A Study on The Attitude of Secondary School Teachers of West Bengal Towards CLIL

PIKU CHOWDHURY

Satyapriya Roy College of Education, Kolkata

Email: chowdhury.piku@yahoo.com

Abstract Cognitive development goes hand in hand with linguistic development, and language emerges as a tool through which a learner comes to understand the world. In the first language these processes are paired naturally, though for second language learners like the majority of learners of English in India, traditional methods for teaching second/foreign languages often dissociate language learning from cognitive or academic development. By contrast, an integrated approach brings these domains together in instruction. Integration of language and content, commonly known as CLIL, therefore emerges as significant for effective education. However, though the West Bengal Elementary Teacher Education Curriculum Framework encourages? CLIL, there seems to be a significant knowledge gap among practising secondary and higher secondary teachers regarding language and content integrated teaching and learning. The present study seeks to explore the knowledge and attitude of teachers of West Bengal regarding the CLIL methodology.

Keywords: Content, Language, Integration, CLIL, Teacher attitude, Knowledge, Teacher education

1. INTRODUCTION

There is growing interest in a model of teaching in which language is integrated with content instruction in the language classroom. This approach contrasts with methods, in which language skills are taught in isolation from substantive content. For young children, cognitive development goes hand in hand with linguistic development, and language emerges as a tool through which a learner comes to understand the world. In the first language these processes are paired naturally, though for second language learners like the majority of learners of English in India, traditional methods for teaching second/foreign languages often dissociate language learning from cognitive or academic development. By contrast, an integrated approach brings these domains together in instruction. Moreover, language is learned most effectively for communication in meaningful, purposeful social and academic contexts. In

real life, people use language to talk about what they know and what they want to know more about, not to talk about language itself, whereas in the typical school setting, the emphasis remains on content of different academic subjects and language finds attention and focus only in language classes In most cases, language learning and content learning are treated as independent processes. Mohan (1986) notes: "In subject matter learning we overlook the role of language as a medium of learning. In language learning we overlook the fact that content is being communicated" (p. 1) Again, the integration of content with language instruction provides a substantive/firm basis for language teaching and learning. Content provides a primary motivational incentive for language learning insofar as it is interesting and of some value to the learner and therefore worth learning. Language then will be learned because it provides access to content, and language learning may even become incidental to learning about the content. Content also provides a cognitive basis for language learning in that it provides real meaning that is an inherent feature of naturalistic language learning. Meaning provides conceptual or cognitive basis on which language functions and structures can be placed. In the absence of real meaning, language structures and functions are likely to be learned as abstractions devoid of conceptual or communicative value. In India, especially in West Bengal English is taught in most secondary schools as a second language and CLIL remains a largely unexplored concept for many practising second language teachers. Interestingly enough CLIL finds a place in the West Bengal Elementary Teacher Education Curriculum Framework and certain practicum in the prevalent revised B.Ed. Courses imply practice but how far the teacher education system prepares teachers for the same and how far practising and trained teachers are aware of this remains to be brought under the scanner. Habitat/Context? appears as an important factor in the study since teaching in rural belts practically boils down to translation in second language classes and in most cases note giving practice in vernacular with scant scope for CLIL which would be much needed for the learners' linguistic as well as cognitive development.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Thuy, Linh Nguyen Thi (2016) in their article "Reconsidering the First Steps of CLIL Implementation in Vietnam" aimed at discussing four critiques raised by insiders regarding (i) the significance of CLIL in Vietnam, (ii) teachers' readiness, (iii) students' readiness for CLIL and (iv) the lack of availab le CLIL materials and the study revealed that "CLIL training is necessary from teachers' viewpoint. The outcome of the questionnaire revea ls that the teaching staffwere not prepared for CLIL during their teacher education" and the findings further

endorsed that "besides improving English competence, teachers for CLIL need to understand their new role s and modify their teaching approaches, as well as do team teaching with language teachers to succeed in CLIL. (p.29)." In many researches it is often noticed that teachers might lack "professional competences" for materials adaptation, supple mentation and design (Coonan 2007, in Mäkiranta 2014), that leads to lack of confidence and hence a lack of positive attitude towards CLIL. Again Nhan (2013) finds thathe limitation in English competence of teachers or students become a more serious hindrance for CLIL when the content subjects for uppersecondary school students are more complex a nd advanced and as a result, CLIL for upper-secondary education tend to impose more demanding requirements such as teachers' competences, facilities, etc. that may generate a lack of positive attitude towards CLIL among the teachers. Smala, Simone (2013) in the study titled "Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) showed that curriculum materials are often not available in the second language and special attention need s to be given to the preparation of content into understandable segments. Birch (1995) has proposed a focus on scaffolding subject content in CLI L classrooms with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978) in mind, as well as taking related concepts from second language teaching methodology, like Krashen's (1981) comprehensible input concept, into consideration. Both approaches postulate that learning occurs when learners are exposed to information just above their current understanding. The researches in the area reveal a plethora of problems moistly centred around TLM and teachers'competency even after formal training, that leads to a dearth of confidence and hence a lack of positive attitude towards CLIL in the long run.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To find out whether there is any significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between urban teachers with B.Ed. and urban teachers without B.Ed.

