

**Evi Puspitasari**

received her master's degree in English Language Studies from Universitas Sanata Dharma (USD). Prior to starting her master, she had experiences of teaching English to students with different levels of education. Her research interests are Extensive Reading, Literature in Education and Teaching English as a Foreign Language. She is now teaching in English Language Education Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY).

## Classroom Activities in Content and Language Integrated Learning

**1-13****ABSTRACT**

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an approach used to teach subjects which focuses on learning a new language and content. In one English teacher training program in Indonesia, to achieve the goal of learning where the students master the target language and concepts of pedagogy, classroom activities to accommodate them in the dual-focused process are needed. This research scrutinized activities implemented in the program to achieve the learning goal and discussed the students' responses toward the activities. By interviewing four third semester students who enrolled in two content subjects in that semester, the data were gained. Four classroom activities used were revealed. Those were quiz, group presentation, group teaching and classroom discussion. In general, the students responded each activity positively. In addition, suggestions related to how the teachers brings some activities were addressed by the students.

*Keywords:* Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL, classroom activities, students' responses

**INTRODUCTION**

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is popular in a foreign language context in institutions where content subjects are taught in English. The aim of CLIL that should be achieved is not only enabling students to comprehend the subject areas but also facilitating their mastery on the target language. It is commonly used in areas where the students have not mas-

tered the target language yet but they are required to achieve the aim of learning the content of a subject. That is supported by Eurydice Network (2006) which pointed out that in CLIL, non-language subjects are not taught in a foreign language but with and through the language. With and through here are used instead of in to highlight that in CLIL, students are still in

the process of learning both the content and the language.

The description above reflects the condition in an English teacher training program in Indonesia where English is learned as a foreign language. In that program, based on the curriculum currently applied, the prominent objective is assisting students to be a professional English teacher. To attain the objective, student-teachers who join the program are facilitated and encouraged to improve their pedagogical skill such as the way they teach English to their future students and English language knowledge as a lesson that they teach to their future students. In the process, students are exposed with English sources and use the language in classroom discussion. Consequently, they endeavor to understand the materials and elevate their mastery of English.

To help the students do the double-focused jobs, i.e., mastering content and the target language, and to assist them to reach the objective of teaching, teachers design several classroom activities. Activities significantly affect students' achievement and motivation in learning. It is in parallel with Kuyper, van der Werf, and Lubbers (2000) who stipulated that learning activities are a strong indicator of a student's success. In effect, the teachers should choose or design activities for their instruction, including in CLIL contexts.

The explanation above becomes a strong reason to conduct a study that focuses on CLIL classrooms in an EFL context. This research put specific attention to activities implemented in the classrooms in CLIL. Students' responses toward those activities would also be scrutinized in this research.

## **CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING**

The instruction of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is to reach the objective of understanding content and language. Brown and Bradford (2017) argued that portions for language and content are equal in that classroom. Students have to strive to understand the content and at the same time they are required to improve their second language. To reach the aim, the target language used is about 50% of the teaching (Eurydice Network, 2006).

To help students achieve the duality of learning goals in CLIL, teachers need some strategies. In line with that, Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) stipulated that teaching strategies can determine a successful CLIL practice. Several experts suggest strategies for teaching CLIL. Dalton-Puffer, Huttner, Jexenflicker, Schindelegger and Smit (2008) said that using humor in teaching CLIL is a thoughtful initiative. A high tension and devastation aroused from students' double focuses on the language and content can be minimized by the teacher through jokes and humor.

Besides using humor, interactive and collaborative activities where students can use the language to communicate with others interactively are also suggested in CLIL. Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) said that the manifestation of interactive teaching strategies is through a pair work, group work and project work. When students do something together either in pairs or in groups, they interact with their teammates and exchange ideas to work on a project. Through their interaction, they share what they learn from the books, which is surely in the target language for CLIL classrooms. Automatically, they use lexis and expres -

sion from the book in communication. It can build up their cognitive development and language skills. It is why interaction and working together with other students are recommended for CLIL.

