

## Applying content and language integrated learning in legal English classes: A Vietnamese perspective

Thanh-Huong Nhap

Hanoi Law University, Vietnam

To develop learners' competence for subject-specific terms and language skills, many teaching approaches have been implemented in teaching and learning English for specific purposes (ESP). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is one of such methods expected to achieve this goal in tertiary education contexts. However, the correlation between language students' and teachers' views on the issue of CLIL in ESP teaching and learning has received inadequate attention from educational scholars. This study, therefore, aimed to examine both teachers' and learners' perspectives on the application of CLIL in teaching and learning legal English. The research used survey questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with 243 students attending legal English courses together with seven instructors of legal English. The results illustrated a general congruence between learners' and teachers' high appreciation of the benefits from CLIL principles implementation in legal English classes. In other aspects, the findings show that two sets of the participants have met obstacles concerning content knowledge for specific law areas. Moreover, English instructors are also struggling in the preparation of teaching materials and activities for their lessons. Such findings set practical pedagogical implications for language educators in ESP teaching and learning.

### Introduction

The success of language teaching and learning processes is highly influenced by a number of factors, one of which is the teaching method implemented. Therefore, more and more attention has been paid by scholars and researchers to identify effective teaching methods in language classes. One of the current approaches which gains much attention from language educators is the application of *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL). CLIL is deemed to be an umbrella term, referring to an innovative educational approach by which a subject is taught in an additional language (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010). Dale and Tanner (2012) stated that CLIL demonstrates considerable educational potential as it offer great benefits for learners, teachers and educational institutions.

In the field of English for specific purposes (ESP), due to its growing importance in globalised contexts, CLIL has also been seen as an alternative approach to enhance learners' English language competence related to specific fields. Yang (2016: 46) stated that "ESP has the single main aim of teaching and learning a foreign language, while CLIL places importance on content matter as well as on the status of the language but this does not make them two absolute opposites". Both ESP and CLIL aim for the development of the four language skills, which makes them complementary. Actually, in ESP classes, learners expect to develop both their language competence and content knowledge, which can be catered for with the use of CLIL method. It is widely believed that one of the major reasons for the application of CLIL in ESP language teaching is that it offers students opportunities to acquire English language in a meaningful way related to specific

fields. Through this resource, learners' capacity for acquisition of target language, language proficiency and the retention of subject knowledge are achieved simultaneously.

Over the past decades, CLIL has been widely adopted in educational institutions in European countries, which is thought to promote motivated and sustained learning attainment (Marsh, 2000). In recent years, CLIL is becoming more and more popular in Asian and Latin American contexts (Banegas, 2011). An increasing number of empirical studies on CLIL principles have been conducted across disciplines at different levels of education in a variety of academic contexts and linguistic backgrounds (e.g., Crosman, 2018; Fazzi & Lasagabaster, 2021; Hurajova, 2021; Kalay, 2021; Kang et al., 2010; Kanoksilapatham & Khamkhien, 2022; Kao, 2022; Mahan, 2020; Navarro-Guzman et al., 2021; Tsagkari, 2019; Thuy & Nguyen, 2016). In Vietnam, with the release of the *Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages in the National Educational System, Period 2008-2020* project, also known as Project 2020, students are required to be capable of confidently and independently using a foreign language related to their specialism to get access to the global labour market.

In the case of teaching legal English (LE), a type of ESP with distinctive features, instructors have realised the importance of both language and content learning, thus CLIL application is readily understood. Actually, CLIL is not a new method in itself, yet its implementation in LE class is a new approach among teachers as well as learners. Linked to this, teachers' attitudes towards CLIL require consideration, as what teachers do, what activities are applied in class, tend to be controlled by their perceptions. At the same time, investigating learners' perspectives of CLIL is needed, to clarify their correlation with teachers' perspectives. However, such types of research on this aspect have not yet received sufficient interest from scholars in ESP higher education. This study, therefore, aims at filling this gap by exploring learners' and teachers' perceptions of CLIL in LE classes in Vietnam. The findings are expected to be of great value to both LE instructors and learners in the process of delivering and acquiring language knowledge and skills related to specific law areas.

## **Literature review**

### **CLIL in tertiary contexts**

English language teaching has shifted from teaching English as a foreign/second language (EFL/ ESL), to teaching *English for Specific Purposes* (ESP), *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL), and then using *English as a Medium of Instruction* (EMI) (Carrió-Pastor, 2021). Among those approaches, CLIL, EMI have been recently promoted by higher education institutions with the aim of educating highly qualified academic and professional students (Tri & Moskovsky, 2019). EMI is defined as "The use of the English language to teach academic subjects [other than English itself] in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English." (Dearden, 2014:2). CLIL, according to Marsh et al. (2012: 9), refers to "any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language". It can be observed that EMI focuses on content knowledge while

CLIL balances between content and language skills. In the literature, research has shown that the implementation of EMI has brought benefits to learners, yet raised a number of problems concerning either students' or content lecturers' insufficient English capacity for specific discipline (Carrió-Pastor, 2021). In such situations, CLIL principles prove to be worthy. Understandably, CLIL principles imply that a subject teacher is required to learn the additional language to use it as the medium of instruction when teaching the subject. Likewise, language teachers are in need of being equipped with the knowledge of the subject content if CLIL is to be successfully adopted.

While CLIL has been applied worldwide to teach the content of a subject, though CLIL courses are mostly delivered by content teachers with an adequate foreign language competence instead of language teachers. Therefore, it seems in the literature the majority of the research on CLIL has been devoted to investigating the perspectives of learners and subject-teachers, and their actual practices of CLIL application in content classes rather than language classes (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Bedir, 2013; Dafouz, Núñez, Sancho & Foran, 2007; Nuñez Asomoza, 2015; Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015). Specifically, the aforementioned studies share similar findings in participants' positive attitudes towards CLIL application, in spite of the possible obstacles in terms of learners' insufficient English knowledge to understand the subject matter as well as lack of subject background knowledge. In order to counter such problems, several aspects regarding CLIL learning materials and lecturers' teaching methods need to be addressed (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012; Nuñez Asomoza, 2015).

