REVISTA ELECTRÓNICA INTERUNIVERSITARIA DE FORMACIÓN DEL PROFESORADO
CONTINUACIÓN DE LA ANTIGUA REVISTA DE ESCUELAS NORMALES

http://revistas.um.es/reifop
http://www.aufop.com/aufop/revistas/lista/digital

Fecha de recepción: 25 de octubre de 2014
Fecha de revisión: 12 de enero 2015
Fecha de aceptación: 18 de febrero 2015

Martín, M.A. (2015). Teacher education for content and language integrated learning: insights from a current European debate. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado, 18* (3), 153-168.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/reifop.18.3.210401

Teacher education for content and language integrated learning: insights from a current European debate

María Ángeles Martín del Pozo
Universidad de Valladolid

Abstract

Bilingual education has outpaced the provision of trained and qualified teachers. Research and training proposals are urgently required. This paper analyses the attention given to language and methodological aspects in seven Spanish studies related to teacher training needs. The discussion is corroborated by a case study. Results indicate the debate regarding expected competences and qualifications is focusing only on the linguistic dimension and disregarding pedagogical issues. Some future actions for teacher education are suggested in order to trigger teachers to consider methodological aspects.

Keywords

Content and language integrated learning; English Medium Instruction; Teacher education; Bilingual education

La formación del profesorado para la enseñanza integrada de contenidos y lengua extranjera: perspectivas de un debate europeo actual

Resumen

La educación bilingüe se ha implantado con mayor velocidad que la preparación de profesores cualificados. Se requieren urgentemente investigaciones y propuestas de formación. Este artículo analiza la atención prestada a los aspectos lingüísticos y a los metodológicos en siete estudios realizados en España que consideran las necesidades de formación. La discusión se corrobora con un breve estudio de caso. Los resultados indican que el debate respecto a las competencias y cualificaciones necesarias se está centrando en la dimensión lingüística sin considerar los aspectos pedagógicos. El artículo concluye con

Contacto:

Mª Ángeles Martín del Pozo, maryange@dlyl.uva.es, Departamento de Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura, Facultad de Educación, Universidad de Valladolid, 40005 Segovia.

algunas sugerencias para promover entre el profesorado la atención a la dimensión metodológica.

Palabras clave

Aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjera; docencia en inglés; formación del profesorado; educación bilingüe

Introduction

A shared concern of theorists and practitioners remains unaddressed by REIFOP: teacher training for bilingual education. The first section of the paper provides a contextualization of bilingual education practices, an expanding educational approach which involves more than language issues. Next, teacher education needs are addressed before the third section reports on how the different dimensions of training are valued by practitioners. Finally, suggestions to trigger a shift of attention to methodological issues are provided.

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) and English Medium Instruction (EMI)

Bilingual education is a prominent word in current educational environments. The most frequent denomination is the acronym CLIL (Content and language integrated learning), defined as

> A generic umbrella term which would encompass any activity in which a foreign language is used as a tool in the learning of a non-language subject in which both language and the subject have a joint curricular role. The rendition of this term into French is Enseignement d´une Matière par l´Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère (EMILE) (Marsh, 2002, p. 58).

This approach is widely spread across European Primary and Secondary education systems (Eurydice 2006, 2011). At tertiary education, the name English Medium Instruction (EMI) is generally preferred. In this novel field conceptualization and nominations are still under construction. Leaving aside the label given to this practice which is prone to be modified by those conceptualizing the field, the most crucial aspect to be taken into account in order to understand the difference and highlight the implications for teacher education is the attention given to language in both CLIL and EMI. The divergence regarding language focus is thus summarized:

> There is an area where CLIL and EMI diverge from each other; this is the attention that each of them pays to language learning. While CLIL is a dual focused process, aiming to overtly develop both language and content knowledge, EMI focuses mainly on subject learning and exploits the language of instruction as a mere neutral tool to perform that goal (Francomacaro, 2011, p. 34).

A second relevant initial consideration regarding CLIL is that, though there is no a priori reason for this (Marsh, 2002, p. 71) "English is the most dominant L2 medium of instruction, with its position forecast to strengthen further" (Marsh & Laitinen 2005, p.2). Currently, regardless educational level, CLIL is mostly implemented in English (Dalton-Puffer, 2011).

Reasons and forces driving CLIL/EMI

The reasons and forces behind the implementation of bilingual programs are also very diverse across educational levels. In Primary and Secondary education CLIL is promoted by European language policies. In addition, three Pro-CLIL arguments (Dalton-Puffer, 2007, p. 2-3) have endorsed the wide acceptance: traditional foreign language classroom is not showing efficiency; non linguistic disciplines are a reservoir of concepts and lexis to establish real communication; the belief that more exposure to target language input will derive in more learning outcomes.