Another way to conduct CLIL successfully is by implementing students-centered learning. Student-centered learning means that students play a significant role in learning. Their role is not only as an active doer of the tasks given but also as consideration for the teachers to decide activities done, materials chosen, and learning speed (Collins & O'Brien, 2003). When teachers make a decision related to the instruction, they have to pay much attention to the students' level, need and interest. Playing active roles in the classroom provides the students with the chance to use the language in discussions, sharing sessions, and practicing concepts they learn. It is supported by Dalton-Puffer (2011) who pointed out that student-centered learning is worth implementing in CLIL contexts because the approach gives students more rooms to comprehend the content and practice the target language.

### **LEARNING ACTIVITIES FOR CLIL**

Learning activities are often used in language teaching and learning articles in different terms. With the same concept as things done in the classroom to achieve teaching goals, Richards and Rodger (2014) put activities under method applied and presents them as the implementation of the method. It means that activities are considered as a set of plans in teaching. Nunan (2004) defined activities as a part of task conducted sequentially in which the teacher and students have their own role to achieve a learning goal. In conclusion, learning activities are procedures used to decide learners' involvement in the activi-

ties to reach the teaching and learning objective.

In CLIL, learning activities are done to enhance students' linguistic and non-linguistic competence. To facilitate improvement on students' linguistic competence, the activities should encourage the students to use the language. In relation to this, Martinez (2011) considered that a classroom is a learning society where the students can learn from people around them. While they are finishing a certain project or task with their friends, they learn both the target language and the content from their friends. That is why cooperative activities are more suggested in learning rather than individual activities.

Cooperative learning addressed by Martinez (2011) can be manifested through group discussions. Linh (2016) carried out a study about the implementation of group discussion in CLIL classroom in Vietnam. In that study, the students discuss in a group to answer questions that might be presented in different types of questions such as multiple-choice, matching, or ordering in order to either check students' comprehension on the content or assess students' language knowledge, such as syntax or lexis.

The other form of cooperative activity in CLIL discussed comes from Aguilar and Munoz (2014) by proposing a series that were successfully proven increasing students' listening and grammar ability. The sequence was commenced by the teacher explaining the materials using power point slides while the students were listening and taking notes. Then, the students would have several recommended readings. After reading, they discussed the topic in groups using the second language. After discussion, a case about

the topic of their assigned readings was given by the teacher and they came back again to the group to find solution to the case. This problem-solving activity is also recommended in CLIL because based on the framework of CLIL activities by Barbero (2012), it belongs to high order thinking skill activities which can train students to think critically. At the last session, the teacher asked the students to make a poster about their reading with the group and present it in front of their classmates.

Besides improving students' listening skill and grammar ability, the activities addressed by Munoz (2014) were also able to facilitate students' comprehension on the content knowledge. In the activities, after reading the assigned materials, the students had a group discussion in different forms such as problem solving and answering conceptual questions from the teacher. In those activities, they talk about the same topic. By talking about the same topic on repeat, the retention of students' understanding on it will be developed (Elizabeth & Rao, 2007), which is good for their cognitive development.

In doing classroom activities, students need assistance. The assistance and companion can be gained from the teacher and the students. It is since, based on Martinez (2011), CLIL classroom is a medium where students can learn new knowledge from the society - people in the classroom. Through cooperativeness and sometimes competition with other students, skills and knowledge are trained. Meanwhile, in their process of learning, they need guidance which is provided by the teacher. They need a party as a guide to tell them what to do and how to do. In this position, the teacher played a role that Brown (2001) said as a facilitator where he manages and provides activities for the students to achieve

the goal.

Besides facilitating the learning process with activities, in learning, students need a teacher to give them feedback. Feedback is strongly needed to let the students know their areas to improve. Schuitmaker-King (2013) highlighted the importance of corrective feedback in CLIL setting by saying that feedback from the teacher is fruitfully helpful for the students' language and cognitive development. It is in parallel with Biber, Nekrasova and Horn (2011), who stated that a teacher will never miss giving students feedback on their writing work if they understand how contributive it is for students' improvement. They also added that the feedback in CLIL should cover linguistic and non-linguistic aspects to improve students' knowledge on content and skills on the language learned.

