

CamTESOL Regional ELT Research Grant Paper

CLIL in Primary English Lessons: Teachers' Perspectives

Bui Le Diem Trang
An Giang University, Vietnam

Truong Thi Thanh Nga
An Giang University, Vietnam

Primary English lessons teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) across Asia have recently been moving towards more student-centered methodologies. However, little research has been done to explore the potential of models which integrate content and language learning (CLIL) from teachers' perspectives. This study presents an overview of teachers' perceptions of their experience of the design and implementation of theme-based CLIL lessons in a Vietnamese EFL context. Qualitative results indicate teachers found the CLIL lesson planning following the 4Cs framework (content, cognition, communication, and culture) time-consuming and demanding in terms of preparing teaching aids, linking content aims and language aims, and including cognition and culture aims in the lessons. However, teachers reported general satisfaction with student performance after implementing the lessons. Teacher perceptions on the process of designing and implementing CLIL alongside regular English classes in Vietnam offer insights into future implementation and research of CLIL in other contexts.

EFL teachers worldwide have found that the integration of curricular subject areas into English lessons can increase students' interest in content themes, therefore providing a cognitively meaningful foundation for new target language items to be acquired. This integration of content and language in English language teaching (ELT) is referred to as a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) approach or content-based instruction (CBI; Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2007). Research results have revealed that this model is effective in enhancing primary English language learning, learning skills, and motivation toward learning a foreign language (see Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2014; Hüter & Rieder-Bünemann, 2010; Serra, 2007; Yamano, 2013). This study attempts to examine the design and implementation of a theme-based CLIL model in a specific primary EFL context of Vietnam. Findings of teachers' perceptions on the challenges of implementation are expected to be useful for teachers interested in how to link English language learning with a primary curriculum. The findings may have ramifications for curriculum designers, reminding them to consider teacher capacity in implementing a language program (Nation & Macalister, 2010).

Literature Review

CLIL in Primary English Education

The practice of CLIL varies along a continuum from a content-driven to a language-driven focus (Met, 1999). Primary CLIL in language teaching is most often conducted in theme-based foreign language instruction by linking it with aspects of other subjects in the curriculum (Coyle, Holmes, & King, 2009). This implementation thus moves toward the language-driven end, or a soft model.

According to Lyster (2011), CBI and CLIL are synonymous in many aspects, with CLIL a more recent term used mostly in Europe. Richards (2006, p. 27) stated that in language teaching, CBI can be seen as “[an] extension of the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) movement but . . . [it] take[s] different routes to achieve the goal of communicative language teaching - to develop learners’ communicative competence.” Snow, Met, and Genesee (1989) argued that in CBI, language development and cognitive development are linked, but are separated in traditional methods. Lyster (2011) also stated that CLIL / CBI lessons in ELT are distinguished from Grammar-Translation teaching in the focus on meaning rather than form. Learning opportunities are initiated through cognitively meaningful communicative activities / tasks rather than repeated practice of discrete grammatical patterns.

Theme-based CLIL lesson design should involve meaningful communicative activities. The activities can be based on the 4Cs framework, which offers four principles connecting content, cognition, communication, and culture. This framework has been advocated as an effective planning tool for this approach. As Coyle, Holmes, and King (2009) argued, teachers can integrate language with content from across the curriculum. This can support both language and content learning. Next, learners should be engaged cognitively through activities that can promote creativity and higher-order thinking skills. Language is then used to learn and mediate ideas, thoughts, and values. Finally, learners should have an opportunity to appreciate the significance of the content and language, and their contribution to identity and citizenship.

Teachers’ Perceptions of CLIL

The potential benefits of CLIL have also been supported by empirical research. Studies reported that it is effective in enhancing primary school students’ proficiency in the target language (see Hüter & Rieder-Bünemann, 2010; Ikeda, 2013; Serra, 2007; Yamano, 2013). In Asian EFL language education, the language-driven version has recently been found to work for Japanese primary and secondary school students. Results from a longitudinal study in a secondary school in Japan revealed that students perceived the CLIL course as distinctively different from other language courses, and teachers reported that their students’ essay writing skills improved significantly (Ikeda, 2013). Similarly, Yamano (2013) conducted a comparative study comparing a CLIL class and a non-CLIL class to explore the potential of the approach using the 4Cs framework in a Japanese primary school. She found that a CLIL program had the potential to improve EFL education, particularly in fostering a positive attitude in students toward the target language and vocabulary learning.

