
48	I can only assess "content" during the lessons.	36	3	5	4.11	.523
	Valid N (listwise)	36				

In terms of challenges encountered during the CLIL implementation, teachers show a high level of agreement in Table 4.8 with the lowest mean of 3.97 for statement 42 (students are willing to prepare for the lessons) and the highest mean of 4.39 for statement 45 (I am overwhelmed with workload), while means of other statements are between 3.97 and 4.49 range. None of the participants answer the open-ended question

requiring them to add more challenges to the list.

The interview shows that the teachers encounter difficulties in enriching themselves with knowledge of CLIL, helping the students, struggling with their limited time amount and workload with reasonable support from authorities and managers.

"I am working in a rural area. My students don't like learning English because they think this subject is very hard to learn and takes time. They argue that if they spend the same amount of time learning the subjects, they can get good marks in Maths, Physics, Geography, etc. but they still get disappointed results in English. In addition, some students study English more slowly than others even though they are smart in other subjects. I have to spend more time working with them." (Teacher T12)

"At my school, we have a lot of tests and we usually use multiple choice tests to save time. They are easy to mark and compile as we can download the tests from the Internet and edit them to use. But now when applying more assessment techniques in CLIL I see that I cannot test CLIL in 45- or 60-minutes tests because they are designed to be conducted for all classes of the same grade at my school so I can only assess it during my lessons." (Teacher T27)

"I know that integrating content into my lessons can help raise my students' interest but for most of the cases I do not have enough time to prepare a good lesson as I expected. I have to teach 20 lessons for students of grade 10 and 11 a week. Also, I have to design, review and mark the tests, monitor the class in which I am the master teacher, work with parents and other teachers, join the school meetings and other professional development activities, etc. In short, I want to apply CLIL but I just can try to apply it as much as possible because it takes very, very much time to prepare and teach a lesson in this approach while I have too many other tasks to do and I have to follow the syllabus and curriculum." (Teacher T23)

The above statement is well backed up by another teacher's sharing that at her school, the teachers are encouraged to apply new things but accompanied with a warning that they are free to apply CLIL approach providing that their application does not interfere with the school curriculum and assessment plan.

The teachers also find preparing CLIL lessons challenging in respect of working with subject teachers. They disclose that not many subject teachers are willing to help. Some subject teachers are either too busy or find cooperating with English teachers a burden as they are not good or even "blind" in English. In some schools, when subject teachers are not happy to cooperate and when the teachers find the subject knowledge too difficult to obtain, the teachers needed to ask for help from the principal but for most of the time, the principal could do nothing as there is no rule that allows him/her to require the subject teachers to help the language teachers. The trainee-teachers also add that only young subject teachers who can use some English and who wish to vary and improve their teaching are willing to support them.

4.4. Discussion

The participants' demographic information shows a big advantage for CLIL implementation at schools as the majority of the teachers have taught English for 11-20

years and are at the age of 35-45, the ages that have a big transition on the career ladder, moving from the stage of gaining acceptance from peers, developing and improving skills to the stage of demonstrating commitment and solidifying position at work. By remaining dedicated to their teaching job, teachers can receive greater responsibility as well as the resulting rewards and recognition. When they are willing and eager to apply CLIL, even the softest type, they can transfer their CLIL knowledge and ambitions to their peers and at the same time triggering the hope of change at their students, their colleagues and the manager in terms of motivating students, building up collaboration, develop thinking skills, etc.

In respect of lesson planning, the means of statements numbered 1, 3, 4 and 6 indicate a big change of teachers in defining clear learning outcomes, selecting CLIL materials that promote active learning, separating content-obligatory language from content-compatible language and adding as many Cs into the lessons as possible. They, to some extent, have made use of Coyle's 4Cs framework, which has initially been proposed to support teachers in lesson planning. As a matter of fact, these changes are meaningful regarding the fact that teachers still have to strictly follow the language syllabus and plan their lessons from language base instead of content base as expected in normal CLIL lessons. This situation can be explained with the interview results in which the teachers confirm that they can only add some "CLIL factors" not the "CLIL features" to their classes since their lessons, in their true nature, are much slanted to language. In the very first stage of CLIL implementation, this is counted as a good signal for enhancing teachers' perception and awareness.

