AISEE
The Association of Indonesian
Scholars of English Education

IMPROVING STUDENTS' FACTUAL REPORT WRITING SKILL BY USING CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING (CLIL) METHOD

Yadi Kusmayadi
Department of English Education, University of Kuningan, Indonesia
Email: yadikusmayadi10@yahoo.com

Yayan Suryana
Department of English Education, University of Kuningan, Indonesia
Email: ysuryana2008@gmail.com

Abstract: Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) seems worthy to investigate since it applies a language other than the student's mother tongue used as a medium of instruction. In this research, the researcher aims to portray two objectives, namely identifying whether CLIL method is effective to improve students' factual report writing skill, and examining students' attitude towards the implementation of this method. This research employs a quasi-experimental design through applying two instruments, namely tests which consists pre-test and post-test, and questionnaires. 60 students of eleventh-grade social class of a state senior high school in Kuningan are involved in the research. They are divided into a control and an experimental group. Tests are analysed quantitatively to identify the first research objective, questionnaires are analysed with descriptive statistic to examine the second research objective. The result taken from independent t-test shows that there is a significant difference on the students' writing skill since the level of significant is lower than the alpha (0.000<0.005) which indicates that CLIL is effective in improving students' writing skill. Furthermore, the result taken from questionnaires portrays that students show positive attitude towards the implementation of CLIL in teaching and learning process.
Keywords: *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), factual report, writing skill*

INTRODUCTION

Teaching and learning method has developed every time and it has changed the educational process as a whole. Human development, technology, even culture are reasons to change the educational teaching method. The multicultural and multilingual era also support teaching method to create a good education, which focuses not only on content but also on language. In this century, researchers found a new teaching method called "Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)." Dalton-Puffer (2007) states that the term CLIL refers to educational setting where a language other than the student's mother tongue is used as a medium of instruction in which content and language are learnt at the same time. Currently, in European educational level and other counties, the language applied in CLIL is mostly English because it is an International language (Dalton-Puffer as cited in Pozo, 2015).

Coyle (1999) state that CLIL is a dual-focused educational approach which focuses on content teaching and language used in that teaching instruction, which they learn content and language at the same time. This means that in CLIL, students learn two points, namely language which refers to a foreign language, and content which refers to all subjects lesson (such as mathematics, geography, physic, biology, etc.). In addition, Eurydice (2006, p. 7) states that "the acronym of CLIL stated to become widely used term for this kind of provision during the 1990s." CLIL is an educational approach

developed in Europe and already in the first half of the 20th century (Papaja, 2014).

The important point of CLIL is built by the conceptual framework. It is supported by Coyle as cited in Cortacans (2013, p. 1) who states that:

> In terms of skills, according to the 4Cs curriculum, a CLIL lesson should contain: Listening as a normal input activity, vital for language learning, reading as a major source of input, speaking as fluent communication focuses on fluency (accuracy is seen as subordinate), and writing as lexical activities through grammar is recycled.

First, culture in CLIL is important part because it relates with awareness of self and others. Marsh (2002) argues that culture in CLIL brings students learning with intercultural knowledge and understanding, developing intercultural communication skills, learning about specific neighboring countries/regions and/or minority group, and introducing the wider culture context. This framework benefits for students in thinking larger and open their mind about other culture that they should know.

Second, students should communicate well in the class as their response to the learning. Dalton-Puffer & Hunt as cited in Agolli (2013, p. 142) state that "communication inculcated into Krashen's Input Hypothesis conceptualizing learning as a feasible acquisition process, solely if the learner is exposed to comprehensible input and experiences positive emotions." The benefit of communication in CLIL is preparing students for real life communication (Dalton-Puffer, Lasagabaster, & Sierra as cited in Harrop, 2012).

The last are content and cognition, which both are related to the subject matter and the thinking way. They are correlated because both of them influence one another. This is in line with Davies in Agolli (2013, p. 142) that "cognition and content are interleaved in the CLIL process being slantingly linked to Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), accentuating the cognitive processing of language learning suited to each learner's comfort zone." Meanwhile, the content in CLIL should be highly level and students should think

critically. The 4Cs framework makes CLIL as an innovative method because in every meeting, there isalways some challengingactivitiesfor students.

