Wenhsien Yang*

National Kaohsiung University of Hospitality and Tourism, Taiwan
yangwenhsien@mail.nkuht.edu.tw

THE DEVELOPMENT, ADOPTION AND EVALUATION OF THE INTEGRATION OF AN ESP AND CLIL TEXTBOOK: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE CLIL LEARNERS

Abstract

Extensive research has confirmed CLIL linguistic benefits but the evaluation of its textbooks and practitioners' performance is still relatively scant. Thus, the aim of this study is to evaluate a customised language-oriented CLIL textbook and the teacher's teaching performance of using it. The textbook was produced by a research team and used for 18 weeks by English majors in a national polytechnic university of Taiwan. After the one-semester trial, two well-established questionnaire surveys were respectively administered to examine 55 learners' judgement of the quality of the textbook and their evaluation of the practitioner's teaching quality. The results indicated that the learners welcomed the idea of integrating language and content learning into a single course, but were also concerned about the quality of its design for facilitating critical thinking, assessment, meaningful learning, and technology inclusion. The learners' English levels and their preferable future jobs significantly affected their attitudes towards the CLIL course. However, they exhibited relatively high satisfaction and agreement with the CLIL practitioner's performance of facilitating exposure to input, meaning-focused processing, form-focused processing, opportunities for output production, and use of learning strategies. The study has implications for CLIL material development and evaluation, particularly in the under-researched context of higher education.

Key words

content and language integrated learning (CLIL), textbook production and evaluation, teacher performance, tertiary level.

* Corresponding address: Wenhsien Yang, 1, Hsung-ho Rd. Hsiao-kang Dist., 812, Taiwan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to the ever-increasing demands of globalisation, enhancing (under)graduates' employability and mobility has become an issue of vital importance to universities around the world. They aim to prepare their students for the international job market by equipping them with the mobility and employability needed to compete with their peers worldwide. One of the most important measures universities are taking is strengthening learners' language competence to allow them to communicate across national borders (Räisänen & Fortanet-Gómez, 2008).

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is one of the common approaches proposed to address the need to acquire both language skills and content knowledge. It has been widely adopted in tertiary education, particularly in Europe (Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015), and is an alternative to the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach (Wahyuningsih, 2016), complementing its scant subject matter. The establishment of tertiary level CLIL programmes has been encouraged in the drive to internationalise higher education in Taiwan (Yang & Gosling, 2014) as well.

However, ESP has received considerably more attention than CLIL in Taiwan. The major differentiating factor is that CLIL is dual-focused, placing equal weight on both the language and subject content, while ESP focuses on providing learners with the language skills necessary to master the content knowledge. Therefore, ESP is considered a form of English Language Teaching (ELT), whereas CLIL is not. Other major differences between the two approaches include the course materials, the teaching strategies, and teacher preparation. Perhaps due to the increased emphasis on ESP, little attention has been paid to the teaching materials used in CLIL courses. However, as CLIL courses are being encouraged in Taiwan, it is essential that suitable resources, such as specifically designed CLIL textbooks, are made available. To seek a possible synergy between ESP and CLIL material production, the aim of this study is therefore to describe the development of a language-based CLIL textbook that integrates ESP materials, its application in the classroom, and 55 English-major students' evaluation of its effectiveness and the performance of the teacher who used the textbook in the CLIL course at a national polytechnic university of Taiwan. The study therefore aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the learners' perceptions of a customised CLIL textbook integrating ESP materials?

2. How do the learners evaluate the practitioner's teaching performance in the integrated ESP and CLIL course using the CLIL-specific textbook?

69

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. (In)compatibility between ESP and CLIL practices

ESP and CLIL have traditionally been viewed as two separate teaching approaches with different focuses, but there has been little discussion of their overlap or compatibility. Some researchers have pointed out that they are not necessarily absolute opposites, but may in fact share some similarities; however, their differences may outweigh their similarities. As Fortanet-Gómez and Bellés-Fortuño (2008) argued, the single main aim of ESP is the teaching and learning of a foreign language, whereas CLIL places more emphasis on content. However, some scholars have argued that the distinction between the two approaches is not completely clear, stating that both ESP and CLIL practitioners need to find a balance between the target language culture and the professional subject matter (Poręcka, 2011). Liew and Khor (2014) argued that CLIL and ESP are two separate approaches but that ESP has moved closer to CLIL due to university students' expectations of learning content knowledge in their language courses. Thus, they define CLIL as an integrated ESP model, stating that integrated ESP can address some of the shortcomings of the traditional ESP approach. However, Riley (2013) argues that it is only with the close collaboration of the content and language teachers that the transformation of ESP into CLIL can be achieved.

70

However, ESP and CLIL are more closely related than many people realise in terms of catering to both language and content learning (Torregrosa Benavent & Sánchez-Reyes Peñamaría, 2011). The complexity of ESP teaching in today's classrooms has attributed CLIL's emergence to the development of ESP, and new developments in the area of ESP have created challenges for ESP teachers due to the need for higher qualifications including content knowledge and transferable skills (Jendrych, 2013). For instance, Bruton and Woźniak (2013) describe a university course which adopted both approaches, and discuss the interconnections between them, their influences on each other, and the benefits and problems encountered. They argue that courses which combine both approaches are time-consuming for both language and content teachers. However, the benefit is that the content teachers' confidence in using English to teach in the classroom increased, as did the language teachers' confidence in teaching the subject content.

González Ardeo's (2013) study investigated the coexistence of both types of courses in a Spanish university. He found that although they were in fact compatible, both approaches posed challenges for the content teachers, the language teachers and the learners such as the diverse students' awareness of language acquisition and content learning, their attitudes towards English, and the feeling of compatibility of ESP and CLIL. Brebera and Hlousková (2012) discussed the application of the principles of CLIL to ESP in a higher education context, and

pointed out the problematic nature of providing uniform CLIL guidelines for teaching content and language in tertiary contexts. They called for further research at the local, national and international levels to help teachers overcome the challenges posed by this new approach.