In contrast, Higher Education is driven by very dissimilar forces. The internationalization of universities in non English speaking countries requires attracting foreign students. This can only be implemented if a lingua franca is used for communication. Moreover, the adaptation to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) (Bologna Declaration, 1999) has accelerated the expansion and turned EMI from an added value to a must at third level institutions in countries where English is not the first language. European universities are thus moving towards EMI driven by seven categories of forces (Coleman, 2006): CLIL, internationalization, student exchange, research and teaching materials, staff mobility, graduate employability and the market of international students. The rapid expansion and vigour predict an "Englishilization of Higher Education" (*Ibidem*).

CLIL/EMI: a potential beyond language learning

At first sight, the promotion of linguistic competence may seem the main or even the only goal of this type of teaching. It is true that two important aspects of learning a foreign language seem to be positively affected by CLIL: the development of oral skills and the increased motivation of students (Pavón & Rubio, 2010, p. 50). Yet, this should not be the outstanding principle to move towards CLIL. Van de Craen *et al*. claim to ponder that "CLIL is more than just another method of language learning. CLIL has implications for the learning process as a whole and is as such an innovative way of looking at (language) education" (2007, p. 75).

Those who defend this position (Marsh *et al.* 2001; Van de Craen *et al.* 2007; Wolff, 2007; Coyle, *Hood & Marsh,* 2010; Moate, 2011 *inter alia*) insist that CLIL aims surpass internationalization and language learning. A comprehensive theory of all dimensions in CLIL is still considered necessary. CLIL is a pedagogical innovation and represents an opportunity to enhance education in general (Marsh *et al.,* 2001). Even the essence of teaching could be affected as Moate forewarns:

> CLIL is more than a methodology. Indeed the practical changes required by CLIL - the way educational activity is framed and enacted - support the notion that CLIL is methodological. Research findings, however, indicate that CLIL does not only require change in the doings of the classroom, but also in the **beings** of the classroom. (2011, p. 18) (Emphasis added)

Consequently, if CLIL is more than language learning and causes significant changes in the planning, sequencing and performance of teaching, these dimensions demand to be covered in the training.

In conclusion, CLIL has developed into an educational practice which has "engendered widespread discussion on the continent and spawned an inordinate almost infinite amount

of publications on the topic" (Pérez-Cañado, 2012, p. 329). Nevertheless, the questions about it are still numerous. All educational levels converge in one shared concern: teacher education.

Teacher education for CLIL and EMI

In the middle of these new bilingual scenarios, with conceptualization under construction and under discussion, one main concern pertaining to both CLIL theorists and practitioners remains unsolved: CLIL teacher training. Abundant evidence of this must can be found in literature (Dafouz, 2008; Halbach, 2009; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2012; Ball, & Lindsay, 2012; Aguilar Pérez & Rodriguez 2012; Martín del Pozo, 2013, *inter ali*). Additionally, official documentation has pointed at this need from the beginning of this practice in Europe (CLIL Cascade Network Think Tank Report, 2010; Eurydice Report 2006, 2012) as well as other less official sources (web sites, expert Forums, Special Interest Research Groups). Paneuropean reports on CLIL at Primary education (Eurydice 2006, 2012) found that CLIL had outpaced the provision of tools and resources for teacher training.

This issue is also considered a key factor for CLIL implementation and success. As Coyle *et al.* state "the key to future capacity building and sustainability is teacher education" (2010, p. 161). The lack or the paucity of teacher training will lead to failure as the eloquent example of Malaysia English Policy has proven (Graddol, 2010). In spite of this wide recognition of teacher training and education as crucial factors to implement CLIL, the specification of these requirements is not that settled. Debate continues about what requirements teachers must fulfil to join a bilingual program. For questions of space, this study will refer to two major concerns, namely

1. What competences do CLIL teachers necessitate?
2. What qualifications should be demanded?

Possible answers emerge from official prescriptive documentation, from research results and from personal but practice and theory founded proposals from stakeholders. A representative summary of the current status of the debate is offered here.

Required Competences

Regarding the first question, there is agreement in two main dimensions of education needed to teach in and through a second language: linguistic education and methodological education (see references previously given). As regards the first dimension, one of the most significant present-day discussions concerns language competence level for CLIL/EMI practitioners. Frequently, this linguistic level has been described in terms of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), a scale which has proven to serve for homogeneity in the description of general language competences in Europe. For example, Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010, p. 288) establish C1 as the minimum for both secondary and tertiary levels, even though a lower level may be allowed by official

legislation. However, it is advisable to consider the warning that a teacher may master general language, the specific language of their subject but may not be competent in classroom language. Llinares and Whittaker (2011) found that secondary school teachers in Madrid lacked metalinguistic awareness, in spite of their high English proficiency in the language of their subject area. This deficiency seemed to be a hindrance for assisting students with the language of the specific domain. One of the implications derived from this study is that high language competence is not enough for an efficient teaching of contents.