Although the potential benefits of CLIL for primary language learning have been supported by research (see Ikeda, 2013; Yamano, 2013), only a few studies have explored teachers’ perceptions of the approach in primary schools. In one such study, Massler (2012) explored how German primary school teachers perceived ProCLIL, a three-year program that investigated CLIL implementation and effectiveness in primary and pre-primary schools in four countries in Europe. Teachers reported a high level of student engagement in learning a foreign language through content-based topics. However, teachers considered CLIL an opportunity for

professional development yet a burden due to the additional workload, preparation time, and cost of materials. Similarly, teacher perceptions of a one-year CLIL implementation in five primary schools in Spain were analysed by Pladevall-Ballester (2015). She found that teachers felt satisfied and rewarded when their students finally adapted to the classes, showing great motivation after some initial reluctance. Teachers revealed challenges such as lack of time to prepare lessons and a lack of support from content teachers.

There are clearly gaps between academic research claims and actual classroom practices as well as how teachers perceive their experiences when they plan, design, and trial CLIL lessons alongside their regular English classes. In Asian contexts, little research on teachers' perceptions of the approach has been conducted. This study will provide a picture of how Vietnamese primary EFL teachers can and do move towards CLIL classroom instruction styles, and their difficulties and successes. It is important to note that the lessons in this study follow a theme-based CLIL model. The utilization of this soft version has considered the specific context of primary English education in Vietnam: traditional teacher-centered Grammar-Translation is still prevalent and primary students' proficiency level is quite low (Nguyen, 2011).

Method

The research questions for this study are:

1. What perceptions do teachers have regarding theme-based CLIL lesson design and implementation?
2. What challenges and successes do teachers encounter when implementing theme-based CLIL lessons in traditional Vietnamese EFL classrooms?

Context and Participants

In Vietnam, primary English education has been compulsory and given a high priority since the launch of the 2008-2020 National Foreign Languages Project (NFLP 2020; Ministry of Education and Training, 2010). However, challenges still exist regarding primary ELT as found in Nguyen's (2011) exploratory case study. She noticed the currently used 3P (present, practice, produce) approach in public primary schools limited students' interaction and communication as they had little chance to be exposed to more authentic communication. She also found that teachers "emphasized mastery of sentence patterns and words rather than stimulating creative or real-world communicative use of language" (p. 240).

The current study involved four primary English teachers who were unfamiliar with CLIL. These teachers, ranging from 23 to 40 years old, had three to 16 years of teaching experience (see Table 2). They were from four public primary schools in An Giang, a rural province, with two schools in Long Xuyen City and two in rural areas. These teachers were recruited from a cohort of local primary school English teachers who had attended an English upgrade program in 2014 at An Giang University (AGU) where the authors were instructors. The participants had expressed a great interest and willingness to participate in the project.

Table 1
Profiles of Four EFL Vietnamese Grade 4 Teachers

Teachers	Age	Gender	Years of service	School status	No. of students
TA	23	Female	3	Rural	35
TB	28	Female	7	Urban	30
TC	40	Female	16	Rural	35
TD	36	Female	15	Urban	38

Students in the participants' Grade 4 classes (nine years old) had started learning English from Grade 2. They had been involved in an NFLP pilot curriculum from Grade 3. Thus, their English classes had increased from two to four 40-minute periods per week as required in the new curriculum. Students' proficiency level was not assessed. However, as teacher trainers having several years of observing classes in many schools in rural and urban areas of the province, the authors felt that at the Grade 4 level, students' proficiency level was generally limited to basic phrases and expressions. Informal discussions with the participants revealed that they believed that students in rural areas had lower proficiency than those in urban areas. More specifically, TA and TC felt that their students in the rural schools had lower levels of proficiency and motivation to learn English than those in TB and TD's urban areas.

The fourth grade level was chosen for two specific reasons: students have sufficient English background to follow the CLIL classes and the Grade 4 maths and science curricular content provides a rich source of ideas / themes which can be closely linked with the objectives of their English classes and meaningfully reinforced in English lessons to enhance language learning.

Procedure

The project was divided into two phases: lesson design and implementation.