Lara-Garrido (as cited in Suwannoppharat & Chinokul, 2015) also argued that there is a close connection between CLIL and ESP, as both place particular emphasis on the learners' needs and on their interest in communication. It therefore seems valid to argue that CLIL is a new and interactive English teaching approach. Fernández (2009) considers it a generic term covering a wide range of notions, including ESP. Tarnopolsky (2013) argued that the two approaches share the common feature of integrating language learning and the content matter of non-linguistic disciplines, with CLIL having a broader scope, while ESP is generally considered a language course. Jendrych and Wisniewska (2010), and Yang (2016) also agreed that in some cases teaching ESP is similar to teaching CLIL due to the emphasis on teaching language and professional skills in both approaches.

Considering the similarities between ESP and CLIL, it is hardly surprising that there have been urgent calls for collaboration between ESP and CLIL practitioners, and for a balanced weighing of the content and language teaching. Nashaat-Sobhy, Berzosa, and Crean (2013), for example, pointed out the need for content and language teachers to collaborate on the design of teaching materials, stating that the schema theory can help learners scaffold their language development while also facilitating peer collaboration. Gavrilova and Trostina (2014) argued that the only way to create the necessary synergy for preparing highly-qualified specialists in particular fields of knowledge is to adopt an integrated language and subject matter interdisciplinary approach.

In short, CLIL and ESP are seemingly two distinct approaches which share notable similarities. For example, needs analysis derived from ESP is applicable in CLIL contexts, while the same teacher preparation procedures can be adopted for both approaches. Similar implementation difficulties are encountered including issues related to teacher training, teaching qualifications, peer collaboration, students' motivation and teaching material design.

2.2. CLIL materials development and evaluation

In the specific context of CLIL, the aim of the textbook is to respond to the 4Cs framework of CLIL (Coyle, 2007). That is, the design should ideally accommodate the development of learners' communicative skills, content knowledge, cognitive ability, and cultural awareness. However, compared to the more abundant ESP teaching materials published by EFL (English as a Foreign Language) publishers, CLIL teaching materials are relatively scant (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010), and even less evaluation has been carried out on CLIL-specific materials. Thus, very often authentic English textbooks are used in CLIL classrooms without proper

content and language design (Yang, 2018). These international series of EFL or CLIL-driven materials without much appropriate adaptation are usually not cognitively engaging or connected to the local context because they are intended to cater to a wide range of educational settings. They are generally not suitable for integrating subject matter and language learning (Banegas, 2012; Bell & Gower, 2011; Tomlinson, 2012). Coyle et al. (2010) maintain that CLIL materials produced under the EFL umbrella tend to overlook the balance of content and linguistic presentation, aspects of courses, modules, and units. In other words, CLIL materials should be developed in accordance with the specific context, considering local school cultures and curricula, and involving the efforts of CLIL practitioners. Contextualisation in Coyle's (2007) 4Cs framework is an important concept of ensuring the success of CLIL-based learning across diverse contexts.

In terms of evaluation, there are only a few well-established criteria specifically used for evaluating CLIL materials, compared to the significant amount of research on how to evaluate EFL and ESL textbooks. Banegas (2012) argues that some ESL/EFL course books may be treated as a weak form of CLIL materials where language classes are taught by CLIL language teachers with great use of content, aiming to develop the learners' content-based language proficiency (Ikeda, 2013). However, the criteria applied to evaluate them may not precisely fit the evaluation of CLIL materials because the majority of these principles focus on language elements and presentation rather than disciplinary knowledge. Moreover, CLIL materials adapting EFL elements tend to be superficial, and there have been few endeavours to promote bilingual education (Banegas, 2012).

Morton (2013) surveyed European CLIL teachers' practices and perceptions of finding, adapting, creating and using materials in secondary education, and found that a great majority of the teachers would be willing to create their own CLIL materials. Yet, they are concerned about the appropriateness of materials in terms of both content and language difficulty in their educational or cultural contexts. So far, the most comprehensive standards for planning quality CLIL materials are Mehisto's principles (2012). Only one study so far has adopted these standards to appraise publisher-made or contextualised self-designed CLIL course books and materials, that is, Yang's (2018) study in Taiwan. A CLIL course book, Introduction to Hospitality and Tourism, was developed and taught for 18 weeks. A post-course survey revealed that the respondents had very high agreement with Mehisto's (2012) principles of quality CLIL materials, but when judging the designed CLIL materials, their agreement reduced by between 5% and 25%, indicating that his materials have room to improve. Yang (2018) found that the variables of learners' gender, previous major at high school and English proficiency led to significant differences in their evaluation. The main reason may be the various levels of English proficiency, expectations regarding the course and their previous knowledge of the content and target language, mirroring the importance but also the difficulties of needs analysis in CLIL execution in Taiwan's polytechnic universities.

72

As Coyle et al. (2010) argue, research is still needed to investigate the effectiveness of CLIL materials from the perspectives of design and task. In addition, CLIL practitioners' classroom practices and how to use tailor-made CLIL materials also have a great effect on the success of the CLIL approach. Thus, the present research aims to have the learners not only evaluate the effectiveness of a contextualised CLIL textbook, but also to evaluate how successfully CLIL practitioners conducted teaching in CLIL classes.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Textbook design, methods, context and participants

In order to answer the research questions, we selected an ESP course, *English for MICE* (meeting, incentive travel, convention and exhibition), to be transformed into a CLIL course. This course was selected because students who had previously graduated expressed the need to learn more content knowledge after returning from their internship. The course was originally delivered in the fourth year of the Applied English Department (AE) at a national polytechnic university of Taiwan, designed and taught according to the ESP approach. This university is well-known for its 'sandwich curriculum', where all the students have to complete a one-year domestic or overseas placement in hospitality and tourism relevant industries. The 55 learners, 46 females and 8 males, had an average English proficiency of CEFR B2 level, which is the highest level among the students in the University. However, having continuously received feedback from previous students and industry employers that AE students lacked professional knowledge of the hospitality and tourism disciplines, the AE faculty decided to integrate the course, *English for MICE*, with more CLIL elements to achieve a better balance between language and content, in the hope of accommodating future learners' and employers' needs. Also, it was assumed that these final year students could make a greater contribution to sensitising the distinguishing features of an integrated CLIL-ESP teaching model, which was actually very different from their previous ESP learning experiences in the first and second years. Furthermore, their internship experiences could help accurately evaluate whether or not the newly-proposed learning model is capable of preparing graduates with sufficient language skills and content knowledge to survive in future job markets.

