A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics

p-ISSN 2356-0401, e-ISSN 2621-9158
Vol. 12 No. 2 December 2025, pp. 890-907

The 3rd grade students' perception on learning CLIL through Cambridge's *Guess What* Textbook: A pilot study

Chatarina Tri Rahmawati[1*], Nunung Suryati[2], M Misbahul Amri[3], Lestari Setyowati[4]
[1*,2,3]Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: rinafelicitas10@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted: 31 July 2025
Revised: 20 August 2025
Accepted: 25 November 2025
Published: 02 December 2025

Keywords:
Cambridge textbook, CLIL, EYL

ABSTRACT

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) offers a strategic approach to developing students' English language proficiency and knowledge of other areas. Originally popular in European learning settings, CLIL has recently gained attention in the Indonesian EFL context. This study examines how 3rd-grade students perceive learning using CLIL through the Cambridge textbook *Guess What*. A quantitative approach was used with 66 third-grade students in a private Catholic elementary school. They filled out a questionnaire that assessed engagement, subject comprehension, and language development. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to identify key trends in student responses. It was found that students enjoyed CLIL-based learning and demonstrated increased engagement. Another thing was that most of the students only felt that their English speaking was developed through CLIL, yet they did not feel the same way about their writing and reading skills. However, while CLIL facilitated better comprehension of other subjects, many students questioned the necessity of learning non-language subjects in their English class. Through the findings, this study will shed light on EFL practices in Indonesia by highlighting CLIL's benefits and challenges at the primary level. It emphasizes the need for targeted strategies to support reading and writing, alongside teacher training to maximize CLIL's effectiveness.

How to cite:
Rahmawati, C.T., Suryati, N., Amri, M.M., Setyowati, L., (2025). The 3rd Grade Students' Perception on Learning CLIL Through Cambridge's Guess What Textbook: A Pilot Study. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics,* 12(2), 890-907. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v12i2.41860

INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has gained significant attention as an innovative approach to teaching and learning, particularly in multilingual and bilingual educational settings. CLIL refers to the academic method in which the subject is taught through English, with dual-focused purposes: understanding the content and learning the language (Coyle et al., 2010; Lo & Lin, 2015; Marsh, 2002). CLIL aims to teach subject content and language simultaneously, enabling students to develop proficiency in a target language while acquiring knowledge in various academic disciplines (Bonces, 2012, Khoiriyah & Soeparto, 2022). Over the last decade, the use of CLIL has expanded globally, including in countries like Indonesia, where bilingual education is becoming increasingly prevalent, especially in schools implementing international curricula.

Historically, CLIL was known as the product of European multilingual policy in the mid-1990s which aimed to enable each European citizen speak three languages (Hemmi & Banegas, 2021). Mehisto et al. (2008) stated that the term CLIL was first coined in 1994 and then started to evolve and be promoted to all language learners, especially in Europe, from 1995 to 2006 (Mehisto et al., 2008). The popularity of CLIL continues to be a prominent approach in EFL (English as a Foreign Language), especially in European schools where many schools offer bilingual education (van Kampen et al., 2017). CLIL has also become popular in many countries and different types of schools. The primary purpose of teaching CLIL is to encourage learners to be proficient in an additional language while understanding various contents, from science to social studies, music to the arts, etc. However, throughout its practice, there seems to be a gap between CLIL specialists and policy makers as there isn't any CLIL policy made for the national level so far to equate the practice of CLIL itself (Hüttner et al., 2013; van Kampen et al., 2017).

The use of CLIL does not stop in European countries, as it has gradually been introduced in some Southeast Asian countries (Marcellino, 2008). In Indonesia's evolving educational landscape, CLIL offers a strategic approach to meet the growing demand for English proficiency alongside content knowledge (Mahmud, 2020; Tsuchiya & Murillo, 2019; Setyaningrum & Khoiriyah, 2022; Yufrizal, 2021). Mahmud (2020) tried conceptualizing the implementation of bilingual education through CLIL. He revealed that CLIL was relevant and applicable in Indonesia due to its relevance to the Indonesian context. As the goal of CLIL was to enable students whose proficiency levels were low to achieve native-like proficiency through instruction, thus the materials should be based on the proficiency level itself. Since research shows that CLIL is suitable for Indonesian education, it is highly suggested to apply CLIL, especially at the primary levels due to time efficiency and effectiveness (Waloyo et al.,

2021). It was also highlighted that throughout CLIL, students improved their language skills and global insight into the content (Norhasanah & Setiawan, 2023).