In the settings of ESP learning and teaching, the implementation of CLIL principles has raised controversial issues. The majority of researchers hold their negative viewpoints on the concurrence between CLIL and ESP for the reason that the two approaches bear greater differences than similarities. CLIL explicitly places a strong emphasis on the content while ESP emphasises providing learners with sufficient language skills to acquire content knowledge related to specific fields (Fortanet-Góme & Bellés-Fortuño, 2008). Tarnopolsky (2013) clarified that CLIL adopts a broader scope with the focus on language and content subjects, whereas ESP is usually viewed as a language course. On the other hand, other scholars believe that CLIL and ESP share a common feature in the sense that CLIL is an all-inclusive term including ESP, in which language learning is integrated with the content of a specific discipline (Riley, 2013). Both ESP and CLIL require a balance between the target language and subject matter content for effective knowledge acquisition. Therefore, ESP and CLIL tend to be closer to each other as learners are expected to acquire content knowledge in language courses, and language skills in content courses.

To some extent, CLIL is construed as an integrated ESP paradigm, which is likely to tackle the drawbacks of standard ESP method (Riley, 2013). To achieve this goal, an urgent call for collaborating between ESP and CLIL practitioners and bridging the gap between content and language teaching is required. Gonzalez Ardeo (2013) examined the coexistence of ESP and CLIL courses in a Spanish university, creating several challenges for content teachers, language teachers and learners. Similarly, Jendrych (2013) addressed how the emanation of CLIL has brought obstacles for traditional ESP teachers, as it

requires higher qualifications with both content knowledge and language skills, which might cause negative attitudes amongst language teachers, preventing them from applying CLIL principles in ESP classes. The preliminary research, moreover, illustrates that ESP teachers are not really ready to adopt CLIL approach as it requires them to cope with syllabus design, teaching materials and assessment methods (Sidorenko, Rosanova, Medvedeva & Eimulienė, 2022). Nonetheless, Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés (2015) explored the importance of language learning in CLIL programs and the implications for ESP. They proposed a program with collaboration between language and content teachers to develop learners' English proficiency. This can occur either through incorporating language in content courses, or content in ESP courses, or both, to make them more relevant to learners' needs.

In Vietnam, since the initiation of Project 2020, a number of tertiary institutions have transformed skills-focused language courses into the integration of language and content in ESP classes. LE, a type of ESP, with distinctive meaning and features poses great challenges for both learners and teachers. Additionally, legal language is created by legal systems reflecting the differences among themselves, which implies that terms are indistinguishable from law. In other words, learners are required to understand content and meaning of law itself to acquire the exact meaning of legal language. Accordingly, the inter-disciplinary requirement in LE courses is significantly higher than in other courses that call for the integration of language and subject content using a CLIL approach. However, the issue of how learners and instructors of LE view the application of CLIL principles in ESP teaching and learning is generally overlooked. Thus, to bridge this gap, this study attempts to investigate the combination of CLIL approach in the LE context from the aforesaid stakeholders' perspectives.

## **Method**

### **Study design**

Both quantitative and qualitative research approach are utilised in this study to identify the perspectives of learners and instructors on the CLIL principles application in LE classes. Specifically, the researcher-made survey questionnaire and interviews were exploited as the main data collection instrument to achieve the aims. The survey questionnaires were distributed to the target sample with their voluntary agreement making use of the snowball and purposive sampling method via the emails. Follow-up interviews were carried out either directly or virtually via the social networking sites with the assistance of zoom meetings or Microsoft *Teams* to clarify their views. The raw data collected went through screening stage before encoding with IBM *SPSS* program for the data treatment.

### **Teaching context**

The main aim of basic LE courses at Hanoi Law University is to provide students with the long-term goal of improving their LE competence as well as general concepts of legal fields. As it is an ESP course, the course is taught by language teachers.

Basic LE courses divided into 3 modules are compulsory courses for international trade and business law majors. Three modules are taught in three consecutive semesters starting from the second semester of the first year to the second year of the program. Each module occupies 42 periods during a 15 week semester. In the first two years of the undergraduate program, due to the syllabus distribution of the programs, several law subjects have been delivered to learners, namely general theory of state and law, constitutional law, and civil law, while throughout the three basic LE courses, language and skills related to ten different law fields are covered. The topics for detailed outlines are designed conforming to the themes of the two course books, namely *Professional English in Use. Law 2* (Brown & Rice, 2007), and *Introduction to international legal English* (Krois-Lindner & Firth, 2008), by Cambridge University Press. Taking into consideration all the distinctive features of LE, teaching methods based on content knowledge are accepted as the most suitable method for basic LE courses. During the courses, the main features of English/American and Vietnamese legal systems or certain fields of law in specific contexts are taught. Learners, at the same time, are acquainted with LE terms and meaningful skills practice in legal language use.

### **Participants**

Participants numbered 250 respondents, including 243 international trade and business law major students and seven instructors in basic LE classes, obtained by a stratified sampling method.

Seven LE instructors (one doctorate and six masters in English language teaching) were included in the instructor group. Notably, the seven instructors all had more than five years' experience in teaching LE. All hold LLB degrees as their second majors, which is the prerequisite requirement for teaching LE courses. Moreover, they have been equipped with the knowledge of CLIL after taking part in a continuing professional developing course focusing on CLIL.

The student group comprised 243 students (eleven of whom participated in semi-structured interviews) attending basic LE courses and specialising in international trade and business law majors. Their general English (GE) level was between B1 and B2 level assessed through a placement test before entering LE courses. Additionally, learners shared similar characteristics in terms of insufficient background knowledge of law when participating in basic LE courses as only a few law subjects have been presented to them.

