

Integrating Content-Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in teaching speaking for young learners

Dicky Rinaldo Hidayat¹, Ari Nurweni², Fajar Riyantika³

Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1 Bandarlampung, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

¹Correspondence: dickyrh11@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to find out whether there was any significant improvement in A1 students' speaking skills after integrating the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) method in their speaking class. This study also aims to know the students' perceptions of the implementation of CLIL. The subjects of the research were taken from two A1 classes in an English Course by employing simple random sampling. Using both quantitative and qualitative designs, this study used a speaking test and a set of questionnaires to gather the data. Besides, the researcher also conducted an interview session during the implementation of CLIL in the class. After analyzing the data using Repeated Measure T-test, the result shows that there was an improvement in the students' speaking after they were being taught through CLIL. The students' mean score increased from 53.56 on the Pre-test to 64.44 on the Post-test. Moreover, based on the result of the questionnaire and the interview, the students gave positive responses regarding the utilization of CLIL in learning speaking. They stated that they were interested to study using CLIL as it could motivate them to be active in the class and it also could help them to understand the lesson more. Hence, it can be concluded that the use of CLIL in the A1 class can give a positive impact on the students' speaking skill.

Keywords: *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), A1 speaking class, teaching speaking, students' speaking skill, CEFR*

I. INTRODUCTION

English is widely utilized in a variety of areas of life, including politics, economics, society, entertainment, and education. English is taught as a foreign language and is a required subject in Indonesia. Additionally, it is widely known that learning a foreign language requires students to acquire four fundamental skills. One of the four language skills (listening, reading, and writing) is speaking. Some functions of speaking are that a speaker can express his or her opinions and feelings, ask for something, share knowledge or information directly and so on so forth. In line with it, Brown and Yule (2002) underline that speaking is one of the basic skills as a measurement of language learners whether someone is successful in learning a language or not. As Richards (2006) suggests that learners consequently often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course on the basis of how well they feel they have improved in their spoken language proficiency; therefore, a student needs to practice it frequently in order to improve their English proficiency. Besides, it helps the students to get used to speak fluently. Also, it trains the students to speak confidently.

Moreover, Pathan and Ali (2017) say that motivation can be considered as the important thing in learning something, especially in learning a Foreign Language (FL). In learning a FL, demotivated learners may lose their interest to study which is avoided by the teacher. Thus, understanding the factors of demotivation from students can help the teachers to solve this problem. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) explained that demotivation comes from an external case, it is related to what Ali and Pathan (2017) have investigated that the factors of demotivation are-negative experiences with teachers, poor school facilities and materials, low self-confidence, bad opinions on the L2 or the L2 culture, negative attitudes of other group members.

By knowing the factors above the writers assumed that CLIL can solve this demotivation problem as it provides learners' passion (science, history, or arts), connection between learners' real life and learning process. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) was published in 2001 (Council of Europe, 2001). The CEFR is a common framework for learning, teaching and assessing a given foreign language. It features six levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2) on the vertical axis and skill areas (reception, interaction, production and mediation) on the horizontal axis. Commonly, these skill areas consist of listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production and writing. The framework has a third dimension, which involves other aspects of communicative competence, such as sociolinguistics, pragmatic, and strategic competences. As most English teaching-learning processes in Indonesia use the standard curriculum from the government, the researcher will try to implement the standard of CEFR in the English teaching-learning process at the A1 level. Not even using the standard curriculum from the government, the learners in Indonesia also have low motivation in the process of learning English as a foreign language. It can be concluded that when using CLIL both language and content are simultaneously given attention and both of them are also conducted in the learning process. Language is used as a vehicle to learn the contents of a subject, and those contents are used as a meaningful medium for learning and using the language in a meaningful and communicative way.

II. METHODS

This study used a quantitative method that focused on measuring the amount of data (Kothari, 1990). In order to collect the data, the researcher employed both pre-test and post-test designs to evaluate the technique and its results. The Repeated Measure T-test was employed to assess the quantitative data. In addition, the triangulation technique was used to collect the qualitative data. This is consistent with the study's goal of using an observational strategy or data collection to understand the dynamics of the impact of the CLIL approach on the students' speaking performance in the class.