To fulfil the high demand for CLIL in Indonesia, some schools, particularly those that use international curricula, have started to pay attention to practicing this teaching method (Mahmud, 2020; Norhasanah & Setiawan, 2023; Yufrizal, 2021). That does not mean that CLIL can only be applied in schools using international curricula since CLIL is not curriculum-specific but rather a pedagogical strategy that can be tailored to local needs (Coyle et al., 2010). Schools that still use the national curricula can also apply CLIL in their English class. As there is no obligation for schools to choose a specific textbook in English teaching and learning, one of the opportunities to apply CLIL can come by using the Cambridge *Guess What* series for elementary learners. This *Guess What* series was chosen as it has a structured integration of English with various subjects and many interactive activities. Moreover, the *Guess What* series provides specific CLIL content in each unit. For instance, "At the Beach" is the topic used in *Guess What* Grade 3 Unit 8. The vocabularies of unit 8 are about things that people can see at the beach and focus on developing students' understanding on possessive adjectives (language). Yet, at the end of Unit 8, there is a CLIL section for Math under the topic "are sea animals symmetrical?". To provide a rich context for the implementation of CLIL, the *Guess What* series is designed for students to learn English while simultaneously developing knowledge on certain topics such as science, geography, culture, arts, and so on. This dual focus aligns with the goals of CLIL, which encourages students to learn through immersion in the subject matter while enhancing their language abilities.

Overall, CLIL has shown promise in Indonesia, but its success heavily depends on adequate preparation, teacher support, and resources to ensure its effectiveness in improving both language proficiency and subject knowledge. Yet, regardless of all the promised benefits CLIL has promised, it can give negative impacts on children's attitudes and motivation to learn of not carefully implemented (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2015; Khoiriyah, 2021). Seikkula-Leino (2007) has noted that non-CLIL students could understand the content better as learning it with the combination of their mother language put them in a better position than CLIL students (Seikkula-Leino, 2007). Another thing that has been recorded in this study is that CLIL students are prone to have low self-esteem as they are frequently exposed to language that is above their competence. Smit (2008) also stated that CLIL might put a burden on the students in terms of difficult tasks (Smit, 2008). Consequently, taking into account to all of the negative impacts that might arise on CLIL practice, schools and teachers face the burden to select and adapt materials appropriately. While the Cambridge *Guess What* series is designed with integrated CLIL content and represents a potential solution for Indonesian schools, there is a distinct lack of empirical, localized research investigating its actual effectiveness from the students' perspective.

To address this gap, this research focuses on how CLIL is implemented in Indonesian elementary schools through the Cambridge *Guess What* series. It explores the perceived effect of using the *Guess What* CLIL textbook on student engagement, comprehension, and language development, especially within the framework of Indonesia's bilingual education goals. By examining how Cambridge's *Guess What* textbook acts as the primary material used in teaching CLIL. Additionally, it looks at the experiences of 3rd-grade students learning through "Guess What' materials. This research is intended to find 1) How do 3rd-grade students perceive their engagement and learning experience when taught through CLIL using the Cambridge *Guess What* textbook?, 2) To what extent do students feel the *Guess What* textbook helps them in understanding other subject?, and 3) How do students perceive the impact of CLIL through the *Guess What* textbook on their English language skills?.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study employed a quantitative research design utilizing a survey design to systematically examine 3rd-grade students' perceptions of CLIL implementation through the Cambridge *Guess What* textbook. As articulated by Creswell (2009) quantitative approaches are particularly appropriate when investigating measurable phenomena within educational settings, allowing for objective analysis of patterns and relationships (Creswell, 2009). The survey methodology was selected based on its ability to efficiently collect standardized data from the target population while minimizing researcher interference in natural classroom environments (Fowler, 2014).

