Trabajo Fin de Grado

CLIL in Andalusia: Study on teachers’ view

Alumno: María del Mar Pérez Crespo
Tutor: Prof. D. María del Carmen Méndez García
Dpto: Filología Inglesa

Julio, 2015
## Contents

1. Abstract and Resumen .................................................. 1
2. Introduction .......................................................... 2
3. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) ............... 2
   3.1. CLIL methodology ............................................. 2
       3.1.1. Definition of CLIL ................................... 2
       3.1.2. Historical Background ................................ 5
       3.1.3. Types of CLIL .......................................... 9
       3.1.4. Benefits and Drawbacks of CLIL .................. 11
       3.1.5. CLIL teachers .......................................... 13
   3.2. CLIL in the Spanish context: the example of Andalusia ... 14
       3.2.1. CLIL in Spain .......................................... 14
       3.2.2. The example of Andalusia .......................... 16
4. CLIL in Jaén: A need analysis study ................................ 19
   4.1 Introduction and contextualisation .......................... 19
   4.2. Limitations of the study ................................... 21
   4.3 Objectives ........................................................ 22
   4.4. Research tool ............................................... 22
   4.4 Results and Discussions ..................................... 26
   4.5 Conclusion ..................................................... 36
5. Conclusion .................................................................. 36
6. References .................................................................. 37
1. Abstract and Resumen

- Abstract
The implementation of CLIL programmes in education has introduced some changes into the curriculum. This study on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) analyses teachers’ views of CLIL programmes from a general perspective and also more specific features such as the subjects taught through CLIL, students, teachers, available materials and languages of the programme. The data were obtained throughout a survey addressed to CLIL secondary school teachers of the province of Jaén.

Keywords: CLIL, teacher, survey, Jaén, secondary education

- Resumen
La implementación de programas de Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenido y Lengua Extranjera (AICLE) en educación ha provocado algunos cambios en el currículum. En este trabajo se presenta un estudio que examina las opiniones de los profesores sobre el programa AICLE desde un punto de vista general así como características específicas como las asignaturas impartidas en programas AICLE, los alumnos, los profesores, los materiales disponibles y los idiomas del programa. Los datos se han obtenido a través de una encuesta dirigida a los profesores que imparten docencia en programas AICLE de educación secundaria de la provincia de Jaén.

Palabras clave: AICLE, profesor, cuestionario, Jaén, educación secundaria
2. Introduction

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) education is based on the use of the students’ mother tongue and a foreign language as vehicular languages for the study of the curriculum.

Bilingualism and plurilingualism are important concepts nowadays. We live in a European society where we need languages to communicate with other European citizens.

CLIL has emerged as a new approach in education. Foreign languages take an important part in the curriculum since some subjects are taught in the foreign language as well as in the mother language.

This project looks into CLIL methodology. It is divided into two main parts. The first part analyses the concept of CLIL, its historical background, different types of CLIL, and its benefits and drawbacks. This initial part concludes with a section about CLIL in Spain and, in particular, CLIL in Andalusia.

The second part of this essay focuses on CLIL in Jaén through a need analysis study. After contextualizing the study, the results and the conclusions extracted from a survey are analysed.

3. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

3.1. CLIL methodology

CLIL methodology is discussed in this chapter. First, it starts with a section on the concept of CLIL. Then, the following section focuses on the historical background of bilingual education, different types of CLIL, the benefits and drawbacks of using CLIL and the teacher’s role when implementing CLIL.

3.1.1. Definition of CLIL

This section discusses the concept of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), CLIL is also known as “Content-based Learning” and “Cross Curricular Content” (Roadshow & Hafenstein, 2008: 16)
CLIL methodology consists in the study of some of the subjects of the curriculum through the use of a foreign or second language (usually called an additional language). According to Marsh (2000) CLIL can be defined as follows:

This approach involves learning subjects such as history, geography or others, through an additional language. It can be very successful in enhancing the learning of languages and other subjects, and developing in the youngsters a positive ‘can do’ attitude towards themselves as language learners. (Marsh, 2000: 2)

This innovation in foreign language learning is based on the rationale that while students acquire new information about a particular content subject (i.e. History) through the additional language they improve their command of the additional language. By receiving input in a second language from different disciplines, new vocabulary and grammar structures, which contain new information about the subject content, are learnt, together with the content of the subject in question. Marsh refers to this process as a dual-focused aim.