Required qualifications

Despite this attention to language, it should be reminded that CLIL is more than language. Therefore, a solid education should go beyond language development and progression (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 161). For this reason, the second main subject of the debate regards the qualifications required to become a CLIL teacher. Almenta (2011) updates Eurydice Report (2006) by describing the high heterogeneity of modalities of courses offered in most of the European countries for training primary and secondary CLIL teachers. The synthesis by Almenta provides a critical and evaluative approach to all these initiatives with the aim of observing good practices and integrating them in formal and recognized European accreditation as CLIL teacher. Some of the surveys and observations point at the need to consider CLIL teacher training as a specific postgraduate qualification and not only as a complementary one. This has resulted in a tendency among universities to offer this type of postgraduate specialization courses. In addition, there are transnational exams and tests to obtain qualifications, for example *Teaching knowledge test: Content and language integrated learning*, one of the Cambridge ESOL Examinations. Manuals for preparing this exam and the corresponding glossaries (Bentley, 2010) are available.

Once again the CLIL scenario displays as heterogeneous and in progress. Participants should have a voice to guide steps towards the consolidation of this emerging educational approach. Next section provides an insight from implicated teachers.

Teachers' perceptions of their own educational needs: Spain under review

CLIL and EMI in Spain

Before considering the data on teachers' perception, it is compulsory to briefly reflect about why "Spain is rapidly becoming one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research" (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010: ix). Regional education authorities are endorsing plurilingual policies mainly at secondary level. In contrast, Spanish universities follow the trends and present the features gathered in the ENLU Report (*European Network for Language Learning Amongst Undergraduates*) about English as the medium of instruction in European Higher Education (Marsh & Laitinanen, 2005).

This rapid spread can be explained by the previous experience with more than one official language in compulsory education. Since the 1980s the main four minority languages in the Spanish state (Galician, Catalan, Basque and Valencian) have been co-official in schools. This practice aided the creation of a bilingual mentality which could be presently facilitating the transfer to the new situation with English, French and German as the new languages for

schooling. Primary and Secondary education have large scale bilingual programs. These programs comprise linguistic and methodological training for teachers coordinated and provided by the Education Department (Consejerías de Educación) of each one of the Comunidades Autónomas. The most relevant initiatives are compiled and well documented in two monographs: *Clil in Spain* (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010) and *CLIL across education levels* (Dafouz & Guerrini, 2009).

In contrast, bilingual degrees were not offered at Spanish universities until 2002, mainly in the private sector (Dafouz & Nuñez, 2009). The current courses and subjects in English at Spanish Universities are compiled by Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte in the document *Degree Programs in English Language in the Spanish University System (2013)*. The areas with the higher number of degrees and postgraduate courses in English are Economy, Business Administration, Engineering, Architecture studies, Primary and Pre-primary Education (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). Requirements, intensity and types are also wide-ranging. The heterogeneity of CLIL at higher education is thus clearly seen in the Spanish context.

Surveys administered to teachers

Teacher and student attitudes towards this new context have been a recurrent topic in research (Dafouz, Chamacho & Urquía, 2013). However, a synthesis of the findings as regards the different aspects concerned with attitude is still needed. This section revises and puts together results of a group of surveys administered to teachers from different educational levels, either at pre CLIL or in CLIL service. This comparison will focus on the consideration given to methodological and linguistic needs in the teachers' own perceptions and expectations of their educational requirements. The aim is to consider current beliefs to propose some future actions for researchers and teacher training. For questions of space, this study will refer only to six studies.

Pena & Porto (2008) polled 150 primary school teachers in Madrid. The answers to the structured questionnaires bring to light some fears and anxieties caused by the novelty of teaching through a foreign language. Some items of the questionnaires referred to their linguistic[1] competence and their methodological/theoretical knowledge about CLIL. 84% of respondents thought their language level was not enough to teach in English and believed that a higher language level would improve their teaching. According to the researchers, this could be interpreted as low self-stem or as a lack of awareness of other issues related to quality CLIL practice. Regarding the specific knowledge of bilingual methodology, 60% of the surveyed had attended basic introductory courses. The resting 40% had not received any formation and relied on colleagues´ experience and advice. The answers to whether they need theoretical knowledge are diverse. Some admit this necessity, 30% considers everyday experience or peer advice as the main source of learning and others recur to their experience with second language teaching methodology. When asked about the type of training they need, the three answers are nearly equally distributed: English improvement, see other colleagues teaching, and specific resources / tasks used in the classroom. Methodology or theoretical knowledge is not mentioned.

