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Abstract
The present BA dissertation focuses on a burning issue in the current foreign language teaching scenario, namely, teacher training for CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). Its chief goal is to identify the current necessities of pre-and in-service teachers in order to successfully step up to the challenge of bilingual teaching, and also to redress the lacunae detected by offering possible solutions to equip teachers with the tools they need in the CLIL arena. In order to achieve this overarching goal, the dissertation is divided into seven main sections. It initially expounds on the characteristics of the CLIL approach, as well as on its pros and cons; it then reviews the main teacher competences and roles required within the CLIL enterprise; it subsequently glosses the main teacher training actions which have been set in place for CLIL education; and it concludes by identifying the main teacher training needs on this front, providing a list of potential solutions in the final heading to counteract these shortcomings.
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Resumen
El presente Trabajo de Fin de Grado (TFG) se centra en un tema candente en el ámbito de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras: la preparación del profesorado AICLE (Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras). Su principal objetivo es identificar las necesidades actuales del profesorado en formación y en servicio para avanzar con éxito en el desafío de la enseñanza bilingüe, así como también corregir las carencias encontradas ofreciendo posibles soluciones para equipar al profesorado con las herramientas necesarias en el campo de AICLE. Para lograr este objetivo general, el TFG se ha dividido en siete secciones principales. En primer lugar se presentan las características del enfoque AICLE, así como sus ventajas e inconvenientes; luego se revisan las principales competencias y roles requeridos para el profesorado AICLE; posteriormente se mencionan las principales acciones formativas de profesorado que han sido adoptadas para enseñar AICLE; y se concluye identificando las principales necesidades en la formación del profesorado en este terreno, proporcionando en la última sección una lista con posibles soluciones para contrarrestar las carencias.
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1. Introduction

The European Commission (EC) stated in its report on languages entitled *Europeans and their languages* (Special Eurobarometer 386, 2012) that “just over half of Europeans (54%) are able to hold a conversation in at least one additional language”. What is more, the majority of its citizens are not even active learners of languages. Within this scenario, the EC aims to implement a new educational approach that promotes the use of foreign languages across the continent, namely *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL). CLIL is an approach to language teaching that has been around for more than twenty-five years now, that is, since the beginning of the 1990s. At a first stage, CLIL mainly consisted of research and studies, and later on it was gradually implemented in the curriculum of some state schools in the European Union.

Notwithstanding the efforts of the EC, there are still many issues affecting the very basis of CLIL that need clarification in order to convert this new teaching method into the final solution for teaching second or foreign languages in our continent (Eurydice, 2006). Putting CLIL into practice is an arduous task that requires a great deal of effort in the field of teacher training, and today this is a burning issue to address.

Given the poor linguistic situation across Europe, CLIL could well be the educational response that Europe needs to develop and promote second languages. This dissertation is thus intended to pinpoint the deficiencies affecting teacher training for CLIL in order to subsequently provide a list of proposals to face these shortcomings. In addition, it will also focus on the concept of CLIL in an attempt to delimit its core characteristics and vouch for its recognition as a unique educational approach. Reviewing these issues is important to build up a collective consciousness on language learning. That is basically the reason why the dissertation is devoted to this topic.

Regarding the structure of the dissertation, it is divided into six sections and presents a sieve-like structure, that is, it moves from the general to the specific. The first section, entitled ‘Definition and characterization of CLIL’, aims to describe the concept of CLIL and delimit its core characteristics. The scope of CLIL is analysed by comparing it to other bilingual approaches, such as immersion programmes. Subsequently, the next section consists of two subsections and intends to point out the advantages and disadvantages of CLIL, as well as the assets and pitfalls of CLIL.
teachers. To demonstrate the benefits of CLIL is essential in order to support the advocacy shown in the first section. Then, the following section discusses the roles of CLIL teachers and their competences. A new teaching approach requires new attitudes and competences that are indispensable for its success, and these will consequently be examined. So far, these three sections focus on the intrinsic characteristics of CLIL, which can serve as the basis to determine teacher training deficiencies.

Afterwards, the section entitled ‘Teacher training actions for CLIL’ explains the actions that educational institutions have taken in the past to supersede the shortcomings affecting teaching. Moreover, the necessity to improve in-service teacher training is emphasized. The next heading, ‘Needs analysis of CLIL teacher training needs’, is the most significant one of this dissertation. It consists of five subsections, and strives to summarize the chief CLIL teacher lacunae. Furthermore, it focuses on the abilities that CLIL teachers need to put into practice within this approach. And finally, the last section is devoted to providing a set of proposals to help teachers to overcome the deficiencies affecting their teaching. The list of proposals is based on a study carried by researchers from the University of Jaén, entitled ‘Proyecto NALTT: Needs Analysis of Language Teacher Training’.

CLIL is thought to be the way forward to upgrade foreign language learning across Europe, notwithstanding that perhaps we have not yet found the way to put it into practice properly. We hope this dissertation contributes to provide a better understanding of the current problems affecting CLIL, as well as to reflect on the possible answers that are required to teach CLIL successfully.

2. Definition and Characterisation of CLIL

As we have previously seen in the section above, the growing interest in bilingual education has given rise to the pursuit of new teaching methods in second and foreign language teaching across Europe. This willingness to discover new teaching methods is expected to improve in a substantial way the current European linguistic situation, and CLIL is thought to be the way forward. Nevertheless, there are still many issues affecting the very basis of CLIL that need to be clarified in order to convert this new
teaching approach into an adequate solution for second language learning in our continent (Eurydice, 2006).

One of these essential aspects is the definition and characterisation of CLIL. Due to the large number of definitions provided by many scholars, and the lack of delimitation in questions like to what extent immersion programmes differ from CLIL, in this section we will deal with the different opinions regarding the pedagogical approaches that claim to integrate both the curricular content and a second language, the balance between content and language, or the goals to be achieved through education.