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) refers to any dual-focused educational context in which an additional language […] It is dual-focused because whereas attention may be predominantly on either subject-specific content or language, both are always accommodated. (Marsh, 2003: 1)

Graddol specifies that speaking English is nowadays a “core skill” (Graddol, 2005: 1). In a global world, people need to be able to speak nowadays at least one foreign language, together with their mother tongue. Furthermore, the European Council Resolution in 1995 stated that “all EU citizens, by the time they leave compulsory schooling, should be able to speak two languages other than the mother tongue” (2012: 3). Thus, CLIL methodology helps students to increase their exposure to the foreign language in classroom and they are likely to improve their language skills. Consequently, their exposure to the foreign language is higher “without requiring extra-time in the curriculum” (Commission of the European Communities, 2003: 8)
Graddol (2006) provides a working definition of CLIL and compares CLIL with English-medium education:

An approach to bilingual education in which both curriculum content (such as Science or Geography) and English are taught together. It differs from simple English-medium education in that the learner is not necessarily expected to have the English proficiency required to cope with the subject before beginning study. (Graddol, 2006: 88)

For Coyle et al. CLIL is “any learning activity where language is used as a tool to develop new learning from a subject area or theme” (2009: 6). In this way, CLIL uses the additional language as a vehicle between content subjects and the foreign language as a subject.

To conclude, CLIL has the potential to present a natural situation in classroom for the development of the foreign language in question. Students in CLIL classes are reported to have more positive attitudes towards language learning than non-CLIL students (Méndez García and Pavón Vázquez, 2012). As Marsh (2000: 3) indicates, CLIL may increase learners’ motivation and make them more willing to learn other languages.

Furthermore, CLIL is becoming a trend in modern education systems as it is considered to be “the best way to foster multilingualism and language diversity, one of the aims of European policies in the last decade” (Lasagabaster & Zarobe, 2010: X)

To sum up, the following illustration shows a key definitions of CLIL through time.
3.1.2. Historical Background

The word CLIL was coined in 1994 by Marsh and “launched by UNICOM, University of Jyvaskyla in Finland and the European Platform for Dutch Education” (Bonces, 2012: 179) However, this methodology is not a new phenomenon. Bilingualism and multilingualism existed, at least in the wealthiest families, around 1890s. During that period, there were two ways of learning a foreign language. On the one hand, parents hired a tutor for boys or a governess for girls who taught their children at home. On the other hand, there was a possibility to send their children abroad to learn it in private local schools (Masdevall, 2012)

The first example of CLIL methodology is considered to have taken place in Canada around the 1960s. English speakers started to become aware of the importance of French in their zone. In addition, they were worried because their children were at a disadvantage with French speakers. Hence, they urged the Government to create immersion programmes in schools where children could learn some subjects through French instead of learning all the subjects of the curriculum in English. This original idea was expanded worldwide. (Genesee and Lindholm-leary, 2007)
In 1970, many bilingual immersion programmes were located in strategic regions such as national border, places where the population used two languages or biggest cities. These programmes appeared because there was an increase in the awareness that language and content were closely associated. Their main aim was:

To turn them into bilingual children by enabling them to acquire proficiency in languages comparable to that of native speakers. Indeed, the terms generally used to denote this kind of provision are ‘bilingual’ school, education or teaching. (Eurydice, 2006: 7)

An important aim in European education is the promotion of linguistic diversity. The European Union has taken an important part in the implementation of language teaching programmes as it has launched several initiatives related to CLIL. The Council Resolution of 31 March 1995 affirms that there is a need to improve and diversify “language learning and teaching within the education system of the European Union” (Eurydice, 2006: 8) In this resolution, CLIL is explicitly related to bilingual teaching. Moreover, this Council specifies the actions to be taken towards CLIL education as far as CLIL teachers are concerned:

Encouraging the exchange with Member States of higher education students working as language assistants in schools, endeavouring to give priority to prospective language teachers or those called upon to teach their subject in a language other than their own (Eurydice, 2006: 8)

Besides, there are several programmes financed by the European Union where the main aim is the development and acquisition of foreign languages. Two of these programmes are Erasmus and Comenius.
Lastly, it is relevant to mention that CLIL methodology has been used in around 20 countries across Europe from the beginning of the 1990s mainly in Primary and Secondary education, although it is also beginning to be implemented in Higher Education. The following table indicates the terms associated with the concept of CLIL in different European countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original Term(s)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE fr</td>
<td>Enseignement en immersion</td>
<td>Immersion education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE de</td>
<td>No official terminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE nl</td>
<td>Tweetalig en meertalig onderwijs</td>
<td>Bilingual or multilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>dvojjazyčné/ bilingvni třídy or dvojjazyčné/ bilingvni sekc</td>
<td>Bilingual classes/bilingual sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Bilingualer Unterricht</td>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Aineõpetus õpitavas keele</td>
<td>Subject teaching in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lengua (AICLE)</td>
<td>CLIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Enseignement bilingue</td>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Múineadh tri Ghaeilge</td>
<td>Teaching of subjects through Irish in English-medium schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Insegnamento bilingue</td>
<td>Bilingual teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comentado [MR15]: This is not true. There are many schools across Europe that do not teach through CLIL.
In its early stages, CLIL appeared in countries with political and administrative problems, such as countries with several official languages, or with geographical problems in border areas, or with demographic problems evident in minority communities. These first countries in which CLIL began to be taught were Belgium, Luxemburg and Malta at the beginning of the 20th century. Later, in the first half of the 21st century, CLIL started to be expanded to other European countries such as Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and the United Kingdom. (Eurydice, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY</th>
<th>I didaskalia mi glossikou mathimatos meso mias ksenis glossas</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Bilingvala izgliba, bilingvala apmaciba and mucihas bilingvali</td>
<td>Bilingual education, bilingual training and learning bilingually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>No official terminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Ket tanitas nyelvu iskolai oktatás</td>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Tweetalig onderwijs ('tto')</td>
<td>CLIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht</td>
<td>CLIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Nauczanie dwujezyczne</td>
<td>Bilingual teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Poucovanje nejezikovnih predmetov v tujem jeziku</td>
<td>Teaching subjects other than foreign languages in a language other than the mother tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Bilingvalne gymnasiun</td>
<td>Bilingual gymnasiun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Kielikylpy</td>
<td>Immersion (with functional bilingualism aim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sprak-och innehallsintegrerad inlarnoch undervisning (SPRINT)</td>
<td>CLIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-ENG</td>
<td>CLIL and bilingual learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Bilingval undervisning or Guovttigielat oahphahus (Samis term)</td>
<td>Bilingual teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Predmeti izuchavani na tchujd ezik</td>
<td>Non-language disciplines (NLDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Invatamant bilingy</td>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1* Terms associated with the concept of CLIL (Eurydice, 2006: 65 - 66)
Nowadays, CLIL provisions are not generally provided in six European countries, particularly in Portugal, Greece and Denmark.

3.1.3. Types of CLIL

According to the adaptation and insertion of CLIL in classes, there is a quite obviously difference into two major types of CLIL. A difference has been established between soft and hard CLIL.

a. **Soft or weak CLIL.** Soft CLIL is language-driven. In this kind of CLIL, “the integration of content and language is done through small “doses” of the non-language area being presented in English” [Lauder, 2009: 1]. Schools, where soft CLIL is carried out, are characterised by teaching some topics as part of a language course.

b. **Hard or strong CLIL.** Hard CLIL is content-driven. In hard CLIL, an important part of the curriculum is learned through the foreign language as it is implemented in schools where there are partial immersion programmes.