Lesson design. The participants were trained in CLIL methodology at a four-hour workshop organized by the authors at AGU (see Appendix A). A range of CLIL materials (see Birdsall, 2001, Calabrese & Rampone, 2007, Dale & Tanner, 2012; Deller & Price, 2007) were employed for reference. Then, based on a 4Cs planning guide, a cross-curricular common theme, Food and Nutrition, was selected. While the science content provided subject information on food and nutrition, the maths content was about calculating sums and presenting figures in a block chart. Pairs of participants worked together at two follow-up meetings to analyse the current primary curriculum with a particular focus on maths and science content. These meetings took place after the training classes at AGU, at the participants' convenience.

A complete lesson plan (see Appendices B and C) for a CLIL unit was successfully built by collecting ideas from individual participants' draft lesson plans. The emphasis was on communicative and hands-on learning activities that could provide opportunities for communication and interaction. The language aims were determined by the Food and Drinks unit goals in the current English textbook. While the maths and science content elements could be reinforced in CLIL lessons, some language items were recycled from earlier classes and some new target language items were taught. As the participants linked content aims with language aims, a series of activities were developed to encourage thinking skills and intercultural understanding. At the end of this lesson-planning phase, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the participants to gain insights into their perceptions regarding the phase.

Lesson implementation. The three 40-minute lessons were implemented in three consecutive weeks by each teacher. Six lessons were observed by the authors and extensive notes were taken. A semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant after each class. All interviews were carried out in Vietnamese. Finally, when the teachers finished their teaching, a focus group interview was conducted to explore their overall perceptions and perceived challenges (See Appendix A for interview questions).

The analysis of the interview data was conducted by assigning codes to the interview transcripts and the classroom observation summaries to identify themes and develop interpretation of the findings. The observation data were analysed and triangulated with the interview data to gain a clearer picture of what had happened in the classrooms. Relevant interview quotes were selected and translated into English by the authors.

Results

Teachers' Perceived Difficulties

The four aims design. The interview data revealed that the participants encountered various challenges in planning theme-based CLIL lessons. Incorporating all four aims in a three-lesson unit and adapting activities from the CLIL materials were demanding and time-consuming.

Designing this CLIL lesson plan to include all four aims demands a great amount of preparation: researching content, linking content of both maths and science and designing a variety of activities to stimulate thinking skills and intercultural understanding. (TB)

Online materials and CLIL activity books represent a great resource, but they need to be adapted both for the language and the content to meet the objectives and to suit the students' level. (TD)

From a traditional towards a Communicative Method classroom. Of the four aims, the implementing of cognition aims (learning skills such as classifying and reasoning) and culture aims (e.g., raising awareness that different people like different foods) took the greatest amount of preparation. The participants noted that before the training sessions, they had been unaware of linking across subjects and had never undertaken these aims in their classrooms.

Timing. While designing the theme-based lessons was reported to take a great amount of time and effort, their implementation was even more challenging. Observational data revealed that CLIL lessons took 50-55 minutes while traditional lessons took 35-40 minutes. The data from the focus group interviews and observations showed that the participants struggled with carrying out the communicative activities / tasks in the lesson plans. As a result, the timing in the lessons represented a major difficulty as the participants then had to actively try to scaffold and differentiate – both of which can take considerable time when the practitioners are new to the skills. TA described the difficulty in terms of preparation time to support weak students.

For my lower proficiency students, I had to provide lots of word cards and picture cards to support their oral retelling. This takes much more time. (TA)

Moreover, handling pair / group activities in large classes and implementing higher-order thinking skill activities represented challenges to the participants. TA and TD claimed that this was due to students' unfamiliarity with a range of collaborative and cognitively-demanding activities in the lessons. None of the participants commented on how these difficulties might

have been due in part to their own unfamiliarity with this method.

Teacher skill. Observational data also reveal that TA and TC, who claimed to have lower-achieving students, spent more time and effort on task delivery, classroom management, and scaffolding. Thus they could not give equal time for student presentations in the final class. TA and TC framed this difficulty in terms of what the students are used to, instead of looking at their own teaching methods.

It is because more pair / group work activities were conducted in the CLIL classes than the traditional classes and children were not used to working collaboratively. (TA)

As students were not familiar with the new lesson format, I had to find different ways to support them during the lesson. This really makes me tired. (TC)

Perceptions of student readiness. Participants were concerned that what they considered to be cognitively demanding activities might cause student reluctance to participate and the demotivation of weak students if the activities were not appropriate to students' age and level. Again, this fear of moving away from a traditional, teacher-centered methodology was reported in terms of student readiness, not as a fear of a different way of teaching. As even the most experienced participant reported:

Designing activities that can stimulate thinking abilities took me so much time. I have to make sure that the activities suit the students' cognitive level and are engaging enough to maintain their attention. My students are not used to learning this way. (TC)

Specialized knowledge. No teachers reported the need to consult the subject teachers for content knowledge as they believed they could manage those curricular aspects themselves by consulting teacher's books for subject teachers. However, TA and TC admitted that some content vocabulary items including *dairy*, *carbohydrate*, and *cereal* were unfamiliar to them. They also had to learn how to report the calculation of math sums in English.