2. To find out whether there is any significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between rural teachers with B.Ed. and rural non B.Ed. teachers.

3. To find out whether there is any significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between trained rural male and trained rural female teachers.

4. To find out if there is any significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between trained urban male teachers and trained urban female teachers To find out if there is any significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between urban male teachers with B.Ed. and rural male teachers with B.Ed.

5. To find out if there is any significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between urban female teachers with B.Ed. and rural female teachers with B.Ed.

4. HYPOTHESES

H_{01}: There no significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between urban teachers with B.Ed. and urban teachers without B.Ed.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between rural teachers with B.Ed. and rural non B.Ed. teachers.

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between trained rural male and trained rural female teachers.

H_{04}: There is no significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between trained urban male teachers and trained urban female teachers.

$H_{05:}$ There is no significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between urban male teachers with B.Ed. and rural male teachers with B.Ed

$H_{06:}$ There is no significant difference in attitude towards CLIL between urban female teachers with B.Ed. and rural female teachers with B.Ed.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample: 700 female and male secondary school teachers, including both trained and untrained teachers, selected randomly from secondary schools from Kolkata, North 24 Parganas, South 24 Parganas, Hoogly and Howrah districts in the southeastern part of West Bengal, Purulia and Bankura in the Western part of the state, and Malda, Siliguri and Jaipaiguri in the northern part of the state. It was not possible to cover each and every district of the state and so representative districts from east, south, west and northern parts were selected for the study.

Technique: Typically, any discussion of research method is dichotomized and presented in either a quantitative or a qualitative category because the two paradigms have been assumed to be polar opposites and, among some, even separate and distinct scientific absolutes. Modern research has shown that a balanced blend of qualitative and quantitative research can only yield the most reliable results and application compared to only quantitative tools. Thus both qualitative and quantitative techniques were used in this study.

Tool: A prepared tool was used for the survey. The tool was duly standardized with the help of experts in the field. Follow up ? unstructured interviews were used to find out the teachers' perception about CLIL, their opinion about the

scope of developing skill for CLIL in the course they are taught in B.Ed. and their personal experiences with CLIL, if any. The scale was made on the basis of need of the present study after critical discussions with experts. The tool thus modified had 40 questions with response options 'Strongly Agree', 'agree'/ 'Disagree' and 'Strongly Disagree'. Values of 4,3,2 and 1 were ascribed to the 'Strongly Agree', / 'agree'/ 'Disagree' and 'Strongly Disagree' options respectively. The tool was tested for reliability and validity. The preliminary draft of the attitude scale was administered on a sample of 250 secondary school teachers of Kolkata and suburbs in West Bengal. The selection of these teachers was made from 35 secondary and higher secondary schools by employing multistage stratified proportionate sampling technique.

Reliability: The reliability of the scale was established by – (a) Test-retest Method and (b) Internal Consistency of the scale. The sample of 250 secondary school teachers, consisting of both male and female school teachers was tested twice with a gap of two months between testing and retesting. The product moment correlation 'r', that is the reliability index, was 0.82. Thus the scale was found to be reliable. The internal consistency of the scale was judged by computing the coefficients of correlation between total score on the scale and score on each of the five areas of the scale.

Validity: The validity of the scale was ascertained on the basis of content validity, cross validity, Item validity and Intrinsic validity. The aspects of inclusive education used in the modified scale has been substantially supported by the literature available in the area of inclusive education and the views and suggestions from various experts at the time of preparing a preliminary draft of the scale. Thus the scale can be said to possess adequate content validity. Each sub-sample of the whole teacher sample selected for the item analysis was entirely different from one another in order to avoid the chance of errors of carry over effect and thus it may be said that cross validity of the scale was ensured. Item validity was established since only those items with t-value of 1.75 or above were retained in the final form of the scale. The intrinsic validity for the scale was ascertained by ensuring internal consistency of the scale through product moment correlation method. The test retest reliability coefficient of 0.82 established the intrinsic validity of the scale. Procedure of **Data Collection:** The tool was administered and also sent by mail to teachers in some cases. Sufficient time was given to the teachers before collecting their feedback so that their responses were well thought over and not perfunctory. Questions were explained in cases where it was needed. Sufficient rapport was built up with the respondents before administering the personal interview

schedules so that the respondents could share their personal experiences without any inhibition.