There is a progression from Hard to Soft CLIL, and an intermediate area where Mid or Comfortable CLIL is placed: “the mid version of CLIL is one where lesson subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught via a foreign language with dual-focused aims, and where learning is a combination of both language and content” [Cain, 2013: 6]. In Mid CLIL, some subjects are learnt through the foreign language during part of the lessons.
I think that Hard CLIL may be the most useful type for students as it enables them to have more contact with the foreign language. Although, on the other hand, Hard CLIL requires a certain degree of familiarity or proficiency in the foreign language. Maybe, Hard CLIL could be implemented in secondary or higher education, whereas, Soft and Mid CLIL can be used as the starting point for younger learners.

Moreover, in the CLIL classroom students’ mother language and foreign language are used to provide and promote a multiperspectival, contrastive and integrated view of the content. This approach entails a significant shift in the role of the mother tongue in language learning, as in some approaches to foreign language teaching the exclusive use of the foreign language is seen as mandatory (Otten and Wildhage, 2003).
All CLIL types share three major elements: language, content and learning skills, although each type is mainly focused on one of these three elements. It has previously been argued that the dual focus of CLIL stems from the combination of content and language learning. Research on CLIL has given rise to a triple focus concept, “whereby content and language goals are pursued with a sophisticated understanding of student cognition, usually referred to as thinking skills” (Marsh and Frigols, 2010: 3).

### 3.1.4. Benefits and Drawbacks of CLIL

Firstly, the major benefit of CLIL is its widespread implementation. In the past, only affluent people could access to bilingual education but nowadays CLIL allows students to have access bilingual education as it is carried out either in state or private schools (Bentley, 2010).

Another advantage is the acquisition of a second language. Learners are exposed to more input in the second language because they need to use their foreign language to learn the content of other subjects. (Bentley, 2010).

Using their foreign language in class, students get more contact, fluency and communication practice in the foreign language. They have more chances to practise that language.

Furthermore, CLIL introduces new concepts related to the culture(s) of the foreign language such as social, economic and traditional events (Roadshow and Hafenstein, 2008). CLIL also seems to motivate students to go on studying a second foreign language.

This methodology has the potential to change class behaviour and learners’ involvement by fostering active participation. It promotes cooperative learning and students also take part in the selection of themes and activities. Students learn a foreign language and the information that they acquire is “interesting, useful and has a clear end goal” (Pavón Vázquez and Rubio Alcalá, 2010: 47).
Apart from the difference in the students’ roles in class, there is also a change regarding teachers’ roles, given that collaboration is essential in CLIL programmes. Team teaching is the act of collaboration between two teachers in the CLIL class (see Hibler, 2010). Team teaching seems to benefit professional development and a supportive environment “by working with another adult, teachers are less lonely (Robinson and Schaible, 1995: 45).

Muñoz (2002) offers an explanation for why CLIL tends to yield positive outcomes. The key reasons include:

1. Learners benefit from higher quality teaching and from input that is meaningful and understandable.
2. CLIL may strengthen learners’ ability to process input, which prepares them for higher-level thinking skills, and enhances cognitive development.
3. In CLIL, literacy development takes place in the first language, which is cognitively beneficial for the child. Later, literacy skills will transfer to the additional languages.
4. In CLIL the learners’ affective filter may be lower than in other situations, for learning takes place in a relatively anxiety-free environment.
5. Learners’ motivation to learn content through the foreign language may foster and sustain motivation towards learning the foreign language itself. (Muñoz, 2002: 36)

However, CLIL has also been reported to have some drawbacks.

The first main disadvantage is students’ familiarity with the foreign language. In order to acquire the new information, students need to be familiar with the additional language and show some proficiency in it. However, as discussed above, learners tend to feel freer to make mistakes than in foreign language classes (Roadshow and Hafenstein, 2008).