In a traditional lesson of Food and Drinks, only names of common food items such as egg, rice, and chicken are taught. They are repetitively drilled and my students merely employed them in the practice stage. I have never thought about expanding the vocabulary items because I am not required to do so. (TA)

Teachers' Perceived Successes

Lesson planning. Few concerns were raised when the participants started jointly planning the three-lesson unit. As the aims were firmly established, the participants could come up with ideas for CLIL activities independently. In their view, bringing content into the language lessons using themes and topics from the content curriculum led to more varied activity ideas due to the enriched cross-curricular opportunities and supporting resources. The participants expressed interest in other curricular topics (e.g., the water cycle, the butterfly life cycle), and in CLIL websites and books.

To be honest, I had found myself and my students getting bored with the content in the current textbook. Lessons [as presented in the textbook guides] are designed in the same format for different levels and the topics are repeated. Topics such as family, friends and school things are important for the students, but we needed to do something different as a way to motivate children. (TC)

Now I realize that teaching based on a textbook is so limited. I am amazed at the resources provided [in the AGU training]. I am able to design a good CLIL lesson if I am given support and relevant materials. (TB)

Student gains. Despite several obstacles encountered during the designing and implementing of the lessons, the participants reported overall satisfaction with student performance during the implementation phase. However, the following results regarding learning outcomes are drawn from participants' subjective assessments and have only been triangulated with in-treatment observational data (i.e., the observations were not of a pre / post design). A conclusion on learning outcomes can only be made when the data in this study are triangulated with quantitative data.

Vocabulary. All participants agreed that most students learned more English (particularly vocabulary) than in a traditional English class. While TB and TD, who have stronger students, did not express much concern about their students' expected uptake of a large number of new vocabulary items in the first class, this had worried TA and TC.

I was really worried on the first day. I had to review familiar food items and teach five new food items and all five food groups while a normal [traditional] lesson requires teaching only five or six simple vocabulary items in a 35-minute period. (TC)

However, the results of the second class surprised them.

I was not sure if the second class could proceed if my students could not use the vocabulary they had learned in the first class. But I was really surprised at their performance in the second class. They grasped the vocabulary better than I thought. That resulted in a smooth transition to the second and third classes. (TA)

Grammar. All participants expressed concern about the complexity of the structural patterns before the lessons. They noted that combined structural patterns are not required in the current syllabus for the fourth graders, and therefore, they had not yet been taught, modelled, or supported. However, TB and TD reported that they felt their classes experienced success after some initial reluctance. From these reports, the participants were clearly gradually getting used to moving towards not only a CLIL classroom, but a truly 3P (present, practice, produce) communicative method classroom. This is expressed by TB as follows.

It is hard for the fourth graders to say combined sentences like "I like . . . but I don't . . ." and "It has . . . because . . ." But I was pleased that they were able to use them after some reluctance. (TB)

Fluency. The participants agreed that most students, even weak students, were involved in speaking in English more actively in the CLIL lessons than in traditional classes. They stated

this was a time when the students could actually use the language. Participants felt that as the students were already familiar with the content, they were motivated to talk in this more natural and meaningful situation.

Some of my weak students did volunteer to successfully tell the class about a food they like and a food they do not like. They have rarely volunteered in my normal classes. They have hardly been able to say a complete sentence in English. (TC)

Motivation and cognition. Both strong and weak students could benefit from this project. While the lessons could motivate weak students because of their focus on using English for a purpose, they challenged the strong students who had been demotivated because of the familiar content in the English textbooks.

I felt that I was not teaching them [the stronger students] anything new because the content I usually taught as new, following the current textbook, was already familiar to them due to their private lessons. (TD)

The participants also noticed that the cognitively engaging activities, such as finding an expert meal maker and doing a survey (see Appendices B and C), could create opportunities for students to use the language and hence stimulate an interest in learning English. Therefore, students could achieve a greater concentration span than in traditional classes.

