

Students' perspectives on required English courses taught via a Communicative Approach and a CLIL approach

Eleanor KANE

1. Introduction: Brief overview of the Communicative Approach and CLIL
2. Freshman course designed with a Communicative Approach
3. Sophomore course designed with a CLIL approach
4. Results and Discussion: Student perspectives on the two courses
 - 4.1 Content: What did you learn during this course?
 - 4.2 Cognition: Which cognitive skills did you use?
 - 4.3 Communication: Which communication tools did you use to contact other students?
 - 4.4. Exposure to English and enjoyment of speaking English
5. Conclusion: Implications for language teaching at the tertiary level

Abstract

This paper looks at two required English courses at the University of Shimane: Freshman English Communication and Sophomore English Communication. It compares students' perceptions of two courses, the first taught in 2015 and designed according to a Communicative Approach, and the second, taught in 2016, designed according to a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach. The paper begins by comparing the two approaches, then describes the differences between the two courses, and analyzes students' responses to the courses. It was found that students on the CLIL course learned content in addition to English communication skills; emphasized more higher order thinking skills(HOTS): used various methods of communication to connect with classmates; and many students gained confidence in speaking English. Finally, implications for language courses at the tertiary level are discussed, with the recommendation that more content be included in required courses for higher proficiency students. In conclusion, this study shows that a CLIL approach at the University of Shimane can combine skill-getting with knowledge-getting, allowing students to enjoy learning appropriate new content while still developing their language skills.

1. Introduction: Brief overview of the Communicative Approach and CLIL

The two courses focused on in this paper were designed according to the principles of Communicative Language Teaching. The first, a more general conversation course, was taught with a Communicative Approach, while the second was a more specialized Content and Language

Integrated Learning course, designed to teach global issues, in addition to language skills. This section of the paper gives a brief overview of these two approaches.

The Communicative Approach developed in the 1970s as a reaction to mid-twentieth-century structural syllabuses, which were based on the idea of habit formation, and underpinned by theories from structural linguistics and behavioural psychology. During World War II, the US Army Specialized Training Programmes for language learning had had great success with structural syllabuses and audiolingual courses for highly motivated adult learners (Stern, 1983, p. 463). However, these results could not be replicated in a school setting. Students found that, after years of 'listen and repeat' drills, they could not actually use the language outside classroom settings. They had been taught to avoid errors, thus many preferred to avoid using language when they were not completely confident. Audiolingual courses made too many demands on students' memorization skills, and had too little focus on psychological faculties. Older studies from the 1970s, which introduced the Communicative Approach to teachers, give examples of stilted and repetitive classroom dialogues using the audiolingual method, with little focus on meaning (e.g. Widdowson, 1978, pp. 5-12). Such grammar-focused teaching may lead to higher results on formal grammar tests, but 'Communicative language ability—the ability to express one's self and to understand others— develops as learners engage in communication and not as a result of habit formation with grammatical items' (Lee & Van Patten, 2003, p. 51).

In reaction to these issues with structural syllabuses, the Communicative Approach has become the dominant model of language teaching in the West since the 1970s. As Savignon says, 'development of the learners' communicative abilities is seen to depend not so much on the time they spend rehearsing grammatical patterns as on the opportunities they are given to interpret, to express and negotiate meaning in real-life situations' (1997, p. xi). The Communicative Approach's basic characteristics can be listed as follow: focus on communication, emphasis on meaning, regard for authenticity, learner-centered focus on pair- and group-work, preference for process over product, emphasis on fluency over accuracy, and focus on real world tasks rather than isolated language. These characteristics are all still very much the mainstay of language teaching in many parts of the world at the present time. Popular tasks in today's language classrooms (information gaps and transfers, jigsaw, opinion gaps) are those advocated by the Communicative Approach for the past 40 years. The Communicative Approach does not seek to ignore grammar teaching completely, but recognises that grammatical or formal exercises 'are of most use when they accompany or follow rather than precede communicative experiences, and they should be based on the needs generated by those experiences' (Savignon, 1997, p. 36).