The implementation of CLIL method between one and other countries is different. It is related to the state's obligation, school roles, teachers' competences, and students' ability. Besides, the implementation of CLIL needs well-preparation in material, tasks, learning hours, and many other. Claudiocol (2010) states that there are three types of CLIL, namely *hard, mid*, and *soft CLIL*.

Hard CLIL is the way in which school requires teachers to teach a half of the curriculum in a target language (content led). This type of CLIL focuses more on content. The learners are taught the content/subject by using the target language. On the other hand, *Mid CLIL* is the way which school requires teachers to teach some CLIL modules where a subject is taught for a limited amount of hours. In contrast, *Soft CLIL* is the way which school requires teachers to teach English by using different materials, content/subjects such as biology, physics, chemistry, etc. This is a part of the language ELT course curriculum (language led course). The focus of this type is language.

The types of CLIL gives an opportunity to the teachers to consider how they can implement CLIL method based on the context, what the language used, and also the time allocation during teaching and learning based on the need. In this line, the researcher applied soft CLIL. Meyer as cited in Prasetianto (2015) states that soft CLIL is a more EFL version of CLIL.

CLIL method can be implemented by considering the educational rules of the government, school and even teacher as the first source in delivering the materials. Wolff as cited in Papaja (2014) argues that "enumerates five environmental parameters which are responsible for the development of different forms of CLIL includes *interpretation of the concept, subject taught, exposure time, curricular integration,* and *linguistic situation*" (p. 9).

Tthe first is *interpretation of the concept.* The concept of interpretation of CLIL might be different in various countries. In

some countries, the main focus of CLIL is language teaching, but in other countries is content. Papaja (2014) states that "there is a very important factor which may influence the CLIL concept, namely the qualifications of teachers" (p. 10). The content teacher with the knowledge of a foreign language will adapt the CLIL concept to the language teaching and also the language teacher with the knowledge of content will adapt the CLIL concept to the content teaching.

The second is *subject taught.* In some countries, subject belonging to the humanities is chosen to be taught, but in other countries, science including artistic and physical education are also taken as subject taught. "The reason why particular subjects are chosen as CLIL subjects can be also connected with the availability of teachers" (Papaja, 2014, p. 10). It means that the subject taught is related to the teachers' competencies.

The third is *exposure time. Exposure time* relates to the hours subject are taught in CLIL class. "In some countries the learners are 6 hours per week during which the teacher uses the mother tongue and in others only 3 hours per week during which the teacher does not say a word in mother tongue" (Papaja, 2014, p. 11).

The forth is *curricular integration.* The implementation of CLIL is based on the curricular integration. Prasetianto (2015, p. 156) argues that "the 2013 curriculum can support the use of CLIL because the curriculum integrates several subjects or them in organized horizontally; it can integrate the content and English (language)." This is one of advantages for Indonesian teacher because the education curriculum really matches with the CLIL method, so it will adapt easily in implementing CLIL method in Indonesian school.

The fifth is *linguistic situation.* The reason of implemented CLIL in European because in those countries there are mixing multicultural societies in different background of language, culture, education etc. In this research, the researcher implements CLIL method because the subject material is English and CLIL also uses English as a language medium. So, both of them

relates each other. Meanwhile, the contents follow the topics in English teaching syllabus.

The implementation of CLIL in writing is based on Dale, Es, and Tanner's (2011) theory. Dale, *et al.* state that "CLIL subject teacher plays an important role in encouraging their learners to produce different types of written output" (2011, p. 139). There are several points that CLIL teacher should follow in teaching writing through CLIL, as follows:

1. Methodological Approaches
    Dale, *et al.* (2011) state that "the process approach sees writing as a process and stresses the need to help learners understand the stage writers go through when they produce a text" (p. 140). These stages involves generating ideas (brainstorming), organizing the ideas (structuring), and linking the ideas (linking sentences and paragraphs).