### **Research instruments**

#### *Survey questionnaires*

The researcher-designed questionnaire for students and teachers was developed from those applied in Wahyuningsih et al. (2016), and Nguyen and Sercu (2021). The items in the questionnaires were based on factual and behavioural questions (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). The content of the questionnaire was evaluated by three language teaching specialists on CLIL and ESP principles. The content of the survey questionnaire was refined after administering to a pilot group of 51 students. An internal consistency test

was carried out with *SPSS* software, finding acceptable Cronbach's alpha values,  $0.852 < \alpha < 0.90$ . Moreover, all the shown correlation coefficients were significant at the 0.01 level. Therefore, the questionnaire was considered reliable and valid for what it was initially designed. (Cronbach, 1951; Gay & Airasian, 2005).

The questionnaire was arranged in two sections, demographic information of the participants (duration of their GE studying, self-assessment of their GE proficiency) and 35 items on their perceptions of CLIL implementation: (1) the benefits and necessity of CLIL in ESP learning (Items 1 - 7); (2) teaching materials (Items 8 - 16); (3) instructors and teaching methods (Items 17 - 28); and (4) assessment and evaluation (Items 29 - 35). Each item used a five-point Likert scale (strongly disagree=1; disagree=2; neutral=3; agree=4; strongly agree=5), with interpretations: 1.0-1.79 strongly disagree; 1.8-2.59 disagree; 2.6-3.39 neutral; 3.4-4.19 agree; and 4.2-5.0 strongly agree.

#### *Semi-structured interviews*

Semi-structured interviews was also conducted to gain a better interpretation of a current situation (Gay & Airasian, 2005; Siddaway et al., 2019). The two sets of questions (see Appendix) were constructed and expanded following the in-depth analysis and scrutiny of previous CLIL studies (Wahyuningsih et al., 2016; Nguyen & Sercu, 2021; Sidorenko et al., 2022).

### **Data collection and analysis**

After obtaining learners' consent to voluntarily participate in the study, the researcher provided them with the survey questionnaires in a *Google Docs* form via their email addresses in the first semester of the school year 2022–2023. The participants were invited to respond to the questionnaire within the two weeks from 1 to 15 December, 2022. The researcher also invited student participants in the follow-up semi-structured interviews, with 11 accepting.

The seven teachers' perspectives on CLIL application in LE classes were obtained through individual semi-structured interviews, each conducted in Vietnamese to assure clarity. Both direct face-to-face conversations and interviews via a social networking sites or Microsoft *Teams* were used, with recording, note taking and transcription for later analysis.

Data presentation made use of a concurrent mixed-method design. The results from the analyses of both datasets were interpreted and compared to check whether the results supported or contradicted each other. As soon as collected, the quantitative data went through a careful data screening process to obtain the targeted number, including 243 students in the first group of the study population. The data were processed for analysis with the support of IBM *SPSS* program to calculate means (M) and standard deviations (SD) values of 35 items to characterise learners' perspectives towards the benefits and necessity of CLIL, teaching materials, instructors and teaching methods, assessment and evaluation. Means in the range 1.0-1.79 were characterised as very low, 1.8-2.59 as low, 2.6-3.39 as neutral, 3.4-4.19 as high, and 4.2-5.0 as very high.

Interview recordings were transcribed verbatim to address learners' and teachers' perspectives. The data were coded thematically according to the interview questions guides. An interpretive description method was used to analyse the coded data.

## Findings

Data collected in the first section of the questionnaire illustrated that the group is notably homogeneous in regard to both duration of their study and their self-evaluation of GE competence. Incredibly, most of the respondents have been studying English language for up to 10 years (69.6%), and the rests over 10 years (30.4%). They self-assessed their English language capacity as follows: good (30.2%), very good (52.2%), and excellent (17.6%). Such statistics indicate that their level of GE is clearly not a hindrance to their LE studying. Concerning their legal knowledge before starting LE, all of the respondents asserted that they had little background law knowledge of law and LE language. Thus the majority of students were beginners in studying LE and legal content.

Data from the second part of the questionnaire showed a high proportion of the respondents (93%) believing in the importance of being equipped with the knowledge of the legal system of their home country before starting to learn and master LE language and skills. Similarly, a high proportion (95%) assessed the provision of knowledge of English legal systems and terms as significantly important. As noted, the majority of surveyed students expressed their view on the necessity of legal background knowledge in order to acquire LE successfully. Therefore, it can be concluded that knowledge of the legal systems and terms of both mother country and a foreign country is important to students.

### The benefits of CLIL

Investigation of students' perspectives (Table 1) showed high agreement that integrating content and language in teaching LE provided them with knowledge of language, content and learning skills ( $M=3.58$ ;  $SD=.764$ ). However, there were still many indicating that they could not see clearly the goals of CLIL principles in LE classes. In some cases, they did not distinguish the type of knowledge they obtained in LE classes. Concerning the specific benefits of CLIL in promoting learners' collaboration, critical thinking, and motivation, the agreement reached very high means ( $M=4.26$ ;  $4.12$ ;  $4.09$  respectively). Specifically, students recognised highly the positive effect of CLIL principles on their collaboration with their classmates ( $M=4.26$ ;  $SD=.742$ ), in particular, sharing the point that CLIL is useful in building and fostering their critical thinking ( $M=4.12$ ;  $SD=.928$ ) and making them to be motivated ( $M=4.09$ ;  $SD=.733$ ). Following that trend, students held high perceptions towards the enhancement of knowledge of legal terms in the sense that authentic context in CLIL approach helped to develop their vocabulary ( $M=4.26$ ;  $SD=.845$ ). In regards of their improvement in language fluency and accuracy competence, despite receiving less level of agreement, the majority of learners still asserted the roles of CLIL as they are likely to have chances to communicate in specific situations using real-life English ( $M=3.95$ ;  $SD=.859$ ). In general, learners highly appreciated the enjoyable

atmosphere in LE lessons when the specialised knowledge is provided first, followed by legal terms and grammar acquisitions (M=4.17; SD=.618).