It is remarkable to ascertain that the need for a unanimously accepted definition of the term is very important if the CLIL community wants to attain a meaningful teaching experience. Otherwise, the interpretation of the term can be as broad as the number of classrooms committed to the practice of this pedagogical approach, posing a barrier to its evolution (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2013: 2).

The term has been defined in a variety ways, although the definition given by Coyle et al. (2010: 1) is a very adequate point of reference to start with:

*Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. That is, in the teaching and learning process, there is a focus not only on content, and not only on language. Each is interwoven, even if the emphasis is greater on one or the other at a given time.*

However, this definition gives rise to a wide range of possibilities whereby many educational approaches can be conceived. The dual-focused approach idea was employed by Marsh (2002) to refer to the simultaneous learning of both content and a foreign language. This very same definition also talks of “an additional language used for the learning and teaching of both content and language”, i.e. an additional language, presumably a second or foreign language, being used as the medium of tuition. And last but not least, this short definition concludes with these words: “Each (element: language and content) is interwoven, even if the emphasis is greater on one or the other at a given time”. This points to one of the most controversial issues: does CLIL relate certain specific percentages to content and language? It does not; some scholars have claimed
that a 50:50 proportion is the most suitable proportion, although many others think that there is not a precise percentage in this sense.

A further analysis of CLIL suggests that it is an ‘umbrella’ term. Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols (2008) believe that CLIL covers around a dozen educational approaches, amongst which they distinguish ‘total immersion’, ‘partial immersion’, ‘international projects’, ‘local projects’, or ‘student exchanges’. This large variety of approaches has both a positive side and a negative one: the upside makes us reflect on the great number of opportunities that CLIL offers in order to teach content through a second language, whereas the downside dwells on establishing links or identifying specific characteristics that apply to all of these approaches, thus being unique in CLIL. “In other words, the possible forms that CLIL can take are so inclusive that it is difficult to think of any teaching or learning activity in which a second/foreign language would be used that could not be considered CLIL” (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2013: 4).

In short, the notion of CLIL still needs to be fine-tuned since its core characteristics cannot be clearly distinguished. The most outstanding feature of CLIL is related to the teaching of content through a second language as the medium of instruction, yet this characteristic can no longer be ‘innovative’ or ‘forward-looking’ if it is not possible to set boundaries between CLIL and other Content-Based Instruction programmes. Hence, in order to establish a clear-cut definition of CLIL, a further distinction concerning the relation between immersion programmes and CLIL is necessary.

By comparing CLIL and immersion programmes it is possible to establish their differences and similarities, one of the principal aims of this discussion that tries to establish the characteristics of CLIL. A first noteworthy feature of CLIL is its markedly European character; it is considered to be the European alternative to bilingual education. Genesee (1994) claims that, at some point in the 20th century, the European choice that involved the learning of language through content overtook North American foreign language instruction in isolation. CLIL has evolved so that nowadays it is no longer a branch of American immersion programmes, and their differences can be pinpointed vis-à-vis their goals, the target languages, or the balance that exists between content and language.
The distinction of the goals in CLIL and immersion programmes resides in to what extent, and for what purpose, students want to use the language. That is, it has often been stated that immersion programmes try to achieve a high level proficiency, close to a native-like proficiency, while CLIL is thought to be a methodological approach to improve considerably a second language, though with some more restrictions in terms of language efficiency (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010).

Nevertheless, the European Commission (2012), in its report on languages, believes that the academic expectations of CLIL across different countries in Europe might be different. They think of the Swedish attaining a much higher language proficiency than Portuguese or Spanish students would. Likewise, some immersion programmes do not seek for a native-like proficiency in their students, as might be the case of Spanish immersion programmes in countries like China or the USA, where an instrumental use of the language is preferred in order to build up business links.

In terms of target language, it has usually been stated that CLIL programmes promote the use of a foreign language, instead of a regional/local spoken language which is usually developed in immersion programmes (Lasagabaster & Sierra 2010). However, the Eurydice report provides a different view on this issue by stating that CLIL is also present in programmes that deal with local and regional languages. According to our own perception of CLIL, and taking into consideration its aim to promote second languages across Europe, we would agree with Lasagabaster & Sierra’s notion of the target language of the speaker. This idea is likely to be in accordance with the European purpose to increase second language development. Although local or regional languages are not as conspicuous in CLIL programmes, these minority languages are not left to oblivion within them.

A further possible distinction between CLIL and immersion education resides in the balance between language and content in class. This issue is probably the most difficult to deal with, for CLIL and their closest approaches, like CBI programmes, mainly differ on this controversial balance. Therefore, there are many opinions on CLIL and immersion programmes with respect to how much language or content is integrated in the lesson, differentiating between language-driven programmes, where the focus of the learning programme is to learn language, and content-driven programmes, where the main focus of the learning task resides in the learning of content through a second
language. Despite this apparently very simple choice, there are many doubts on the intrinsic nature of both programmes. According to Coyle et al. (2010: 1), CLIL is a content-driven program and it is thus considered innovative in the European context, as a result of teaching content through a foreign language. Furthermore, although CLIL seems to be one more content-based approach out of the several which exist, Marsh (2008) insists on the idea that the innovation of CLIL resides in the development of content through a second language integrated within the curricular content of a certain subject. Furthermore, Marsh (2008) envisages CLIL as a content-driven approach whereby language skills significantly progress despite its content focus, and states that immersion programmes differ considerably from CLIL since the former are more interested in the use of language rather than in content.

It is also possible to state that there is some evidence which points to the fact that CLIL is an approach where the curriculum is somehow designed in a way that both language and content are given the importance expected beforehand (Coyle 2008; Coyle et al. 2010: 6). This evidence arises from the fact that CLIL teachers normally are subject specialists, an aspect that tends to confirm their faithfulness to the teaching of content through a second language.