Upon securing the faculty's consensus, the first step was to turn the current ESP textbook into a CLIL one. In designing this new textbook, titled *MICE 2*, we kept the language elements intact and designed additional subject matter to achieve a suitable balance between content and language. The newly-developed CLIL textbook was mainly written by the researcher and his research assistant who had industrial internship experience in a MICE-relevant industry. In addition,

73

one MICE content specialist in the University was asked to offer guidance or consultancy if professional opinions were sought. The content of each unit came from on-line resources and some already existing Chinese MICE textbooks with appropriate selection and adaptation. Both the content and the English were refined and proofread by a local content specialist and a native English-speaking teacher. Finally, the textbook consisted of 14 units, each of which aims to develop learners' 4Cs skills or knowledge (communication, content, cognition, cultural awareness). Four major sections of each unit were designed to address each C individually. The Reading section is to instruct content knowledge, the Vocabulary, Dialogues and Communicative Activity sections aim to provide learners with necessary language and communication skills to demonstrate their content knowledge, the Cognitive Activity section challenges learners' lower-order and higher-order thinking skills to elicit critical thinking, and the Learning Activity section uses on-line videos to train learners' learning skills and to help them compare and contrast diversities of managing MICE industries in different settings in order to raise their (inter)cultural awareness. The new textbook was completed in the summer of 2018.

In the fall semester of 2018, the newly-produced textbook was used as the main teaching resource for the *English for MICE* course which was delivered for a period of 18 weeks for two hours per week to a class of 55 undergraduate AE learners with an average English proficiency of above CEFR B2. The instructor of this new CLIL course was also the researcher of this study as he was the only teacher in the AE faculty who had received formal CLIL teacher training and had published many journal articles on CLIL. He performed multiple roles as he was not only a researcher, but also a textbook writer and a CLIL practitioner, "who plays a crucial role in understanding his students and designing meaningful learning experiences that reflect their needs and interests" (Jones, 2016). Thus, the research framework of this study is teacher's action research, where the researcher as a practitioner continuously reflects on his teaching practices in terms of ideals and knowledge of the local situation (Hammersley, 1993).

By the end of the semester, in order to elicit the learners' perceptions of the textbook to answer RQ1, they were asked to complete a questionnaire in the final week of the semester. This bilingual Mandarin Chinese/English questionnaire is composed of three main sections with a total of 21 questions: the participants' demographic information (4 items), their perceptions of the evaluation of the CLIL materials (16 items), and one open-ended question about any extra comments they would like to add to the textbook. The items were adopted from Mehisto's (2012) principle of producing quality CLIL learning materials where 16 specific criteria are proposed to evaluate CLIL materials (see Appendix A). A 7-point Likert scale was used, ranging from *1: strongly disagree* to *7: strongly agree.* The questionnaire was provided in an online format, and took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. A total of 55 valid questionnaires were received, giving a

response rate of 100%, and its reliability reached Cronbach's alpha .95, tested in previous similar cases (Yang, 2018).

To answer RQ2, we administered another questionnaire to investigate how the learners appraised the CLIL practitioner's teaching in the classroom. We used de Graaff, Jan Koopman, Anikina, and Westhoff's (2007) observation tool to survey learners' perceptions of the effectiveness of the teaching. The questionnaire was presented in both Chinese and English and consists of four demographic items, five sections with a total of 24 items on how teachers facilitate exposure to input at a minimal challenging level, meaning-focused processing, form-focused processing, output production and the use of teaching strategies such as eliciting receptive compensation strategies, productive compensation strategies or reflection on strategy use. The questionnaire also included an open-ended question about any additional comments on improving future teaching, giving 29 questions in total. This questionnaire also used a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 =*strongly disagree* and 7=*strongly agree*. This second questionnaire was administered at the end of the semester together with the first one (also in an online format), and took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. A total of 55 valid questionnaires were received, giving a response rate of 100% as well, and its Cronbach's alpha reliability reached .98 (see Appendix B for the complete questionnaire). In terms of the ethical issues around student participation in the study, before completing the questionnaires, students were made aware that their responses would be anonymous and would not have an influence on their course grade.

75

3.2. Data analysis

The data from the two questionnaires, the first on the learners' perceptions of the CLIL textbook and the second on their perceptions of the practitioner's teaching performance, were analysed using the statistical software SPSS 16.0. In addition to the essential descriptive analysis, *t* tests and one-way ANOVA were run in order to determine the effects of gender, English proficiency, internship location, and job preference after graduation. The Scheffé post-hoc test was used to determine any significant differences within the groups, while the Pearson correlation test was used to determine any significant relationships between the variables. The standard for significance for this research was set at p<.05. In addition, the validity of the data collected in the two questionnaire surveys was enhanced by judiciously combining the teacher's involvement in designing the materials and conducting teaching as an insider, and his purposeful estrangement of being physically absent while the learners were completing the surveys (Hammersley, 1993). In the following sections, we present the major results and discuss the most significant findings.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Evaluation of a customised CLIL textbook

The results of the students' evaluation of the textbook are summarised in Table 1 and are discussed in detail below.

Item	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8
Mean	5.07	5.35	5.05	5.24	5.18	4.89	4.87	4.91
SD	1.05	1.00	1.11	1.09	1.26	1.23	1.09	1.25
Agree	79.9%	80%	67.3%	83.6%	76.4%	63.6%	60%	61.8%
Item	**2.9**	**2.10**	**2.11**	**2.12**	**2.13**	**2.14**	**2.15**	**2.16**
Mean	4.87	5.09	4.81	5.13	5.04	5.11	4.12	3.87
SD	1.26	1.34	1.40	1.28	1.33	1.44	1.69	1.48
Agree	61.8%	70.6%	60%	74.5%	67.3%	63.6%	41.8%	34.5%

Table 1. Descriptive results of evaluating the CLIL textbook[1]

The results revealed that the students showed low agreement with the statement that the current CLIL textbook meets the principles of good quality CLIL materials. For items related to assessment (2.7), fostering critical thinking (2.11) and meaningful learning (2.13), the average agreement reached between 60% and 68%, while items 2.15 (environmental issues) and 2.16 (social issues) had much lower agreement of 41.8% and 34.5% respectively. The major reason for this result may be the fact that all of the learners were senior students with a full one-year industrial internship experience and so they had much higher expectations of what content elements the CLIL book should contain. Compared to what they had experienced in their industrial placements, the social or environmental issues were less mentioned in the textbook. Besides, the students expressed their concern that fewer opportunities were offered for collaborative learning with peers and for autonomous learning. Communicative activities and collaborative work were included in the design but were not always covered owing to the time pressure to complete one textbook unit within one 2-hour class.