The research design incorporated several key characteristics of rigorous quantitative studies. First, it maintained a structured, predetermined approach to data collection, ensuring consistency across all participants (Check & Schutt, 2012). Second, the design facilitated the examination of multiple variables simultaneously which include engagement levels, content comprehension, and language development. It also controls for extraneous factors through standardized administration procedures (Ponto, 2015). Third, the quantitative framework enabled the use of descriptive statistics to identify central tendencies and variability in student responses, providing a robust foundation for concluding the CLIL implementation.

Population and sample

This research was conducted in a private school in East Java at the primary education level. For the ethical considerations, disclosing the school could indirectly reveal identities (e.g., small private schools with unique programs). Thus, the school's identity was withheld per ethical guidelines. The reason why this specific school was chosen was that this school uses Cambridge's *Guess What* book for the English

learning content. As the population of this study was a number of 457 students in the school, the samples that were taken for this research were 72 3rd-grade students. As taken from Singh (2006), there are two types of sampling, which are probability sampling and non-probability sampling (as cited in Apriani et al., 2024). This study used purposive non-probability sampling, which enables all students to be a part of this study. CLIL is taught from 1st up to 6th grade, yet, as a previous study mentioned, CLIL only benefits older learners (Lorenzo et al., 2010). This study wanted to try out how CLIL affects young learners. 3rd grade was chosen as it is important to find the youngest group of students while paying attention to their ability to fill out a questionnaire correctly.

Instruments

The instrument used in this study is a closed-ended questionnaire that should be filled out by the sample of this study. Only a questionnaire was used in the study due to the time limitation given by the school regulation, which made an interview impossible. The questionnaire was specifically made for this study as the existing questionnaire related to CLIL did not portray the involvement of Cambridge *Guess What* and did not suit the population of this study, the primary level students (as can be seen in Table 1). Using a 4-point Likert scale, starting from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree, the pilot test was held. It was conducted in two processes. The first process was to establish face validity (Collingridge, 2014), which was obtained by getting an expert validity. An English for Young Learners (EYL) expert evaluated the questionnaire instrument by filling out the "Survey Instrument Validation Rating Scale" which was adopted from Oducado (2020) (Oducado, 2020).

Table 1. Blueprint of the questionnaire

Aspect	Number of Items	Total of Items
Students' engagement and learning experience	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	5
Understanding of subject	6, 7, 8	3
Content English language proficiency	9, 10, 11	3

After gaining face validity through the expert, the researcher took the second step by conducting a pilot study involving ten students: five girls and five boys. Using this dataset, the researcher tried to find the validity through Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC) and the reliability using Cronbach's Alpha. As for the validity of the questionnaire, corrected item-total correlation was utilized to represent the correlation between a given item and all other items. Item-total correlation of 0.30 and 0.49 indicates a medium correlation, while higher than 0.50 depicts a strong correlation (Raharjanti et al., 2022). Then, Cronbach's Alpha, a statistic used to determine the reliability of instruments in research, was used to see the reliability of

the questionnaire (Kamis & Lynch, 2024). The questionnaire consists of 11 questions with Likert-scale items, which are 1) students' engagement and learning experience, 2) understanding of subject, and 3) content English language proficiency.

To ensure the validity and reliability of each section of the questionnaire corresponding to the three research questions, the researchers conducted separate statistical analyses for each part. In the first section, which measured students' engagement and learning experience, the Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC) analysis revealed that Item 2 had a very weak correlation (0.104) with the other items in this section, indicating it did not align well with the overall construct being measured. Following the removal of this problematic item, the reliability analysis showed a significant improvement, with Cronbach's Alpha coefficient increasing to 0.959 for the remaining five items. This high reliability score demonstrates excellent internal consistency among the questions in this section. Thus, from six questions, one question was eliminated as it was not related to the rest of the questions.

Table 2. Reliability statistics section 1

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.959	5

For the second section of the questionnaire, which assessed students' understanding of subject content, the researchers performed a similar validation process. The Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC) analysis identified that Question 8 demonstrated only a moderate correlation with the other items in this section. Since this medium-strength correlation suggested that Q8 did not strongly align with the overall construct, it was determined that removing this item would enhance the section's validity. After eliminating Q8, the reliability analysis for the remaining three items (Q7, Q9, and Q10) yielded a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.926. This high reliability score indicates excellent internal consistency among the questions in this modified section, confirming that the three retained items effectively measured students' understanding of subject content without the less correlated question.