There are even more aspects that could be discussed in order to distinguish both of these programmes. For instance, teaching materials are one such pedagogical issue. Lasagabaster & Sierra (2009), through their experience as teachers, have noticed that immersion programmes tend to hand out materials especially designed for native speakers of the language, whereas CLIL mainly employs edited teaching materials. As a consequence, CLIL materials are determined by their language objective.

In summary, CLIL deserves to be considered an innovative approach that has changed the European view on teaching a second language including subject content in bilingual schools. Pérez Cañado (2012: 318) insists on the idea that CLIL is “clearly distinct”, and that “it thus merits attention on its own right, as it is no longer considered a mere offshoot of other types of bilingual programmes, but an increasingly acknowledged trend in foreign language teaching”.

Nevertheless, it is remarkable to mention that immersion programmes have been a point of departure in the design of some of the core characteristics of CLIL related to language teaching (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009), namely American bilingual
programmes and French immersion programmes in Canada. In order to continue delving deeper into the specific nature of CLIL, let us now examine its chief assets and pitfalls in order to determine its efficacy for teachers and students.

3. Advantages and disadvantages

Many studies have revealed that CLIL is substantially beneficial for students. CLIL has been implemented in Europe in order to upgrade foreign language competence, and seems to be totally accepted as it is not considered potentially detrimental for European education (Bruton, 2013).

However, the aim of this section is also to highlight some of the disadvantages that CLIL may convey. For each of the arguments that support the implementation of CLIL in European classrooms there is a reason against it, although the latter may not be as convincing as the reasons in favour of its implementation. The following discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of CLIL is based primarily on Bruton (2013), Maza Calviño (2012), and Pérez Cañado (2013).

3.1. Advantages

Let us begin by compiling some of the beneficial effects that may result from the implementation of CLIL in the classroom. One of the most significant advantages is the fact that it is an approach which depends on many factors for its implementation, being context one of the most determining issues (Bruton, 2013). For instance, teachers can adapt their materials according to the needs of their students: thus, it is possible to affirm that CLIL is taught with regard to the language possibilities of the students.

Regarding the linguistic dimension, Pérez Cañado (2013) remarks the increment of exposure to authentic input in class for the students, which would result in the increase of the communicative competence of the students. With respect to content knowledge, students are favoured by using CLIL, since they develop academic competences together with specific communicative skills.

Besides, students may feel they are learning a second language meaningfully in so far as this learning is reflected in their actual use of the second language in class, or
basically because they need it in order to pass the content of the subject (Maza Calviño 2012). Thus, attitude and self-confidence is considerably reinforced, for many reasons:

1. Students’ attitudes in learning foreign languages are favoured as a result of a meaningful learning in which they do not focus on grammar. What is more, they focus on meaning, and so it entails the possibility to communicate with native speakers of the language.

2. Students develop cultural ties with the native-speaking countries of the foreign language they are learning, increasing their interest in their language and their tolerance to other cultures.

3. Students feel comfortable with a natural use of the language as a result of the necessity to fulfil some tasks with their classmates.

Apart from students, there are also assets for teachers in the implementation of CLIL in their classrooms. For instance, teachers who know foreign languages and are also qualified to teach a curricular subject other than second languages have more opportunities to be chosen amongst the different state schools thanks to the implementation of CLIL (Maza Calviño 2012).

Besides, the CLIL approach is likely to link the different departments of a certain school, who now have to cooperate to a greater extent for the correct development of this unique approach (Pérez Cañado 2013). What is more, it can be thought of as a career ladder for bilingual schools to organize intercultural exchanges across Europe, spreading the CLIL community to every corner of the continent. And finally, CLIL involves the use of materials and technology whereby new, meaningful pedagogical teaching can be obtained.

Another noteworthy benefit in the use of CLIL is the case of the ‘motivated teacher’, as Bruton (2013) puts it. He underscores that there are a lot of teachers who feel enthusiastic about becoming involved in this new teaching experience. These teachers are moved by their vocational commitment, and consequently their lessons are, to a greater extent, commendable.

3.2. Disadvantages

However, there is also a potentially large downside to CLIL implementation. The latter affects both teachers (and, most prominently, their preparation) and students.
Hopefully, it is just a matter of time for CLIL to be successfully implemented in state schools. However, it seems we are not sufficiently prepared yet to undertake this new approach, and the reason is basically the lack of preparation of CLIL teachers. Most of the potential teachers that there are nowadays need to attend some special courses designed for the development of a second language through which they will teach contents (Pérez Cañado 2013).

Another issue that is not a reality yet is the lack of materials for organizing a CLIL lesson (Pérez Cañado 2013). The fact that the implementation of the CLIL approach is dependent on the context of the country/region is a serious problem for the publishing houses concerning the design of materials, not to mention the different education systems in each country across Europe. This leads state schools to create their own materials, and to allot precious time to this lack of resources.

Something that has been briefly commented on above is the variety of educational systems across Europe, whereby every country establishes its own systems attending to its specific needs. This fact makes it difficult to prepare teaching materials, but it also has a potentially large upside, as it allows tailoring materials to the classes’ specific needs, thus teaching according to the students’ capabilities.

It is also remarkable to consider CLIL as a political tool used to cause harm to minority languages by imposing English as second language in most bilingual schools. In the Spanish context, the case of Basque, Galician, or Catalan, being official languages are at risk due to the English supremacy in bilingual schools, a phenomenon that Dalton-Puffer (2011) ironically names ‘Content and English Integrated Learning’.