On the other hand, items about CLIL facilitating proficiency of English and the authentic language use (2.5, 2.10) received more than 70% agreement, indicating good quality. The results show that most learners believe this textbook was designed as a language-oriented CLIL version, but that it also addressed subject matters. The CLIL practitioner, who is also an ESP teacher, might naturally highlight language elements in his instruction, making learners perceive that language teaching outweighs content teaching. Thus, the respondents expressed

76

---

[1] Agreement percentage was calculated by adding up the points, 5, 6, and 7 in the Likert Scale of the questionnaires.

higher agreement with the design of the language components in the CLIL book. Another reason may be that they are English language majors and thus view language learning as essential. Regarding the inclusion of ICT (2.14), the current CLIL materials did not greatly satisfy the learners, with 63.6% agreement. The learners' responses imply that to design good quality CLIL materials, collaboration between content and language teachers may not be sufficient, as it can only ensure the accuracy of and a good balance between language and subject matters. Inviting ICT experts to help design CLIL materials seems indispensable in the Internet age as technology and multimodalities can highly motivate learners, facilitate autonomous learning and sustain learning. One positive finding could be that learners' awareness of what CLIL is was raised (2.4). There was 83.6% agreement with the intentions and process the CLIL course aimed to deliver to the learners. It seems that the learners had a good understanding of the importance and necessity of integrating content and language. This awareness is also one implicit purpose of designing customised CLIL materials as, unless such awareness is raised, CLIL will be confused with the ESP approach.

When comparing the responses across students, we found that there were no significant differences between genders or the locations of having their industrial placement, indicating that the learners who stayed in Taiwan and those who went overseas for internship had similar judgements of the textbook. We had anticipated that those who spent time overseas might require much more language and content input in order to survive compared with those staying at home, but no such difference emerged. A possible reason may be that nearly all of the respondents took very basic job positions in the hospitality and tourism industry which did not require them to have many professional skills or much content knowledge, and some jobs, such as housekeeping or restaurant service, offered few chances for communication.

One significant difference under the variable of English proficiency ($F_{(3:51)}=2.796$, $p<.05$) and two under job preference after graduation were found. For the item: *The current CLIL materials meet appropriate technical requirements, like pictures, format, or multimedia*, the respondents with higher English proficiency showed much higher disagreement with the book meeting this principle than those with lower level English. This suggests that higher L2 achievers rely more on contextual cues, inferential strategies and other resources to interpret the meaning of the target language, while lower proficiency learners depend more on their prior knowledge (Sun & Dong, 2004).

Likewise, the respondents showed significantly different agreement with the items: *The current CLIL materials seek ways of incorporating authentic language and authentic language use* ($F_{(3:51)}=2.170$, $p<.05$) and *The current CLIL materials help students to reach well beyond what they could do on their own* ($F_{(3:51)}=2.857$, $p<.05$) when the variable of their job preference after graduation was examined. Half of the graduates plan to stay in the hospitality or tourism (H&T) business sectors such as hotels, airlines or travel agencies, and the other half expect to

77

choose jobs related to English such as secretarial or tutorial jobs. MICE is a new emerging job outlet in the local context and thus courses like *English for MICE* (an ESP course) and *Introduction to MICE* (a content course delivered in Mandarin Chinese) are both taught in the University. The new CLIL-based MICE book was designed and used for the purpose of equipping the learners with both language skills and content knowledge about MICE. We discovered that those who plan to seek jobs in the H&T (40%) and MICE (7.3%) sectors rather than English-related jobs (41.8%) had higher agreement with the CLIL materials meeting these two principles. This may be because these students had a stronger preference for seeking relevant jobs so they were more involved in the CLIL course and had a more positive attitude. They believed that authentic language integrated into the content is vital and useful for their future jobs.

Differing from other content courses instructed in their L1, what makes CLIL learners feel challenged is that they have to learn the subject matter in an L2. CLIL learners are expected to process both the L2 and the unfamiliar content knowledge simultaneously, which adds to their cognitive loadings. Hence, timely gradual scaffolding is important (Mehisto, 2012). Those who were considering H&T and MICE jobs after graduation exhibited higher agreement with the textbook being able to help them reach beyond what they could do on their own than those who chose English language relevant jobs. The newly-developed CLIL MICE textbook is language-based, containing more subject knowledge than other ESP textbooks but easier content than the disciplinary textbooks written either in Chinese or English. This purposeful design gradually guides learners to know more about the MICE industry in the L2 which they are more comfortable using than other non-English majors are.

4.2. Evaluation of the CLIL teacher's classroom practices

After evaluating the quality of the customised CLIL textbook, the learners were asked to judge the CLIL practitioner's teaching practices. It has to be remembered that the textbook writer/ course instructor is both a well-trained ESP teacher and a qualified CLIL practitioner with English language expertise and content knowledge. It is assumed that these dual roles and integrated identity in the teaching profession can exemplify how ESP and CLIL teacher preparation can be compatibly designed. Surprisingly, the respondents demonstrated higher agreement with the indicators of good performance of the practitioner than of the materials. This may have been because the researcher was both the author and the teacher, and the students may not have wanted to offend him. However, as the responses to the questionnaires were anonymous, did not affect the students' grades, and the students did not hesitate to criticise the design of the textbook, there may be other reasons for their more positive response to the teaching. The indicators for examining the CLIL teaching are classed into five categories as

shown in Table 2 below, and are discussed in the following sections (see de Graaff et al., 2007).