Table 3. Reliability statistics section two

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.926	3

As for the section three, which focuses on students' language skills, it was obtained that Cronbach's Alpha was 0.871. Even though the correlation between Q11 and the rest of the questions was relatively medium, it was necessary to include question related to speaking skills in the questionnaire. Moreover, in the Item Total Statistics table, Cronbach's Alpha would not increase significantly if one of the items was removed. Thus, the researchers kept Section 3 as it was.

Table 4. Reliability statistics section three

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.738	.807	3

From the CITC and Cronbach's Alpha, two questions were considered invalid. Therefore, the researcher would only use eleven questions for the data collection process.

Data collection

Before the survey was done, the researcher obtained the permission from all parties involved to make sure that this research was ethically conducted and compliance with the educational regulations. It was also stated in the printed questionnaire that the data gotten from this survey would be kept confidential and would only be used for the study. Then, the data were taken from the students after finishing Unit 3 in the textbook. As learning process utilizing CLIL-based lessons using the *Guess What* textbook has been done in the targeted school, then the students were asked to fill a questionnaire related to the CLIL content that they have learned. When filling the questionnaire, guidance was given to the students to ensure that they understand the questions.

Data analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to identify trends and patterns in student responses. As quoted by Cooksey (2020), descriptive statistics can use either some pictorial or graphical representation of the data (Cooksey, 2020). The data were evaluated to determine:

1. The level of student engagement and motivation when learning through CLIL.
2. The perceived impact on both English proficiency and understanding of subject content (e.g., science, geography).
3. The language proficiency that students got through CLIL.

Average scores for each section will be calculated, and responses will be grouped to identify any significant variations in perception based on factors such as prior English exposure or learning preferences.

RESULTS

In the data collection process, 69 of 72 respondents were obtained in this study as the other 3 students did not come to school that day. After getting this data, the researcher cleaned the received data by checking for missing values and ensuring the data were coded correctly and consistently across the dataset. During the process, four datasets were omitted as they were incomplete.

Students' engagement and learning experience

In section one, it could be seen that students tend to choose agree to strongly agree when it came to their engagement and happiness in using the *Guess What* textbook. Table 4 highlights how students enjoy CLIL through the *Guess What* series (Item 1 and Item 4). The high motivation of learning can also be seen in Item 2 and Item 3. Whereas Item 5 shows that most of the students agreed that CLIL helps them in learning language as well as the content, rather than impeding comprehension due to language barriers. While students acknowledged CLIL's dual benefits (Item 1 – Item 4), Item 5 shows the lowest mean score and the highest SD that suggests some students may not fully recognize the value of integrating non-language subjects into English class (Item 5).

The standard deviation in each item also indicates the degree of consistency in students' responses (how diverse the responses are). Item 1, 3, and 4 with lower standard deviations showcase that most students responded similarly to the items (mostly agreed or strongly agrees with little variation in the responses). Conversely, higher SD in Item 2 and 5 indicate that the responses for these items were more diverse and varied.

Table 5. Students' engagement and learning experience

Name	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 1	I enjoy learning English through the *Guess What* textbook.	65	3.40	.553
Item 2	I look forward to English lessons that use the *Guess What* textbook.	65	3.40	.666
Item 3	I feel more motivated to learn English when it is combined with other subjects (e.g., science, geography	65	3.32	.533
Item 4	I enjoy participating in group activities during CLIL lessons through *Guess What*.	65	3.45	.588
Item 5	I think learning English through the *Guess What* textbook helps	65	3.15	.667

	me in both English and other subjects.

Understanding of subject

In section two, "Understanding of Subject," there was a contradiction among the three items. For item 6, students tend to think that this textbook somewhat helps them understand topics from other subjects, likely due to its multimodal approach (visuals, activities), as can be seen in Item 7. Item 6 and 7 display a pretty similar result in terms of the mean and the SD. It can be interpreted that students have a relatively same opinion in these items. Yet, when asked whether they liked it or not, the majority of students stated that they preferred to learn just English in their English class. Item 8 (SD = 0.916) reveals highly diverse responses which indicate that not all students are comfortable integrating content subjects into English lesson (M = 2.94). These contradictory responses may reflect cognitive overload (Ahern, 2014), which might be caused by the high difficulty of the tasks. Unlike section one which items have some lower SDs, the SDs in this section are relatively high.