From the findings of teachers' changes in material development and adaptation, it can be interpreted that teachers

are well aware of the role of materials in delivering CLIL lessons. The teachers also make great effort on changing the materials to match the lesson objectives as well as adding multimedia, relia and other interesting resources to motivate their students and make their lessons more attractive. In their many years of teaching, these teachers have been familiar with preparing, adapting and even developing their own materials but working with CLIL materials is not an easy task for such language teachers like them. Again, this research is just a very starting step which aims at investigating the application of "soft CLIL" while the application of "hard CLIL" needs long-term preparation and a backup legal system. The teachers' efforts, therefore, should be noted as a significant trigger for CLIL implementation in the future.

In the matter of lesson delivery, the teachers have demonstrated a dramatic change when all-except-one of the teachers agree on changing aspects listed in statements numbered 14 to 30 (Mean = 4.03 to 4.22). The total agreement of the teachers on the lesson indicates that they understand and well maintain what is called "core features" of a CLIL lesson proposed by Mehisto et al. (2008) including the lesson's multiple focuses, safe and enriching learning environment, authenticity, active learning and scaffolding. The teachers are not only aware of CLIL teaching strategies and techniques but also can apply some of them in their classes. They are true when they believe that content knowledge, to some extent, can motivate their students who prefer learning Science to English. Only statement 17 has mean of 3.53 which suggests that a majority of the teachers agree that they allow students to discuss or work on content concepts in their mother tongue. This mean, however, is still a bit slanted to the central tendency (Mean = 3.4). This can be rationalized by the teachers' teaching

habit in English, namely asking the students to use as much English in their lessons as possible. In reality, the use of mother tongue in CLIL is tolerated and acceptable according to Papaja & Wysocka-Narewska (2020).

With regard to assessing the lessons, all of the teachers acknowledge the contribution of CLIL to their changes. Previously, as English teachers, they use such tests as 15-minute, 30-minute, 45-minute, 60-minute tests to assess the students. These tests mostly contain multiple choice items. Under the light of CLIL, they now look at the objectives of the lessons, the outcomes of each semester and assess the students through high order questions, tasks that require high thinking skills, positive comments and feedback and let the students help and correct one another to mirror the objectives and outcomes. The teachers' changes from more summative assessment and achievement tests to more formative assessment with more focus on motivating students through positive feedback, fostering learner's autonomy through self-assessment and creating a collaborative learning environment through peer assessment. These changes well reflect the positive fact that in their "CLIL lessons", the teachers employ all types including assessment of learning, assessment for learning and assessment as learning but they concentrate more on the two latter in assessing CLIL. This is understandable as what the teachers have applied reflect Sadler (1989) and Cohen (1994)'s opinions for formative assessment and assessment as and for learning. Accordingly, they argue that these forms of assessment are for both teachers and learners. As for teachers, through formative activities alongside classroom tasks, they could better evaluate their students' skills and competences. As for students, in receiving authentically evaluative experience, they could identify work of high quality and evaluate their own progress towards it. These ways of assessment surely have positive washback on bringing changes to students' learning process and teachers' teaching methods.

Finally, as can be seen from data collected, all of the teachers agree that changes they encounter during the CLIL implementation centering around critical points related to teachers' own issues (subject knowledge, time constraint and workload), the students' motivation and perception and legal support from line agencies. All of the teachers admit that preparing a CLIL lesson is time-consuming and effort-taking while they, at the same time, are suffering from the current workload at their schools. Unfortunately, as there is not much help and many policies to support teachers who wish to apply CLIL in their teaching, the teachers have to handle everything on their own in current situations. Obviously, the teachers' efforts should be appreciated by their school managers and also higher level managers if the managers wish to create a more active and effective teaching environment at their schools, their districts or their cities.

5. Conclusion

The study was conducted to investigate the trainee-teachers' changes and challenges in CLIL implementation after a CLIL training program. The findings show that teachers have made promising changes in lesson planning, material development, lesson delivery and assessment. These significant changes indicate that the teachers are well aware of CLIL key concepts, elements and principles and have tried their best to integrate content, bring the 4Cs and the sense of CLIL to their classes. The challenges they have encountered during the CLIL implementation should be taken into consideration as the success of a CLIL program needs systematic supports and

collaboration of all the managing and operating bodies related to the program including not only the teachers themselves but also the authorities, the parents, the students, the experts and other entities of the whole society. With more research and trial programs to be carried out in Vietnam, we do hope that the application of CLIL will be feasible in our country in the future.

References

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). *Putting CLIL into practice*. Oxford University Press.

Bentley, K. (2010). *The TKT course: CLIL module*. Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge ESOL. (2011). *Teaching Maths through English - a CLIL approach*. University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations.

Cohen, A. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom* (2e). Heinle and Heinle.