Item	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3
Mean	5.20	5.16	5.24	5.33	5.25	5.09	5.18	5.23
SD	1.24	1.08	1.10	1.04	1.14	1.38	1.23	1.29
Agree	72.7%	70%	72.7%	78.2%	70.9%	69.1%	74.5%	74.5%
Item	**2.4**	**3.1**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**3.4**	**3.5**	**4.1**	**4.2**
Mean	5.32	5.05	5.11	5.00	5.16	5.45	5.65	5.82
SD	1.32	1.39	1.31	1.33	1.30	1.25	1.19	1.88
Agree	74.5%	63.6%	70.9%	63.6%	70.9%	76.4%	80%	85.5%
Item	**4.3**	**4.4**	**4.5**	**4.6**	**5.1**	**5.2**	**5.3**	**5.4**
Mean	5.89	5.64	5.38	4.41	5.09	5.27	5.24	5.27
SD	1.10	1.19	1.62	1.54	1.27	1.28	1.29	1.15
Agree	87.3%	83.6%	76.4%	52.7%	63.6%	72.7%	69.1%	72.7%

Table 2. Descriptive results of evaluating the CLIL teacher's teaching performance[1]

4.2.1. Exposure to input at a (minimally) challenging level

The agreement with items 1.1 to 1.5 reaches 72.7% on average, with 78.2% the highest for item 1.4 and the lowest (70%) for item 1.2. When learning an L2, meaningful exposure and functional input are viewed as essential (Krashen, 1985). Thus, in CLIL teaching, teachers are expected to select and customise the materials to be challenging but comprehensible (de Graaff et al., 2007). The practitioner in the present research obtained nearly 75% agreement that his performance facilitated exposure to input at a challenging level. Since this is the first trial of adopting the CLIL approach and a tailor-made textbook in the MICE course, both the practitioner and learners were experimenting with this new approach. With no prior similar instructional experience to rely on, the practitioner kept adjusting the materials and the teaching pace to fit the learners' needs and performance outcomes in class. Besides, as discussed earlier, CLIL learners have to cognitively process the L2 and the subject knowledge simultaneously, and this inevitably creates a heavier psychological load and slows the learning pace. Thus, CLIL practitioners need to fine-tune their class talk in order to make themselves comprehensible and allow time for processing while addressing the L2 and the subject matter. The current CLIL practitioner's performance in this category was acknowledged by the majority of the learners.

79

---

[1] Agreement percentage was calculated by adding up the points, 5, 6, and 7 in the Likert Scale of the questionnaires.

4.2.2. Meaning-focused processing

Exposure to input is not sufficient or effective to facilitate language learning on its own; the input should also be meaningful, storable and retrievable from working and long-term memory (Johnson, 1982). Thus, CLIL practitioners are expected to design oral or written activities and tasks to continuously check if the instruction is adequately comprehended by the learners (de Graaff et al., 2007). Items 2.1 to 2.4 belong to this category and reached 73% agreement, with the lowest agreement for item 2.1 (69.1%) and the highest for 2.4 (74.5%).

The customised CLIL textbook was designed based on its original *English for MICE* textbook which included several communicative activities for practice. More vocabulary practice, cognitive tasks and learning skill activities were added to allow the learners to complete tasks which checked their comprehension of the content in the L2. These specially designed activities helped the practitioner to identify if the input had become meaningful knowledge for the learners and to check if there was any need for further clarification, validation or confirmation. Again, a majority of the learners believed that the current CLIL practitioner exercised satisfactory performance according to these indicators.

4.2.3. Form-focused processing

Although when first learning an L2, fluency comes before accuracy, both are equally important. Housen and Pierrard (2005) summarised a series of studies arguing the importance of instructing language structures and form. Accordingly, CLIL practitioners are expected to raise learners' awareness of 'focus on form' and make them conscious of features in the target language. Hence, teachers' implicit or explicit instruction of demonstrating accurate uses of the L2 and providing feedback or correction are regarded as necessary in CLIL classrooms (de Graaff et al., 2007).

Items 3.1 to 3.5 assessed the CLIL practitioner's performance of assisting learners with form-focused processing, and the agreement with these indicators averaged 69.1%. There was less agreement with items 3.1 and 3.3 (both 63.6%), indicating that the practitioner might not have explicitly offered corrections to problematic language forms in class. The likely reason is that the learners are all relatively proficient English users, so the practitioner assumed that there was no need to correct the wrong usage of language structures. However, Taiwanese English learners are still used to emphasising correct forms when using the L2 and also depend on teachers as the traditional authoritative sources of correct usage. This contextual tendency can explain their lower agreement with these two items.

The last item (3.5) in this category received relatively more agreement from the respondents at 76.4%. Due to the great number of activities, the learners had to collaborate with their peers to complete the tasks; therefore, they had many chances to interact with their peers and to receive feedback from them. This

evidences that in a soft CLIL course, which is language-oriented and opposite to a content-driven hard CLIL model (Ikeda, 2013), including collaborative tasks and activities to apply the L2 should outweigh the instruction of the subject matter.

4.2.4. Opportunities for output production

Output production can help increase fluency in L2 performance, drawing learners' attention to correct form usages, facilitating peer feedback in communicative activities and thus maintaining their motivation to learn (de Bot, 1996). With regard to CLIL practices, teachers are expected to "encourage learners to react and ask questions aimed at functional output as well as stimulate interaction between learners in the target language" (de Graaff et al., 2007: 609). With the design of communicative activities, CLIL teachers can encourage learners to use the L2 to engage in collaborative tasks. It is argued that the more output production, the more chances for providing correct feedback on using language forms.

These indicators received the highest agreement, i.e. 77.6% on average from the respondents, compared to the other four categories. Items 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 have over 80% agreement (80%, 85.5%, 87.3%, and 83.6% respectively), confirming that the teacher used the customised CLIL textbook well to elicit learners' responses and interaction in the target language, and this design was highly welcomed by the learners. Apparently, the soft CLIL model is preferable for L2 majors such as the participants in this study as they are given many opportunities to use the L2 authentically and interactively, which also motivates them to learn the subject matter in the L2.

Indicator 4.6 received the lowest agreement compared to all the other performance indicators, at only 52.7%. Admittedly, written tasks or activities are not the major focus of the book design, nor are they the focus of the classroom instruction. Practice of L2 writing is not listed as an aim of the current course so the lowest agreement for this indicator is predictable. These responses also confirm previous research on the development of the four L2 skills in CLIL education, that is, usually CLIL learners' receptive skills (reading and listening) outperform their productive skills (writing and speaking) (Aguilar & Rodríguez, 2012; Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Jiménez-Catalán & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2009) due to the productive skills being less practiced in CLIL classrooms (Coonan, 2007).