To sum up, interaction in CLIL learning is significant. Through interaction, students are able to absorb new linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge from their friends. In addition, they are also able to practice the language for real communication and exchange their understanding about content knowledge with either their classmates. That is the reason why teachers are encouraged to design and prepare engaging activities that involve students' interaction; for instance, group discussion and group presentation. In what form the group discussion is implemented depends on the teachers' creativity as long as the lesson is able to hold students' attention (Berton, 2008). Besides designing tasks and preparing activities, the teacher is also encouraged to give feedback on students' work to facilitate their language and content learning process.

## RESEARCH TYPE

This study belongs to qualitative research. Creswell (2012) stated that qualitative research focuses on exploring a phenomenon and investigating people's mind, feeling, and opinions about the issue. Meanwhile, this research put the center on types of activities used by teachers in CLIL classrooms and scrutinizing students' reactions and responses toward those activities. Classroom activities in a CLIL context is the phenomenon and how the students respond the activities implemented equals with the opinion toward the issue that Creswell addressed.

## RESEARCH CONTEXT

This qualitative research was carried out at an English teacher training program in one of universities in Indonesia. In this program, students are prepared to be an English teacher. In this institution, the teaching and learning process applies CLIL. It is because to reach the goal, the students have to enroll courses which are about 70% delivered in English which belongs to the number of English usage in CLIL (Eurydice Network, 2006). The rest of that number is general compulsory subjects based on national curriculum of higher education in Indonesia and internal curriculum implemented as a specific characteristic of the university.

Besides the frequency of the target language used in the instruction which indicates that the classroom is CLIL not CBI, another proof is in the areas the teaching training program focuses on. In this program, the goal is focusing on both pedagogical and English language theories. It means that the students learn the theories of pedagogy as the content subjects with English as a target language that clearly

indicates CLIL implementation rather than CBI (Eurydice Network, 2006).

In this institution, English subject courses that the students have to enroll are divided into four based on students' level. In the first year, students learn foundation of English skills through skill-based subjects to improve their ability in the target language. After finishing their first year, students obtain theory-based subjects to learn concepts and principles of teaching and learning a foreign language. Then, going to the next level, in the third year, students are exposed with research-based subjects to prepare their undergraduate thesis. Last, in the fourth year, they work on their undergraduate thesis and take the last course about academic presentation which equips them with skills and knowledge for their thesis defense.

In each batch, the class is commonly classified into four groups (group A, B, C, and D). It also happens to theory courses. Every theoretical subject was handled by a pair of teachers. Group A and B were taught by teacher 1 while Group C and D were taught by teacher 2. So, there were four different teachers teaching two content subjects. Those teachers have different strategies in teaching content which means they may also implement different activities in their instruction.

## RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This research involved second year students in the program, specifically in the third semester. The fundamental reason for choosing students in that semester is that they had their first experience receiving theory-based subjects in the form of CLIL instruction. Four students were selected as participants based on the recommendation received from teachers of theory-based

subjects in that semester. Based on the teachers' opinion, the students appointed were articulated, that help the researcher get rich data. The most of all, all participants were participative in doing classroom activities. The teachers also said, since they were active and participative, they were assumed to follow complete steps passed through in the activities. Hence, the students were able to give information about the activities in details and elaborative responses based on what they experienced. They consisted of one male student and three female students. They were presented using pseudonyms (Ana, Bimo, Cindy and Dina) to give them confidentiality.

### **DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE**

After getting information from the teachers, the researcher contacted the participants to make an appointment for an interview. The interview for four students was conducted separately using Indonesian language which were the first language of both sides - the researcher and students. Then, the interview was transcribed and validated through member checking. Based on that process, there were no changes on the data collected.

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Quiz**

The data showed that quiz is one of the activities in the program. It was done by the students individually. Four participants also revealed that the quiz was conducted by different teachers in different ways. Some teachers used weekly essay and another one used multiple-choice questions. Weekly essay was done in every meeting while the multiple-choice test was conducted after four topics discussed. For the essay, the students were given two or

three questions based on the assigned chapter and they had to answer them on paper in thirty minutes. Dina said that sometimes, it was done after a group discussion, but some other time, it was implemented in the last thirty minutes of the meeting. It was supported by Ana who said that the students submitted the work after answering all questions and they would get it back next meeting with written feedback toward their content and structure from the teachers. For the multiple-choice test, Bimo said that it took place once in four meetings and there would be one meeting allocated for this quiz only. In this quiz, the students were given twenty multiple choice questions related to four chapters discussed. Ana stated that the students usually finished it in twenty or twenty-five minutes.