2. Discuss Text Types, Aims and Audience
    This point is related to the genre of the text, which the students should know the function, aims, and audiences as reader. Dale, *et al.* (2011) state that "to write effectively, learners must recognize, understand and work with different text types, such as newspaper articles, poems, laboratory reports, and posters" (p. 141).

3. Work with Examples
    Teacher can give the students text examples as the figure for them. Dale, *et al.* (2011) say that "find examples of good texts and discuss them with the learners: what makes this text a clear, well-organized and generally well-written text? In this way learners become familiar with different text types and are able to use them as models for their own writing" (p. 142).

4. Look at Text Features (Text Deconstruction)
    This point makes students understand that different text will have different text's features. Dale, *et al.* (2011) state that looking as models of complete texts, teachers can discuss the writing conventions and language features of texts with the learners, which is in genre

approach. This is called as deconstruction stage.

5. Help Learners Generate the Idea
    Sometimes, students get writing block and confuse to begin. Dale, *et al.* (2011) declare that "before learners start writing, encourage them to think about what they are going to write" (p. 144).

6. Write Together (Joint Construction)
    Dale, *et al.* (2011) state that it can be useful part of the learning process to do some writing together and shared writing is teacher-led: teachers and learners write a text together. This is called as joint construction. Here, teacher can begin with a discussion with learner, gives suggestion for the class, explains why certain word is better, etc.

7. Guide and Support First Attempts
    It helps students to write the simplest text to complex text. Dale, *et al.* (2011) state that "it is useful to develop learners' writing skills by starting with short writing assignments before moving on to longer, more formal texts: in other words, moving from BICS to CALP" (p. 144).

8. Scaffold the Writing Process
    The scaffold of writing in CLIL include in content and language. According to Dale, *et al.* (2011), "in CLIL, production scaffolds can be used to support writing" (p. 145).

9. Encourage Learners to Write Independently
    In the beginning, students can learn together until they can write independently to build their confident. As stated by Dale, *et al.* (2011) that "to become independent writers, learners need ample opportunities to practice" (p. 148).

10. Encourage Peer Reviewing
    Students will be more confident after getting peer-feedback and suggestion from teacher. Dale, *et al.* (2011) state that "encouraging learners to give feedback on their own and other work can also help them become more independent writers" (p. 149).

11. Give Feedback during the Writing Process

Teacher can give feedback during the writing process that will make students understand the step by step to be a better writer. Dale, *et al.* (2011) note that "useful feedback can be given during all stages of the writing process, not just on the final product" (p. 150).

CLIL as an innovative method is now being implemented in many countries in the world. CLIL is implemented in school because it has many benefits for both teacher and students. Papaja (2014) argues that there are a lot of advantages which make CLIL an innovative methodology that has emerged to cater for this interconnected age. Those advantages are introducing a wider culture context, preparing that learners for international activities and exchanges, giving access to international certification, improving general and specific language competence, preparing for professional life and providing more job opportunities, developing multilingual interests and attitudes, and increasing learners' motivation to learn a second or even a third language.

Language is an important part in human life and it can occur in individual level until large group level. In line with this, Ar-Rasheed (2012) states that language plays an important role in the negotiation of power relationships both at an interpersonal level and at a wider societal level. If talking the language function in larger scale, it will refer to English as a global language (Ha, 2008). Some researchers stated that Asian students showed the passive response to English including Indonesia. Similarly, Exley (2005, p. 3) says that "other literature concedes that Indonesian students also exhibit English more passive, compliant, and unreflective learners characteristics." One reason for those problems is because English in Indonesia is used as a foreign language not as primary or secondary language (Lie, 2007).

Thus, students are forced to master the two productive skills, namely speaking and writing. Harmer (2007) states that "spoken language for a child is acquired naturally as a result of being exposed to it, whereas the ability to write has to be consciously learned" (p. 3). It means that writing skill is more difficult than speaking because in reality,

teacher should teach writing deeply and patiently, while speaking can be learnedin daily communication. Therefore, the researcher focuses on investigating whether or not CLIL method can improve students' factual report writing skill as well as to know students' response towards the implementation of this method.