Related to the curricular subjects, some of these present a limited amount of syntactic structures or lexicon, as it is the case of Mathematics or other science subjects. Furthermore, most of the language used in class possesses academic characteristics; that is, it is a kind of language oriented to fulfil academic tasks, and hence, in many cases there is a lack of basic communication skills in the students (Ruiz Gómez, 2015). Nevertheless, teachers can overcome this issue by creating appropriate materials that facilitate this use of the language. And finally, the necessity for a correct evaluation is crucial so as to develop CLIL correctly. Results need to be clear in terms of assessment, otherwise it would be very difficult for researchers to investigate the consequences of
the implementation of CLIL in our classrooms, and this is a problem that still needs to be addressed.

Moving onto the disadvantages for students, Pérez Cañado (2013) warns about the possible difficulties posed by CLIL that students may face. For instance, teaching content through a second language may provoke unease or frustration in the students, who may find it difficult to follow a lesson through a second language. In addition, content itself can also be detected as a challenge for them. Hence, the correct integration of the subject content and the foreign language is also critical for students to feel comfortable in a CLIL environment.

Furthermore, CLIL may not be equally effective to all the students; some of the students may be harmed as a result of the implementation of a second language in class, whereas another group of students may progress excessively, thus creating differences among the students (Pérez Cañado, 2013).

All in all, CLIL advocates are optimistic in putting this approach into practice, although as we have ascertained, there are many issues that require special attention in order to overcome the shortcomings that may appear in its process of development. Thus, we can state that depending on the country, CLIL will demand different action plans that adapt to the context of each region. Another noteworthy issue we have observed is the investment that is necessary for the implementation of CLIL, either in terms of materials or vis-à-vis teacher training.

4. Teacher Roles for CLIL and Competences

It is precisely to this teacher training that we now turn. As we have mentioned in the previous section, CLIL has a large number of benefits that guarantee a high-level education, preparing students for the new developing world we are facing. However, it entails a new approach never implemented before, as CLIL requires new pedagogical resources and teaching methodologies. This means that not only do educational systems need to change their perspective on second language teaching in a compulsory way, but also that teachers at all levels of education have to adopt new roles and competences for CLIL. In this section, we will address these new roles and competences which are essential for future CLIL teachers.
4.1. Teacher roles

In order for teachers to successfully step up to CLIL implementation, several aspects are required: a correct preparation in a content subject, a correct use of a second language to accomplish the language purposes in class, the integration of the afore-mentioned aspects, and also the assimilation of CLIL within the educational institution (Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, & Frigols, 2010).

It is usually the content teacher who is thought to be the most adequate CLIL teacher, commonly supported by a language teacher to integrate both language and content, although language teachers also have the possibility to include content in their language classes. Nevertheless, the CLIL teacher usually presents volatility, or lack of confidence, when teaching through the CLIL programme; content teachers find difficulties to express their ideas in the target language, and so do language teachers when teaching content (Pavón & Rubio, 2010). All in all, the CLIL teacher is forced to a certain extent to be capable of teaching content instructions and integrating this with an accurate precision in the use of the second language (Frigols, Marsh, Mehisto, & Wolff, 2011).

According to Pavón & Ellison (2013), content teachers may be faced with two problems when teaching through a foreign language. Firstly, because of the low level in the second language, the content teacher is likely to use the mother tongue in a first attempt to teach the content and subsequently s/he summarizes what s/he has said previously in the mother tongue. This is due to the fact that s/he may feel unable to deliver a full class in the second language. This leads to a positive benefit, which is the consolidation of the lexicon as a consequence of being exposed to both the mother tongue and the second language almost simultaneously. However, there is little integration of language and content, which is the main idea of CLIL. The success of the CLIL teacher is committed to the implementation of linguistic tasks with communicative goals wherein students practice among themselves, not to teach something, but to understand and be able to put it into practice. CLIL reaches its zenith in class when the student is able to understand and retain the content information at the same time as s/he is capable of communicating properly in the second language as a consequence of the content explained in class.
The second issue which is usually attributed to content teachers is the fact that they may feel that students need to acquire language knowledge, resulting in linguistic explanatory lessons instead of conveying the content of the subject. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that content teachers delivering a CLIL class will never be language teachers (Pavón & Ellison, 2013), and this is why CLIL teachers should never try to overexpose their students to a great amount of language elements. As has been previously stated, CLIL students should understand the input they receive and try to reproduce meaningfully what they have been taught through the second language. It is when they participate in tasks with their classmates that students will try to negotiate the meaning of the language (Coyle, 2007). Language is treated as a means to teach content, not as an objective in itself.

4.2. Competences

Having discussed part of the new role of the CLIL teacher, it is now time to focus on the competences that are required for CLIL teaching. Perez Cañado (2015) draws up an original taxonomy of competences for the CLIL teacher, basing herself on the most outstanding national and international proposals (Hansen-Pauly, Bentner, Jovanovic, Zerbato, Llinares, Dafouz, & Hofmannova, 2009; Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, & Frigols, 2010; Bertaux, Coonan, Frigols, & Mehisto, 2010; Lorenzo, Trujillo, & Vez, 2011; Pavón & Ellison, 2013; Madrid Manrique & Madrid Fernández, 2014; Pérez Cañado, 2015) Pérez Cañado includes seven main competences to be adopted by a bilingual teacher, which are detailed below.

The first competence that is mentioned is linguistic competence. This term covers several components such as intercultural competence, or the skills that a learner of foreign languages possesses in order to cope successfully in situations that require intercultural communication; curricular competence, referring to the command of the elements of the educational curriculum; and also the understanding and development of the dichotomy BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency), formulated by Cummins (1999) and broached in the sixth section of this dissertation.

Methodological competence is also required, which deals with the command of students’ pedagogical strategies, the changes that are related to a new educational environment and the correct use of new materials concerned with bilingual education,
apart from ensuring a more transparent and diversified evaluation in which students are assessed in a fair way. Related to the methodological competence, the ‘knowledge basis’ refers to the command of the CLIL approach and its theoretical foundations.