A further disadvantage is related to teacher training. CLIL forces teachers to master the foreign language to a certain extent. That is the reason why, in many primary and secondary schools, teachers need a B2 certificate so as to be able to teach in bilingual programmes. (Roadshow and Hafenstein, 2008; Olivares Leyva and Pena Díaz, 2013).
Probably, the most important drawback could be teachers’ command of English. Teachers may enrol in special training courses to improve their English. However, in most of these courses the major aims are the “study of the English grammatical and phonological systems, with the emphasis on increasing the trainees’ understanding of how the language operates, rather than their mastery in the use of it” (Cullen, 1994: 162). Teachers are more concerned with linguistic factors than the ability of using English in real communication. Moreover, some teachers are only exposed to English in the classroom when they interact with their students. Besides, teachers’ confidence in the class can be affected by their low command of English (Cullen, 1994).

3.1.5. CLIL teachers

In CLIL programmes, there are two main groups of teachers according to their knowledge about the additional language. The first group comprises content teachers, who have to show their level in the additional language. For instance, as English is the commonest foreign language through which CLIL subjects are taught, teachers need at least a B2 certificate in order to be able to teach in this bilingual program. That is the reason why specific training courses for prospective and in-service CLIL teachers are offered (Olivares Leyva and Pena Díaz, 2013). The other group of teachers comprehends language assistants and language teachers, who have an active participation in all CLIL programmes.

Due to the necessities of CLIL programmes, teachers have to work together in teams in order to design the curriculum of CLIL subjects and they also work together to prepare and/or implement CLIL classes. There are two different possibilities of teachers when they work in teams. The most common type of collaboration is between language and content teacher’s coordination. A second possibility involves the language assistant, who is a native speaker of the additional language, and a language teacher or a content teacher (who are not usually native speakers). (Méndez García and Pavón Vazquez, 2012; Hibler, 2010).

In the table below, a distinction is made between native speaker teachers and nonnative speaker teachers according to three main characteristics: use of the English language, attitude towards teaching and classroom practice. It is important to point out that both native speaker teachers and nonnative speaker teachers have different strengths and weaknesses. When they coordinate or co-teach in class, the result is beneficial for students.
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Table 3 Native and Nonnative teachers (adapted from Megyes 1994:27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of the English language</th>
<th>Native Speaker Teachers</th>
<th>Nonnative Speaker teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate high confidence levels</td>
<td>• Lack of confidence in L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use “real” language</td>
<td>• Use “book” language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude towards teaching</th>
<th>Native Speaker Teachers</th>
<th>Nonnative Speaker teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible</td>
<td>• Guided by syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovative</td>
<td>• Cautious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less empathetic</td>
<td>• More empathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less committed</td>
<td>• More committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom practice</th>
<th>Native Speaker Teachers</th>
<th>Nonnative Speaker teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on fluency and oral skills</td>
<td>• Focus on accuracy, form, grammar written and formal registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tolerate errors</td>
<td>• Correct errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of a variety materials</td>
<td>• Depend on bookwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less use of L1</td>
<td>• Use L1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employ pair/group work</td>
<td>• Employ frontal work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. CLIL in the Spanish context: the example of Andalusia

This section explores CLIL in Spain. The first part consists in a general overview of CLIL methodology in Spain. It deals with the differences between the autonomous regions, the foreign languages used in CLIL and the different levels in which CLIL is developed. The second section explicitly focuses on CLIL in Andalusia.

3.2.1. CLIL in Spain

CLIL in Spain is known as AICLE that stands for “Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lengua Extranjera”. In Spain, CLIL has been developed principally during the last decades as “the result of a commitment with the European policies aimed at fostering multilingualism and growing awareness of the need to learn foreign languages” (Lasagabaster and Zarobe, 2010: IX).

In Spain there are 17 autonomous regions plus the autonomous cities of Ceuta and Melilla (located in Africa). In Spain, educational laws and decrees are issued both at national and regional level. This is why there are diverse CLIL models for each region. These models can be broadly classified into two groups (Lasagabaster and Zarobe, 2010):
In Monolingual regions, Spanish is the official language. So, CLIL lessons are taught in Spanish and also in one (mainly) or two foreign languages, depending on the area. In this group, we find autonomous regions such as Madrid, Andalusia, Extremadura, or Murcia, to name but a few.