While it may be argued that the Communicative Approach has led to increased student willingness to communicate, teachers and researchers intent on improving language teaching observed the successes of bilingual programmes, notably French immersion in Canada (e.g. Lyster, 2007, pp.14-17), and examined how to include the successes of such programmes into foreign language environments. Bilingual education in Europe before the 1970s was traditionally only available in regions which were close to national borders or where two languages were used. However, recently immersion programmes in Europe and Canada where some or all subjects are

taught in a second or foreign language have had a great influence upon CLIL.

CLIL is a dual approach, where vehicular language and subject have equal importance. It is more an umbrella term than a prescriptive methodology, 'covering a dozen or more educational approaches (e.g. immersion, bilingual education, multilingual education, language showers, and enriched language programmes)'(Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008, p. 12). Rather than teach a foreign language in isolation, it is argued that teaching another subject through the target language will increase its authenticity for learners, especially in foreign language environments where there is little contact with the target language outside school. The target subject in CLIL also provides authentic texts, and preferred forms for language learners to analyze and use.

In Japan, the Communicative Approach, not CLIL, is widely used in junior high school education. It could be argued that the goal of English education in junior high is what Cummins has termed BICS, or Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (Cummins, 2000, pp. 58-59). The textbooks prescribed in junior high school by the Ministry of Education emphasize practical communication skills in a variety of situations such as shopping, asking for directions, introducing one's hometown and Japanese culture, and ordering food in a restaurant. In contrast, CLIL does not emphasize such highly situationalized language, but instead focuses on collaborating with classmates in the target language to better understand another school subject through the vehicular language. However, as Ball et al. point out 'there must clearly be a level of learner ability in the Medium of Instruction [target language] below which teaching and learning subjects in an L2 becomes ineffective' (Ball, Kelly, & Clegg, 2015, p. 11). CLIL in Japan might be said to facilitate CALP, or Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, the language needed to succeed in an academic setting. Cummins's research in Canada with immigrant children showed that 'conversational aspects of proficiency reached peer-appropriate levels usually within about two years of exposure to L2 but a period of five to seven years was required, on average, for immigrant students to approach grade norms in academic aspects of English'(2000, p. 58). Clearly Japanese students in public schools have much less exposure to English: three to four hours per week during the school year.

The term CLIL was first used in the 1990s in Europe, where there has been great political will to improve language learning for citizens. Since 2002 the language policy of the EU has been "Mother Tongue + 2". CLIL is now part of education for children in the EU, whether as part of mainstream school education in Austria, France, Ireland, Wales, Poland, and Romania for example, or within pilot projects in countries such as England, Italy, Scotland, and Spain (Eurydice, 2006, p. 13).

CLIL can give a great deal of exposure to the language, increasing input both in terms of quantity and quality, in agreement with the input hypothesis, the theory which has greatly influenced Communicative Language Teaching (Krashen, 1988). Teaching a subject in the vehicular language also frees up the timetable to allow more time to be spent in that language. Naves recaps the main SLA research in favour of CLIL thus

a second language is most successfully acquired when the conditions are similar to those present in first-language acquisition: that is, when the focus of instruction is on meaning rather than on form, when the language input is at or just above the

proficiency level of the learner and when there is sufficient opportunity to engage in the meaningful use of that language in a relatively anxiety-free environment (2009, p. 25)