Another competence to take into account is organizational competence, which is concerned with the management and control of the lesson in consonance with the new methodological currents that suggest a different view of the class in terms of organization and distribution of the class elements. Interpersonal competence is also pivotal, which has to do with socio-emotional factors that help to create the proper conditions for students to feel comfortable. CLIL teachers are responsible for creating a close relationship and rapport between themselves and their students, so that the latter realise they are supported by the teacher.

One of the characteristics of CLIL is the close collaboration between the different departments; that is, between language teachers and subject teachers. This is known as the collaborative competence, which encourages teamwork through the cooperation of the educational community. And finally, the last competence mentioned by Pérez Cañado is the competence for reflection and development, concerned with research through the teachers’ professional career, committing to the new educational models and lifelong learning, that is, the self-development of knowledge during our entire life.

In conclusion, CLIL is an approach whereby language teachers teach content through a second language, or content teachers deliver their classes using a second language. As a result, collaboration between both kinds of teachers prevails so that CLIL results in a successful educational method. To reach the integration of language and content does not only imply such an attitude, but other means are essential as well, just like we have previously mentioned in this section: new roles and competences to be adopted; a new perspective in terms of class organization; and a positive attitude to believe in such a European project that will change the outlook on second language education across the continent.
Do existing teacher training actions develop the afore-mentioned competences? This next section will attempt to canvass existing teacher development actions to determine whether or not this is the case. The first heading of this dissertation discussed the initial idea of CLIL, and what the European Commission aimed at with the implementation of this approach. There, we mentioned that this language project has been around for more than twenty-five years now, that is, since the beginning of the 1990s. However, even though universities have tried to lead teacher training courses, they did not appear until fifteen years ago, when local institutions decided to take part in this matter. As a consequence, the increase in interest and improvement of these courses by local schools has made possible the progress towards courses which are in accordance with the schools’ specific needs (Coonan, 2011).

Nowadays, teacher training courses are adapted to the people involved according to their shortcomings and the way they act within these practical courses. The participants in these courses need to develop a sense of creativity to formulate their own method so as to teach a course that may require specific needs (Coonan, 2011). This is extremely important due to the fact that one of the key elements of CLIL is to be able to adapt to the teaching to the needs of a certain group. Besides, these courses develop teachers’ competences in consonance with this new approach.

Attending to integration needs, it is possible to identify two major types of courses, which depend on the addressseees. On the one hand, there are training courses for language teachers who must integrate content in their lessons. And, on the other, there are courses for content teachers who need to know how to integrate a second language in the curricular subject they teach.

As has been mentioned before, it is both the universities and the local and regional administration that have promoted training courses to educate CLIL teachers (Madrid Manrique & Madrid Fernández, 2014). Different university faculties have launched new university degrees explicitly created to put an end to the shortcomings of previous degrees where CLIL was left aside. Nevertheless, it is important to state that some studies prove that such efforts have not been enough to cope with the new requirements in present-day bilingual education (Pérez Cañado, 2015). In turn, the local and regional administrations have launched courses to improve linguistic and
methodological practices, lectures related to this purpose, and several projects and scholarships. All of these events have been a positive push for the future CLIL teachers, although as Cabezas Cabello (2010) states, there must be alternatives that enhance teacher training apart from these attempted, but as yet insufficient, efforts.

Despite these previous lines of action, more emphasis is being placed on the preparation of future CLIL teachers. What is relevant currently is that, thanks to the implementation of CLIL in state schools around Europe, more information is being obtained on how CLIL is working in practice (Pavón & Ellison, 2013), and consequently CLIL advocates are becoming conscious of the shortcomings, which will be commented on in the following section.

CLIL training programmes must be designed to address the competences that this approach requires and to develop not only knowledge of the language but also its integrated use with content. Considering this fact, the objectives in these courses are oriented towards collaboration and coordination between the teachers involved, that is, language teachers and content teachers (European Commission, Eurydice, 2003).

One recurrent question in these CLIL training courses is: ‘are language teachers prepared enough to teach content for CLIL programmes?’, and vice versa, ‘are content teachers prepared enough to teach through a second language?’. It is remarkable to state that teacher preparation for CLIL does not only imply attending specific courses which showcase how to teach in a CLIL programme; other requirements are also necessary, such as a certification that proves the linguistic level of a practitioner. In the case of in-service teachers, who in the past have not had as many opportunities as present-day teachers, they are given the chance to attend to language lessons so that their language level increases gradually (Pavón, 2010).

Pavón & Ellison (2013) consider “personal reflection, CLIL fundamentals and methodology and assessment the most important dimensions that a training programme for CLIL should cover”. In other words, CLIL training programmes should emphasize the core characteristics of CLIL and comply with these; otherwise this approach might become something with similar characteristics to CLIL, but distinct from the integration of both content and language.
6. Needs analysis of CLIL teacher training needs

Teacher training actions have thus far been deemed insufficient on the basis of research outcomes, on which we now proceed to focus. There has been a great interest in conducting research dealing with the integration of content and language. Initially, it helped to build the basis of CLIL, giving rise to the first attempts to put CLIL into practice, whereas in a second stage, research was mainly devoted to the analysis of the first attempts of CLIL, thereby collecting information on the needs to improve teaching practices.

In the past, CLIL advocates seemed to be very confident in the positive results of this new approach despite the fact that no solid, empirically-based conclusions could be derived. In this sense, there was a certain risk of disappointment if the results of research were not sufficient to satisfy the provisions stipulated by the European Commission (Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter, 2013). However, even though the research conducted was favourable, reports on needs analysis made evident the lacunae that continue to exist in most CLIL schools.