Table 6. Understanding of Subject

Name	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 6	Learning with the *Guess What* textbook helps me understand topics in other subjects (e.g. Science, geography, art, etc.)	65	3.28	.650
Item 7	The visuals and activities in the textbook help me understand the subject topics better.	65	3.26	.644
Item 8	I prefer learning subjects like Science and Geography in my English class than just English.	65	2.94	.916

English language proficiency

Lastly, in section three, "English Language Proficiency", students felt that this book only helped them in terms of speaking and vocabulary enrichment. CLIL's immersive context enhanced oral skills and vocabulary, consistent with prior research (Kovacikova, 2019; Gierlinger & Wagner, 2016). Even though most students chose agree or strongly agree when it comes to listening and speaking skills, most students disagreed that the *Guess What* textbook played a role in boosting their confidence in reading and writing. The lowest score in this section reflects that the *Guess What* textbook has limitation in literacy-focused supplements for students.

Table 7. English language proficiency

Name	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 9	Learning CLIL through *Guess What* helps me improve my speaking skills in English.	65	3.25	.730
Item 10	My vocabulary has improved because of the *Guess What* lessons.	65	3.22	.739
Item 11	I feel more confident reading and writing in English because of CLIL lessons in the *Guess What* textbook.	65	2.97	.684

Overall, the findings indicate that while CLIL-based learning through the *Guess What* textbook positively influences student engagement and speaking proficiency, there are gaps in reading and writing development. Although students appreciate the integration of subject content with English learning, they do not always recognize its necessity. These insights suggest that while CLIL offers benefits in fostering communication skills and subject comprehension, additional support is needed to enhance literacy skills. Future studies could explore how tailored instructional approaches and supplementary reading and writing activities might bridge this gap and improve the effectiveness of CLIL in young learners' education.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) using the Cambridge *Guess What* textbook among 3rd-grade students in an Indonesian context. Overall, the results indicate that students generally had positive perceptions of learning through CLIL, with notable improvements in their engagement, understanding of subject content, and English language proficiency. These outcomes collectively suggest that the *Guess What* materials effectively operationalize core CLIL principles by successfully integrating language learning with subject content learning.

A key strength identified was the high level of student engagement. The high mean scores in the students' engagement section suggested that they found learning English through the *Guess What* textbook engaging and motivating. Activities integrating English with subjects such as science, geography, or even music enhanced students' learning enthusiasm. These results showed that learners' engagement was developed through the implementation of CLIL (Heras & Lasagabaster, 2015; Lasagabaster, 2011). Results from the questionnaire showcased that students enjoyed learning through the *Guess What* textbook and felt motivated to learn CLIL. This finding supported the existing theory that an appropriate and well-designed textbook would affect students' CLIL experiences (López-Medina, 2021). As the textbook is

well-crafted and suitable for students' fundamental skills in English, they do not have low self-esteem in learning or dealing with the contents integrated with the English lesson. In addition, Sylvén and Thompson (2015) also highlighted that this high motivation and engagement are crucial factors in English vocabulary acquisition which is associated with the result in Table 5 (M = 3.22, SD = 0.739) (Sylvén & Thompson, 2015).

However, result that was gotten from Item 5 with the lowest mean score in section 1 slightly indicates that there is a potential cognitive overload (Ahern, 2014) or lack of explicit connection between language and content in instruction. This result is in line to Nikula et al. (2013) who have mentioned that language learning is frequently assumed happen automatically through content which then neglect the metacognitive strategies (Nikula et al., 2013). Morton (2018) has also stated how teachers lack of training often failed to link subject concepts to language forms (Morton, 2018). In order to dig more into Item 5, another study focusing on teachers in teaching CLIL needs to be conducted.