The use of weekly essay and multiple-choice test as an option for CLIL classrooms has also been discussed in multiple studies. Regarding the use of multiple choice questions, Linh (2016) stated that that type of exercise is one of common activities besides matching, ordering, mistake finding and group discussion that was designed by Vietnamese teachers in their CLIL classrooms in which some of them focused on the language and some others focused on the content. Based on CLIL conceptual framework and activities classification designed by Barbero (2012), multiple choice question is considered as a lower order thinking skill activity while essay writing belongs to higher order thinking skill activities.

For what the students say about quizzes - both weekly essay and multiple-choice test - students responded that weekly essay provided more benefits than multiple-choice test. Students felt easier to prepare one chapter rather than four

chapters for the test. In addition, Ana stated that she and her friends felt it was worth it for reading one chapter for essay rather than studying four chapters only for twenty questions of multiple choice test. She added that in the multiple-choice quiz, the questions were not discussed after all so that she did not know the right answer. She argued that the teacher had better discuss the questions and the right answer further so that she and other students could understand the mistakes in the quiz and points to improve in the topics discussed.

The data also showed that the students liked doing weekly essay since that activity encouraged them to read. Ana admitted, "I like this quiz. Because of the quiz, I read. Somebody should force us to read." The statement that showed the quiz was able to boost students' willingness to read is also in line with Dina's and Cindy's. They agreed that they could not answer the questions in weekly essay without reading. However, that is contrasted by statement given by Bimo. He said that he rarely read the book. He just listened to his friends who presented the topic attentively. He may be a person who learn from audio instead of reading texts and prefer listening to reading to get information about the topic.

Besides giving space to receive and produce the language and providing them with teachers' feedback, the data also presented some other reasons why some participants responded weekly essay positively as an activity in CLIL by comparing it to the multiple-choice quiz. They preferred to read one chapter and to do the assessment in an essay form instead of reading four chapters answering twenty questions of a multiple-choice quiz. They thought that twenty points would not be able to accommodate content in four chapters. Last but not the least, the students pointed that

weekly essay trained them to use their high order of thinking. Cindy explained that they were demanded to explain in detail and gave real cases taken from daily life and experience as an instance, which means the students had to connect the concept to real life situation.

From the data presented above, it can be concluded that participants supported quiz as an activity that gave them sufficient space to practice the language. However, compared to multiple-choice questions, they were more into weekly essays. Even though there was one student stating that he was reluctant to read and he practiced the language by listening to his friends' presentation, the rest of the participants revealed that the weekly essay was able to increase their enthusiasm to read. Their voices are in line with Dalton-Puffer's (2011) statement that in CLIL classroom, students are empowered to practice new knowledge and skills. By practicing, they will internalize the language and content knowledge accurately and able to produce things from what they have learned. In weekly essays in the context of this study, students got some input of the language and content by reading. Then, in the classroom, they produced the language and put points that they comprehended through writing.

They also revealed that besides improving their language and content knowledge, weekly essay is also beneficial to sharpen their critical thinking skill since they have to relate the concept to their real life. For the language skill and content knowledge improvement, they agreed that the feedback from the teachers played a crucial role. Schuitemaker-King (2013) stipulated that corrective feedback from the teachers in CLIL can promote and scaffold students in learning the dichotomy of language

and content. Being in the same side, Biber, Nekrasova and Horn (2011) stated that from the feedback, which is suggested to focus on both content and forms, students are able to recognize their mistakes and points to improve. Some questions in weekly essays asked them to find a real example for concepts or promote solution to a problem which can be categorized into high order thinking skill (Barbero, 2012). That is in line with Thomas (2011), who highlighted that ideal classroom activities for higher education students is one that trains their critical thinking.

### **Group Presentation**

The next activity mentioned by the participants is group presentation. Working in a group of three or four, the students presented the topic assigned to them. The distribution of the topic and group had been decided by the teacher in the first meeting when the syllabus was given to the students. In one class, this activity was done after group discussion, but in the other, it was implemented in the first turn of the teaching sequence.