It is more difficult to learn like this, especially at the beginning, but it makes students concentrate more, then they learn it better. (TD)

I found my students were amazed at how areas of maths and science were creatively recycled. They liked to report their calculation of the sums in English. This new experience may have excited them. (TC)

Discussion

The study investigated the participants' perceptions of their experience with the process of designing and planning theme-based CLIL lessons that were integrated in an EFL teaching setting. The participants perceived both challenges and benefits with regard to the implementation of the lessons. The reported benefits, to some extent, support the results of previous studies (Doiz et al., 2014; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009; Massler, 2012; Pladevall-Ballester, 2015; Yamano, 2013). In fact, the current study reveals that the familiar curricular areas integrated and recycled in the English classes could engage students cognitively due to exposure to a meaningful learning context. This was found to offer a better opportunity for learning vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. Similarly, the reported challenges of additional workload and preparation time are consistent with those found in Massler (2012) and Pladevall-Ballester (2015).

Furthermore, as the participants perceived, this form of CLIL could enhance a positive attitude to learning English. Therefore, the results highlight the significance of promoting "deep" learning for young language learners. This has been pointed out in Yamano (2013): Japanese primary students in a CLIL class outperformed those in non-CLIL English classes who "simply engage in memorizing or producing the correct use of the learned language" (p. 25). The results of this study thus support Yamano (2013) and might provide evidence to explain the reasons why the participants perceived the cognition and culture aims as most challenging when they started designing the activities.

However, the findings also support Nguyen (2011) and Le and Do (2012) in that the participants were not adequately prepared to teach primary English. In fact, the participants' perceived challenges of the design and implementation of the lessons have raised two issues. First, the participants needed to have a wide range of experience of non-traditional, student-based teaching methodology (where group / pair work is standard and differentiation is mainstream) to handle the communicative activities. From the interview data, some pedagogical skills required in a communicative language class (e.g., timing, conducting pair / group activities in large-size classes, providing support materials, and classroom management) seemed to be lacking among the participants. The transition from traditional Grammar-Translation practice to CLIL seemed to be difficult for the participants and many of their challenges lay within the scope of communicative methodology. For teachers without training or experience in communicative methodology, CLIL represents a significant challenge.

Secondly, the reported challenges also imply that the participants lacked some skills required to carry out the CLIL lessons specifically. The lack of awareness until the training course of CLIL support materials (e.g., CLIL activity books or websites) was also a great obstacle for these participants. Hence, the ideas and skills to integrate other subject themes into the EFL lessons were not easily available for them. Therefore, these participants faced difficulties with CLIL-specific skills such as awareness of other grade curricular areas and integration of themes into instruction.

Generally, although the participants did not yet have all the skills necessary for CLT, they showed signs of readiness for cognitively meaningful English teaching such as CLIL. The awareness of the limitations of textbook-bound teaching and of perceived improvement in learners' motivation and learning outcomes that designing and implementing CLIL activities seem to bring teachers could have implications for in-service professional training and the implementation of the NFLP 2020.

More specifically, this research into the perceptions of difficulties and successes of teachers moving into modern language teaching techniques shows that teacher preparation programs should give greater emphasis on training in communicative or student-centered methodologies. As many of the difficulties these participants reported (e.g., time management) were necessary steps into CLIL, training in these basic teaching techniques would be valuable to teachers. To achieve the goals of the NFLP 2020, it would be of great help to in-service and pre-service teachers to have these skills. The NFLP 2020 should take into account teachers' pedagogical skills.

There are many limitations in this study. The most important were the unforeseen difficulties that the transition from traditional teaching to CLIL would cause. Future researchers may want to measure the pre- and post-perceptions of teachers along a continuum of traditional approaches to communicative methodology and then into CLIL. Discrete steps would allow for a greater measurement of where the challenges lie, and therefore give a better picture of how training can raise skills. Also, measuring student skill level gains would be helpful for clarifying how useful these methodologies are. Future research may look at either student pre- / post-treatment tests and / or triangulated longitudinal observational data. Regarding teacher perceptions, future studies might employ journaling through the process to better understand teachers' difficulties and successes with small day-to-day hurdles. A complete understanding of the teaching methodology and classroom before the training course would also help researchers more clearly understand the situations of participants.

As in any locally situated study, the small, localized sample size can be viewed as a possible limitation. Yet, in regard to the NFLP 2020 in Vietnam and the lack of other research looking into this specific location, the data from this set of participants is still resonant. Even with these limitations, it is clear that these teachers engaged with CLIL in a meaningful way and came away with a deeper understanding of what they could offer their students. This in itself is a strong outcome for the research into teacher perceptions.