Beyond that, students reported improved comprehension of non-language subjects due to the visuals and activities in the textbook. This highlighted the effectiveness of CLIL in supporting content understanding alongside language acquisition. However, the slightly lower score for preferring subject integration (M = 2.95, SD = 0.916) indicated a potential need for more tailored or balanced approaches to combining subject content with language learning, ensuring students feel equally supported in both areas (Coyle et al., 2010). While students found CLIL motivating and engaging, simultaneously processing both content knowledge and language skills might make students feel cognitive overload (Otwinowska & and Foryś, 2017; Smit, 2008). The high motivation does not eliminate the possibility that students feel overwhelmed by the complexity of the materials or the high-level tasks in CLIL. However, it is important to note that these cognitive challenges may contribute to long-term developmental benefits. As demonstrated in studies by Admiraal et al. (2006), CLIL students often develop enhanced cognitive flexibility and superior problem-solving skills compared to their non-CLIL peers (Admiraal et al., 2006). This cognitive advantage stems precisely from the need to constantly navigate between linguistic and content-based demands, which appears to train more versatile thinking skills (Lasagabaster, 2011; Lorenzo et al., 2010). The current findings raise important questions about the specific factors contributing to students' reservations about subject integration. As suggested by Otwinowska and Foryś (2015), these could stem from either the design of instructional materials (in this case, the *Guess What* textbook) or from implementation factors in classroom practice. Previous research by Mehisto (2012) has shown that CLIL success depends heavily on both material quality and teacher methodology (Mehisto et al., 2008). Therefore, future research should investigate these variables more systematically, potentially drawing on frameworks like the CLIL Teacher's

Competences Grid (Bertaux et al., 2010) or the Matrix for CLIL Material Evaluation (Coyle et al., 2010) to identify specific areas for improvement as mentioned in the result for section 1.

Finally, this study highlighted is that CLIL positively impacts students' English proficiency, particularly in speaking and vocabulary development. These findings align with previous research emphasizing the role of CLIL in promoting language proficiency through contextualized learning (Belenkova, 2014; Cañado & Lancaster, 2017). When it comes to speaking, Kovacikova (2019) mentioned that CLIL helps students overcome professional vocabulary and pronunciation challenges (Kovacikova, 2019). In line with the enhanced speaking skills, students also felt the benefits of using CLIL in learning many new vocabularies through the textbook. Heras and Lasagabaster (2015) also stated that CLIL modules helped students in learning technical content-related vocabulary than non-CLIL students (Heras & Lasagabaster, 2015). This difference might happen due to the variations in the amount and type of exposure to the targeted language in which CLIL shows greater and more varied exposure (Castellano-Risco et al., 2020). By using CLIL, students can broaden their word bank as it incorporates subject-specific vocabulary that traditional EFL instruction often overlooks. Gierlinger and Wagner (2016) also stated that CLIL has shown its role as a linguistics input towards students' vocabulary growth (Gierlinger & Wagner, 2016). Nonetheless, the lower score in confidence for reading and writing suggests areas where additional support. This anomaly might happen due to the content provided by the Cambridge *Guess What* textbook. In the book, the CLIL section is provided in form of listening and repeating, and then watching a video. As the book does not provide any text to be read or task to write, thus students do not feel any significant improvement in their writing and reading skills. To address this matter, adding focused exercises or teacher guidance could be beneficial.

As a final point, the findings of this study show that the implementation of CLIL through the Cambridge *Guess What* textbook offers significant benefits for young EFL learners, particularly in fostering engagement, motivation, content comprehension, and vocabulary acquisition. While some challenges such as potential cognitive overload and limited development of reading and writing skills were identified, these do not diminish the overall positive impact of CLIL. Rather, they highlight the importance of careful material design and teacher support to ensure a balanced integration of content and language

CONCLUSION

This study highlighted the potential of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) as a method for enhancing both language proficiency and subject knowledge in primary education. By utilizing the Cambridge *Guess What* textbook, students

showed increased engagement, improved understanding of subject content, and notable progress in English language skills, particularly in speaking and vocabulary. The textbook itself has successfully made students engaged and motivated to CLIL with the help of the visuals, activities, and group works. While the findings underscored the benefits of utilizing CLIL through the *Guess What* textbook, there are several areas that need attention, such as building confidence in reading and writing as well as how to deal with cognitive overload.

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, due to time constraints imposed by school regulations, the research relied solely on quantitative data from questionnaires, which limited the depth of insights that could have been gained through qualitative methods such as interviews or classroom observations. Second, the small sample size of 65 participants from a single private school in Malang may affect the generalizability of the findings to other educational contexts in Indonesia. Third, the study focused exclusively on student perceptions, omitting the perspectives of teachers, whose instructional strategies and experiences with CLIL could provide valuable context for interpreting the results.