4.2.5. The use of strategies

The last category of performance indicators is whether the CLIL practitioner facilitated the use of strategies. In language learning, strategies can be classed into two main areas, direct (memory, cognitive, and compensation) and indirect (metacognitive, affective, and social) strategies (Oxford, 1990). Learners can use inferential strategies such as retrieving their prior knowledge to compensate for their deficiencies in receptive knowledge, and may also apply strategies such as

81

negotiating, paraphrasing or avoidance to accommodate their deficiencies in productive knowledge (Bialystok, 1990; Westhoff, 1991). It has also been found that when ESP learners become CLIL learners, they gradually change from using direct to indirect strategies as the CLIL approach demands more interaction and collaboration (Yang, 2017). Therefore, CLIL practitioners should be able to develop "a repertoire of receptive and productive compensatory and communication strategies" (de Graaff et al., 2007: 610) and also suggest effective strategies to help learners overcome their language and content comprehension and production problems.

The participants showed an average of 70% agreement with these indicators with the highest for items 5.2 and 5.4 (both in 72.7%) and the lowest for item 5.1 (63.6%). Although the majority of the learners still believed the CLIL practitioner had satisfactory performance with reference to these indicators, the agreement is relatively low compared to other categories. The possible explanations are that firstly they were not clearly aware that the practitioner was teaching them certain types of strategies to approach CLIL learning, even though there is a section in each textbook unit, *Learning Skills Activities*, to train learners to use strategies such as note-taking, memorisation or noticing. Secondly, the learners themselves may not have been aware that they were employing certain learning strategies such as negotiating or avoidance (mostly indirect strategies) when they were engaging in the communicative and collaborative tasks. Their replies raise a concern regarding whether language learning strategies should be explicitly taught, in particular when learners have to use the L2 to learn content and language at the same time, which is very different from their previous experiences of learning the target language. This issue also elicits another concern regarding whether CLIL practitioners (either language or content teachers) are capable of teaching language learning strategies. More preparation for teachers should be offered in order to effectively teach learners' strategies.

4.2.6. Significant differences by variables

When comparing the students' replies according to various variables, we discovered some significant variances by the categories English proficiency and job preference after graduation, as shown in Table 3.

Performance indicator	F-value
1.1 Selecting texts in advance	$(F:(3:51)=4.525, p<.01)$
1.2 Adapting texts in advance	$(F:(3:51)=5.072, p<.01)$
1.3 Adapting teacher talk in advance	$(F:(3:51)=3.220, p<.05)$
2.3 Emphasising correct and relevant identifications of meaning	$(F:(3:51)=2.786, p<.05)$
4.1 Asking for reactions	$(F:(3:51)=2.927, p<.05)$

Table 3. Significant differences according to the variables of English proficiency and job preference after graduation

Although all the participants in the present study had at least a CEFR (The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) B2 (equivalent to a TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) score of at least 750) English level, higher English achievers (HA) with TOEIC scores above 880 and lower English achievers (LA) with TOEIC scores between 750 and 880 showed significantly different degrees of agreement with some of the performance indicators. In general, the LA group agreed less with performance indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 2.3. This is probably because the lectures included language elements and subject matter, which is double the learning load compared to the previous ESP course, *English for MICE,* and thus they would feel more stressed and anxious about dealing with these two focuses. Another possibility could be that the CLIL practitioner regarded all of the participants as proficient English users and did not suspect that any of them had problems understanding the new concepts or vocabulary. Hence, the LA group was not able to fully master the concepts, leading to their significant disagreement. These responses remind teachers to attend to minor differences even in homogeneous classes, especially when a new educational approach, curriculum or course is introduced.

Interestingly, those who considered working in the MICE industry in the future had significantly higher agreement with performance indicator 4.1 than did those who might stay in the H&T industry or engage in English-relevant jobs. This may be because the former group are interested in the MICE industry and thus were more motivated to interact with their peers or the practitioner. It can be assumed that they would show higher interest in answering questions when asked to make responses in class. Thus, when the course is designed to connect to their future needs, learners would be more highly motivated and more committed to learning.

To conclude this section, we believe that CLIL teachers must be well prepared to facilitate exposure to input at a minimally challenging level, meaning-focused processing, form-focused processing, output production and the use of strategies. We argue that a well-organised and flexible teacher training path to help teachers move from language teachers or subject teachers to CLIL practitioners should be designed to assist practitioners in realising good quality teaching performance in CLIL education.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The focus of this action research was on the development, adoption and evaluation of an ESP and CLIL integrated textbook and it aimed to answer two research questions: how learners evaluate a customised integrated CLIL textbook, and how they appraise a CLIL practitioner's teaching practices using that textbook in the classroom. To answer these questions, we developed a tailor-made CLIL textbook, *MICE 2*, based on its original ESP version, and used it as the major teaching

resource. After the one-semester trial, two questionnaires were administered to examine learners' judgement of the quality of the book and the practitioner's teaching quality. The results indicated that the learners welcomed the idea of integrating language and content learning into a single course, but were also concerned about the quality of its design for facilitating critical thinking, assessment, meaningful learning and technology-inclusion. Moreover, the learners' English levels and their preferable future jobs significantly affected their attitudes towards the course. In contrast, the learners exhibited relatively high satisfaction and agreement with the CLIL practitioner's performance.

The following two pedagogical implications are suggested. Firstly, in terms of designing CLIL materials, Coyle's (2007) 4Cs framework can be a good start for practitioners to raise teachers' awareness of how CLIL materials can be produced and what should be taught in CLIL lessons (Vázquez & Ellison, 2018). Material writers should be clearly aware that language and content are equally emphasised in CLIL textbooks or materials, and the ultimate goal of implementing a CLIL lesson is to equip learners with communication skills, content knowledge, cognitive thinking and cultural awareness. Thus, any new CLIL teaching production should be able to develop these four categories of competency. According to our experiences in this study, if CLIL materials are designed by language teachers, a language-driven approach can be taken. That is, a soft CLIL model can be adopted. Any currently available ESP learning materials can be used as the basis; the aims, scope and subject matter can then be extended to meet CLIL requirements, which saves time and effort. Accordingly, fewer negative responses and less opposition from language and content specialists will result. Although ESP and CLIL are not completely compatible *per se*, this integrated CLIL and ESP model which borrows the ESP notions of needs analysis and material design, can bridge the two extremes between a language-driven and a content-based course (Yang, 2016).