In Bilingual regions Spanish is likewise the official language, but there is also a co-official regional language. Bilingual regions are autonomous communities such as Valencia, Catalonia (Catalan is spoken in both), the Basque country (Basque) and Galicia (Galician). The peculiarity of CLIL in these regions is that the curriculum is taught in Spain and in the co-official regional language, plus one or two foreign languages.

In Bilingual regions in Spain, there were Spanish-Catalan, Spanish-Basque, or Spanish-Galician bilingual programmes before the implementation of CLIL. So, in bilingual regions there was already a bilingual context where students learnt through two languages at school. Moreover, in these regions there is also a third language subject or even a fourth one, which in both cases are foreign languages. The peculiarity of these programmes was that students have been learning many subject, such as Science, Geography, the language itself and its literature, in the co-official regional language (Lasagabaster and Zarobe, 2010).

CLIL programmes are funded by educational and political authorities and they are taught mainly, although not exclusively, in state schools. At present, only two or three subjects of the whole curriculum of an academic year in each level are taught in the foreign language. So we can consider that CLIL in Spain belongs to the Mid CLIL type, although the Ministry of Education intends to increase the number of subjects taught in CLIL programmes. The subjects which are taught through CLIL are chiefly the Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Physical Education and Arts and Crafts (Muñoz & Navés, 2007).
By far, the commonest additional language is English. French is the second foreign language taught in Spain though there are some regions (Aragón, Andalucía, Murcia and Extremadura) where it can be the first foreign language. Besides, in other regions such as Andalucía and Extremadura, here also CLIL languages such as German, Italian or Portuguese due, for example, to their geographical position (Lorenzo, 2010 and Muñoz and Navés, 2007).

Bilingual or CLIL programmes in Spain are mostly implemented in compulsory education. Therefore, institutions are now considering the convenience to continue expanding these programmes into higher levels of educations such as universities. Spanish universities are gradually implementing bilingual degrees. For example, the University of Granada offers a bilingual degree in Primary Education, and the European University of Madrid offers eleven degrees taught only in English and three bilingual degrees taught in Spanish and English. Besides, it is important to underline that translation and English Studies degrees are not considered bilingual degrees as they have always been taught in English (García, 2013).

Like the University of Granada, there are other Spanish universities that offer Primary and Pre–Primary education bilingual degrees as a way of prospective CLIL primary school teachers. Moreover, the number of masters taught in a foreign language, mainly English, is increasing. For instance, the University of Granada offers three masters in English and seven bilingual, English and Spanish masters (García, 2013).

To sum up:

Spain is rapidly becoming one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research. The richness of its cultural and linguistic diversity has led to a wide variety of CLIL policies and practices which provide us with many examples of CLIL in different stages of development that are applicable to contexts both within and beyond Spain (Coyle, 2010: VIII).

3.2.2. The example of Andalusia

CLIL programmes are seen as “an innovative idea to promote the learning of foreign languages in monolingual environments” (Méndez García and Pavón Vazquez, 2012: 2) as it is the case of Andalusia.
According to the previous classification of CLIL programmes in Spain, Andalusia is a monolingual region whose official language is Spanish. It is an important region with approximately eight million inhabitants and it has a similar size in comparison with some countries of Europe such as Estonia, Greece and the Netherlands (Lorenzo, 2010).

One traditional characteristic of Andalusia is its monoglot mindset with Spanish as the main language for all its population. However, in the 1990s due to some circumstances such as immigration, tourism and Erasmus mobility for instance, a new plurilingual scenario emerged. As the Statute of Autonomy of Andalusia affirms:

Andalusia is the compilation of a rich cultural resource representing the confluence of a multiplicity of peoples and civilisations thereby providing a fine example of social interrelations through the centuries. The interculturality of practices, habits and ways of life provides us with the profile of an Andalusian character based on non-exclusive universal values (Andalusian Parliament: Autonomous Statutes of Andalusia, 2006: 1, quoted by Lorenzo, 2010: 3)

Even though there have been pilot CLIL programmes from the late 1990s, CLIL programmes were not established until 2005, after the publication of Plan de fomento del plurilingüismo (Junta de Andalucía, 2005: 27).