To build on this research, future studies could adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining surveys with interviews or focus groups to gain deeper insights into both student and teacher experiences with CLIL. Expanding the sample size and including multiple schools with varying curricula would enhance the generalizability of findings. Longitudinal research could also be beneficial to assess the long-term effects of CLIL on language proficiency and content mastery. Additionally, comparative studies between CLIL and non-CLIL classrooms could help identify best practices for integrating language and subject learning. Finally, investigating targeted interventions, such as supplementary reading and writing exercises or teacher training programs, could address the gaps in literacy skills observed in this study and further optimize CLIL's effectiveness in primary education. New chat

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper and that this paper was ethically conducted.

AUTHOR (S) CONTRIBUTION

Chatarina Tri Rahmawati: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing (Original Draft, Review, and Editing). **Nunung Suryati**: Methodology, Writing (Review and Editing), Supervision. **M Misbahul Amri**: Methodology, Writing (Review & Editing), Supervision. **Lestari Setyowati**: Validation, Supervision, Project Administration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to all those who have supported and contributed to the completion of this research. Our sincere appreciation goes to our colleagues and research participants for their collaboration and insightful feedback during the study. Special thanks to the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions that greatly enhanced the quality of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G. J., & De Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803610500392160

Ahern, A. (2014). *Integration of theory and practice in CLIL* (Vols. 1–28). Brill.

Apriani, D., Annisa, A., & Prastowo, F. (2024). Risks of freedom of speech and democracy in social media: case study of Bima content creator criticizing Lampung government. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Contemporary Risk Studies, ICONIC-RS 2023, 21-22 September 2023, Bali, Indonesia*. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.21-9-2023.2345670

Belenkova, N. (2014). CLIL approach in foreign language speaking skills development. In *Conference Proceeding: 7th Conference Edition. Florence, Italy, 13-14 November 2014* (7th ed.). Liberia Universitaria. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=PZdsBQAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

Bertaux, P., Coonan, C. M., Frigols-Martín, M. J., & Mehisto. (2010). *The CLIL teacher's competences grid*. https://tplusm.net/CLIL_Competences_Grid_31.12.09.pdf

Bonces, J. R. (2012). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Considerations in the colombian Context*. *6*.

Cañado, M. L. P., & Lancaster, N. K. (2017). The effects of CLIL on oral comprehension and production: A longitudinal case study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *30*(3), 300–316. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2017.1338717

Castellano-Risco, I., Alejo-González, R., & Piquer-Píriz, A. M. (2020). The development of receptive vocabulary in CLIL vs EFL: Is the learning context the main variable? *System*, *91*, 102263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102263

Collingridge, D. (2014, September 23). Validating a questionnaire. *Sage Research Methods Community*. https://researchmethodscommunity.sagepub.com/blog/validating-a-questionnaire

Cooksey, R. W. (2020). Descriptive statistics for summarising data. In R. W. Cooksey (Ed.), *Illustrating Statistical Procedures: Finding Meaning in Quantitative Data* (pp. 61–139). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-2537-7_5

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and language integrated learning. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=9MfuzgEACAAJ

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Rulinawaty-Kasmad/publication/342328830_THIRD_EDITION/links/5eed839ca6fdcc73be8d869e/THIRD-EDITION.pdf

Fowler, F. J. (2014). Survey research method (5th ed.). Centre for Survey Research, University of Massachusetts. https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Survey_Research_Methods.html?id=GcKhAQAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y

Gierlinger, E. M., & Wagner, T. A. (2016). The more the merrier – revisiting CLIL-based vocabulary growth in secondary education. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, *9*(1), 37–63. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2016.9.1.3

Hemmi, C., & Banegas, D. (2021). *CLIL: An Overview* (pp. 1–20). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70095-9_1

Heras, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2015). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(1), 70–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541736

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 267–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777385

Kamis, C., & Lynch, S. (2024). *Cronbach's Alpha*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036917133

Khoiriyah, K. (2021). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Indonesian Context: an Overview. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, *11*(3), 587–601. https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v11.i3.202110

Khoiriyah,K. & Soeparto. (2022). Language learning strategies in online CLIL-oriented classrooms: Voices from Indonesian higher education students. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing Dan Sastra*, *6*(2), 479–496.