However, more is required of the CLIL subject teacher than simply switching the language of instruction (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, pp. 27-28). Input has to be carefully scaffolded, with help for the learners taking many forms in the classroom. Materials are packaged in visual form: diagrams, maps, graphs, and tables are widely used to allow students to understand the information visually, as well as through more traditional text. (Dale, van der Es, & Tanner, 2011, pp. 93-98 offer many suggestions for scaffolding). This requires considerable preparation on the part of the teacher, as there is little published material. There are for example, no English materials which cover subjects outlined in the Japanese curriculum, making it very difficult to incorporate CLIL in public schools. This is one reason why CLIL in Japan generally follows a 'soft' or 'light' approach, where an English teacher introduces a few topics or projects in the vehicular language. In contrast, in Europe, one may find so-called 'hard' CLIL where subject teachers teach in a foreign language, with materials which meet the demands of the national curriculum, and where students are tested on these materials in the foreign language. Some European countries require secondary school teachers to have two subject licences (e.g. Austria, Dalton-Puffer, 2007, p. 52), making it easier for language teachers to teach content confidently. Research in Europe has shown that even less proficient students can benefit from a CLIL approach: 'average C- grade students do well in CLIL programmes. They still have C- grade average, but they learn to speak another language and gain many socio-cultural skills that will enrich their professional and personal lives' (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008, p. 21).

2. Freshman Course designed with a Communicative Approach

Freshman English Communication (FEC) is a required 4-skills class for small groups of around 24 first-year students, mainly taught by native speakers of English. There are ten sections of this course. Contact time is 30 classes per semester, each 45-minutes long, taught in tandem with a 45-minute period of free reading using books from the university's Extensive Reading programme (Kane, 2008, pp. 10-12). Its goals are to increase students' communicative competence in English in five areas: (i) improving everyday conversation, (ii) understanding basic spoken and written texts, (iii) improving communication skills through pair work and group work, (iv) understanding simple articles from an English-language newspaper, and (v) increasing student autonomy through Extensive Reading. Five teachers are responsible for this course. Students are divided into the ten sections according to their TOEIC scores.

The course described here was taught to students who scored highest on TOEIC administered at the beginning of the academic year in April. A corpus-based Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) syllabus was used, with the textbook *Touchstone 2* providing some classroom tasks and input, in addition to English-language newspapers and Extensive Reading. The textbook is based on the Cambridge English Corpus, a multi-billion word collection of written and spoken English.

The conversations claim to be 'useful, natural, and up-to-date', and indeed the textbook dialogues do sound like authentic conversation:

Ray: Are you going to the fiesta at the weekend?

Tina: I don't know. It depends. What is it exactly?

Ray: Well, it's just um... it's a festival. It's lots of parades and stuff like that.

Everybody gets dressed, you know...

Tina: You mean in costumes?

Ray: Yeah, there are hundreds of cute little kids in purple and silver outfits with makeup and everything.

Tina: Uh-huh. Uh, I'm not big on parades.

Ray: And there's good food. You can get all kinds of tacos and things. Do you want to go?

Tina: Hmm. Well, maybe. (*Touchstone 2*, p. 38).

Such authentic-sounding dialogs are presented for students to comprehend, and then used for focus on form, for example in the dialogue above, teaching how to use vague language rather than practising specific grammar forms. Focus on form is also based on frequency of use, and students learn, for example, that 'everybody' and 'nobody' are much more frequent than 'everyone' and 'no one' (p.15), or that 'OK' is six times more frequent than 'all right' (p.123). The textbook is structured around 12 themes of immediate interest to the student, which can be readily personalized, such as talking about local festivals, one's childhood, health, or sightseeing. Students' oral communicative competence was tested in one-to-one interviews with the teacher, answering questions from the textbook, and in extended turns talking about themes from the textbook such as 'Tell me about a time you got in trouble as a child', or 'Tell me about your town's local festival'. Written work was assessed through newspaper journals and book reports based on their extensive reading.

3. Sophomore course designed with a CLIL approach

Sophomore English Communication (SEC) is also a required 4-skills class for small groups of around 24 second-year students. Similar to FEC, it is mainly taught by native speakers of English. There are ten sections of this course, and again students are divided into sections according to their TOEIC scores at the end of first year. Contact time is 30 classes per semester, each 45-minutes long. Its goals are to improve upon the skills gained in FEC and encourage learner autonomy through resources such as an English-language newspaper, Extensive Reading, and visits to the university's Language Learning Support Room (LLSR).