Table 1: Students' perspectives towards the benefits of CLIL in ESP teaching (N=243)

Item	Benefits of CLIL	Mean	SD
1.	CLIL approach application in LE classes provides me with different knowledge: Language, content and learning skills.	3.58	.961
2.	CLIL in LE classes promotes my collaboration.	4.26	.845
3.	CLIL in LE classes builds and fosters my critical thinking.	4.12	.928
4.	CLIL in LE classes builds and fosters my motivation.	4.09	.733
5.	I could develop my English fluency and accuracy through using real-life English to communicate in specific situations.	3.95	.859
6.	Lessons are more enjoyable when the content is provided first, followed by grammar and terms acquisition.	4.17	.618
7.	Authentic contexts in CLIL approach help to develop a wide range of vocabulary.	4.26	.742

Evidence from the semi-structured interviews showed that students agreed that besides helping to improve their four language skills, CLIL is very necessary in providing their knowledge relating to the specific field, which often is lacking in traditional ESP language classes. Such kinds of knowledge are very practical in their future career.

I become more active and collaborative with my teammates when dealing with the real-life cases through activities such as mock trial, moot court. Not only my English competence improves but my knowledge of law does enhance. I feel so motivated in such lessons. (Student 10).

Concerning the fluency and accuracy of language use, one respondent gave a further explanation:

To me, when using language, fluency is more important than accuracy and errors are a natural part of language learning. However, in the case of LE, a type of ESP that requires the high level of accuracy, with the program of integrating content and language, I can develop both my accuracy and fluency in LE by it to communicate for legal purposes... (Student 6).

Instructors shared similar positive attitudes towards CLIL application in their LE lessons. They all believed that CLIL principles addressed the shortcomings of traditional ESP. Emphasising the importance of content in teaching LE, teacher H claimed:

The knowledge of content needs to be considered an indispensable part of teaching and learning LE. Law subject is quite complex that lay persons, even law students, find it difficult to understand. In such context, learners should be provided the knowledge of law areas before or at the time of acquiring LE.

Similarly, teacher T expressed his view:



I can see my students' motivation, collaboration when dealing with the knowledge of the law in each law area. Moreover, students are more critical when throwing themselves in dealing with projects or cases. Although their language skills may not develop much better than in traditional ESP class, their knowledge of law is surely improvable. More than that, they have chances of exploring, discovering, searching and connecting with others.

**Teaching materials**

When implementing CLIL principles in ESP classes in general and LE classes in particular, teaching and learning materials, one of the key pedagogical components, are of great importance.

Table 2: Students' perspectives on teaching materials used in LE classes (N=243)

Item	Teaching materials	Mean	SD
8.	The teaching and learning materials help me to acquire both language and content knowledge.	4.25	.835
9.	Content is more focused on than language in the teaching materials.	2.13	.467
10.	Language is more focused on than content in the current materials.	3.89	.753
11.	The teaching materials promote LE proficiency.	4.27	.637
12.	The teaching materials promote LE accuracy.	4.37	.626
13.	The teaching materials promote learners' autonomy.	3.57	.478
14.	The teaching materials promote cooperative learning.	4.02	.732
15.	The teaching materials promote critical thinking.	4.01	.921
16.	The teaching materials promote the learning in the course to be meaningful.	4.17	.725

As illustrated in Table 2, when asked whether the materials might help them to acquire both course contents and the English language, item 8 received a high rate of agreement of the students (M=4.25; SD=.835). Understandably, as LE lessons are language classes, focusing on the enhancement of learners' English skills relating to law areas, items 9-10 gained different rate of agreement. (M=2.13; SD= .467; M= 3.89; SD=.753, respectively). Relating to the strong points of teaching materials, many of the students expressed their desire for its effect on development of their autonomy (M=3.57; SD=.478), cooperative learning (M=4.02; SD=.732), critical thinking (M=4.01; SD=.921) and especially their English accuracy and fluency related to specific law areas (M=4.37; SD=.626; M=4.27; SD=.637). Following this tendency, learners believed that the teaching materials are surely to make the lessons more meaningful with the high mean rate of agreement (M=4.17; SD=.725).

Data from interviews shed light on the students' attitudes towards the teaching materials. The majority of the participants confirmed that the teaching materials are important in creating a meaningful lesson. Students 5 and 8 held similar points of view:

I, as with many other friends, learnt English since the early age. Yet, regarding English for law, or English in legal field, without the knowledge of law area, it would cause great obstacles to our understanding. With the CLIL principles, the balance of content and

language in teaching materials cater for our needs, in which both knowledge of law areas and language develop. (Student 5)

The content of teaching material is useful in helping me develop my critical thinking, operative learning in dealing with authentic legal cases. At the same time, I can improve my real-life LE, which is necessary for my future career. (Student 8)

From teachers' perspectives, they advocated equal proportions of content and language knowledge in the teaching materials, due to their vital contribution to the success of the lessons. However, most of the language teachers perceived obstacles in choosing and preparing materials for their ESP classes. For example:

Although I feel eager to apply CLIL principles in my ESP lessons due to its necessity, it is undeniable that I find it hard to adapt or adopt relevant CLIL teaching materials for my LE classes. It takes huge time and efforts. (Teacher M)

LE instructors highlighted the necessity for time and effort for preparing materials, collaborating with subject teachers, for example:

It is advisable to consult subject teachers, in this case, law teachers or law professors when choosing the CLIL materials for ESP classes. They can provide the reliable and informative sources, which are useful either for teachers to get insight into the topic or for students' knowledge of specialised subjects. (Teacher D)

On the other hand, there is also an opposing point of view when expressing an opinion about consulting help from subject teachers.