Having done this activity, the group typically received feedback from the teachers. The feedback focused on the students' body language, language used and slides in their presentation. Based on the participants' statement, one teacher usually helped the presenters answer questions from the audiences when it was needed and completed information which the presenters might miss to share. Meanwhile, the other teacher only provided short conclusion without giving further explanation on the topic.

From the data, it is known that the students' response toward the activity is positive. Bimo admitted that the presenta-

tion helped him gain good comprehension. He rarely read the book since he found a significant number of unfamiliar vocabulary in the book that hindered his willingness to read. Alternatively, Bimo chose to listen to the presentation rather than reading the handout for weekly quiz.

Even though getting a good response, some participants noted points to consider about this activity. The participants said that presenters' lack of preparation and English ability triggered students not to pay much attention to the presenters. Ana pointed that if the presenters were well-prepared, the presentation would be easy to follow and understandable. Yet, if they lacked preparation, the presentation would be boring because they just read the words on the slides which they just copied and pasted from the book. It made the presentation not communicative. Bimo admitted, "I rely on the presentation to understand the material because they [the presenters] had simplified the language when sharing, but if they just read from the book when presenting, that does not help me."

The students preferred this activity because they considered that commonly, the language used by the presenters was not as complicated as the one used in the book. In result, they perceived it an alternative to understand the topic without reading. However, when the presenters did not do preparation such as paraphrasing the line on the book for their slides and using simple sentences when delivering the presentation, it made the presentation not communicative. In consequence, the students would not absorb information



maximally from the presentation. That is why Dalton-Puffer (2011) said that because of the tension in CLIL where the students learn the language and the content at the same time, CLIL students need activities with communicative and understandable input. In relation to the findings, if the presentation was not communicative, it hindered the students from understanding the content.

From the data presented above, it was revealed that Bimo and other participants felt helped with the presentation. That is also in line with Martinez (2011), who emphasized that CLIL classroom is a learning society where the students learn from people around them, including their classmates and their teachers. They can learn the language itself and the content area learned. In that classroom, Bimo preferred listening to the presentation to reading the book. He and others also stated that the language used by the presenters was simpler than the one used in the book. Therefore, Bimo here, learned the content from his friends and took benefits of CLIL classroom as his learning society.

The last issue that appeared from the students' response toward group presentation was the teacher role. Ana and Bimo mentioned that teacher was the factor to make the presentation effective. When the presenters were confused in answering their friends' questions, the teacher took the place and helped them. Sometimes the teacher also clarified or added some cases or points delivered by the presenters. In this case, the teacher played a role as a facilitator. She let the students practiced and presented the materials and she was ready to give help when the students got stuck in finding a solution. It can decrease students' dependency in learning and practice student-centered learning, which is strong-

ly suggested in CLIL practice (Marsh, Maltjer & Hartiala, 2001; Dalton-Puffer, 2011). In giving that help, the teacher used bilingual (mixed Indonesian and English) and some jokes, which created stress-free ambience in the classroom. Jokes and humor are constituent in applying CLIL because it can reduce students' tension and stress for having dual goals to achieve (Dalton-Puffer, Huttner, Jexenflicker, Schindelegger & Smit, 2008). For being bilingual in class, the teacher might want all students with different proficiency level of English to understand the point. In this case, she understood that it was not easy to learn a new language, which means she tried to put herself in students' position as a language learner. It was a good strategy to make the students not intimidated by the teacher in the classroom (Nikula, 2010). For not feeling unintimidated, they will feel free to ask questions and discuss the content knowledge with the teacher.

### **Group Teaching**

Besides group presentation, in running the classroom, group teaching was also applied to learn both language and content. In this activity, the students were put in a group of three or four to teach other students. This activity was different from group presentation because the students did not only stand in front and present the assigned chapter. They were required to act as a teacher in about ninety minutes. They had to manage the class and teach other students. Dina said that the topic to teach had been distributed by the teacher based on the book used in the first meeting. She added that they could consult to the teacher before the day her group would present to ensure whether their understanding on the book was correct.

Dina added that mostly, the students consulted points to share to others rather than the teaching techniques used.

Dina also informed that in the middle of the activity, the teacher usually raised some issues related to the topic and asked some questions to all students in the class, including the group who taught others. Then, the teacher asked them to discuss the issue with their friends and share their thought to the class.