The number of schools involved in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes in Andalusia has grown exponentially: from 18 pilot French-Spanish and 8 German-Spanish programmes in 1998, to more than 694 primary and secondary schools in 2010: 90% English-Spanish, 8% French-Spanish and 2% German-Spanish programmes (Segovia et al., 2010: 161, quoted by Méndez García, 2012: 2)

Indeed, these schools are called bilingual or CLIL institutions and offer CLIL programmes in English, French or German, at all level of compulsory education. In Spain, compulsory education includes from 6 to 16 years as primary schools cover from 6 to 12 and secondary schools from 13 to 16. In these schools, CLIL programmes are taught at least with in one class per level.
In the following table, the characteristics of Andalusian CLIL programmes are presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of disciplines taught through CLIL</th>
<th>It is customary for schools to teach at least three disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLIL groups per grade</td>
<td>At least one group is offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages of the programme</td>
<td>Spanish – English/ French/ German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>Spanish is used in each CLIL subject together with the foreign language of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching time allocated to the language</td>
<td>Initially, at least a third of each subject is taught in the foreign language. This percentage may gradually increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching model</td>
<td>Language and content teachers coordinate with language assistants with whom content teachers co-teach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Distinctive feature of CLIL in Andalusia (Méndez García, 2014: 24)

Moreover, CLIL schools have to teach a minimum of one subject per level but most schools teach three subjects. In primary schools, the main subject taught in this program is Sciences while Social Sciences is the main subject taught in secondary schools. (Frigols Martín, 2008)

The number of bilingual or CLIL schools has significantly increased during the last decade in Andalusia and all over Spain. Although, CLIL programmes in Andalusia use the foreign language only during a third of the whole teaching time of those subjects that belongs to CLIL. So according to the previous classification of CLIL, Andalusian CLIL programmes are examples of Mid CLIL where teachers teach more or less one hour per week of each bilingual subject. However, this feature related with teaching time in the foreign language is progressively growing (Méndez García, 2014).

In fact there is a research in Andalusia about learners’ opinions that indicates that CLIL students are satisfied with bilingual programmes. They express their intention to go on studying through CLIL and they know the possibility that learning a foreign language offers in order to get a better job position in the future. Furthermore, students are more motivated towards foreign language learning and drop-out rates seem to be ‘reasonably low’ (Frigols Martín, 2008: 225, quoted by Méndez García, 2012: 198).
Throughout The Plan (Junta de Andalucía, 2005), students have a powerful tool which helps them to go through their mother tongue, their culture and other cultures and where teachers have a main role as linkers between students’ own culture and the foreign culture. Besides, having access to foreign languages, also helps “individuals to become aware of the relativity of their own way of thinking, making them reject stereotypes and be more tolerant, and fostering respect for other people’s personal and cultural diversity” (Méndez García, 2012: 198).

4. CLIL in Jaén: A need analysis study

4.1 Introduction and contextualisation

As it has previously been discussed, CLIL methodology is part of mainstream education nowadays. That is the main reason why I have decided to conduct a study on CLIL in Jaén. The major aim of this study is to discover the necessities of teachers involved in CLIL. With this purpose, I have designed a survey with several questions mainly related to available material, teachers' needs when it comes to preparing their lessons and their opinion about the CLIL project.

The survey was addressed to secondary school teachers involved in CLIL projects in the province of Jaén. It was answered by different high schools teachers working in Andújar, Baeza, Bailén, Martos and Jaén. The IES Jándula, IES Virgen de la Cabeza, SAFA Andújar, and Colegio Madre del Divino Pastor are the high schools that participated in the study in Andújar. In Baeza, teachers from the IES Andrés de Vandelvira and IES Santísima Trinidad answered the survey. Moreover, the IES María Bellido and IES Hermanos Medina Rivilla in Bailén, the IES San Felipe Neri in Martos and the IES Auringis, IES Virgen del Carmen and IES Jabalcuz in Jaén took part in the study.