Analysis of data: The t-test was also applied to the data collected so far after subjecting the data to normality test. The?? It was found to be near normal though not exactly normal.. t Test was applied on the scores obtained by teachers to test the following null hypotheses against corresponding alternative hypotheses:

[In the case of Alternative hypothesis, the hypothesis is specified as Hxy, where x denotes alternative number and y denotes the test number corresponding to the alternative hypotheses. Eg: H_{23} denotes alternative hypothesis for alternative hypothesis 2 for test number 3 or the third test as shown in the sequence below]

Null Hypothesis	Alternative Hypothesis 1	Alternative Hypothesis 2
H_{01} : There is no difference in attitude between rural B.ED vs rural non B.ED	H_{11} : Attitude of rural B.ED is better than rural non B.ED	H_{21} : Attitude of rural B.ED is poorer than rural non B.ED
H_{02} : There is no difference in attitude between urban B.ED vs urban non-B.ED	H_{12} : Attitude of urban B.ED is better than urban non B.ED	H_{22} : Attitude of urban B.ED is poorer than urban non B.ED
H_{03} : There is no difference in attitude between rural male B.ED vs rural female B.ED	H_{13}: Rural male B.ED have poorer attitude than their female counterparts	H_{23}: Rural male B.ED have better attitude than their female counterparts
H_{04} : There is no difference in attitude between urban male B.ED vs urban female B.ED	H_{14} : urban male B.ED have poorer attitude than their female counterparts	H_{24} : urban male B.ED have better attitude than their female counterparts
H_{05} There is no difference in attitude between rural male B.ED vs urban male B.ED	H_{15} : rural male B.ED have poorer attitude than their urban counterparts	H_{25} : rural male B.ED have better attitude than their urban counterparts
H_{06} : There is no difference in attitude between rural female B.ED vs urban female B.Ed.	H_{16} : rural female B.ED have poorer attitude than their urban counterparts	H_{26} : rural female B.ED have better attitude than their urban counterparts

For each of the above hypotheses, we compute the value of t statistic[1]
Values of t statistic (rounded off to 3 decimal places) and corresponding inferences are summarized in the table below:

Hypothesis	Computation in Annexure	Computed t value	Observation	Inference
H_{01}	I	0.125	$\|$Computed t$\|$ $< t_{0.005,\infty}$	H_{01} is accepted
H_{02}	II	0.006	$\|$Computed t$\|$ $< t_{0.005,\infty}$	H_{02} is accepted
H_{03}	III	-5.559	Computed t $< - t_{0.01,\infty}$	H_{03} is rejected in favor of H_{13}
H_{04}	IV	-11.389	Computed t $< - t_{0.01,\infty}$	H_{04} is rejected in favor of H_{14}
H_{05}	V	-2.936	Computed t $< - t_{0.01,\infty}$	H_{05} is rejected in favor of H_{15}
H_{06}	VI	-4.829	Computed I $< - t_{0.01,\infty}$	H_{06} is rejected in favor of H_{16}

Analysis: B.Ed.-Attitude :Table shows the analysis of data as regards any influence of B.Ed degree [and hence with exposure to supervised practice teaching] on a teacher's attitude towards CLIL.

χ^2 Test was applied to test null hypothesis at 5% level of significance.[2]

	Teachers with B.Ed. degree	Teachers without B.Ed. degree	Total
Teachers with favourable attitude	154	70	224
Teachers with unfavourable attitude	360	116	476
Total	514	186	700

Inference: Since the computed χ^2 value is less than the tabulated value at 5% level, the null hypothesis is accepted and we have no reason to believe that B.Ed. degree with planned supervised practice teaching has any influence on a teacher's attitude towards CLIL. Location – attitude: Table shows the analysis of data as regards any significant difference between trained urban and rural teachers [having undergone supervised practice teaching] in their attitude towards CLIL.