The evidence showed interesting students' responses about group teaching. Mostly, students were excited with the activity. That was something new for them. Cindy and Dina thought that it assisted them to comprehend the material well. Dina admitted that when she played a role as a teacher, she was demanded to master the materials. To accomplish that task, they needed to read several times and then shared. It made her understand the material maximally. Additionally, before performing, they were allowed to meet the teacher to consult the material. Cindy said that before the meeting, she was confused about what to teach. Then, she initiated to meet up with the teacher for consultation and she felt enlightened afterwards. She said, "I must do that (consultation). I was afraid, if we did not consult the materials to the teachers, our understanding was not in line with what the book said." Dina agreed with that by stating, "By meeting up with the teacher, I could have holistic understanding, so I knew what I had to teach to my friends.

Students' responses toward this activity are also obtained from their suggestion to this activity. It is true that they like doing this activity. Moreover, the teacher assisted them well. However, they perceived that this activity would be more effective if the

teacher raised the issues about the topic later after the presenters finished their teaching. Dina said that the teacher's interruption distracted their focus to their friends' teaching. Cindy added that she felt distracted in teaching their friends when the teacher cut a teaching process she did. When the teacher finished discussing the issues, she forgot in which point she had to continue the teaching.

Regardless suggestion given by the students about the activity, the data showed that this activity is able to engage the students' attention. The students had great motivation in doing this task. They read and pretended to be a teacher for the classmates. Through this activity, the students who acted to be a teacher for the class can practice using the language, which means that the activity provided opportunity for students to practice what they learn. It is in parallel with Dalton-Puffer (2011) who stated that students in CLIL classrooms need activities which give them opportunity to practice the target language because practicing is an effective way to elevate their mastery on the language. This activity also provided repetition that is needed by students in learning. First, they read the material on the assigned chapter. After reading, they met up with the teacher to confirm and make sure what they understand from the chapter is correct. Then, they presented the material to others. Hence, they met the topic on repeat. Based on Elizabeth and Rao (2007), by talking about a certain topic repeatedly, students' retention toward the concept is developed.

Students in the class who listen to friends explaining the materials can learn the content from them. Besides from the students, a party from whom they learn is a teacher. They learn from teacher through

consultation conducted before teaching and from the feedback. This condition is the manifestation of the learning society that Martinez (2011) addressed, where students can experience the process of learning from people there, both from the teacher and their classmates.

### **Group Discussion**

Group discussion was one of the activities implemented in the program. The data showed that the content of the discussion was various. Ana and Bimo pointed, sometimes the teachers gave a real case of how the problems related to the concept learned were applied in their life and asked the students to find a solution. However, some other teachers brought the discussion to review questions in the weekly quiz. They asked the students to share their answers to their group after the weekly essay. Then the teachers guided them into classroom discussion by asking one representative of the group to share the result to the class orally. The last topic to discuss in this activity was prominent points in chapters of the book they read. Cindy and Dina stated that one of the content teachers asked them to make a diagram to summarize the chapter. In doing that, they needed to discuss with teammates to decide what points to be put in the diagram. Dina added that sometimes, they were also required to recall previous lessons to complete the mind map.

Students' responses toward this activity is positive. After reading the book that they considered the language was too heavy, they needed to check and complete information from friends. Bimo said that group discussion helped him since he hardly ever read the book. He got information discussed every meeting from this activity. He added that group discussion created

casual atmosphere so that he never felt shy or reluctant to ask his teammates to explain if he had questions. Cindy had the same opinion. She said, "I read at home but I need to check whether what I understand is the same as what my friends understand". Dina agreed with those participants. She stated, "For those who have not got the points, this activity helps them a lot. They can ask their friends."

This activity is such a medium where the students exchange their understanding after reading the book. They share their knowledge, ask some questions, and solve problems related to the content learned. It means that this activity provides opportunity for the students to interact with each other. That is in line with what Maillat (2010) suggested that a CLIL classroom needs to be set to gain students' interaction and communication. In group discussions, they did so. In addition, group discussion is also a student-centered learning activity because the students actively solve the problems in learning by themselves without depending much on the teachers (Collins & O'Brien, 2003; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Marsh, Maltjer, & Hartiala, 2001).