The exact effectiveness of CLIL is a debate that is likely to be solved thanks to more research on the field. For instance in Europe, the research driven by CLIL advocates is mainly involved with the compliance of integration between content and language, the role and competences of the CLIL teacher, and training teacher methods (Wolff, 2005). Nevertheless, researchers have not been able to conclude whether the results are positive or negative, and this has to do with the fact that, according to Coyle (2007), there are more than 200 types of CLIL programmes across Europe. The actual situation in Europe in terms of CLIL approaches, however, is not as different as it might seem. There are more similarities than differences amongst CLIL programmes in Europe (Marsh, 2002), and English tends to be the most commonly taught language.

The responsibility of the success of CLIL does not only depend on teachers, as it happens in other approaches (ESP): it affects students, state schools, universities, and even the European Commission. Nevertheless, one of the direct participants in CLIL is the teacher community, who must be provided with specific courses to teach CLIL and with the support of the different political institutions (Fortanet-Gómez & Ruiz-Garrido, 2009). Concerning teaching training needs in Europe, recent studies have helped shed some much-needed light on needs analysis for future CLIL teachers.
Following Cabezas Cabello (2010), Coonan (2011), Pérez Cañado (2014), and Rubio Mostacero (2009), the chief areas where teacher training has been found to be pivotal for successful CLIL implementation will not be outlined. These comprise five chief headings: linguistic aspects, methodological aspects, material and resources, assessment, and motivation and coordination. This overview will allow us to canvass current teachers’ lacunae and what teacher training courses should offer in order to address these niches.

6.1. Linguistic aspects

Concerning linguistic competence, Pérez Cañado (2014) identified conspicuous lacunae related to the use of language in class through the results obtained from the ‘NALTT Project’\(^1\). Firstly, the study demonstrated that trainee teachers present considerable shortcomings vis-à-vis linguistic and intercultural competences. The study detected problems of pronunciation, and the need to improve language skills related to communication and interaction with the foreign language in real contexts. Furthermore, pre- and in-teachers require increased training in BICS and CALP in order to successfully step up to bilingual teaching. BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) are two concepts formulated by Cummins (1999); the former refers to the language skills that are applied in social circumstances, the skills a person possesses to develop social relationships, whereas the latter refers to the learning associated with academic purposes.

Coonan (2011) has also highlighted some of the teacher training needs in relation to the linguistic area. Three aspects were emphasized taking into account teachers’ second language competence. First, it was considered essential for teachers to possess a recognized linguistic level in a foreign language as specified by CLIL programmes; the knowledge of the foreign language should not only refer to the aspects covered in class. The linguistic flexibility of the teacher was equally foregrounded in this study: this linguistic flexibility refers to the skills of the CLIL teacher to cope with any difficulty in the second language beyond what is covered in the lesson. It is highly important because it is considered as an indispensable support for the students, who might become interested in some issue related to the topic at hand of the class. If the CLIL teacher shows lack of linguistic flexibility, the whole CLIL programme might be

\(^1\) “NALTT Project: Needs Analysis of Language Teacher Training: A European Perspective” (EA2010-0087).
compromised due to the lack of motivation of the students. And finally, the need to work abroad is also underscored, in order to improve the teachers’ linguistic skills in the foreign language.

Language proficiency also transpires as a major deficiency in Cabezas Cabello’s research (2010). In his analysis of the APPP (Andalusian Plurilingualism Promotion Plan), this author remarked that most of the non-linguistic subject teachers do not apply properly the language skills needed to deliver a CLIL lesson through a second language, something he ascribes to their limited second language proficiency. As a consequence, he also ponders over the possibility to review some of the foreign language needs in teacher training programmes for subject teachers.

6.2. Methodological aspects

A second noteworthy area in need of further training for CLIL teachers affects methodological aspects. Teachers’ deficiencies on this front include problems to adapt and design a curriculum for CLIL, as well as the integration of the latter within their teaching lessons (Pérez Cañado, 2014). As a consequence, most trainee teachers do not find the way to implement a student-centred methodology, which comprises such recent language teaching trends as task-based language teaching, cooperative learning, or project-based learning. What is more, they also find problems with establishing collaboration between content and language teachers, a crucial aspect for a success-prone implementation of CLIL. The CLIL teachers need to adopt a new teaching perspective, together with a new attitude, and a new viewpoint concerning team-work. According to Cabezas Cabello (2010), educational authorities have not anticipated these problems related to the integration of the curriculum into the new educational approach, thereby adopting a subject-centred curriculum.

Another important issue that trainee teachers should revise in order to adequately implement CLIL methodology affects the theoretical fundamentals of CLIL. They are aware of the main objectives of CLIL and recognise what implementation of this approach aims to achieve, but they are not familiar with the characteristics of CLIL, its origins and models, and even the reasons why today it is being implemented throughout Europe (Rubio Mostacero, 2009; Pérez Cañado, 2014).
A final concern pertaining to the methodological area has to do with getting students to speak in class. This is one of the greatest challenges that a foreign language teacher has to face, and it is likely to appear in CLIL lessons as well. There are two main reasons why students are not receptive enough to try to speak in class: shyness, or fear to be laughed at by the rest of the students, and the lack of knowledge of the structure of the language or expressions. These actions have important negative consequences on the students’ development of the language and their communicative competence, which is one of the reasons why it should be directly addressed by the CLIL teacher (Coonan, 2011).

6.3. Materials and resources

In line with methodology are materials and resources, another pivotal area in dire need of amelioration. At present, they are conspicuous for their scarcity in CLIL programmes. Due to this lack of availability of adequate CLIL materials, teachers have to face the daunting task of adapting authentic materials in their lessons or designing original ones to meet their students’ needs.

Pérez Cañado (2014: 16) points out some of the key deficiencies related to the materials and resources for CLIL purposes: “Thus, it seems that practicing teachers are well-acquainted with the authentic materials and software available for CLIL programs, but lack sufficient grounding on ICT options, (except for interactive whiteboards), materials design and adaptation, and collaborative work for integrated curriculum design”.