χ^2 Test was applied to test null hypothesis at 5% level of significance.[3]

	Urban teachers with experience of Pedagogical analysis under supervision	Rural teachers with experience of Pedagogical analysis under supervision	Total
Teachers with favourable attitude	186	38	224
Teachers with unfavourable attitude	406	70	476
Total	592	108	700

Inference: Since the computed χ^2 value is less than the tabulated value at 5% level, the null hypothesis is accepted and we have no reason to believe that Area has any influence on a teacher's attitude towards CLIL.

Personal experience – B.Ed.: An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine whether personal experience of CLIL in form of demonstration classes in the teacher education course or exposure to international workshops attended during their service, and having a B.Ed degree, has any influence on a teacher's favourable attitude towards CLIL. 224 teachers' favourable responses were categorized as follows;-

Tabulated value of F with Degrees of Freedom 1,1 at α-level 0.05 = 161.4

	Teachers with personal experience	Teachers without personal experience	Total
Teachers with B.Ed.	107	47	154
Teachers without B.Ed.	61	9	70
Total	168	56	224

ANOVA was calculated[4] and F values are computed as follows

Factors	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Square	Mean Square	Observed F
B.Ed. Degree	1	1764	1764	110.25
Personal Experience	1	3136	3136	196.00
Error	1	16	16	

A Study on The
Attitude of
Secondary School
Teachers of West
Bengal Towards
Clil

Thus we observe that:

F value for the factor 'B.Ed. Degree' < tabulated F value.

F value for the factor 'Personal Experience' > tabulated F value.

Hence the Analysis of Variance indicates that personal experience has a positive influence on a teacher's favourable attitude towards inclusive education. But no such conclusion can be drawn for B.Ed degree.

4. QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

An interview schedule was also constructed and administered to the high school teachers. Data Analysis revealed that around 45% teachers familiar with the concept of CLIL feel that it is beneficial for the learners while the majority are apprehensive for the introduction of CLIL methodology. The lack of confidence and very poor or almost no exposure to the method in a planned and well organized way was evident and the responses revealed a general lack of confidence when it comes to the development of necessary knowledge base and skill for CLIL. The interview practically brought to the forefront the need to revisit the approach of teacher education to still to considering the language class separate from the content based class.

CONCLUSION

The study reveals that content teachers in tandem with language teachers should be provided with a systematic approach to the identification and instruction of language aims within content teaching, and that the main teacher development courses are failing in ways more than one in doing so, despite NCTE curriculum revision in both elementary and secondary level teacher education. The need for in-service professional development of the teacher educators themselves emerges as a necessary corollary The teacher education curriculum clearly points to the development of CLIL skills and techniques as a part of the cours, though the study reflects teacher education not developing tachers adequately for this approach. ‑

REFERENCES

[1] Anderson, J. R., Eisenberg, N., Holland, J., Weiner, H. S., with Rivera- Kron, C. (1983). Integrated skills reinforcement: Reading, writing, speaking, and listening across the curriculum. New York: Longman.

[2] Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). Content-area language instruction: Approaches and strategies. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

[3] Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach. TESOL Quarterly, **21,** 227–p.?

Chowdhury, P

[4] Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

[5] Mohan, B. M. (1986). Language and content. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

[6] Nhan, T. (2013) 'Promoting Content and Language Integrated Learning in Gifted High Schools in Vietnam: Challenges and Impacts', *Internet Journal of Language, Culture and Society* **38:** 146–53

[7] Short, D. J. (1991). How to integrate language and content instruction: A training manual (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics

[8] Smala, Simone (2013). "Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Pedagogies in Queensland". *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*. **8**, Issue: 3

[9] Thuy, Linh Nguyen Thi (2016) "Reconsidering the First Steps of CLIL Implementation in Vietnam", | *European Journal of Language Policy*.

END NOTE:

[1.] For each of the above hypotheses, we compute the value of I statistic as follows;-Let x_1 and x_2 denote the scores of the two sets.

x_1(mean) and x_2(mean) are sample means from the two sets. n_1 and n_2 are the sample sizes of the two sets.

t statistic is computed as follows:

t = (x_1(mean) - x_2(mean)) / (s X N)

N = square root $(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)$

s = square root ((X_1+X_2) /(n_1+n_2-2))

$X_1 = \sum x_1^2 - n_1 (x_1$(mean))^2

$X_2 = \sum x_2^2 - n_2 (x_2$(mean))^2

Tabulated value of t at 1% & 0.5% confidence levels are noted as follows;-

$t_{0.01,\infty}$ = 2.326, $t_{0.005,\infty}$ = 2.576

Please note that degrees of freedom (n_1+n_2-2), for the sample sizes corresponding to each of the hypotheses are greater than 120 (please refer to n_1 and n_2 values in Annexures I to VI). In Table 12 of *Biometrika Tables for Statisticians*, *Vol. I*, degrees of freedom greater than 120 is marked as infinity (∞). Hence we have noted tabulated I values with degrees of freedom as ∞.