Each unit in this course was designed to include content, language, and learning skills. The course outline below shows the initial plan.

Classes	Content	Language	Learning skills
1-5	Introduction / How much do you know already? Pre-course survey/ Stereotypes & Racism	Comparisons TOEIC 1000-1040 Topic 1 vocabulary, p. 118	How to record an interview on an iPad
6-9	Information and Communication (Interviewing in the LLSR, presenting your findings without visual aids)	Explaining a table TOEIC 1040-1080 Topic 2 vocabulary, p. 118	Presenting in English
10-13	Culture and Fashion	Defining TOEIC 1080-1120 Topic 3 vocabulary, p. 118-119	Speed reading
14-17	Health	Explaining a graph TOEIC 1120-1160 Topic 4 vocabulary, p. 119	Intensive reading
18-21	Food (Interviewing in the LLSR, presenting your findings with slideware)	Explaining a pie chart TOEIC 1160-1200 Topic 5 vocabulary, p. 119	Focus on listening
22-25	Recycling	Classifying TOEIC 1200-1240 Topic 6 vocabulary, p. 119-120	Note-taking
26-30	Global Warming/ Exam practice/ Newspaper journal during class.	Using cautious language TOEIC 1240-1280 Topic 7 vocabulary, p. 120-121	Academic writing skills
Final Exam	Three-person interview. You will interview/ record your partners on the topics we have learned about. Later, you will have a chance to add to your exam answers, after seeing your video online.		

The course described here was taught to students who scored highest on TOEIC at the end of their first year of university. A CLIL syllabus was used, with the textbook *CLIL: Global Issues* (Sasajima, 2014) providing some classroom tasks and input, in addition to newspapers and Extensive Reading. The textbook is structured around 14 global issues such as Stereotypes and Racism, Global Warming, Sustainable Society, and Human Rights. Students are introduced to the topic via visuals in the textbook and teacher-created visual materials, before listening to a dialogue or short talk introducing the topic and its key terms, and reading about the issue. The main reading is followed by several pages of visual data for students to describe and analyze in English, and finally they have the chance to present their own opinions on a range of related topics during groupwork, including a final group discussion for a 45-minute class at the end of each theme.

This is the first time that a CLIL approach has been adopted for required English courses at this university. Several issues arose. The first was the lack of suitable materials. In previous CLIL courses (e.g. British and American Culture Studies), I created all the materials on five themes. This was very time-intensive but ensured that all of the materials were up-to-date and tailored to the syllabus. In particular jigsaw tasks and information gaps required much preparation. *CLIL: Global Issues*,

however, is very text-heavy, and so students were required to do all of the extended reading at home in order to leave class time for conversation and discussion. Its listening tasks are poorly designed and require more scaffolding than the textbook provides: transcripts were not available, and had to be made from scratch. The difference in quality between the corpus-based materials for FEC and the extract below from published CLIL materials is very clear:

- B: Oh no. She closed all the windows, so it got too hot in the car.
A: That's right. It got too hot because of the greenhouse effect. Do you know what that is?
B: The greenhouse effect? What's that?
A: Well, think of a greenhouse. What is a greenhouse used for?
B: It is used for growing plants when it's cold outside
A: Right. So how does a greenhouse work? Sunlight passes through the glass of the greenhouse, but some of the heat does not escape, so what happens inside the greenhouse?
B: It gets warmer
A: Exactly. Because of the glass the sunlight can come into the greenhouse, but cannot completely escape. So the inside gets warmer and warmer. That's what we call the greenhouse effect.
B: I see. (*CLIL: Global Issues*, p. 54)

The dialogue is unnaturally stilted, with a lack of interaction, more extended turns than is normal in real conversation, and shows a lack of hesitations and the normal repetitions which occur in unscripted speech. More natural input was provided in the form of teacher talk, and pair work. For each topic, students interviewed each other and other native speakers of English before having a 45-minute class for group discussion at the end of each theme.