[1] Most of these studies begin with questions regarding informant´s self reported language competence

Similar beliefs are found in primary and secondary teachers in Andalusia. Bilingual education in this Spanish community is quite spread and well coordinated through the *Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo*, a plan advocating for multilingual teaching. Pavón & Rubio (2010) recount the lack of adequate knowledge of the language as one of the concerns frequently reported by teachers. Given the unease this deficiency created among them, the leaders of plurilingual education in Andalusia considered to train foreign language teachers as experts in content. This option was rejected because it emphasized language over methodology, leading therefore to a misinterpretation of genuine CLIL practice. The study does not mention if these teachers have been explicitly asked to express their perceived training needs. However, the authors repeat throughout their paper the necessity of methodological training, since, once again, linguistic issues absorbed the attention.

Uneasiness is reflected not only in research results. More informal contexts such as social networks, blogs or discussion forums reveal this anxiety about adequate linguistic competence as the main factor for successful CLIL[2].

Recent studies at university level also show this underestimation and even reluctance to theory and methodology as required training needs. In the case of higher education we will make reference to six contexts: five previous studies and our won data. Preceding studies can be grouped in:

1) a priori, with teachers consulted not yet involved in a CLIL experience and

2) studies in a population already in ongoing practice.

A study about the attitudes of 70 lecturers not yet involved in CLIL at the Universidad Complutense and the Universidad Politécnica (Madrid) revealed their expectations regarding methodological adjustments for the bilingual context. The three main expected changes were adapting material, slowing down of classroom rhythm and, as a consequence, a slight reduction of content. Apart from the questionnaires, semi-structured interviews allowed to enquire about the possible differences between teaching in their native language and in English. All comments refer to language competence limitations. Dafouz et *al*. (2007) relate this to the prevalence of lecturing as the main teaching modality. Hence, lecturers do not consider any other aspect apart from what seems to be the core of the lecture, that is, their own discourse.

A more recent feasibility study on bilingual instruction at the School Agricultural Engineering of the Technical University of Madrid (Adán *et al.,* 2013) showed willingness of both students and teachers to participate in this program along with a shared thought of the positive implications of English instruction. In spite of this optimistic and open attitude, the conclusions and recommendations derived from this project totally ignore methodological issues. Language competence had a pervasive presence in all items regarding teacher education. The questionnaires used were closed, which entails the

[2] As an example of informal context we offer, the blog "CLIL Café – Teaching teachers for CLIL" from the conference *CLIL 2010, In pursuit of excellence*, Eichstätt. One of the entries reads as: "Language upskilling almost always seems to come first in the list when CLIL teachers are asked about their professional development needs. In addition to what we think CLIL teachers need to know in the language, what do they need to know about the language?"

informants' responses were restricted to the proposed questions. However, methodological aspects could have been mentioned by some other means. What is overt is that the issue of methodology and knowledge about bilingual education was rejected by the questionnaire designers. In the same line, only one of the proposed actions to implement the bilingual degrees made reference to methodology.[3]

The second group of studies at Spanish Higher Education shows beliefs and attitudes from ongoing practice. Aguilar & Rodriguez (2012) gather 17 lecturers' and 193 students' self-reported perceptions after their first CLIL 15 week semester. The experience appears to be satisfactory for both groups. Among other issues, lecturers were inquired about their attitude towards receiving methodological training. The researchers report the reality with these words:

> It turned out they were not interested at all. Most (78%) agreed to follow the courses the university was offering, but they showed interest in improving general-purpose and academic English (i.e. traditional English lessons). The vast majority showed clear reluctance to methodological training and explicitly refused to be trained in CLIL methodology (p.188)

Universitat Jaume I is already bilingual (Valencian and Spanish) and is considering multilingualism with the introduction of English. Insights from these contexts are very similar to the previous ones regarding beliefs and attitudes Fortanet (2012). Results show that lecturers are concerned that their linguistic competence either in Valencian or in English would be lesser than their students who have been brought up in bilingual classrooms. The aim of this case study is to provide ideas for the design of a multilingual policy at a university. Particularly, Fortanet insists on introducing CLIL as opposite to simple immersion. This way, content lectures would teach language.

The purpose of the survey was to find out teachers' knowledge and beliefs about languages, their pedagogical styles and opinion about introducing a third language. Results show teachers consider they do not have enough proficiency to teach in English. However and in the light of other responses, Fortanet considers this as a low self stem because they report to be able to conduct research and presentations in English. With respect to the teaching strategies used, there were differences among disciplines, though lecturing is the most common in all. Also in relation to methodology, 15 lecturers were investigated more in depth holding informal discussions. They admitted the need of a different methodology but seem to lack knowledge of what this could mean. Fortanet concluded that the investigated CLIL lecturers showed scarce methodological and pedagogical awareness.