Consulting subject teachers when choosing materials is beneficial if they have knowledge of teaching language because language teaching and subject teaching are different. In some cases, subject teachers put their content knowledge in priority while under-evaluating the importance of language skills. The reading materials, for example, are too long with little knowledge in language focus. (Teacher P)

### **Instructors and teaching methods**

As regards teachers' English and content competence, the respondents gave very high ratings ( $M=4.13$ ;  $SD=.621$ ;  $M=4.02$ ;  $SD=.824$  respectively). It might be explained by the fact that all teachers partaking in the study hold English language teaching and law major degrees. The statistics also indicated that in LE classes, instructors spend more time on teaching language than content knowledge ( $M=3.89$ ;  $SD=.723$ ) while a small number of students feel that instructors spend more time on teaching content than language knowledge. When seeking their opinions on whether English teachers or subject teachers should teach their ESP class, the majority of students would prefer to be instructed by English teachers ( $M=3.86$ ;  $SD=.812$ ) rather than subject teachers ( $M=2.78$ ;  $SD=.524$ ). Such perceptions were affirmed in the interview data. In particular, two thirds of interviewees stated that if LE classes were in charge of subject teachers, it would turn into English as EMI classes where content knowledge is more emphasised. For example:

I do appreciate my LE lessons where I acquire a huge number of LE terms, which are extremely useful for my later EMI lessons. Language teachers know how to explain the terms and from this explanation, I could understand the meaning of the terms and use them in the suitable context. (Student 9)

Table 3: Students' perspectives on instructors and teaching methods (N=243)

Item	Instructors and teaching methods.	Mean	SD
17.	The instructors teaching LE have good English competence.	4.13	.621
18.	The instructors teaching LE have good knowledge in the content-subject.	4.02	.824
18.	Instructors of LE classes should be the subject teacher when applying the principles of CLIL.	2.78	.524
20.	Instructors of LE should be the English teachers when applying the principles of CLIL.	3.86	.812
21.	The instructors should use mother tongue in LE classes to explain the equivalent terms.	4.27	.646
22.	The instructors use too much mother tongue in LE classes.	14.37	.642
23.	The instructors spend much more time on teaching content than language knowledge.	3.28	.532
24.	The instructors spend much more time on teaching language than content knowledge.	3.89	.723
25.	The teachers do not need to be an "expert" in a particular subject.	3.14	.784
26.	I find oral group work presentation in content-subject issue useful.	4.12	.736
27.	I find teachers delivering lectures to explain terms and content useful.	4.32	.571
28.	I find the discussion activities useful.	4.13	.469

On the other hand, contrasting view exists when seeking learners' opinion about whether teachers are required to be experts in a particular area of law or not. It can be seen that survey respondents expressed a neutral point of view on this item ( $M=3.14$ ;  $SD=.784$ ). It also illustrates that learners expect their instructors in LE classes not only to be language teachers but to specialise in a specific law area, as well.

I think that it would be wonderful if my teachers are good at language teaching, explaining the content well and having an adequate knowledge of specialised terms. You know, law is different from other fields, thus, the instructors need to be an expert in legal fields in order to provide content knowledge accurately. (Student 4)

Concerning the teachers' use of mother tongue in LE classes, a high proportion of learners held the idea that instructors should use mother tongue to explain the equivalent terms in Vietnamese ( $M= 4.31$ ;  $SD=.826$ ). Yet learners disapproved of the item stating teachers' overuse of mother tongue when teaching LE ( $M=1.37$ ;  $SD=.642$ )

LE has its own characteristics such as the use of archaic, borrowed, formal, and technical words or phrases that I find it difficult to understand. In such cases, it is better if my teacher provides me with Vietnamese equivalents after explaining terms in English. That is much more helpful. (Student 10)

When asked about the usefulness of teaching activities, the students showed their preferences of teachers' delivering lectures activities to instruct learners with content and

LE terminology interpretation ( $M=4.32$ ;  $SD=.571$ ), followed by content discussion activities ( $M=4.13$ ;  $SD=.469$ ;) and oral presentation in content-subject ( $M=4.12$ ;  $SD=.736$ ).

In case of teachers' point of view, five had a similar preference in terms of instructors providing ESP lessons.

Collaborating with subject teachers to select or adapt content knowledge is necessary, yet I think that instructors of ESP lessons should be English teachers with second major in law because although subject teachers may have a good command of using English, they may lack teaching English methodology. Subject teachers with good knowledge of English should be the instructors of content lessons. (Teacher L)

Some teachers admitted that actually, they sometimes found it hard to explain or find Vietnamese equivalents for LE terms. In such situations, they needed to consult subject teachers. Also, there are some cases where even subject teachers could not find the exact terms in Vietnamese. Reaching high agreement on the statement that the teachers do not need to be an "expert" in a particular subject, they claimed that teachers are required to hold a law degree in order to provide students with adequate content knowledge.

I always bear in mind that I am teaching LE, the focus of our lectures is to equip learners with LE terminology and skills to use in legal contexts, thus I think that much more time should be spent on teaching and practising language skills. However, in some cases, I spend more time delivering content when my students find it hard to grasp content knowledge, which might affect their language acquisition. (Teacher H)

Anticipating the obstacles concerning their competence in content knowledge, instructors of English strongly believed it is much better for them to collaborate with content teachers for better insight into specific knowledge when implementing CLIL in ESP classes, especially in LE classes.

### **Assessment and evaluation**

Table 4 reveals the students' viewpoints on the assessment and evaluation in ESP classes applying CLIL principles.

As illustrated, the students showed that they would like to be assessed on both content knowledge and language skills ( $M=4.23$ ;  $SD=.631$ ). They tended to disagree with the statement that they are assessed by content knowledge more than language skills ( $M=2.12$ ;  $SD=.624$ ). This statistic links the results of learners' view on the next item where English instructors emphasise learners' accuracy and fluency of using English instead of content knowledge ( $M=4.03$ ;  $SD=.378$ ). Concerning the type of assessment, different types of assessment in the form of in-class discussion, in-class writing assignment and oral presentation gained high agreement among students ( $M=3.92$ ;  $SD=.597$ ;  $M=3.87$ ;  $SD=.635$ ;  $M=4.28$ ;  $SD=.792$ , respectively). Interviewed students supported the survey finding of their high rating for such kinds of on-going assessment.