Conclusion

This paper examined the potential challenges and successes of theme-based CLIL lessons from primary English teachers' perceptions of their experience with the lesson design and implementation process. Challenges and benefits associated with this process were found. The results showed the participants had limited methodological repertoires of teaching skills that were necessary to handle a range of communicative activities / tasks as well as specific skills required in CLIL classes. However, the participants' positive perceptions of their students' enhanced motivation and learning outcomes revealed that the potential benefits of theme-based CLIL lessons could be promoted as long as teachers are adequately trained with CLIL and non-CLIL skills.

Recognizing the challenges of incorporating the CLIL approach in foreign language classrooms in Asia is important. There is a clear need for further research to determine students' reactions and their linguistic development affected by CLIL.

Author Note

Bui Le Diem Trang, Department of Foreign Languages, School of Education, An Giang University, Vietnam; Truong Thi Thanh Nga, Department of Foreign Languages, School of Education, An Giang University, Vietnam.

Bui Le Diem Trang is a lecturer and teacher trainer at An Giang University, Vietnam. She has taught TESOL pedagogy and trained EFL teachers at both pre-service and in-service levels. Her research interest areas include content and language integrated learning (CLIL), task-based language teaching (TBLT) and critical pedagogy (CP).

Truong Thi Thanh Nga has been teaching English for over ten years at An Giang University. She mainly teaches Writing, Reading, and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Her research areas include teaching writing and immersion language learning and teaching.

The authors would like to thank the CamTESOL Research Grant Committee for giving the opportunity to carry out the study. The authors also thank Dr. Elizabeth Clark from RMIT University for her suggestions on the early drafts of the paper.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bui Le Diem Trang or Truong Thi Thanh Nga, Department of Foreign Languages, School of Education, An Giang University, 25 Vo Thi Sau street, Long Xuyen, An Giang, Vietnam. E-mail: bldtrang@agu.edu.vn; ttnga@agu.edu.vn

References

- Birdsall, M. (2001). *Timesaver cross-curricular English Activities*. Oxford, England: Cornelsen.
- Calabrese, I., & Rampone, S. (2007). *Cross-curricular resources for young learners*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Coyle, D., Holmes, D., & King, L. (2009). *Towards an integrated curriculum – CLIL national statement and guidelines*. London, England: The Languages Company.
- Dale, L., & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2014). CLIL and motivation: The effect of individual and contextual variables. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 209-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889508>
- Hüter, J., & Rieder-Bünemann, A. (2010). A cross-sectional analysis of oral narratives by children with CLIL and non-CLIL instruction. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 61-80). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Ikeda, M. (2013). Does CLIL work for Japanese secondary school students? Potential for the “weak” version of CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 2(1), 31-42. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/21/article3.html>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International Journal CLIL Research*, 1(2), 4-17. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/12/article1.html>
- Le, V. C., & Do, T. M. C. (2012). Teacher preparation for primary school English education: A case of Vietnam. In B. Spolsky & Y. Moon (Eds.). *Primary school English language education in Asia* (pp. 106-128). New York, USA: Taylor & Francis.
- Lyster, R. (2011). Content-based second language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 631-644). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Massler, U. (2012). Primary CLIL and its stakeholders: What children, parents and teachers think of the potential merits and pitfalls of CLIL modules in primary teaching. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(4), 36-46.
- Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL counterweights: Recognising and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 93-119. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/11/article8.html>
- Met, M. (1999). *Content-based instruction: Defining terms, making decisions*. NFLC Reports. Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.
- Nation, P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge.
- Nguyen, T. M. H. (2011). Primary English language education policy in Vietnam: Insights from implementation. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(2), 225-249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2011.597048>
- Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2015). Exploring primary school CLIL perceptions in Catalonia: Students, teachers and parents’ opinions and expectations. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 45-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.874972>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Serra, C. (2007). Assessing CLIL at primary school: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 582-602.
- Snow, M., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 201-217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587333>

- Ministry of Education and Training (MOET). (2010). *Dự thảo chương trình tiếng Anh tiểu học thuộc đề án 2020* [Draft of primary English program: Project of the year 2020]. Retrieved from <http://www.moet.gov.vn/?page=1.24&view=2545>
- Yamano, S. (2013). CLIL in a Japanese primary school: Exploring the potential of CLIL in a Japanese EFL context. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 2(1), 19-30. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/21/article2.html>