2. χ2 value, computed based on the above data after applying Yate's correction for continuity

= [{ |154 X 116 - 70 X 360| - 700/2 $\}^2$ X 700] / (154+70) X (360+116) X (154+360) X (70+116)

= 3.696 (rounded to 3 decimal places)

Tabulated value of χ2 with Degrees of Freedom 1, at α-level 0.05 = 3.841

3. χ2 value, computed based on the above data after applying Yate's correction for continuity = [{ |186 X 70 − 38 X 406| - 700/2 $\}^2$ X 700] / (186+38) X

(406+70) X (186+406) X (38+70) = 0.595 (rounded to 3 decimal places)
Tabulated value of χ^2 with Degrees of Freedom 1, at α-level 0.05 = 3.841
4. ANOVA calculations are as follows;
Sum of squares of raw values = 17460
Correction Factor = $(224)^2$ / (2 X 2) = 12544
Total SS (Sum of Square) = 17460 − 12544 = 4916
SS due to Degree = $[(154)2 + (70)^2]$ / 2 − 12544 = 1764
SS due to Personal Experience = $[(168)^2 + (56)^2]$ / 2 − 12544 = 3136
SSE (Sum of Squares due to Error) = 4916 − 1764 − 3136 = 16

APPENDIX

SCALE TO MEASURE ATTITUDE OF SECONDARY TEACHERS OF WEST BENGAL TOWARDS CLIL

Name:

Age:　　　　**Sex: Male** ☐　　　　**Female** ☐

Name of School:

Locality- Urban ☐　　**Rural** ☐

B.Ed. - Yes ☐　**No** ☐

[Please tick mark against appropriatStrict confidentiality will be maintained and the data will be used for research only.]

1. CLIL is useful for language acquisition.
    Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐
2. CLIL is useful for content subject acquisition
    Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐ .
    CLIL is is useful for acquiring both the language and the subject
    Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐
4. I doubt that CLIL is useful at all
    Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐
5. Reading specialised texts in English in the classroom or independently is important
    Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐
6. Searching for some information from the Internet using sources in English is done in class

Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

7. It is useful to make students explore charts, tables and drawings containing some information in English
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

8. Teacher student ratio makes it impossible to practise CLIL in my class
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

9. Reading specific terminology in English must be practised
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

10. Reading specific documentation (reports, check-lists, accident reports) is useful
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

11. Reading instructions in other subjects can be done in the class
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

12. Writing a summary on the basis of videos/texts presented in the classroom is practised for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

13. It is useful to give Test instructions and assignments in English in other classes
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

14. Describing charts, tables and drawings containing some information in English can be done for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

15. Writing down specific terminology in English is useful
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

16. Translating from English into my mother tongue and backwards in useful in all content areas
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

17. The curriculum must be revised for effective implementation of CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

18. The teachers should be trained separately for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

19. Teacher Education courses did not prepare us for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

20. Present timetable doesnot permit effective implementation of CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

21. There is ample scope of effective implementation of CLIL in the present curriculum
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

22. Teachers should get incentive for implementing CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

23. CLIL leads to wastage of time in the class
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

24. CLIL cannot be applied to a multilingual class
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

25. CLIL calls for a reconstruction of the examination system
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

26. Participating in subject-related discussions in English can be done for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

27. Making topic-related oral presentations in English should be done in all the classes
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

28. Using English during group works and carrying out projects should be made mandatory for effective CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

29. Listening to audio-files in English can be done in class for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

30. Listening to instructions for filling out specific documentation in English can be done in class for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

31. Listening to some part of a topic-related material in English presented orally by teacher can be done in class for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

32. Listening to subject-related presentations presented in English by peers can be useful for CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

33. Listening to English during group works, discussions and carrying out projects is useful for CLIL.
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

34. CLIL cannot be practised in multilingual and multicultural classes
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

35. CLIL is not fit for Indian classrooms with huge student strength
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

36. Subject teachers other than language teachers feel burdened with CLIL
Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

37. Students would be subjected to stress due to CLIL

Chowdhury, P

Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

38. The course structure and allotted time makes CLIL very difficult to be practised

Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

39. Content of subjects other than language would suffer with too much emphasis on language through CLIL

Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐

40. CLIL leads to development of metacognition needed in understanding all content areas

Agree ☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagreed ☐