METHOD

This study used quantitative method supported by statistical data. Creswell (2012, p. 13) stated that "it acquires the statistic in relating variables and collecting numeric data from large number of people using instrument with pretest questions and responses." Here, the researcher applied a quasi-experimental design. Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) explained that "quasi-experimental designs rely instead in other techniques to control (or at least reduce) threats to internal validity" (p. 227). There were two instruments used, namely tests which consists pre-test and post-test, and questionnaires. 60 students of eleventh-grade social class of a state senior high school in Kuningan were involved in the research. They were divided into a control and an experimental group.

Tests were analysed quantitatively to identify the effectiveness of CLIL method. Therefore, the researcher formulated two hypotheses as follow:

H_0 : The CLIL method is not effective to improve students' factual report writing skill.

$H\alpha$: The CLIL method is effective to improve students' factual report writing skill.

On the other hand, questionnaires were analysed with descriptive statistic to examine the students' attitude towards the implementation of CLIL in classroom.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to meet the first research question, the researcher firstly calculated the data taken from pretest in both experimental and control group by using SPSS 20.0. The requisite of conducted t-test is that the data should be normal and homogeneous, so the normality and homogeneity of pretest and posttest were done before doing t-test. Normality distribution test was calculated to investigate whether the distribution of pre-test and posttest scores in two groups were normally distributed or not. The criterion of normal distribution is when the probability is higher than the level of significant ($p > 0.05$). Whereas, if the probability is lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the distribution is not normal.

H_0 : **the score of two groups are normally distributed ($p>0.05$)**

Table 1. *Test of Normality on Pretest*

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Normality Pre-Experimental	Normality Pre-Control
N		30	30
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	7.03	6.73
	Std. Deviation	3.327	2.677
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.155	.159
	Positive	.155	.152
	Negative	-.117	-.159
Test Statistic		.155	.159
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.063[c]	.052[c]
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction.			

Table 2. *Test of Normality on Posttest*

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Normality Pos-Experimental	Normality Pos-Control
N		30	30
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	33.63	8.80
	Std. Deviation	9.076	3.800
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.128	.152

		Positive	.128	.150
		Negative	-.090	-.152
Test Statistic			.128	.152
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			.200[c,d]	.075[c]

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
b. *This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table 1 shows that the asymp.sig score for both group were higher than the level of significance. The asymp.sig score of experimental group was 0.063 and control group was 0.052. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted meaning that the scores of experimental and control group on pretest were normally distributed.

Table 2 shows that the asygmp.sig score of the experimental and control group on posttest were higher than the level of significance (0.200 > 0.05) and (0.075 > 0.05). Thus, it was assumed that the null hypothesis was accepted meaning that the score of experimental and control group on posttest were normally distributed.

The homogeneity of variance test was done as the main requirement for conducting the T-test. If the variances of the data collected from both groups are homogenous, the T-test can be conducted. On the other hand, if the variances are not homogenous, the T-test cannot be used and it must use the non-parametric test.

H$_0$: The data variances of the two groups are homogenous

Table 3. *Test of Homogeneity of Variance on Pretest*

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.613	3	26	.211

Table 4. *Test of Homogeneity of Variance on Posttest*

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.572	4	24	.686

On Table 4, it can be seen that the significance score of the homogeneity of variance test was 0.211. It was higher than 0.05. It means that the data variances of the experimental and control groups on pretest were homogenous, so the null hypothesis was accepted and T-test can be done. In addition, it can be seen from Table 4 that the significance score of the homogeneity of variance test was 0.686. It was higher than 0.05. It means that the data variances of the experimental and control groups on posttest are homogenous, so the null hypothesis was accepted and T-test can be done.

Afterwarsd, Independent T-test on pre-test was conducting to investigate the significance difference of the data between experiment and control groups before administering the treatments.