Appendix A

Researchers' Field Notes from the Workshop on CLIL Methodology

We began the workshop by eliciting the teachers' thinking about the idea of enriching primary English teaching using the cross-curricular content aspects. We then raised awareness of CLIL practice by introducing the theory and existing CLIL examples in primary schools. As the teachers were able to get to know the 4Cs principles of CLIL and the possibilities of integrating cross curricular content into English lessons, we introduced the CLIL activities in a number of resource books such as Teaching other subjects through English (Deller and Price, 2007), Timesaver resource book (Birdsall, 2001), Cross-curricular resources for young learners (Calabrese and Rampone, 2007), CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers Dale and Tanner (2012), and a range of CLIL websites. Then we provided them some tips on material development and classroom activities. The session continued with a demonstration of a CLIL activity adapted to integrate into one of the current English lessons for Vietnamese fourth graders using the maths and science content areas. The teachers were asked to evaluate the demo on CLIL principles. Finally, they were invited to discuss the content elements in the textbooks for maths and science for the fourth graders to find a common curricular theme for the design of a CLIL unit.

Interview Prompts

Post-lesson design interview prompts

1. What are the differences between planning a CLIL lesson compared to what you normally do in your English class?
2. What difficulties did you have when planning the CLIL lessons?
3. Did you have to consult the subject teachers?
4. What do you think about your CLIL lesson-planning experience?





Post-lesson implementation interview prompts

1. What are your views on the perceived effects of CLIL lessons on learners' attitudes towards language learning?
2. Do you think the CLIL lessons increase student motivation and participations in the lessons?
3. In what way did the lessons bring opportunities to develop the pupils thinking skills / cognition as compared to traditional language learning?
4. What subject related challenges might CLIL teaching represent?
5. Do you think the CLIL approach lead to better oral performance in the target language compared to traditional approaches?
6. What challenges did you encounter when implementing this project in your traditional English classroom?
7. Does CLIL contribute to your continuing professional development?

Appendix B
A Language-Driven CLIL Lesson Plan for Implementation

THEME: Food and Nutrition	
<p>Curricular subjects: Science and Math Level: Primary (Grade 4) Time: 120 minutes approximately (three forty-minute periods) Prior learning: This is a review of Lesson 4, 5 and 7 in the science subject and Lesson 1 and 2 in the math subject taught in the mother tongue.</p>	
<p>AIMS Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be aware of healthy and unhealthy food. Learn to eat healthily (science). ▪ Learn to describe the results of a survey diagrammatically (maths) and learn to calculate the sum in English, (e.g., 2 plus 3 equals 5). <p>Language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Target vocabulary: Food items (cereal, chicken, butter, cheese, eggs, hamburgers, yogurt, chips); food groups (grains, vegetables, fruits, meat, dairy); nutrients (carbohydrate, protein, fat, vitamins and minerals) ▪ Structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review: <i>I like . . . / I don't like . . . and how many . . . ?</i> - Use target structure: <i>What do you like to eat for breakfast?</i> - Use linking words: <i>but, and, because</i> ▪ Skill: Speaking. By the end of the unit, students will be able to say what food and drinks they like and don't like and say what they like to eat for a meal such as breakfast. They are expected to provide the rationale for their preferences. <p>Cognition: Classifying, reasoning, interviewing, decision-making, problem-solving Culture: Raising awareness that different people like different foods.</p>	
<p>MATERIALS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A poster of food pyramid ▪ A set flashcards (word cards and picture cards) of foods, food groups, and nutrients ▪ A bean bag 	
PROCEDURE	
Day 1	
<p>1. Introduce the topic, teach the names of food and food groups (10 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher (T) writes the word FOOD in the middle of the board to create a spider gram. T shows a picture of various food items. Students (Ss) go to the board to write down as many food items as they know from the picture and their own knowledge. - T uses flashcards to review familiar food items, teach unfamiliar food items and food groups. Groups of 4 or 5 are handed with a set of flashcards of food from each of the food group. Each time T holds up a flashcard with a title of a food group and Ss show a flashcard of food that corresponds to that group (e.g., T says dairy, Ss raise a flashcard of cheese, butter, or milk and read it out loud).