In this course, each unit contained approximately fifty relevant words per unit, and students used Quizlet to remember them. The CLIL course required much more specialized vocabulary than the Communicative Approach one for first years.

4. Results and Discussion: Student perspectives on the two courses

Students were surveyed at the end of the year-long course for FEC, and at the end of the first semester for SEC. 48 responses (every student) were obtained from FEC students via Moodle, and 40 responses from a total of 46 students were obtained from SEC on a paper-based survey.

4.1. Content: What did you learn during this course?

Students were asked open-ended question about what they had learned in terms of skills and knowledge. They could answer in English or Japanese. Students were permitted to write multiple answers. Thus, the total number is greater than the number of students. Free descriptions were categorized and then ranked from most frequent to least frequent. Despite the similarities between the courses (both were Communicative Language Teaching courses including extensive reading,

newspaper reading, and TOEIC vocabulary study), the students seemed to feel that there was a great difference between the two, as evidenced in the table below.

Table 1: What did you learn during this course? Skills? Knowledge?

What did you learn on this course? Skills? Knowledge?		
Responses	FEC students Communicative Approach n=48	SEC students CLIL approach n=40
English communication skills	41 (85%)	3 (8%)
Global Issues	0	30 (75%)
Vocabulary	8 (17%)	5 (13%)
Extensive Reading	2 (4%)	0
Newspaper reading	0	2 (5%)
Pronunciation	1 (2%)	0
Writing skills	1 (2%)	0

The CLIL course students were further asked an open question concerning which skills they had learned during the course. The most frequent answer could be classified as 'English communication skills': 36 out of 40 students, or 90%, mentioned communication, conversation, speaking, talking during group work, or expressing one's own opinion. The students also said that they had learned writing skills (3 students); presentation skills (3 students); vocabulary (3 students); thinking skills (2 students); and reading (1 student).

Since this was the first time to teach a CLIL approach in a required course, I was interested to discover what the students thought about learning another subject through the vehicular language of English. Students could answer in English or Japanese. All 40 students replied to the question 'What did you think about studying global issues in English?' Thirty-two students used positive words in their responses, such as 'good', 'relevant', 'necessary', 'happy' and 'interesting'. Eighteen students mentioned the difficulty due to new vocabulary or trying to express their ideas in English. For example: "I think it is very hard to study but it is good to study global issues in English for thinking global opinions and studying English"; "It's difficult for me to express my opinion", 「自分の考えを英語で説明するのが難しかったので、よく考えた。良かったと思う」(It was difficult for me to explain my thoughts in English so I had to think hard. It was good.), 「難しかった。日本語でも難しいので。でも英語も、グローバルな問題についても同時に学べてので良い勉強になった」(It was difficult. Because it's difficult in Japanese, too. However, I learned both English and global issues at the same time so that was a good way to study.)

The final comment was echoed by three other students. They noted that they were learning both English and content e.g. "That was very efficient, I thought. We can learn about the issues and also can improve our English" and 「とても大事な事だと思った。英語を勉強しつつグローバル問題について考える事ができ、一石二鳥だと思った」(I thought it was an important issue. While learning English, I also thought about global issues. It killed two birds with one stone.)

Three students also mentioned learning from a different perspective, and not being limited to only the Japanese language for sources of information or expressing one's opinions: 「いつもは日

本語で社会問題を考えるが、社会の問題だから英語で学び、その言語で考えを伝える事は需要だと思う」(I always think about global issues in Japanese, but thinking about these societal problems in English, and expressing them in English is necessary); 「日本語の論文にはやはり限りがあるわけなので、将来的にそういった海外の論文を読むための、良い機会となった」(There's a limit to what you can learn from Japanese essays, this [course] was a good chance in order to read essays from overseas in the future); and, 「日本語で書かれたこと以外のことも英語で書かれた記事には書いていてあるから良いと思う」(It was good because there are things written in English articles which aren't written about in Japanese.)