The instruments used in the research were a speaking test and a questionnaire which were adapted and adopted from Puspaningtyas (2015). It was given after conducting the observation and speaking test. The researcher took all the students in the class to do the tests in order to investigate the students' improvement after the implementation of CLIL. Additionally, the data were taken by distributing a set of questionnaires and conducting an interview session. The questionnaire that was used was close-ended questions. Besides, the observation towards the integration of CLIL method in speaking class was also done to give deeper analysis.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Result of The Pre-test and Post-test

In the experimental class, a pre-test and post-test were given to see if the students' speaking proficiency improved. Before beginning the treatment, the pre-test was provided to determine the students' proficiency in speaking. The post-test was administered in the meanwhile to see if the students' speaking abilities improved as a result of being taught through CLIL. Both the tests were in the form of monologue test where the students had to choose a topic and present it in front of the class. When the students presented their monologues in front of the class, the researcher used a voice recorder to help him give the scores more accurately. The scores of the students and the frequency results of the pre-test and post-test are listed as follows

Table 1. The Difference of Students' Speaking Score in the Pre-Test and Post- Test

Students' code	D pretest	Pretest (R1 and R2)	D posttest	Posttest (R1 and R2)
S1	4	54.00	4	68.00
S2	4	54.00	4	66.00
S3	4	60.00	0	68.00
S4	4	60.00	4	64.00
S5	0	52.00	4	60.00
S6	8	60.00	4	74.00
S7	6	54.00	0	60.00
S8	12	64.00	8	78.00
S9	6	54.00	4	64.00
S10	4	54.00	4	70.00
S11	4	58.00	0	60.00
S12	0	48.00	4	54.00
S13	8	46.00	4	64.00
S14	4	50.00	4	60.00
S15	4	50.00	0	60.00
S16	4	52.00	0	60.00
S17	4	50.00	8	64.00
S18	0	60.00	0	66.00

The table above shows that all of the students' scores improved from the pre-test to the post-test that they got higher scores after getting the treatment. However, none of the students could get a score above 70 on the pre-test and only a few students could achieve it on the post-test

Table 2. The mean score of students' pre-test and post-test

	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
Mean Score	53.56	64.44	9.88

The table above presents the mean score of the students' pre-test and post-test. It can be said that the students' mean score on the post-test was higher than the score on the pre-test. It means that the students performed better during the post-test.

The Result of Hypothesis Testing

The function of hypotheses testing was to prove whether the hypotheses proposed by the researcher were accepted or not. The researcher used Paired Sample T-test to analyse the data. The hypothesis used in Paired Sample T-test was as follows:

H₀ : There is a significant improvement in the students' speaking skills after being taught using CLIL in the class

Table 3. Paired Samples Test

Table 8. Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences							Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	posttest - pretest	10.8889	4.45750	1.05064	8.67223	13.10555	10.364	17	.000

The table shows that the results of the computation of the value of two tailed significance is 0.000. It means that H₁ is accepted because $0.00 < 0.05$. It proves that there was an improvement in the students' speaking achievement from the pre-test to the post-test after being taught using CLIL. Then, if the t-value (10.364) compared with t- table (2.0639), it can be seen that the students' speaking improved since t-value > t- table. It can be concluded that there was an improvement in the students' speaking achievement in the A1 and A1+ class of Youngsters English Class. It also is concluded that the research hypothesis is accepted; there is a significant improvement in the students' speaking achievement after being taught through CLIL.

Based on the tables opinions (X₂) above, most of the students answered either "Yes" or "Always" in almost all the questions in the questionnaire. As we can see in the table X₂, it is shown that more than 50% of the students agreed if CLIL is applied for further classes. They also agreed that CLIL encouraged them to learn more about English. Besides, there are still 50% students stated that they were not sure whether there were any differences when they were taught with or without CLIL. But moreover, there are 40% students who stated that they achieved better scores when they were taught using CLIL.

The Result of Questionnaire and Interview

The data of the students' improvement and interest was gained from the close-ended questionnaire. To administer the questionnaire, the researcher took all the students from the class to be the respondents and they were asked about their opinion after the implementation of CLIL. To make sure they would give consistent answers, the researcher also conducted an interview with respect to the questionnaire. There were two categories in the questionnaire: frequencies and opinions. Each point in the category is symbolized with X₁ (frequencies) and X₂ (opinions) in the result for coding purposes.

For the frequencies (X₁) category, it can be seen that CLIL pulled the interests of the students to learn English. We can see that no less than 50% of the students always answered "Always" in the questionnaire. As we can see from the answers of the questionnaire, most of the students always came on time, always paid attention when the researcher applied CLIL in the class, actively answered the questions from the teacher during the lesson, and it is also stated that CLIL helped them to understand English well. Nevertheless, there were still half of the students who were shy to ask questions. It was because the gaps between the students and the difficulty of the materials given by the teacher during the lesson were too far and the students were not encouraged enough to ask something they still did not know during the lesson.

Besides, the researcher also recorded and conducted a mini-interview with the students to ensure the consistency of the data taken from the questionnaire. The researcher found that most of the students' answers in the questionnaire were valid and consistent. It can be seen from one of the students' answer of the interview below:

“yeah..it is fun.. I understand the..the...the..lesson!”

The answer shows that the student, as the interviewee, was excited about the lesson that applied CLIL. It was also found that she agreed if CLIL is applied in their further study in the class as we can see in the part of the answer below:

“ye..yess.. I..I will like it.. of course!”