Costa, F. (2016). *CLIL (Content and language integrated learning) through English in Italian higher education*. LED Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto. http://www.ledonline.it/Lingue-e-culture/785-Content-Language-Integrated-Learning.php

Coyle, D. (2006). Content and language integrated learning: Motivating learners and teachers. *Scottish Languages Review*, 13, 1-18.

Coyle, D. (2015). Strengthening integrated learning: Towards a new era for pluriliteracies and intercultural learning. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *8*(2), 89-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2015.8.2.2

Coyle, D., Hood P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in CLIL classrooms*. John Benjamin.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (Eds.). (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Eurydice. (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. https://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/eurydice/CLIL_EN.pdf

Grieveson, M., & Wendy, S. (2017). *The CLIL resource pack: Photocopiable and interactive whiteboard activities for primary and lower secondary teachers.* Delta Publishing.

Heine, L. (2010). *Problem solving in a foreign language: A study in content and language integrated learning.* Walter de Gruyter GmBH & Co.

Ioannou-Georgiou, S., & Pavlou, P. (Eds.). (2011). *Guidelines for CLIL implementation in primary and pre-primary education.* PROCLIL and European Commission. http://docplayer.net/21884649-Guidelines-for-clil-implementation-in-primary-and-pre-primary-education.html

Lorenzo, F. (2008). Instructional discourse in bilingual settings: An empirical study of linguistic adjustments in CLIL. *Language Learning Journal*, *36*(1), 21-23.

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE- The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential*. European Commission.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL, content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Macmillan.

Nikula, T., & Marsh, D. (1996). *Kartoitus vieraskielisen opetuksen tarjonnasta peruskouluissa ja lukioissa* (Language and content instruction in the Finnish primary and secondary sectors). Opetushallitus.

Papaja, K., & Wysocka-Narewska, M. (2020). Investigating code-switching in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classroom. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*, *6*(1), 51-63.

Pokrivcakova, S. (2015). Research implications for the training of CLIL teachers in Slovakia. In D. Hanesova (Ed.), *Learning together to be a better CLIL Teacher* (pp. 23-28). Pedagogicka fakulta, Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Jimenez C. R. M. (Eds.) (2009). *CLIL: Evidence from research in Europe.* Multilingual Matters.

Sadler. D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, *18*, 119-144.

Straková, Z. (2013). *Introduction to teaching English*. Vydavateľstvo Prešovskej univerzity.

Yassin, S. M., Marsh, D., Tek O. E., & Ying, L. Y. (2009). Learners' perceptions towards the teaching of science through English in Malaysia: A quantitative analysis. *International CLIL Research Journal*, *1*(2), 54-69. http://www.icrj.eu/12/article6.html

NHỮNG THAY ĐỔI VÀ THÁCH THỨC GIÁO VIÊN GẶP PHẢI KHI TRIỂN KHAI DẠY HỌC TIẾNG ANH TÍCH HỢP NỘI DUNG CHUYÊN NGÀNH[***]

Trần Thị Thu Hiền

Trường Đại học Ngoại ngữ, ĐHQGHN, Phạm Văn Đồng, Cầu Giấy, Hà Nội, Việt Nam

Tóm tắt: Nghiên cứu này được thực hiện nhằm mục đích tìm hiểu những thay đổi và thách thức giáo viên bậc trung học phổ thông gặp phải trong quá trình triển khai dạy học tiếng Anh tích hợp nội dung chuyên ngành. Phiếu khảo sát và phỏng vấn sâu là hai công cụ được chọn để thu thập dữ liệu nghiên cứu cho đề tài. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy giáo viên đã có những thay đổi đáng khích lệ trong việc soạn giáo án, phát triển tài liệu giảng dạy, sử dụng các chiến lược, kĩ thuật giảng dạy và đánh giá học sinh theo đường hướng dạy học tích hợp ngoại ngữ và nội dung chuyên ngành (CLIL). Những thách thức mà giáo viên gặp phải bao gồm kiến thức chuyên ngành, thời gian hạn hẹp, khối lượng công việc nhiều, động lực học của học sinh và sự thiếu vắng các chính sách hỗ trợ việc giảng dạy theo đường hướng CLIL. Kết quả nghiên cứu có thể là nguồn thông tin tham khảo cho công tác triển khai việc dạy học theo đường hướng tích hợp ngoại ngữ và nội dung chuyên ngành ở nước ta sau này.

Từ khóa: CLIL, ngoại ngữ, nội dung chuyên ngành, dạy học tích hợp

---