These five cases show what seems to be a common feature in Europe as other teacher trainers have found the same attitude also outside Spain: Austria (Dalton-Puffer, 2007); Netherlands (Klaassen, 2008); Italy (Francomacaro, 2011). Teachers' ideas at the beginning of CLIL implementation broadly coincide in these contexts.

On the other extreme of the continuum, the Spanish setting presents in service research studies. Johnson (2012) analyzes the development of the beliefs of five university lecturers involved in a bilingual project. These professionals from *Escuela Universitaria Cardenal Cisneros* teacher training college in Alcalá de Henares (Madrid) received over two hundred

[3] Este Plan de Formación deberá incluir formación en metodologías AICLE. (p. 116)

hours of CLIL training over a period of more than two years. Before the training began, an initial questionnaire was administered to gather information about the participants' previous knowledge, concerns and preconceptions of bilingual education and about their perceived needs and expectations. After two years, a slot of time which, according to the researcher would allow for a potentially revealing comparison, a very similar questionnaire was used to investigate lecturers' perception of the received training and the need for any further education. Johnson summarizes the main conclusion regarding the effects of the training course:

> The principal aim of the lecturers' extensive training period was to equip them with the knowledge, resources and techniques so that they would be better prepared to implement a CLIL approach to their teaching on a bilingual degree program. New knowledge, however, seems to have caused a change in beliefs.[…] what the lecturers learned about CLIL seems to have caused in them a shift in epistemological beliefs, at least as far as teaching at university is concerned. They saw the need for a move away from a lecturing style towards a learner-centred, active, participative methodology (p.68).

Another interesting finding of Johnson´s study and related to the goal of this paper is that after the training lecturers believe CLIL can be successful, but they consider it is not being implemented effectively in schools. These statements could be interpreted as a pronouncement for the need of methodological training. In addition, their responses indicate a shift in the primary goal of bilingual education from the learning of English to an added gain from the teaching of subject contents through English.

The following literature review matrix displays a summary of the information previously presented.

Table 1.

Literature Review Matrix

study	Educational level	Participants/ discipline	methodology	Focus	Results/ conclusion
Dafouz et al. (2007)	Higher Education Universidad Complutense Universidad Politécnica Madrid	70 Chemistry, Aeronautical Engineering, Pharmacy and Medicine	Closed questionnaires Interviews	A priori expectations and fears	adapting material, slowing down of classroom rhythm, a slight reduction of content.
Pena & Porto (2008)	Primary Madrid	150	Structured questionnaires	Fears and anxieties Linguistic competence methodological/theoretical knowledge about CLIL	40% no formation, 60% introductory courses Methodology or theoretical knowledge is not mentioned as a need
Pavón & Rubio (2010)	Primary and Secondary Andalucía	Not stated	Personal reports		lack of adequate knowledge of the language as one of the concerns frequently reported no necessity of methodological training
Aguilar & Rodriguez (2012)	Higher Education Catalonia	17 engineering	Questionnaire Oral interview	Self-reported perceptions after their first CLIL 15 week semester	showed interest in improving general-purpose and academic English clear reluctance to methodological training and explicitly refused to be trained in CLIL methodology
Fortanet (2012)	Higher Education Valencia community	78 content 11 language	Questionnaire Oral interview	Attitudes towards multilingualism	Scarce methodological / pedagogical awareness. Concerned that their linguistic competence either in Valencian or in English
Adan et al. (2013)	Higher Education Madrid	125 Agricultural Engineering	closed questionnaires	Feasibility study	Language competence had a pervasive presence in questionnaire items No reference made to methodology
Johnson (2012)	Higher Education Madrid	5 Teacher training college	Longitudinal Questionnaire (2 years)	Lecturers received + 200 hours of CLIL training Shift in epistemological beliefs?	Move from lecturing towards active, participative methodology Without training, CLIL not being implemented effectively

Research Context

The data for this study were collected at Escuela Universitaria de Informática (Universidad de Valladolid, Campus Segovia) where teaching through English has been an optional practice since 2006. This context does not present explicit language objectives neither at institutional nor at individual level. Nonetheless, it is expected that students' linguistic competence will benefit from the bilingual program *Ingeniero técnico de informática de gestión.*

The researcher´s connection with this college dates from 2003, when she taught English for computing for one academic year. In 2006, when the institution was about to start the bilingual program, she was asked for some guidance due to her research interest in languages for specialised and academic purposes. During the first two years of the program, she provided some training to the lecturers involved, mainly conversation and academic English lessons. The data presented in this paper are part of an in depth multiple case study that includes detailed transcription and analysis of classroom discourse. Open ended questionnaires were administered to 10 lecturers with at least two year experience teaching their technical subjects in English. The items relating to methodology and theoretical issues received very similar responses to those in the studies just reviewed.