H$_0$: There is no significance difference of means between two groups on pretest

Table 5. *Independent T-test on Pretest*

Group Statistics

	XI IPS 1 and XI IPS 2	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Independent Pre-	1	30	7.03	3.327	.607
Experimental-Control	2	30	6.73	2.677	.489

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means	

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Independent Pre-Experimental-Control	Equal variances assumed	1.409	.240	.385	58	.702	.300	.780	-1.261	1.861
	Equal variances not assumed			.385	55.463	.702	.300	.780	-1.262	1.862

Table 5 shows that the significance score of experimental and control groups in pretest was 0.702, it was higher than 0.05 (0.702>0.05). Besides, the mean of both groups were not significantly different; the experimental group was 7.03 and the control group was 6.73. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted which means that there was no significance different of means between two group on pretest.

Independent T-test on posttest was aimed to investigate the significance difference of means between experimental and control groups after administering the treatments.

H_0 : **There is no significance difference of means between two groups on posttest**

Table 6. *Independent T-test on Posttest*

Group Statistics

	XI IPS 1 and XI IPS 2	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Independent Pos-Experimental-Control	1	30	33.63	9.076	1.657
	2	30	8.80	3.800	.694

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Independent Pos-Experimental-Control	Equal variances assumed	17.622	.000	13.823	58	.000	24.833	1.796	21.237	28.429
	Equal variances not assumed			13.823	38.865	.000	24.833	1.796	21.199	28.467

Table 6 shows that the score of both experimental and control groups indicated the significance value 0.000, which was lower than the level of significance 0.05 (0.000<0.005). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that there was significance difference of means between two groups on posttest. It can also be seen from table of group statistics in which the mean score of both groups were significantly different; the experimental group was 33.63

and the control group was 8.80, the different score between both were 24.83.

Accordingly, the researcher concluded that the students' writing skill increased after receiving the treatments. In other words, CLIL method was effective in improving students' writing skill, especially in factual report writing.

Dependent T-test on Experimental Group

The dependent T-test is used to know the significant differences of means in

experimental group before and after receiving the treatment. The result of the dependent T-test is shown in Table 7.

H₀ : **There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest score**

Table 7. *Paired Samples Statistics of the Experimental Group*

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Dep Pre-Experimental	7.03	30	3.327	.607
	Dep Post-Experimental	33.63	30	9.076	1.657

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences						Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		T		
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Dep Pre-Experimental – Dep Post-Experimental	-26.600	9.235	1.686	-30.048	-23.152	-15.777	29	.000

Based on the Table 7, it can be seen that the pretest mean of the experimental group was 7.03 and the posttest mean of the experimental group increases up to 33.63. The significance score also supported the increasing of the experimental mean during the study which resulted 0.000. It was lower than the significance level 0.05. Based on those results, the researcher concluded that the null hypothesis was rejected which means that there was significant difference of mean between the pretest and posttest score on the experimental group and indicating that the CLIL method was effective in improving students' writing skills.

Students' attitude towards the implementation of CLIL method

In measuring students' attitude towards the use of CLIL method in their writing activity, the researcher used questionnaire as an instrument to collect the data. The students were expected to fill the questionnaire items consisting of ten statements of preference.

As the result of questionnaire analysis, it was found that the items of affective aspect indicated that more than half of the students (53%) in experimental group agreed that they like writing factual report by using CLIL method, while 40% of them feel excited in

learning by using CLIL. Students who agreed and strongly agreed to the items stating that writing became fun activity after they learnt to write factual report text through CLIL method were 36.7%.It indicated that they still unfamiliar with CLIL method.

In the behavioral aspect, 60% students stated that they will follow the learning process if the teacher used CLIL method in writing factual report text, while 43% of them tried to be involved actively if the teacher taught writing factual report text through CLIL method. Here, the researcher concluded that most student enthusiast to learn through CLIL method, but just 43% students tried to be active. Overall, 53,3% students can write factual report text more effective after learning through CLIL method and they agreed it can improve their writing skill.

In addition, after learning writing by using CLIL method, 50% students strongly agreed that CLIL method was suitable for learning factual report text writing, while 46.7% students agreed and strongly agreed that they felt learning more effective when the teacher provided the material of factual report text through CLIL method and they thought their ability improved after learning factual report text through CLIL method. Besides, 43.3% students stated that they thought CLIL method can help them to

AISEE
The Association of Indonesian
Scholars of English Education

understand all about factual report materials. Overall, the result of questionnaire showed that students gave positive response in implementing CLIL method in teaching and learning factual report writing.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the CLIL method was effective in improving students' factual report writing skills. This is shown by the result taken from the t-test. The result taken from independent t-test shows that there is a significant difference on the students' writing skill since the level of significant is lower than the alpha (0.000<0.005) which indicates that CLIL is effective in improving students' writing skill. Furthermore, the result taken from questionnaires portrays that students show positive attitude towards the implementation of CLIL in teaching and learning process.