On the whole, students enjoyed the course and found it meaningful, however they found it challenging. Eight students commented that the course was difficult, without qualifying this statement. Next semester, students' homework will be designed to require more scaffolding of materials, in particular for specialized vocabulary.

4. 2.Cognition: Which cognitive skills did you use?

It is claimed that CLIL courses, in contrast to traditional CLT courses, require the use of more advanced cognitive skills according to Bloom's revised Taxonomy of Thinking Skills (Dale & Tanner, p. 32). They cite Wragg and Brown (2001) as showing that 70 to 80% of questions in primary school classes focus on remembering and understanding, while Dalton-Puffer has analyzed her corpus of 14 CLIL classes in Austria and found that 'numerous factual questions with their minimal response are a sign that that the interaction is cognitively relatively undemanding' (2007, p. 126). She recommends that CLIL teachers enhance their students' speaking skills through giving students more opportunities for extended responses by asking non-factual questions. So it would seem that students on the CLIL course in this study would record using more HOTS than students on the CLT course since they were given discussion classes at the end of each unit where they had to prepare several opinion questions for homework and then share those opinions in group work during class. Ball et al. claim that 'there is a growing body of evidence that multilingual people think in different ways, and those ways might be better suited to the sorts of competences that people are going to need in the future' (2015, p. 45).

The table below shows the cognitive skills, which students said they used during both courses. Students could answer in English or Japanese. They were permitted to write multiple answers. Thus, the total number is greater than the number of students. Free descriptions were categorized and then ranked from most frequent to least frequent. However, six students out of 40 on the CLIL course did not answer this question at all, and the answers are sometimes opaque. In addition, although the FEC survey stated in Japanese that students could choose more than one answer to this question, they chose one each. The numbers in brackets refer to the number of students who gave this answer. Students on the CLT course emphasized remembering and understanding, while few chose HOTS. Students on the CLIL course also chose lower order thinking skills such as remembering and understanding, but they also put an emphasis on HOTS, in particular creating. This is unsurprising given the task design in both courses, with the CLT course having less scope for creative use of language and fewer opportunities for extended turns in the classroom than the CLIL course.

Table 2: Which cognitive skills did you use in this class?

Cognitive processes	FEC (CLT class) n=48	SEC (CLIL class) n=40
暗記 Remembering	15 students (31%) · Vocabulary (13) · Remembering English expressions (4) · Remembering own newspaper presentation (1)	26 students (65%) · Vocabulary (23) · Remembering own presentation (1) · Remembering English expressions (1) · Unspecified (1)
理解 Understanding	12 students (25%) · Listening and speaking to other students (7) · Extensive Reading (3) · Reading English texts (1) · Understanding the textbook (1) · Understanding the newspaper (1)	25 students (63%) · Reading longer texts from the textbook (8) · Listening and speaking to other students (7) · Completing homework (3) · Societal problems (2) · Newspaper, ER (1) · Understanding other cultures (1) · Speaking in LLSR (1) · Unspecified (3)
適応 Applying	10 students (21%) · Speaking to other students in class (9) · Choosing ER books (1)	11 students (28%) · Expressing one's own ideas during groupwork (6) · Reading the newspaper (1) · Listening (1) · Working at LLSR (1)
分析 Analyzing	1 student (2%) · Newspaper homework	11 students (28%) · Reading graphs and data (4) · Reading numbers in texts carefully (1) · Reading the textbook carefully, and thinking about my own opinions (1) · Discussion (1) · Searching online (1) · Unspecified (1)
評価 Evaluating	2 students (4%) · Talking to other students	7 students (18%) · Extensive reading (2) · Evaluating other students' opinions (1) · Newspaper (1) · Unspecified (1)
作成 Creating	8 students (17%) · Choosing and writing a report about a newspaper article (6) · Choosing and writing a report about an ER book (5) · Choosing and writing about a topic for class (1)	20 students (50%) · Presentations (10) · Preparing what to say in English (4) · Making questions (2) · Using expressions I learned in first year (1) · Using the whiteboard (1) · Discussion class (1) · Groupwork (1) · Newspaper (1) · Unspecified (1)