Methodological training is not perceived as a priority, and lecturers explicitly affirm that there has not been any methodological modification with the change of language. Some examples[i4] from the questionnaires show indifference (1 and 2) and unawareness regarding methodological changes (3) or the pedagogical complexity of the situation caused by the change of language.

> (1) Language has not affected the organization of contents. The only difference for me between lesson preparation in English or in Spanish is the time used in searching specialized vocabulary.
>
> (2) After all this is all about being able to be speaking in English for an hour.
>
> (3) As regards the organization of subject contents, in Spanish I have always begun with the most abstract topics. On the contrary, I decided to start the subject in English with a simpler topic which they partially may know. I do this so that at the beginning of term the difficulty may be mainly in the language. Once they are `immerse´ in the English language it is possible to continue with more complex mathematical topics.

Lecturer 3 is somehow acknowledging that modifications had to occur. This decision was probably taken by intuition. Many good teachers rely on their intuition and experience. We suggest that if this professional intuition were turned into professional awareness, teachers' performance and autonomy would be enhanced to the benefit of teaching competences in one´s native language as well. In any case, good teaching practices in one language could be transferred to another, one more argument in favour of the convenience

[4] Our own translation from the original Spanish.

of methodological training. Regarding good teaching competences, one of the lecturers commented

> (4) Some of us need a good deal of language training. But others will continue being bad teachers even if they do receive methodological training. It is not a question of only training but of commitment and responsibility.

Our findings are thus in accordance to what some previous studies have reported. It could be said that these seven studies represent a tendency derived from a misinterpretation of CLIL as a mere language teaching methodology.

In conclusion, as regards teachers´ own perceptions, linguistic competence is overshadowing other issues which should have the same prevailing role in genuine and effective CLIL practice. We highlight that these findings could be important beyond the confines of each one of these specific research projects, including our own. To demonstrate significance, next section addresses how research results can be applied returning to the subject of teacher education and discussing some future prospects and alternative scenarios to contend with this deficiency.

The challenge: trigger teachers to consider the methodological implications

The studies summarized in the previous section show that CLIL theoretical knowledge and methodology is not a priority for those who are considering this approach or for those already involved. In the case of Higher Education, this lack of consideration of any methodological training is on the scene before CLIL, at least in the Spanish context. It is commonly but mistakenly thought that content experts are prepared to teach their subjects simply because they are specialists in the discipline. Universities are frequently functioning under this belief. For instance, the official texts about the EHEA did not refer to teacher education (this journal, Torrego, 2004, p. 263) a crucial aspect for any educational modification, more expected in a compulsory and official reform.

However, in the case of teaching in English, an optional and not official change in most cases, the need for training is emphasized. It seems obvious that the language barrier has stimulated teachers to consider they require assistance. Nonetheless, the studies reviewed in the previous section are evidence for the scarce relevance or even reluctance still given to methodology. The exception is the longitudinal case study reported by Johnson (2012). Experiences like this constitute a strong argument in favour of the promotion of theoretical and methodological training. Next question is how this can be accomplished if the most general attitude seems to be a major concern about linguistic competence and a frequent dismissal of methodological issues. Two answers are suggested as responses to the challenge of triggering lecturers to consider methodological implications derived from a change in the language of the classroom.

One possible answer could be in the very essence of CLIL. As stated in the introduction of this paper, this approach advocates for the concurrent teaching of language and content. The training may consist of a CLIL course about CLIL, or a ´metaCLIL´ course. In other words, a course whose contents include theoretical knowledge about CLIL and some

methodological principles to implement it. Concurrently, it should be a language course. Trainees attending the course would benefit from language and methodology, respecting the significant role of the latter. Some aspects of the debate along with our own position towards the role of language as an incentive in training courses are thus recapitulated:

> Awareness and understanding of the complexity of the pedagogical situation is essential for improving English-medium instruction. To raise this awareness in a content and language integrated teacher training approach is useful and relevant. Although one of the objectives of the courses is to improve language skills, language improvement is not necessarily realised, as language improvement requires long term dedication. **English language proficiency** is therewith an **appetizer for the improvement of lecturing behaviour** relevant for an English-medium instructional setting. (Klaassen, 2008, p. 42) (Emphasis added)

Regarding the language which should be taught to CLIL teachers, this paper suggests considering the benefits which would derive from halting to reduce to proficiency level the debate about linguistic needs and, as an alternative, focus attention on the types of language demanded by the bilingual classroom. Several aspects have to be considered to move forward in this direction.