One of the key elements for the success of the CLIL teacher is related to the ability to create activities for their teaching lessons. At this point, it would be necessary to differentiate between foreign language teachers and content teachers. Traditionally, language teachers have been taught how to create new activities for their lessons because these play a prominent role in language lessons. However, content teachers may not have sufficient grounding in creating their own exercises, which means that they should hone and fine-tune this aspect of their teaching methodology. The reinforcement of the creativity of exercises is thought as essential in CLIL owing to the scarcity of materials specifically designed for teaching through this approach. In this sense, CLIL is not likely to be successful if teachers are not provided with quality materials (Cabezas Cabello, 2010).
A final training need which is foregrounded on the materials front is the desirability of instructing content teachers to collaborate adequately with language teachers in order to prepare their own materials. In addition, the creation of CLIL teacher associations or websites that allow teachers to comment and reflect on their production is deemed a very effective way to promote the creation of support materials. For instance, teacher training courses would improve substantially by means of supplying some kind of assistance through CLIL websites where adapted content for CLIL lessons is facilitated (Coonan, 2011). Another useful idea would be the foundation of newspapers devoted to CLIL and in which debates concerning these issues would be taken into account; the collaboration of the different schools of the area would be a very adequate point of departure in this sense.

6.4. Assessment

Another crucial curricular aspect alongside methodology and materials is evaluation. It is always difficult to assess students irrespective of the educational approach being followed, but in the case of CLIL it is particularly troublesome. CLIL is a dual-focused approach, which means that two aspects are being considered: content and language. Thus, how can CLIL teachers assess both dimensions? Should there be an emphasis of one over the other? With which instruments can it be validly and reliably carried out? These are all important questions which arise when CLIL evaluation is considered (Pérez Cañado, 2014).

Content can be evaluated by means of how much the student knows about the information taught in class, although it can be more complex than it seems due to the fact that the student may have language obstacles to communicate what s/he knows. As a result, assessment can be unfair in some cases. A primacy of content over language assessment has often been advocated in CLIL contexts, as language is used by teachers as a means of communication to promote content learning. However, both aspects need to be considered for adequate CLIL evaluation and in the right proportion, which is no mean feat for many teachers, who consequently require increased training in this area.

6.5. Further issues: motivation and coordination

Finally, for any CLIL programme to come to fruition, commitment and cooperation are crucial on the part of all the stakeholders involved. The lack of coordination and
motivation between CLIL teachers has been identified as a problem that endangers the sustainability of CLIL in terms of results.

Many CLIL teachers find in CLIL an opportunity to move from their workplace rather than to embrace a new educational approach destined to overcome the current deficiencies in second language teaching (Cabezas Cabello, 2010). As a consequence, such detrimental actions are usually reflected in the results obtained in many of the studies that have been carried up until present.

A large number of CLIL teachers do not regularly engage in ongoing professional development, seldom attending courses or lectures devoted to improving their CLIL training or their teaching skills. What is more, there is a lack of concern towards research in the field of CLIL. Hence, one of the most distinctive deficiencies is the low interest in what is known as lifelong-learning (Pérez Cañado, 2014).

Concerning collaboration between the educational community, efforts clearly need to be increased. According to Pérez Cañado (2014: 4), “techniques for successful tandem teaching among language teachers, content teachers, and TAs are therefore required to ensure smooth sailing on the correct integration between content and language”, thereby attaining a proper coordination. In the case of the Andalusian Plurilingualism Promotion Plan (APPP), Cabezas Cabello (2010) mentions that there is a lack of coordination between bilingual schools, with notable organisational problems and no support for the aforementioned educational plan from the educational authorities.

Thus, the needs analysis conducted via the afore-mentioned studies for teaching CLIL is intended to be the basis of series of actions geared at improving pre- and in-service teachers’ preparation for bilingual teaching. Identifying and becoming cognizant of these deficiencies is crucial to be able to address them.

7. Teacher training proposals

And this is precisely the aim of the following section: after identifying the chief training deficiencies for CLIL teaching, it is time now to reflect on how to face up to these lacunae. This section will be devoted to the proposal of precise actions that help the teacher community to cope with the previously mentioned shortcomings in the future.
Following the pattern used to summarize teachers’ deficiencies, the following list of proposals will be based on the solutions proposed by Pérez Cañado (2014 and 2015).

Amongst these proposed lines of action, a thorough analysis of the past and current actions in CLIL is indispensable to be ready to take actions against teachers’ training deficiencies. The success in changing any aspect of the past that we consider deficient depends on how much we know about it. A deficiency is completely overcome when we make sure that we will not make the same mistakes we used to, so departing from observation of the past is essential. There are several methods whereby it is possible to achieve these analyses. First, it is essential to carry out studies to analyse how much content and educational strategies are included in teacher training for bilingual purposes. Then, institutions ought to coordinate meetings or forums in which colleagues and participants can share their critical thought on the issues affecting the proper implementation of CLIL.

Research is logically one of the key aspects to consider if we want to tackle the shortcomings and implement new proposals that replace the previous practices. Some researchers (Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter, 2013) have underscored the insufficient research devoted to CLIL, a serious matter that demands an urgent solution. This research should be the device that drives the afore-mentioned reflection and must be carried out both top-down (that is, from superior institutions like universities) and bottom-up (research driven by small institutions like state schools), trying to reach a common viewpoint amongst these institutions so as to facilitate solid, steadfast results. It would thus put an end to the existence of different theories that contradict each other.

Another important point is the fact that the information extracted from the research ought to be spread to the whole community that makes up CLIL. The dissemination of this information seeks to ensure that every CLIL advocate is updated with the latest news about what CLIL is and how it is functioning. It is crucial that the research results have a vast outreach to the rest of the community involved in CLIL, as well as to ensure all the stakeholders are familiar with the news and publications through associations, journals, or networks devoted to CLIL.