Even so, there was a student who felt that studying using CLIL was difficult as shows in his statement below:

“umm..umm..sometimes yes.. I just can't understand some..some..of it”

Nonetheless, it can be concluded that most of the students' answers in the questionnaire were consistent since there were so many similarities between their answer in the questionnaire compared to when they were being interviewed.

Discussion

The results of the research show that the students' speaking achievement improved after they were taught by CLIL at the A1 and A1+ classes in Youngsters English Class. From the results presented before, it can be seen that the scores of the students' post-test was higher than the scores of the pre-test. This can be seen from the mean score of the pre-test, 53.56, which improved to 64.44 in the post-test.

The obtained result from the data analysis shows that almost all the respondents were interested in having CLIL applied in the class. It is shown in the students' answers that they agreed if CLIL is applied in the further research, and they also agreed that CLIL encouraged them to learn English both during the lesson in the class and their homes. The students' answers also show that they were interested to learn using CLIL since they always came on time to the class, actively answered the teacher's questions during the lesson, and stated that CLIL helped them to understand English well; even though there were some students who were still shy to ask questions if they felt like they could not understand the materials during the lesson.

According to the findings of the previous researchers and this research, CLIL approach can be applied in the curriculum since CLIL provides students with some approaches that can attract the students' interest to learn English. It is in line with Khoiriyah (2021) who states that CLIL effectively provides proper teaching materials for the targeted learners in different education levels. The availability of teaching resources in situations where the materials will be used is one of the most important contextual factors. Hence, research and development projects in education are highly recommended to validate the effectiveness of designed teaching materials.

However, There are differences between this research and the previous studies. The most different part is the researcher did an observation during the implementation of the CLIL approach to know its effectiveness in improving students' speaking achievement. The second is the researcher focused on how CLIL gained interest from the students in a small class consisting of only eighteen students since CEFR is not an official curriculum in Indonesia and is only applied in some English courses.

Nevertheless, the results of the questionnaire in this research mostly show positive feedback from the students. It can be seen from the frequencies and the scores of each item answered by the students. It is in

line with Kang, et al (2010) who state that several learning approaches, including the CLIL method, have influenced the way students learn by doing. In connection with changes in learning styles in the era of the industrial revolution 4.0, language learning is not only focused on teaching language intrinsically but also has attempted to provide an overview of interactions in various contexts. As added by Simbolon (2020) that students like the learning environment in the implementation of CLIL since it allows them to acquire a new language and improves their contextual understanding. In this case, the CLIL method offers a new perspective to improve understanding of the world through culture, language acquisition, and specific contexts. It is in line with the statement from Campillo et. Al (2019) that CLIL can motivate students and foster their oral skills and intercultural awareness. It can be concluded that CLIL does not only affect the improvement in the students' achievement during the lesson but it also attracts the students' interest to learn English with various methods that are applied.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The outcomes of the students' learning are impacted by this method, according to the statistical data. It is indicated by the t-test findings which show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores. These findings indicate that the application of CLIL enhanced the students' speaking abilities. It can be seen from the mean score, 53.56, in the pre-test increased by 9.88 points to 64.44 in the post-test. Besides, CLIL attracted the students' interest in learning English. It can be seen from the students' answers to the questionnaire. Most of the students agreed if CLIL is applied for their further studies. They also stated that they were helped during the lesson when the teacher used CLIL as the teaching approach in the class.

In light of the benefits of CLIL, the researcher advises English teachers in the class to use CLIL as an alternate method of teaching English, particularly in speaking ability. To ensure that the learning process is successful, the teachers should establish an effective time estimation and learn more about how to implement CLIL in the classroom since it is not embedded in Indonesian curriculum for domestic schools. Besides, further researchers may try to find out the effect of using CLIL in different levels of courses or schools with domestic curriculum: junior high school, senior high school and university level, or even in a school that applies a different approach of learning English. Moreover, considering the benefits of CLIL, there should be more techniques developed by applying CLIL in the class. So, further researchers can do research regarding to the implementation of CLIL compared to another learning approach.

REFERENCES

- Brown, G and G. Yule. (2002). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge.
- Campillo, J. M., Sánchez, R., & Miralles, P. (2019). Primary teachers' perceptions of CLIL implementation in Spain. *English language teaching*, 12(4), 149-156.
- Khoiriyah. (2021). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Indonesian Context: an Overview*. Malang: University of Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Kothari, C. R. (1990). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques.*, New Delhi: Kk. Gupta.
- Pathan, H., Ali, S., (2017). Exploring factors causing demotivation and motivation in learning English language among college students of Quetta, Pakistan. Institute of English Language & Literature, University of Balochistan, Quetta. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 7, No. 2; 2017. Pakistan.

Richards. (2006). *Language and professional identity: Aspects of collaborative interaction*. University of Warwick. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simbolon, N. E. (2020). CLIL practice in a maritime English course: EFL students' perception. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 5(2), 263-276.