Table 4: Students' perceptions on assessment and evaluation (N=243)

Items	Assessment and evaluation	Mean	SD
29.	I would like to be assessed on both content knowledge and language skills.	4.23	.631
30.	The instructors assess students' acquisition of content knowledge much more than English language and skills.	2.12	.624
31.	The instructor emphasises the learners' competence of using English when applying CLIL approach than content language.	4.03	.378
32.	In-class discussion is useful in evaluating learners' on-going performance.	3.92	.597
33.	Assigning in-class writing assignment is a good way to measure learners' competence of language and language skills.	3.87	.635
34.	Oral presentation is a useful way to measure learners' competence in language and content.	4.28	.792
35.	Multiple-choice final test is suitable for evaluating learners' development in ESP classes.	2.93	.502

I do realise the efficiency of assignment and oral presentation as the type of assessment as we can be assessed by our acquisition of both content and language skills. (Student 2)

During the course of LE courses, the teachers evaluate our understanding of the lessons with in-class discussion and in-class writing, which was useful for us to revise and drill our knowledge. (Student 8)

Concerning summative assessment in the form of multiple-choice final tests, few students held high ratings ( $M=2.93$ ;  $SD=.502$ ). Reasons are clarified in an interview:

Multiple choice tests are suitable for assessment learners' language competence in the sense of grammar, legal terms, reading skills but not writing and speaking. Thus, it's better if we are assessed by language and legal critical thinking in the form of portfolio, for example. (Student 11)

However, one student expressed the view that:

I think multiple choice test is suitable as it saves time, but still achieving its aims in measuring learners' competence in language, which is the key goal in teaching and learning ESP. Content competence is assessed through on-going activities. We should not confuse LE lesson with law lesson with English as a medium of Instruction. They are the separate terms with distinctive features. (Student 7)

Interestingly, in terms of assessment, teachers and students shared similar attitudes. Specifically, the majority of the teachers approved of using portfolios in the form of assignment and oral presentation. explained that:

Assigning topics for groups of three students to make presentation as a summative assessment at the end of the course is beneficial. With this assessment method, learners can be measured in both their acquisition of language competence as well as content knowledge. The criteria for marking and grading students' performance are equally divided between content and language skills. (Teacher M)

Personally, in my ESP classes, even when CLIL approach has not been applied, I still evaluate my students based on their language competence and acquisition of content although it focuses more on learners' language competence. However, since the implementation of CLIL principles, both teachers and learners find it clearer to use such kinds of assessment methods. (Teacher D)

## **Discussion**

Overall, both learners and teachers held a positive attitude towards CLIL principles, acknowledging its benefits and necessity. Specifically, the implementation of CLIL in LE classes is advantageous in some ways, including fostering learners' creativity, motivation, collaboration and critical thinking. Such findings are congruent with previous research (Bedir, 2013; Dale & Tanner, 2012; Dafouz et al., 2007; Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015; Yavuz et al, 2020). In particular, both learners and teachers believed that learners are provided with content, language knowledge and skills which are necessary for their learning. This is clearly demonstrated from their responses to all of the pedagogical components: teaching materials, instructors and teaching method, and assessment. Concerning teaching materials, although they were all quite satisfied with teaching materials and methods, instructors perceived challenges in designing or preparing teaching materials, which required a large amount of time and effort. LE teachers believed that they would be able to adapt or adopt available textbooks, materials, and resources through collaboration and consultation with content teachers in selecting contexts or content subject. This study shared similar findings with previous research (Dale & Tanner, 2012; Yavuz et al, 2020).

When being interviewed about instructors and teaching methods, the respondents are in agreement with the characteristics of CLIL-related teaching methods which combines content and language in the teaching and learning process. Yet they were all aware that LE classes are, by essence, language classes, instructors, therefore, are language teachers, not content teachers. This point of view is consistent with the findings by Yavuz et al (2020). On being questioned if it is beneficial to collaborate with content teachers, the majority of the respondents confirmed yes, though one respondent indicated drawbacks due to different features of language teaching and content teaching, that content teachers find it hard to adapt. This is closely related to Dale and Tanner's (2012) result suggesting that it requires cooperation between language teachers and subject teachers' on developing subject language with learners in classes applying CLIL approaches. Also, teachers and learners held the same perspectives on providing Vietnamese explanations or equivalents for LE terms. This is in line with the research which reveals that teachers should include some translation into the mother tongue in the classroom (Aguilar & Rodríguez, 2012). In addition, regarding assessment and evaluation methods, all of the instructors responded that they assessed students both their language skills and content knowledge. Assessment methods used in those LE classes are in-class writing assignments and oral presentations, which are considered to be useful in evaluating students' progress in achieving content and language knowledge. These activities are also favoured by learners as they are compelled to expand their personal competence in content and language in an integrated way, for example the case of an oral presentation followed by a Q&A session. This

corresponds to the Mehisto, Marsh and Frigols (2008) findings on the characteristics of assessment in CLIL despite differences in the proportions of content and language assessed.

All of the findings show that teachers' and learners' views are congruent in this study in the sense that CLIL approach is relevant with teaching and learning ESP. Although teaching materials for using CLIL in ESP classes were considered difficult and required a lot of effort to provide, there were positive attitudes towards teachers' ability to adopt textbooks suitable for using a CLIL approach. Positive attitudes were also reflected in the acceptance that teaching ESP classes by using CLIL required more preparation, not only in providing teaching materials, but also applying teaching methods and conducting assessment.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, both groups of the participants are aware and convinced about the benefits of CLIL principles implementation in an ESP context. Also, they perceived several challenges when it comes to applying CLIL in their LE classrooms. Especially, the teachers are struggling to adapt and adopt teaching materials for suitable balances between the content and language knowledge provided for their students, as well as specialised knowledge of different areas of law. Language teachers, accordingly, should face the challenge to customise their language teaching activities while applying CLIL principles in their ESP classes. There is a need for collaborative programs between language and content teachers in the implementation of CLIL principles in ESP class, in order to develop better CLIL-related materials, focusing on the necessity of practising and developing language skills with the content knowledge as an indispensable requirement for a successful CLIL integration (Mehisto, 2010). Needs analyses should be conducted to organise the required arrangements, which should take note the existing literature (Ruiz-Garrido & Fortanet-Gomez, 2009). Furthermore, it may be advisable to develop a CLIL methods course for content lecturers to give lectures in ESP context in which students can learn both specialist subject matter content and accurate academic and professional English in an integrated manner. In this way, they would be able to enjoy participating actively in ESP courses, whilst at the same time acquiring academic and professional skills.