The answers which students gave to the surveys were sometimes difficult to interpret or incomplete. For example, one student simply wrote 'newspaper' when giving an example of "evaluating" in class or for homework. Clearly all the students did evaluate newspaper articles for class (are they interesting, easy to understand, long enough, what is my opinion on this article) in order to complete written homework and present their ideas to partners during class. However, very brief answers were difficult to interpret. Semi-scripted interviews would have been more informative. With such large numbers of students, perhaps a better approach would have been to give students more examples of the cognitive skills I had designed the course to promote.

4.3. Communication: Which communication tools did you use to contact other students?

Both traditional CLT and CLIL emphasize communication among students as a means to increase input and have students engage with topics in the target language. The CLIL course, however, was designed to make students speak to each other outside of class in order to complete various homework tasks (See Appendix 1: CLIL speaking task). The tools which students used in both classes are shown in the table below. They were asked how they connected with each other inside and outside of class. Students could answer in English or Japanese. They were permitted to write multiple answers. Thus, the total number is greater than the number of students. Some students gave examples of how they had used each communication tool.

Table 3: Which communication tools did you use to contact other students?

Communication tool	FEC n=48	SEC n=40
Facebook	1 (2%)	0
Instant messaging (e.g. Line)	18 (38%)	24 (60%)
Phone calls	3 (6%)	2 (5%)
Moodle	0	0
Face to face chatting	21 (44%)	23 (58%)
Anything else?	5 (Twitter, email) (10%)	5 (Twitter, email, video chat) 13%

The CLIL students were assigned homework that required groups of four students to visit the Language Learning Support Room (LLSR) twice per semester. The students agreed on a topic from the textbook; coordinated with each other to write and share three different questions on this topic; prepared their own answers; and then asked and answered the questions with a native speaker in the LLSR. After their visit, they were further required to reflect on the answers, the learning experience, and what they would like to improve for next time. Each group then made a short slideware presentation during class to other groups. It would seem that this collaborative work led to more use of communication tools, and more communication outside class in English. For both classes, students said that they prepared in English for their final speaking test outside class. Simple task design and exam structure can lead to students using the target language more outside contact time with the teacher. More collaborative tasks could be included to increase student use of the target language outside class.

4.4.Exposure to English and enjoyment of speaking English

Thirty-one FEC students, or 65% of the class, said that after a year of CLT they had more confidence in speaking English. Forty-three FEC students, or 90%, said they enjoyed speaking English, but only 12 students, 25%, regularly spoke with people from other countries. After a semester of CLIL, a similar proportion of SEC students (24 students or 60%) said that they had more confidence in speaking English; while 11 students or 28% said that they had not gained confidence; five students did not answer this question. Twenty-six SEC students (65%) said that they enjoyed speaking English, but three students (8%) said that they did not, while 11 students (28%) did not answer this question. Only nine SEC students (23%) regularly spoke with people from other countries, but a further six (15%) said that this was because they had few opportunities.

The results for FEC and SEC are fairly similar, however enjoyment of speaking English may have decreased. Since few SEC students gave reasons for their answers, and eleven students did not answer it is difficult to decide whether this is actually the case, and if so, to explain why students felt this way. A future survey of the students needs to ask in more detail about students' enjoyment of speaking English. Nine second-year students, only 23%, said that they spoke English regularly outside of class. All nine of these SEC students who created regular opportunities to speak English with overseas students and teachers, for example in their seminars or dormitory or at LLSR, enjoyed speaking English. However, many of the 26 students who enjoyed English did not create such opportunities. This figure is something I hope to improve through task design in the second semester, requiring students to visit the Language Learning Support Room, and to connect virtually with overseas students in Mexico and Holland in the second semester.