In addition to observation, information, and investigation, Pérez Cañado (2014, 2015) considers education as a fourth basic pillar on which teacher training proposals should rest. As this author contends (2014: 2): “the key to any future vision for bilingual
education is to be found in teacher training (Coyle, 2011): it is where CLIL will stand or fall in terms of sustainability”.

To begin with, new training actions entail modifications in the current curriculum, such as fostering and launching new lines of research that enhance bilingual education amongst university students, or encouraging authorities to include subjects and a specific field of study related to bilingual education in university degrees. Universities can also take into account the possibility of offering subjects related to bilingual education in teacher training master’s degrees, including traineeship programmes in bilingual schools.

Further pre- and in-service education actions include the implementation of new bilingual degrees specifically designed for teaching bilingual education, and consequently, the creation of new teaching training courses for teachers working in the field of bilingual studies. The implementation of a specific degree for bilingual teaching would thus end with many of the deficiencies through a complete degree in which CLIL would be the cornerstone. Similarly, it would be reasonable to conceive the idea of a new university master’s degree specially designed for CLIL, in which students would also focus on the main needs detected in present-day teaching.

The last of the training actions proposed concerns the possibility to enable new, specific training courses both for trainee teachers and in-service teachers. In the case of trainee teachers, the courses can be integrated in the curriculum of their master’s degree or bachelor’s degree; for instance, a subject related to CLIL belonging to the list of optional subjects. On the other hand, in the case of in-service teachers, these courses would reinforce their theoretical knowledge on how to teach CLIL successfully, as well as to upgrade their linguistic skills, like the already launched project Real English for CLIL, developed by Pérez Cañado.

Finally, motivation is vital for the success of CLIL (Fernández & Halbach, 2011; Pérez Cañado, 2014, 2015). All of the afore-mentioned actions need to walk hand in hand with motivation. Sometimes the gap between success and failure is at the mercy of teachers’ commitment and motivation, especially in CLIL, an approach that raises a number of issues and doubts. The profile of a CLIL teacher requires commitment, motivation, curiosity to be updated with the latest news in the field of research, and to be conscious that CLIL takes time until we obtain results from the educational reforms.
All in all, we have described a list of proposals designed by the members of the NALTT Project to redress a set of deficiencies, and thus seeking to ensure a better future for CLIL. The proposals suggested are related to one another in terms of gradual sequence, a continuum of actions that need each other for success (observation > investigation > information > education > motivation).

8. Conclusion

Throughout this dissertation we have reviewed the intrinsic nature of CLIL, teacher training actions taken in the past, the needs of the current teaching situation, and a list of proposals to address these needs. Hopefully, this list of contents has helped attain the objectives outlined in the introduction: to pinpoint the deficiencies affecting teacher training for CLIL and to propose a set of solutions to face up to these deficiencies. Furthermore, and despite the fact that it was not the main issue under consideration in this dissertation, we have also discussed the concept of CLIL as the broader backdrop within which our specific topic is inserted and in an attempt to describe CLIL as a “well-recognized and useful construct for promoting foreign language teaching” (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2013: 16).

In relation to the content of each of the sections, the following conclusions can be drawn. Starting with ‘Definition and characterization of CLIL’, we have discussed what CLIL is, what is expected from CLIL, and we have also delimited its core characteristics. Due to the lack of consensus to distill its features, we have reviewed the concept of CLIL providing a wide range of viewpoints and comparing this approach with immersion programmes at all levels. In the end, we have concluded that CLIL is different from its predecessors, and that it is now considered a full-fledged approach to language teaching in its own right. Subsequently, in ‘Advantages and disadvantages of CLIL’ we have highlighted some of the assets and pitfalls that CLIL entails, and it has been possible to confirm that, notwithstanding the issues that require special attention to overcome the deficiencies, CLIL is a worthwhile endeavour to carry out since its benefits are outstanding.

‘Teacher Roles for CLIL and Competences’ has sought to set forth the new pedagogical resources and teaching methodology required to teach through this novel
educational approach. In general terms, we have reviewed teaching requirements to apply CLIL, in addition to underscoring the necessity to appeal for the collaboration between departments of schools in order to coordinate the integration of content and language in CLIL contexts. Next, in ‘Teacher training actions for CLIL’, we have discussed the actions that were taken in the past for teacher training, and the position of the institutions regarding CLIL, preparing the context for the next section, which has dealt with current deficiencies in CLIL lessons.

And finally, in the last two sections we have reached the climax of the dissertation, since we have addressed its main objectives. The second-to-last section, entitled ‘Needs analysis of CLIL teacher training needs’, is divided into five major areas: linguistic aspects, methodological aspects, materials and resources, assessment, and further issues: motivation and coordination. By canvassing these major areas, we have identified, following the latest specialized literature, the main lacunae which still need to be addressed in equipping pre- and in-service teachers for the CLIL challenge. And finally, in ‘Teacher training proposals’, we have closed the dissertation with a set of proposals to provide answers to all these deficiencies that we pinpointed in the previous section. The proposals are based on the results of the NALTT Project, thereby constituting an instance of evidence-based practice, that is, of research at the service of pedagogy, a view we very much subscribe.

CLIL is quite possibly the way forward for second and foreign language teaching in our continent. It meets the requirements to solve the European problems in terms of language learning, and it could well be the best choice if the educational community is supported by both the educational and political institutions. By setting forth a series of clear-cut proposals to counter the main deficiencies diagnosed in teacher training for CLIL, we hope this dissertation can contribute to pushing the CLIL field forward by focusing on what is perhaps the most important factor in its implementation: the teacher and his/her needs.
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