Firstly, research results about the actual language spoken in the CLIL contexts. Europe is leading CLIL classroom discourse analysis (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Dafouz & Nuñez, 2009; Francomacaro, 201; Llinares & Whittaker, 2011, Sánchez García, 2010; Martín del Pozo, 2015 inter alia). The pedagogical implications derived from these studies provide pathways for teacher trainers. Secondly, teacher trainers should consider theoretical models of language used in CLIL (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Coyle et al. 2010; Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2011; Gierlinger, 2013, summarized and evaluated in Martín del Pozo, 2013, 2015). These proposals could function as tools for needs analysis and language education. As Dalton-Puffer (2007) defended after her groundbreaking study of CLIL classrooms discourse, practitioners necessitate academic language skills for knowledge acquisition and transmission. Linguistic training should advance in this line.

A second response to how to generate an interest in methodology could derive from an investigation of whether it is the professionals´ own perception that there are not methodological changes or, the opposite, those modifications do actually happen (unconsciously and involuntarily). If it were their own perception, it could be interpreted as a lack pedagogical awareness as Fortanet (2012) signalled in her data. Videotaping lecturers teaching in Spanish and comparing the lessons with others of the same subject in English would permit to observe if these methodological alterations occur or not. A contrast of strategies and actions in both languages could provide interesting information about how teaching behaviour is (unconsciously) modified depending on the language of instruction.

If research results show there are methodological changes in those who are not aware or even deny them, an emphasis on methodological aspects could be spontaneously compelled. In this case, it is necessary to consider that "at the tertiary level, CLIL pedagogy needs to be different from CLIL models for primary and secondary education" (Dafouz &

Nuñez, 2009, p. 105). The analyses of the methodology used and CLIL teacher observation has been pointed as one of the future "research avenues" (Perez-Cañado, 2012, p. 331).

Summary and future directions

The article began with a presentation of the lack of agreement regarding the concept of CLIL. There is a parallel the lack of agreement of competences or qualifications needed for teachers to join a CLIL program. Equally, there is no consensus on how to implement a CLIL approach, mainly amongst universities. Therefore, this domain remains under epistemological and praxeological construction. A second section of the paper has provided evidence of the accord regarding CLIL teacher training as a key factor for successful implementation, along with the urgency to reflect about how this is /should be approached.

As Spain stands out within the European CLIL landscape, section three detailed surveys administered to Spanish teachers from all educational levels. Attention focused on the self perception of needs to join a CLIL programme. In spite of the lack of formal training in bilingual methodologies, the teachers in studies reported here and in our own research context do not consider in need of it, neither is methodology perceived as a priority. A correlation between high language level and good teaching is a belief which permeates the data and language qualifications are the main concern.

In light of all this, the paper concludes by proposing two possible prospect directions to trigger teachers and teacher trainers to consider methodological aspects in bilingual education:

1) Shift attention from language level to the language type required;

2) Methodological awareness. This would include teaching practice in their native language. A CLIL course about CLIL is suggested in response to the challenge posed to teachers by CLIL practice.

References

Adán, A. Alvir, A., Blanco, M. et al. (2013). *Proyecto AgroInglés, Proyecto de Innovación Educativa de la Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.*Madrid: UPM.

Aguilar Pérez, M. & Rodriguez, R. (2012) Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, 15* (2), 183-197.

Almenta, E. (2011) *CLIL Teacher Training across Europe. Current state of the art, good practices and guidelines for the future. Available from: http://uma.academia.edu/EstefaniaAlmenta, accessed 11 May 2013.*

Ball, P. & Lindsay, D. (2012) Language demands and support for English Medium Instruction in tertiary education. In *English-Medium Instruction at Universities*. A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J.M. Sierra (eds.) (pp. 44-64). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bentley, K. (2010). *The Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT).CLIL Module*. Cambridge: CUP.

Bologna Declaration (1999). *The European Higher Education Area*. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education Convened in Bologna at the 19th of June 1999.

CLIL Cascade Network (2010). *Talking the Future: Languages in Education 2010-2020*. CCN Foresight Think Tank Report: University of Jyvaskyla

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Coleman, J. (2006). English-Medium Teaching in European Higher Education, *Language Teaching 39*, 1- 14.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dafouz, E. (2008). La Universidad y el reto bilingüe. ¿Está preparada la educación superior para el aprendizaje en una lengua extranjera? *AULA de Innovación Educativa, 168*, 45-49.

Dafouz, E., Nuñez, B., Sancho, C., & Foran, D. (2007). Integrating CLIL at the Tertiary Level: Teachers' and Students' Reactions. In D. Wolff & D. Marsh (eds.) *Diverse Contexts, Converging Goals: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Europe* (pp.91-102).Frankfurt, Peter Lang.

Dafouz, E. & Guerrini, M. (eds.) (2009). *CLIL across education levels: opportunities for all.* Madrid: Richmond-Santillana Publishing.