5. Conclusion: Implications for language teaching at the tertiary level

When asked what content they had learned on the CLIL course 75% of students answered they had learned about global issues. When asked about which skills they had learned, 90% of them said they had learned English communication skills. Most students (80%) used positive terms to describe learning about global issues at the same time as communication skills. More students described using HOTS than during the Communicative Approach class for first-years, while more students communicated outside of class on the CLIL course due to group homework.

After at least six years of English education, many university entrants are still unable to hold a basic conversation in English due to a lack of input, and few opportunities to practise their language skills. They have, however, all been exposed to MEXT's Course of Study for junior high school, which emphasizes a Communicative Approach, in highly situationalized settings such as shopping, giving directions, and ordering food. For many students who cannot imagine themselves visiting other countries or having opportunities to use English outside of the classroom and the textbook, these classes are easily dismissed as irrelevant. The dual focus in CLIL, on the other hand, learning another subject in addition to a foreign language, makes the classes immediately more relevant to students.

While CLIL materials are not yet readily available in Japan, simple material for younger native speakers and language learners can be adapted, and students can easily find their own materials

online, or in this university by making use of the LLSR. The CLIL course students in this study wrote that the course was challenging, but years of skill-focused CLT has meant little gain for many of them. In this CLIL course, speaking about global issues is more level-appropriate for twenty-year-old undergraduates than learning to speak about one's favourite music or food. In conclusion, a CLIL approach at the University of Shimane can combine skill-getting with knowledge-getting, allowing students to enjoy learning appropriate new content while still developing their language skills.

References

- Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). *Putting CLIL into practice*. Oxford: OUP.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dale, L. & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dale, L., van der Es, W. & Tanner, R. (2011). *CLIL skills*. Haarlem: European Platform.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Current research from Europe. In Werner Delanoy and Laurenz Volkmann, (Eds.) *Future perspectives for English language teaching*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Eurydice. (2006). *CLIL at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice Unit.
- Kane, E. (2008). Motivating students with SSR, in *Extensive Reading in Japan*, 2:2, pp.10-12
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.
- Lee, J. & Van Patten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. Second Edition. McGraw-Hill.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- McCarthy, M., McCarten, M., & Sandiford, H. (2014). *Touchstone 2. Student's book*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M.J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and integrated language learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Naves, T. (2009). Effective content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R.M. Jimenez Catalan (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*. (pp. 22-40). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sasajima, S. (Ed.) (2014). *CLIL: Global issues*. Tokyo: Sanshusha.
- Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Second Edition. McGraw-Hill.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: OUP.

KEYWORDS: CLIL, communicative approach, CLT.

(Eleanor KANE)

Appendix 1

Interviewing in the LLSR Your name _____

Deadline: 27th June. This activity is 5% of your final grade.

1. In your group, choose a topic we have discussed in class: culture & fashion OR health OR food.
2. You will make three questions each about this topic. Talk with your group to make sure you have 12 different questions. You must write your partners' questions on your paper, too. You can contact each other via Moodle if you can't meet face-to-face.
3. You should be able to answer your groups' questions about your home country (China or Japan).
4. After the interview, you will make a 5-minute presentation with slides. You will make at least 12 slides not including the first and last. We will talk about how to make slides in class.

12 groups will be doing this homework so don't wait until the last minute to start. If the teacher in the LLSR is too busy to answer your questions, it means you did not prepare early enough. You could email to make an appointment.

Your questions	Your answers	Teacher's answers. Take a brief memo in LLSR.
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

Your questions	Your answers	Teacher's answers. Take a brief memo in LLSR.
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		

Go to the LLSR together. You will need about 15 minutes per group to ask all of your questions and take a memo
 What surprised you about your group's answers or the teacher's answers?

Was this homework easier the second time? What would you like to improve for next time?

**Bring this paper to class on 27th June. We will use it during our discussion.
 This activity is 5% of your final grade.**

LLSR stamp