## References

- Arnó-Macià, E. & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.007>
- Aguilar, M. & Rodriguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 183-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.615906>

- Banegas, D. L. (2011). Content and language integrated learning in Argentina 2008-2011. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 4(2), 33-50. <https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2011.4.2.4>
- Bedir, H. (2013). The perceptions of ELT prospective teachers on CLIL. In K. Papaja & A. Świątek (Eds.), *Modernizing educational practice: Perspectives in content and language integrated learning*. (pp. 1-17). Cambridge Scholars Publishing. <https://dokumen.pub/modernizing-educational-practice-perspectives-in-content-and-language-integrated-learning-clil-1nbsped-9781443888639-9781443885355.html>
- Brown, G. D. & Rice, S. (2007). *Professional English in use. Law 2*. Cambridge University Press. <https://archive.org/details/CambridgeProfessionalEnglishInUse.Law2/mode/2up>
- Carrió-Pastor, M. L. (2021). CLIL vs EMI: Different approaches or the same dog with a different collar? In M. L. Carrió-Pastor & B. Bellés-Fortuño (Eds.), *Teaching language and content in multicultural and multilingual classrooms* (pp. 13-30). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56615-9\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56615-9_2)
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02310555>
- Crosman, K. (2018). Immersed in academic English: Vocabulary and academic outcomes of a CLIL university preparation course. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(5), 564-577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1494698>
- Dafouz, E., Núñez, B., Sancho, C. & Foran, D. (2007). Integrating CLIL at the tertiary level: Teachers' and students' reactions. In D. Marsh & D. Wolf (Eds.), *Diverse contexts, converging goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. (pp. 91-102).
- Dale, L. & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction - A growing global phenomenon*. <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4f72cdf8-b2eb-4d41-a785-4a283bf6caaa>
- Dörnyei, Z. & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration and processing* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203864739>
- Fazzi, F. & Lasagabaster, D. (2021). Learning beyond the classroom: Students' attitudes towards the integration of CLIL and museum-based pedagogies. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(2), 156-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1714630>
- Fortanet-Gómez, I. & Bellés-Fortuño, B. (2008). The relevance of discourse markers in teacher training courses for Content and Language Integrated Learning in higher education. In O. Martí Arnáinz & M. P. Safont Jordá (Eds.), *Achieving multilingualism: Wills and ways. Proceedings of the First international conference on multilingualism (ICOM)* (pp. 149-159). Castelló de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265183472\\_The\\_relevance\\_of\\_discourse\\_markers\\_in\\_teacher\\_training\\_courses\\_for\\_content\\_and\\_language\\_integrated\\_learning\\_in\\_higher\\_education](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265183472_The_relevance_of_discourse_markers_in_teacher_training_courses_for_content_and_language_integrated_learning_in_higher_education)
- Gonzalez Ardeo, J. M. (2013). (In)compatibility of CLIL and ESP courses at university. *Language Value*, 5(1), 24-47. <https://www.e-revistas.uji.es/index.php/languagevalue/article/view/4774>
- Gay, L. & Airasian, P. (2005). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Prentice Hall.



- Hurajová, L. (2021). Can close cooperation between ESP/CLIL experts and disciplinary teachers in higher education lead to fostering English education environment. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 129-136. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2101129H>
- Jendrych, E. (2013). Developments in ESP teaching. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 34(1), 43-58. <https://intapi.sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/slgr-2013-0022>
- Kalay, D. (2021). Receptive vocabulary knowledge of university students in CLIL instruction. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(3), 33-52. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i3.3527>
- Kang, Y., Hwang, H., Nam, K. & Choi, Y. (2010). Comparison of teacher talk of Korean and native English-speaking teachers: On the efficiency of delivering content knowledge in EFL contexts. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(2), 1-28. <https://www.earticle.net/Article/A182276>
- Kanoksilapatham, B. & Khamkhien, A. (2022). CLIL implemented and scaffolded in an EFL higher education context: Engineering research methodology course. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 502-514. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i3.36913>
- Kao, Y. T. (2022). Understanding and addressing the challenges of teaching an online CLIL course: A teacher education study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(2), 656-675. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1713723>
- Krois-Lindner, A. & Firth, M. (2008). *Introduction to international legal English*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/af/cambridgeenglish/catalog/business-professional-and-vocational/introduction-international-legal-english/introduction-international-legal-english-a-course-classroom-or-self-study-use-students-book-audio-cds-2>
- Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities. *ELT Journal*, 64(4), 367-375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp082>
- Mahan, K. R. (2020). The comprehending teacher: Scaffolding in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(1), 74-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1705879>
- Marsh, D. (2000). CLIL: An interview with Professor David Marsh. [further information not found 6 Nov 2023] <https://www.scribd.com/document/357961878/Entrevista-Con-David-Marshall>
- Marsh, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D. & Frigols-Martín, M. J. (2012). *European Framework for CLIL teacher education. A framework for the professional development of CLIL teachers*. <https://www.calameo.com/books/0074600887184293d9aa3>
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Navarro-Guzman, J., Romero-Alfaro, E., Menacho-Jimenez, I., & Aragon-Mendizabal, E. (2021). Teaching psychology at university using the content and language integrated learning (CLIL) approach. *Porta Linguarum*, 35, 77-91. <https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.v0i35.16858>
- Nguyen, P. B. T. & Sercu, L. (2021). Students' perceptions of content- and language-integrated learning in Vietnam: A survey study. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(12), 1-18. <https://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/4458>