<p>2. Play the Show and Tell game and chain game (13 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ss practice talking about food items they like and dislike. Ss review the structure “<i>I like . . . but I don’t like . . .</i>” A set of flashcards of food is handed to each group again. Ss take turn to show and tell food items they like and don’t like in their own group. T holds up 2 cards and gives a model sentence: <i>I like rice, but I don’t like bread.</i> - Then groups of Ss take turn to go to the board and play the chain game. Each group member holds up his/her flashcards of a food item and tells the class about the food he/she likes. Then the rest of the class will decide whether the group members eat healthy food by a show of hands.
<p>3. Play the Board Race game (15 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ss learn to classify food items into the correct food groups. T draws 2 pyramids with 5 sections on the board. T divides the class into 2 teams. Ss run to the board to put the correct flashcards of food items in the correct sections in the pyramids. - To check Ss’ understanding of the food pyramid, T asks why there are five sections and some of the sections are bigger than the others in Vietnamese. - In groups, Ss discuss the sections and types of food they should eat more, eat moderately and eat less through their interpretation of the food pyramid. Ss are encouraged to speak English but Vietnamese is allowed for this task. - T monitors the group work and assesses Ss’ understanding of the food pyramid.
<p>4. End of class (2 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - T reminds Ss of what they have learnt and asks them to think about nutrients given from different foods in their meals before they start the next class.
<p>Day 2</p>	
<p>1. Review the names of food and food groups; teach leader nutrients of each food groups (10 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In small circles, the S in the center throws a bean bag to an S in the circle and shouts out a food name from one of the food groups. The receiver shouts out a food from that group and throws the ball back to the S in the center. The receiver who cannot name a food from a food group has to stand out. - T uses flashcards to teach the leader nutrients of each food group (carbohydrate, protein, fat, vitamins, and minerals) - Ss play the matching game to check their understanding of the names of nutrients. Ss match the food items with their leader nutrients.
<p>2. Do the Table Display activity (10 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ss identify the nutrients found in each food group. Ss take turns picking up different food items on the table and describe nutrients found in that item to their group. For example, Ss may say “<i>Rice contains carbohydrates. Chicken contains protein.</i>”
<p>3. Do the survey (18 mins)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ss practice doing a survey to collect data on food for breakfast. T elicits and then drills the question form <i>What do you like to eat for breakfast?</i> before Ss start.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - T gives Ss a handout for the survey and tells them how to do the survey. (See Appendix C). - After the survey, T shows Ss how to complete the bar chart by doing an example on the board. T demonstrates counting the sticks for each food by asking them to count how many Ss have, for example, milk for breakfast. T gives a model sentence pattern for calculating the sum (e.g., 1 plus 2 equals 3). T shows how the results can be reported diagrammatically on the bar graph (see Appendix C).
4. End of class (2 mins)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - T consolidates the content of the class and asks Ss to think about what makes a healthy lunch.
Day 3	
1. Sing a song (5 mins)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ss sing along with a song from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UaqISEs_uj0. This song is to warm them up before starting the new lesson and to review their previous knowledge of healthy food and unhealthy food and the structure "Do you like . . . ?"
2. Class project: Finding an expert meal maker (20 mins)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - T reminds Ss of the nutritional requirements for a balanced diet and a healthy meal which contains a variety of food from all food groups. - In groups, Ss create a poster on which they display food items that make up a balanced and nutritious lunch. Ss share their meal with that of other groups and then Ss take turns to explain the meal they make in front of the class. Ss vote for the healthiest lunch. - T elicits a model answer: <i>This is a healthy lunch. It has some  because rice contains carbohydrate. It has some  because fish contains protein. It has some  because tomatoes contain vitamins and minerals. It has some  because milk contains fats.</i> - This activity will help consolidate content knowledge and language knowledge in the previous activities.
3. Game: Board Race (8 mins)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ss discuss typical foods worldwide. Then T sticks some pictures of food (sushi, spaghetti, hamburger, curry, and cheese) on the board. - T gives each group of Ss flags of Japan, Italy, America, India, and France. Ss run to the board to match the food with the country of its origin.
4. End of class (2 mins)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - T consolidates the content of three lessons.

Appendix C
Class Survey

<i>Name</i>	<i>Vietnamese bread</i>	<i>Instant noodles</i>	<i>Omelet</i>	<i>Steamed sticky rice</i>	<i>Rice noodle soup</i>
1. _____					
2. _____					
3. _____					
4. _____					
5. _____					
Total = 5					

Arranging Information in a Block Chart