Secondly, CLIL practitioners should be well prepared once teaching materials are available, particularly if language teachers lack disciplinary knowledge or content specialists do not have a language teaching background. Thus, a systematic CLIL education framework for both language and content teachers seems indispensable; the European Framework for CLIL teacher education (Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, & Frigols Martín, 2012) provides a good example. In their design, "teachers undertaking CLIL will need to be prepared to develop multiple types of expertise: among others, in the content subject; in a language; in best practice in teaching and learning; in the integration of the previous three; and, in the integration of CLIL within an educational institution" (Marsh et al., 2012: 5). The CLIL training framework includes education on developing CLIL practitioners' knowledge of methodology for integrating both language and content and skills of creating rich and supportive target-language environments, making input comprehensible, using teacher-talk effectively, promoting student-comprehensible output, attending to diverse student needs and continuously improving accuracy (Hillyard, 2011).

84

Since developing and evaluating CLIL materials is still in its infancy, future studies and attempts can be made to complement it. For instance, will the quality of the CLIL textbook be the same, better or worse if it is produced based on a content textbook and written by content teachers? Similarly, will there be any different results of teaching appraisal if the same CLIL course is taught by a content teacher instead of a language teacher? Future comparison investigations on these issues can help depict a holistic framework of CLIL teacher training. In addition, qualitative data can be adopted to support the questionnaire surveys. For instance, interviews with the CLIL learners and prospective practitioners can better realise what they expect from a quality CLIL textbook and what teaching performance should be exercised to achieve the aims of the textbook, thus benefiting students to a greater extent.

Acknowledgement

85

References

Aguilar, M., & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, *15*(2), 183-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.615906

Arnó-Macià, E., & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, *3*7, 63-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.007

Banegas, D. L. (2012). CLIL teacher development: Challenges and experiences. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *5*(1), 46-56. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2012.5.1.4

Bell, J., & Gower, R. (2011). Writing material courses for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp.135-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brebera, P., & Hlousková, J. (2012). Applying principles of CLIL to ESP in higher education. In R. Breeze, F. Jiménez Berrio, C. Llamas Saíz, C. Martínez Pasamar, & C. Tabernero Sala (Eds.), *Teaching approaches to CLIL* (pp. 27-37). Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.

Bruton, L., & Woźniak, M. (2013). English for physiotherapy, physiotherapy for English: A synergistic approach. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*, *13*, 189-199.

Coonan, C. M. (2007). Insider views of the CLIL class through teacher self-observation–introspection. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 625-646. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb463.0

Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 543-562. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb459.0

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

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.20

de Bot, K. (1996). The psycholinguistics of the output hypothesis. *Language Learning*, *46*(3), 529-555. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01246.x

de Graaff, R., Jan Koopman, G., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 603-624. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb462.0

Fernández, D. J. (2009). CLIL at the university level: Relating language teaching with and through content teaching. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *2*(2), 10-26. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2009.2.2.11

Fortanet-Gómez, I., & Bellés-Fortuño, B. (2008). The relevance of discourse markers in teacher training courses for content and language integrated learning in higher education. In O. M. Arnándiz (Ed.), *Achieving multilingualism: Wills and ways. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Multilingualism (ICOM)* (pp. 149-159). Castelló de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I.

Gavrilova, E., & Trostina, K. (2014). Teaching English for professional purposes (EPP) vs content and language integrated learning (CLIL): The case of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics (PRUE). *European Scientific Journal*, *10*(10), 7-17.

González Ardeo, J. M. (2013). (In)compatibility of CLIL and ESP courses at university. *Language Value*, *5*(1), 24-47. https://doi.org/10.6035/LanguageV.2013.5.3

Hammersley, M. (1993). On the teacher as researcher. *Educational Action Research*, *1*(3), 425-445. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965079930010308

Hillyard, S. (2011). First steps in CLIL: Training the teachers. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *4*(2), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2011.4.2.1

Housen, A., & Pierrard, M. (2005). Instructed second language acquisition: Introduction. In A. Housen, & M. Pierrard (Eds), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 1-26). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197372

Ikeda, M. (2013). Does CLIL work for Japanese secondary school students? Potential for the 'weak' version of CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, *2*(1), 31-43.

Jendrych, E. (2013). Developments in ESP teaching. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, *34*(1), 43-58. https://doi.org/10.2478/slgr-2013-0022

Jendrych, E., & Wisniewska, H. (2010, November). *ESP: How to design challenging tasks for adult learners.* Paper presented at the ICT for language learning, Florence, Italy. Retrieved from http://www.pixelonline.org/ICT4LL2010/common/download/Proceedings_pdf/CLIL01-Jendrych,Wisniewska.pdf

Jiménez-Catalán, R. M., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2009). The receptive vocabulary of EFL learners in two instructional contexts: CLIL versus non-CLIL instruction. In R. M. Jiménez-Catalán, & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *Content and language integrated*

learning: Evidence from research in Europe (pp. 81-92). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-008

Johnson, K. (1982). *Communicative syllabus design and methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Jones, S. (2016, March). *Teachers as researchers*. Paper presented at the Youth Sport Trust 2016 Conference, Exeter, UK.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Liew, K. L., & Khor, C. P. (2014). ESP at tertiary level: Traditional ESP or integrated ESP? Retrieved from http://dspace.unimap.edu.my/dspace/handle/123456789/34587

Marsh, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D., & Frigols Martín, M. J. (2012). *European framework for CLIL teacher education*. Graz: European Centre for Modern Language.