Kovacikova, E. (2019). Development of speaking at primary schools through CLIL. *XLinguae*, *12*(2), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2019.12.02.02

Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *5*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2010.519030

Lasagabaster, D., & Doiz, A. (2015). A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on affective factors. *Applied Linguistics*, amv059. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv059

Lo, Y. Y., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2015). Special issue: Designing multilingual and multimodal CLIL frameworks for EFL students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(3), 261–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.988111

López-Medina, B. (2021). On the development of a CLIL textbook evaluation checklist: A focus group study. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, *25*(1).

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*(3), 418–442. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp041

Mahmud, Y. (2020). Conceptualizing bilingual education programs through CLIL and genre-based approach: An Indonesian context. *VELES Voices of English Language Education Society*, *4*(1), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v4i1.2005

Marcellino, M. (2008). English language teaching in Indonesia: A continuous challenge in education and cultural diversity. *TEFLIN*, *19*(1), 57–69. https://doi.org/10.15639/ teflinjournal.v19i1/57-69

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE - The European Dimension*. UniCOM. https://www.ecml.at/Portals/1/resources/Articles%20and%20publications%20on%20the%20ECML/CLIL_EMILE.pdf

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education. *Macmillan Education*. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=amvGGAAACAAJ

Morton, T. (2018). Reconceptualizing and describing teachers' knowledge of language for content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(3), 275–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1383352

Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C., & García, A. L. (2013). CLIL classroom discourse: Research from Europe. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *1*(1), 70–100. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.04nik

Norhasanah, & Setiawan, R. (2023). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) implementation for Indonesian EFL learners: A Case Study. *SAGA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.21460/saga.2023.42.165

Oducado, R. M. F. (2020). *Survey instrument validation rating scale* [Https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm?abstractid=3789575]. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/nur.20147

Otwinowska, A., & and Foryś, M. (2017). They learn the CLIL way, but do they like it? Affectivity and cognition in upper-primary CLIL classes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *20*(5), 457–480. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1051944

Ponto, J. (2015). Understanding and evaluating survey research. *Journal of the Advanced Practitioner in Oncology*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.6004/jadpro.2015.6.2.9

Raharjanti, N. W., Wiguna, T., Purwadianto, A., Soemantri, D., Indriatmi, W., Poerwandari, E. K., Mahajudin, M. S., Nugrahadi, N. R., Roekman, A. E., Saroso, O. J. D. A., Ramadianto, A. S., & Levania, M. K. (2022). Translation, validity and reliability of decision style scale in forensic psychiatric setting in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, *8*(7), e09810. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09810

Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). CLIL Learning: Achievement levels and affective factors. *Language and Education*, *21*(4), 328–341. https://doi.org/10.2167/le635.0

Setyaningrum, R. W., & Khoiriyah, K. (2022). Core features of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): An exploratory study in Indonesian primary schools. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *46*(3), 1–13.

Smit, U. (2008). The AILA research network – CLIL and immersion classrooms: Applied linguistic perspectives. *Language Teaching - LANG TEACH*, *41*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004922

Sylvén, L., & Thompson, A. S. (2015). Language learning motivation and CLIL: Is there a connection? *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *3*(1).

Tsuchiya, K., & Murillo, M. D. P. (Eds.). (2019). *Content and Language Integrated Learning in Spanish and Japanese Contexts: Policy, Practice and Pedagogy*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27443-6

van Kampen, E., Meirink, J., Admiraal, W., & Berry, A. (2017). Do we all share the same goals for content and language integrated learning (CLIL)? Specialist and practitioner perceptions of 'ideal' CLIL pedagogies in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *23*(8), 855–871. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1411332

Waloyo, A. A., Khoiriyah, K., & Farah, R. R. (2021). Teachers' Perception to CLIL and web-based material implementation in an elementary school. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *9*(2), 227–234. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v9i2.4347

Yufrizal, H. (2021). The impact of project based-CLIL on students' English proficiency. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *15*(1), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v15i1.15692