The students also issued some suggestions toward the implementation of this activity. Dina addressed that she sometimes felt bored of joining group discussions because meeting by meeting, they did the same thing. They discussed and reported. She hoped that the teacher could create a different scheme for this activity, such as doing the discussion outside the class. She also stated, "I got dizzy in understanding the chapters. The vocabulary is difficult and the content is hard to understand." The statement reflects what they want in learning CLIL. They seem to need more interesting activity that can

reduce their stress because of the complicated language and difficult content. They were striving to understand the language and attempting to absorb that the chapters in the book told them about. In result, refreshing and entertaining activities are needed to lessen the pressure and tension in CLIL which is suggested by Dalton-Puffer, Huttner, Jexenflicker, Schindelegger and Smit (2008).

## CONCLUSION

This study reveals classroom activities that facilitate the students in improving their new language and comprehension on content subjects. Not only types of activity implemented, this research also scrutinizes students' responses toward each of them. The evidence illustrates that quiz, group presentation, group teaching and group discussion are activities applied in dual-focused instruction of the English teacher training program, the place where this research was conducted. Students perceived that those activities are able to help them achieve the learning goal that is acquiring the language and theoretical subjects.

From the findings and discussion, it can also be concluded that the key factor determining the success of an activity is the teacher. Quiz will be a good activity to assist students in learning theories and a target language as far as the teachers choose the right type of quiz. The students show a positive response to the quiz that provides them sufficient opportunity to use the language, such as an essay instead of multiple-choice quiz. Similar to quiz, group presentation, group teaching, group discussion become a facilitative tool to gain the English skills and content if the teachers help the students without making them dependent on the teacher' assistance.

Teachers can also change classroom ambience in CLIL, which is usually demanding because of double focused goals to be more interesting and stress free by doing a fun thing such as making jokes while teaching.

## REFERENCES

- Aguilar, M. & Munoz, C. (2014). The effect of proficiency on CLIL benefits in engineering students in Spain. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-18.
- Barbero, T. (2012). Assessment tools and practices in CLIL. In F. Quartapelle (Ed.), *Assessment and evaluation in CLIL* (pp. 38-56). Pavia: Ibis-Como.
- Biber, D., Nekrasova, T., & Horn, B. (2011). *The effectiveness of feedback for L1-English and L2-writing development: A meta-analysis*. ETS Research Report. Princeton, NJ: ETS.
- Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In P. Clements, A. Krause & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education* (pp 328-334). Tokyo: JALT.
- Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: The same or different? *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 8-24.
- Collins, J. W., & O'Brien, N. P. (Eds.). (2003). *Greenwood dictionary of education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182-204.

- Dalton-Puffer, C., Huttner, J., Jexenflicker, S., Schindelegger, V., & Smit, U. (2008). *Content and language integrated learning on Österreichs Hoheren Technischen Lehranstalten: Forschungsbericht*. Vienna, Austria: Universität Wien & Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kultur und Kunst
- Elizabeth, M.E.S. & Rao, B.D. (2007). *Methods of teaching English*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Eurydice Network. (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission. Retrieved from [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/thematic\\_studies\\_archives\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/thematic_studies_archives_en.php)
- Linh, N. T. T. (2016). *Reconsidering the first steps of CLIL implementation in Vietnam*. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 8(1), 31-56.
- Maillat, D. (2010). The pragmatics of L2 in CLIL. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL* (pp. 39-60). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marsh, D. & Hartiala, A.K. (2001). Dimensions of content and language integrated learning. In D. Marsh, A. Maltjær, & Hartiala, A.K. (Eds.), *Profiling European CLIL classrooms: Languages open doors*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.
- Martinez, M. R. P. (2011). CLIL and cooperative learning. *Encuentro*, 109-118.
- Nikula, T. (2010). On effects of CLIL on a teacher's language use. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 105-124). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T. S., (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schuitemaker-King, J. (2013). Giving corrective feedback in CLIL and EFL classes. *Levende Talen Tijdschrift*, 14(2), 3-10.
- Thomas, T. (2011). Developing first year students' critical thinking skills. *Asian Social Science*, 7, 26-35.