Mehisto, P. (2012). Criteria for producing CLIL learning material. *Eucuentro*, *21*, 15-33. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED539729.pdf

Morton, T. (2013). Critically evaluating materials for CLIL: Practitioners' practices and perspectives. In J. Gray (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on language teaching materials* (pp. 111-136). London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137384263_6

Nashaat-Sobhy, N., Berzosa, C., & Crean, F. M. (2013). From ESP to CLIL using the schema theory. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, *19*, 251-267.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York, NY: Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Poręcka, B. (2011, October). The LSP-CLIL interface in the university context. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference ICT for Language Learning*, Florence: Italy. Retrieved from https://conference.pixel-online.net/conferences/ICT4LL2011/common/download/Paper_pdf/CLIL13-422-FP-Porecka-ICT4LL2011.pdf

Räisänen, C., & Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2008). The state of ESP teaching and learning in Western European higher education after Bologna. In I. Fortanet-Gómez, & C. Räisänen (Eds.), *ESP in European higher education. Integrating language and content* (pp. 11-51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.4.03rai

Riley, C. (2013). A long hard climb: Getting from the bottom to the top of the CLIL incline. *Recherche et pratiques pédagogiques en langues de spécialité. Cahiers de l'Apliut*, *32*(3), 30-56. https://doi.org/10.4000/apliut.3853

Sun, Y., & Dong, Q. (2004). An experiment on supporting children's English vocabulary learning in multimedia context. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *17*(2), 131-147. https://doi.org/10.1080/0958822042000334217

Suwannoppharat, K., & Chinokul, S. (2015). Applying CLIL to English language teaching in Thailand: Issues and challenges. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 8*(2), 237-254. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2015.8.2.8

Tarnopolsky, O. (2013). Content-based instruction, CLIL, and immersion in teaching ESP at tertiary schools in non-English-speaking countries. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL)*, *1*(1), 1-11.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning. and teaching. *Language Teaching*, *45*(2), 143-179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528

Torregrosa Benavent, G., & Sánchez-Reyes Peñamaría, S. (2011). Use of authentic materials in the ESP classroom. *Encuentro*, *20*, 89-94. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED530013.pdf

Vázquez, V. P., & Ellison, M. (2018). Examining teacher roles and competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *Linguarum Arena: Revista de Estudos em Didática de Línguas da Universidade do Porto*, *4*, 65-78.

Wahyuningsih, N. (2016). Teachers' attitudes toward the use of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in ESP classes. Abstract retrieved from DISERTASI dan TESIS Program Pascasarjana UM. (http://karya-ilmiah.um.ac.id/index.php/disertasi/article/view/51721)

Westhoff, G. J. (1991). Increasing the effectiveness of foreign language reading instruction (Part 1). *ADFL Bulletin*, *22*(2), 29-36. https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.22.2.29

Yang, W. (2016). ESP vs. CLIL: A coin of two sides or a continuum of two extremes? *ESP Today*, *4*(1), 43-68. Retrieved from http://www.esptodayjournal.org/pdf/current_issue/3.6.2016/WENHSIEN-YANG-full%20text.pdf

Yang, W. (2017). From similarity to diversity: The changing use of language learning strategies in content and language integrated learning education at the tertiary level in Taiwan. *English Teaching & Learning*, *41*(1), 1-33.

Yang, W. (2018). Evaluating contextualized content and language integrated learning materials at tertiary level. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *11*(2), 236-274. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2018.11.2.4

Yang, W., & Gosling, M. (2014). What makes a Taiwan CLIL programme highly recommended or not recommended? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *17*(4), 394-409. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.808168

WENHSIEN YANG is Associate Professor in the Department of Applied English at National Kaohsiung University of Hospitality and Tourism, Taiwan. His main research and teaching interests include the areas of ESP, genre analysis, corpus linguistics, second language writing and CLIL, and he has published many research articles about those topics in world-leading journals.

88

Appendix A

Questionnaire: Evaluating the CLIL customised textbook

1.1 Gender: (Female, Male)
1.2 English proficiency (TOEIC: <500, 551-750, 751-880, >881, Unknown)
1.3 Location for internship (Domestic, Overseas)
1.4 Preferable job after graduation (Hospitality & tourism, MICE specific, English relevant, Others)

2.1 Language and content teaching is equally weighted.
2.2 Language teaching outweighs content teaching.
2.3 Content teaching outweighs language teaching.

The current CLIL textbook:
2.4 makes the learning intentions and process visible to students.
2.5 systematically fosters English proficiency.
2.6 fosters learning skills development and learner autonomy.
2.7 includes self, peer and other types of formative assessment.
2.8 helps create a safe learning environment.
2.9 fosters cooperative learning.
2.10 seeks ways of incorporating authentic language and authentic language use.
2.11 fosters critical thinking.
2.12 helps students to reach well beyond what they could do on their own.
2.13 helps to make learning meaningful.

2.14 meets appropriate technical requirements, like pictures, format, or multimedia.
2.15 includes environmental issues.
2.16 contains social issues like the elderly, the physically challenged, minorities, gender equality or general social concerns.

3. Please write down any comments or suggestions for the current CLIL textbook.

(Adapted from Mehisto, 2012)

Appendix B

Questionnaire: Evaluating the CLIL practitioner's teaching

A1. Gender: (Female, Male)
A2. English proficiency (TOEIC: <500, 551-750, 751-880, >881, Unknown)
A3. Location for internship (Domestic, Overseas)
A4. Preferable job after graduation (Hospitality & tourism, MICE specific, English relevant, Others)

The CLIL practitioner:
1.1 selected texts in advance.
1.2 adapted texts in advance.
1.3 adapted teacher talk in advance.
1.4 adapted text in teaching.
1.5 fine-tuned teacher talk.

2.1 stimulated meaning identification.
2.2 checked meaning identification.
2.3 emphasised correct and relevant identifications of meaning.
2.4 provided exercises on correct and relevant identifications of meaning.

3.1 facilitated noticing of problematic and relevant language forms.
3.2 provided examples of correct and relevant language forms.
3.3 corrected use of problematic and relevant language forms.
3.4 explained problematic and relevant language forms, e.g. by giving rules.
3.5 had pupils give peer feedback.

4.1 asked for reactions.
4.2 asked for interaction.
4.3 let students communicate.
4.4 stimulated the use of the target language.
4.5 provided feedback, focusing on corrected output.
4.6 organised written practice.

5.1 elicited receptive compensation strategies.
5.2 elicited productive compensation strategies.
5.3 elicited reflection on strategy use.
5.4 scaffolded strategy use.

6. Please write down any comments or suggestions for the current CLIL practitioner.

(Adapted from de Graaff et. al., 2007)