Dafouz, E. & Núñez, B. (2009). CLIL in higher education: devising a new learning landscape. In E. Dafouz & M. Guerrini (eds.) (pp.101-112).

Dafouz, E., Camacho, M., & Urquía, E. (2013). 'Surely they can't do as well': a comparison of business students' academic performance in English-medium and Spanish-as-first-language-medium programmes, *Language and Education 28* (3), 1-14. **DOI:** 10.1080/09500782.2013.808661

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

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and language integrated learning: from practice to principles. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182-204.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J.M. (2012). (Eds.) *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges* (Bristol, Multilingual Matters)

Eurydice Network. (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe.* Brussels: Eurydice.

Eurydice Network. (2012). *Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe 2012.* Brussels: Eurydice.

Fortanet, I. (2012). Academics' beliefs about language use and proficiency in Spanish multilingual higher education. *Aila Review 25*, 48 – 63

Francomacaro, M.R. (2011). *English as a Medium of Instruction at an Italian Engineering Faculty: an Investigation of Structural Features and Pragmatic Functions*. University of Naples, Doctoral Thesis.

Gierlinger, E. (2013). The languages for CLIL Model, Available from http://clilingmesoftly.wordpress.com/clil-teachers-tl-competence/, accessed 11 April 2014.

Graddol, D. (2010). *English next India: The future of English in India. London: The BritishCouncil.* Available from: http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-english-next-india-2010-book.pdf, accessed 11 April 2014.

Halbach, A. (2009). The primary school teacher and the challenges of bilingual education. In E. Dafouz & M. Guerrini (eds.) (pp.19-26).

Johnson, M. (2012). Bilingual Degree Teacher's Beliefs: A case study in a tertiary setting. *Pulso Revista de Educación 35*, 49-74.

Klaassen, R. (2008). Preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (eds.) *Realizing content and language integration in higher education* (pp.32-42). Maastricht, Maastricht University Language Centre.

Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (Eds.) (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Library.

Llinares, A., Morton, T. & Whittaker, R. (2011). *The Role of Language in CLIL.* Cambridge: CUP.

Llinares A. & R. Whittaker (2011). Functions of language in CLIL secondary classes: a systemic functional approach. In C. Escobar, & L. Nussbaum (eds.) *Learning through another Language* (pp.141-161). Barcelona: UAB.

Marsh D., Maljers A. & Hartiala A.K. (2001). Profiling European CLIL Classrooms. Languages Open Doors (Jyväskylä, University of Jyväskylä)

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE –The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential.* Jyväskylä: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä

Marsh, D. & J. Laitinen (2005). *Medium of instruction in European higher education: Summary of research outcomes of European Network for Language Learning Amongst Undergraduates (ENLU) Task Group 4*. Jyväskylä: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä.

Martín del Pozo, M.A. (2013). Formación lingüística del profesorado universitario para la docencia en inglés. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria 11* (3). 197-218.

Martín del Pozo, M.A. (April 2015). The needs of a new EAP learner: CLIL teachers. In. P. Shrestha, (Ed.) *Current Developments in English for Academic and Specific Purposes: Local innovations and global perspectives.* (pp. 115-138). Reading: Garnett Education.

Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (2013). *Degree Programs in English Language in the Spanish University System.* MECD

Moate, J. (2010). The Integrated Nature of CLIL: A sociocultural perspective. *International CLIL Research Journal 1* (3) 38-45.

Pavón, V. & Rubio, F. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes. *Porta Linguarum, 14*, 45-58.

Pena, C. & Porto, M. (2008). Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project. *Porta Linguarum, 10*, 151-161.

Pérez-Cañado, M.L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: past, present, future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 15*(3), 315-341

Sánchez García, D. (2010). *Classroom interaction in University Settings*: The case of questions in three disciplines. M.A Dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Torrego Egido, L. (2004) Ser profesor universitario, ¿un reto en el contexto de la convergencia europea? UN recorrido por declaraciones y comunicados. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación de Profesorado, 51*, 259-268.

Van de Craen, P., Mondt, K., Allain, L. & Gao, Y. (2007). Why and How CLIL Works. An Outline for a CLIL Theory. *Vienna English Working Papers 16*, 3, 70-78.

Wolff, D. (2007). Bridging the gap between school and working life. In D. Wolff & D. Marsh (eds.) (pp.*120-130).*

Author

María Ángeles Martín del Pozo

The author has taught English and Spanish as a second language since 1997 (Dublin City University, Ireland; Universidad de Valladolid, Spain). She is currently lecturing on Language Didactics at the Faculty of Education in Segovia. She has recently completed her thesis at Universidad Complutense de Madrid in the field of CLIL teacher training. In 2000 she was awarded the European Label for Innovative Language Teaching and Learning.