- Nuñez Asomoza, A. (2015). Students' perceptions of the impact of CLIL in a Mexican BA program. *Profile: Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 17(2), 111-124. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v17n2.47065>
- Riley, C. (2013). A long hard climb – getting from the bottom to the top of the CLIL incline. *Recherche et pratiques pédagogiques en langues [Researching and Teaching Languages]*, 32(3), 30-56.
- Ruiz-Garrido, M. F. & Fortanet Gómez, I. (2009). Needs analysis in a CLIL context: A transfer from ESP. In D. Marsh, P. Mehisto, D. Wolff, R. Aliaga, T. Asikainen, M. Frigols-Martin, S. Hughes & G. Langé (Eds.), *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field* (pp. 179-188). Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265182718\\_Needs\\_Analysis\\_in\\_a\\_CLIL\\_Context\\_A\\_Transfer\\_from\\_ESP](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265182718_Needs_Analysis_in_a_CLIL_Context_A_Transfer_from_ESP)
- Siddaway, A. P., Wood, A. M. & Hedges, L. V. (2019). How to do a systematic review: A best practice guide to conducting and reporting narrative reviews, meta-analyses, and meta-syntheses. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 747-770. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102803>
- Sidorenko, T. V., Rosanova, Y. V., Medvedeva, O. & Eimulienė, V. (2022). CLIL and ESP at tertiary education: Perspectives of Russia and Lithuania. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Tomsk State University Journal]*, 474, 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/474/5>
- Tarnopolsky, O. (2013). Content-based instruction, CLIL, and immersion in teaching ESP at tertiary schools in non-English-speaking countries. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-11. <https://ir.duan.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/1175/1/Content-Based%20Instruction%2C%20CLIL%2C%20and%20Immersion%20in%20Teaching%20ESP.pdf>
- Thuy, L. N. T. (2016). Reconsidering the first steps of CLIL implementation in Vietnam. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 8(1), 29-56. <https://doi.org/10.3828/EJLP.2016.4>
- Tri, D. H. & Moskovsky, C. (2019). English-medium instruction in Vietnamese higher education: A ROAD-MAPPING perspective. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(4), 1330-1347. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier29/tri.pdf>
- Tsagkari, A. (2019). Students' perceptions on CLIL implementation in China, Japan and Indonesia. *鹿児島純心女子短期大学研究紀要 [Bulletin of Kagoshima Junshin Junior College]*, 49, 31-58. [https://k-junshin.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository\\_action\\_common\\_download&item\\_id=742&item\\_no=1&attribute\\_id=22&file\\_no=1](https://k-junshin.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_action_common_download&item_id=742&item_no=1&attribute_id=22&file_no=1)
- Tsuchiya, K. & Pérez Murillo, M. D. (2015). Comparing the language policies and the students' perceptions of CLIL in tertiary education in Spain and Japan. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 8(1), 25-35. <https://laclil.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/LACLIL/article/view/5091>
- Wahyuningsih, N., Widiati, U. & Anugerahwati, M. (2016). Teachers' attitudes toward the use of CLIL in ESP classes. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 1(9), 1853-1863. <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jptpp/article/view/6845>
- Yang, W. (2016). ESP vs. CLIL: A coin of two sides or a continuum of two extremes? *ESP Today*, 4(1), 43-68. [https://www.esptodayjournal.org/pdf/current\\_issue/3.6.2016/WENHSIEN-YANG-full%20text.pdf](https://www.esptodayjournal.org/pdf/current_issue/3.6.2016/WENHSIEN-YANG-full%20text.pdf)

Yavuz, A. C., Öztuğfekeç, A., Ören, A. K., Kaplan, A. & Uzunkaya, C. Y. (2020). Teachers' perceptions and needs of CLIL: A collective case study from Turkey. *Sabancı International Journal of Education*, 9(1), 92-103. <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9i1.3506>

## Appendix: Questions for semi-structured interviews

### For students

1. What can you benefit from CLIL implementation in your LE classes?
2. Is the learning material important in CLIL implementation? Why/ Why not?
3. What do you think of the role of the instructors and their teaching methods in your LE classes?
4. In your opinion, should the instructor of LE classes be the English teacher or law teacher? Can you explain for your viewpoint?
5. Do you prefer being instructed with the knowledge of LE skills to the knowledge of law subject in LE classes? Why?
6. There are several ways to assess your performance in LE classes, that is, in-class writing assignment, in-class multiple-choice tests, or oral presentation? How do you want your performance in LE classes to be assessed?

### For teachers

1. In your opinion what can your students benefit from CLIL implementation in LE classes?
2. Is the teaching material important in CLIL implementation? Why/ Why not?
3. Have you met any obstacles in preparing teaching materials? If you have, what are they? How do you resolve such problems?
4. When delivering the lessons, do you have any difficulties in terms of English language and content knowledge? How do you overcome them? Is it useful to consult with subject teachers in such situations?
5. Which methods of assessment do you often use to evaluate your students' performance? What are the benefits and drawbacks of such methods? Which one do you like best? Why?

**Thanh-Huong Nhac** is currently an instructor of legal English in the Faculty of Legal Foreign Languages at Hanoi Law University, and a researcher in language learning and teaching. Her research interests include EFL and ESP teaching methodology, learning autonomy, and student motivation and encouragement.  
 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0185-529X>  
 Email: [nhacthanhhuong@gmail.com](mailto:nhacthanhhuong@gmail.com)

**Please cite as:** Nhac, T.-H. (2023). Applying content and language integrated learning in legal English classes: A Vietnamese perspective. *Issues in Educational Research*, 33(4), 1513-1531. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier33/nhac.pdf>