REFERENCES

Agolli, R. (2013). A penetrating content and language integrated learning (CLIL) praxis in Italian mainstream education: Streaming novelties and visions. *RPLTL*, *4*(1), 138-157. Retrieved from http://rpltl.eap.gr/images/2013/04-01-138-agolli-b.pdf

Ar-Rasheed, M. M. (2012). Learning English language in Bangladesh: CLT and beyond. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices.* 6(2), 31-49. Retrieved from http://criticalliteracy.freehostia.com/index.php?journal=criticalliteracy&page=article&op=viewFile&path%5B%5D=123&path%5B%5D=92

Claudiocol. (2010). CLIL principle. (Online). Retrieved fromhttp://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/blogs/claudiocol/clil-principles, accessed on February 20th 2013.

Cortacans, E. P. (2013). Speaking in the CLIL classroom: to what extent do teachers & students use English in the classroom?. *UVIC.* Retrieved from http://repositori.uvic.cat/bitstream/handle/10854/2542/trealu_a2013_pares_elvira_speaking.pdf?sequence=1

Coyle, D. (1999). Students in content and language integrated context: Planning for effective classroom. In, J. Masih (Ed.). *Learning through a foreign language: Models, methods, and outcomes.* London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT).

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th edition).* Boston: Pearson.

Dale, L,. Es, W., & Tanner, R. (2011). *CLIL skills.* Leiden: European Flatform-Internasionalising education.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classroom.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Eurydice. (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at school in Europe.* Brussels, Belgium: Directorate-General for Education and Culture. Retrieved from http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_file/eurydice/CLIL_EN.pdf

Exley, B. (2005) Learner characteristics of 'Asian' EFL students: Exceptions to the 'norm' in young, Janelle, eds. proceedings pleasure passion provocation. *Joint National Conference AATE & ALEA,* 1-16. Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/1792/1/1792.pdf

Fraenkel & Wallen (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education (7th Edition).*New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ha, P. L. (2008). *Teaching English as an international language (Identity, resistance and negotiation).* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach writing.* Essex: Longman.

Harrop, E. (2012). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Limitations and possibilities. *Encuentro.*57-70. Retrieved from: http://w.encuentrojournal.org/textos/7.%20Harrop.pdf

Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for high scores. *TEFLIN Journal, 18*(1), 1-4. Retrieved from http://teflin.org/journal/index.php/journal/article/viewFile/48/53

Marsh, D. (2002), Content and language integrated learning: The European dimension-actions, trends and foresight potential. European Commission, Public Service Contract DG 3406/001-001.

Papaja, K. (2014). A qualitative evaluation of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Polish secondary eduacation. *Newcastle: Cambridge Scholarship Publishing.* Retrieved from http://www.cambridgescholars.com/download/sample/61664.

Pozo, M. A . (2015). Teacher education for content and language integrated learning: Insights from a current European debate. *Revista Electro'nica Interuniversitaria de Formaci'ondel Profesorado.18*(3), 153-168. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/reifop.18.3.210401.

Prasetianto, M. (2015). CLIL as suggested English material for curriculum 2013: Indonesia context. *Langlit An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal, 1*(3), 152 -157. Retrieved from https://www.google.co.id/?gws_rd=cr,ssl&ei=dRn6Voa1IomwuATviZnYBQ

#q=Mushoffan+Prasetianto+CLIL+as+Suggested +English+Material+for+Curriculum+2013:+Indo nesia+Context

Vazquez, B. M. (2014). Lexical transfer in the written production of a CLIL group and a non-CLIL group. *IJES, 14*(2), 57-76. Retrieved from http://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/j.16625 1/168551

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psycho-logical processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.