This survey allows to enquire into teachers’ opinions about CLIL projects. It is important to highlight that each secondary school implements CLIL in a slightly different way. Nevertheless, this survey analyses general features that affect all type of CLIL projects.
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This survey was available on the internet through Google Forms from the 5th to the 30th of June 2015. At the end of this period 39 responses were received. The survey was delivered in Spanish, the mother tongue of the teachers.

After designing the survey and making it available via Google Forms, I contacted several secondary schools by email. They were either state or private schools in the whole province of Jaen. Moreover, as I live in Andújar I went to the several secondary schools there where I left a printed version of the survey for their CLIL teachers.

As specified above, the survey was completed by 39 respondents, 21 men and 18 women. The age of the participants ranged from 35 to 45 years old.

![Image 5 Gender of the informants]

Around one third of the survey was answered by secondary teachers of Andújar. These teachers work mainly in four secondary schools: IES Jándula, IES Virgen de la Cabeza, Sagrada Familia and Colegio Madre del Divino Pastor. The first two institutions are state schools where compulsory secondary education and Bachillerato are taught, whereas the latter are private schools which offer primary and secondary education.

I have also received emails with the completed survey from different secondary schools: IES Auringis, which is located in the city of Jaen. In some of the emails I received, teachers who answered the survey also expressed their concern with the main topic of the survey. They said that the results of this survey can be helpful for teachers to improve their CLIL lessons and also to make some changes in their future CLIL classes.
4.2. Limitations of the study

It is important, however, to consider the limitations of this study. An important disadvantage was the limited time that teachers had to answer the survey. A second factor is the time when the survey was made available at the end of the academic year, a busy period for teachers. Thirdly, it is possible that if the survey had been available during a longer period more responses would have been received. Last but not least, due to time constraints, not many schools could be contacted, and a considerable number of the responses belong to Andújar secondary schools.

Another possible limitation might be the language of the CLIL programmes. Only one out of the 39 surveys was given by a teacher whose secondary school offers CLIL in French. The rest of the answers were provided by teachers from secondary schools with CLIL courses in English.

In spite of these constraints I consider that this study is a good starting point to evaluate how these projects are carried out, what teachers’ necessities are and what teachers consider that needs to be improved.
4.3 Objectives

The main aim of this study is to look into teachers’ opinions about CLIL projects. Teachers have a key role in these projects as they are in charge of devising and implementing them. Hence their conclusions about these projects may help improve CLIL tuition. That is the reason why I decided to conduct need analysis research on some major elements such as students, materials or teacher cooperation.

This study has the following goal
1. To study how teachers view CLIL programmes.

4.4. Research tool

In order to fulfill these general and specific objectives the following guiding questions were established:

- What do you think about the number of hours allocated to CLIL?
- How can students access CLIL programmes?
- What do you think about students’ mastery of the foreign language?
- Do you use the mother language of your students in class?
- What do you think about the material available for your subject?
- How do you prepare your classes?
- What do you think about teachers’ proficiency in the foreign language?
- What is your general opinion of CLIL programmes?

Those previous questions were used as the basis to create the final survey that informants completed on internet. In order to make the survey quicker and faster for them to answer, I decided to make different types of questions. Some questions where formulated as Likert-scale items, other questions were open-ended, and in other where multiple choice questions.

The survey used was the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clases impartidas en el centro en español y en:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INGLES  FRANCES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor del profesor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESOR DE ÁREAS LINGUISTICAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESOR DE ÁREAS NO LINGUISTICAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIAR DE CONVERSACIÓN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asignaturas que imparte en el grupo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ciencias Sociales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengua Castellana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biología</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecnología</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matemáticas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Física y Química</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educación Física</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto Integrado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciencias Naturales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geografía e Historia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otro:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horas impartidas en los grupos bilingües son:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escasas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suficientes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número de asignaturas impartidas en el programa bilingüe son:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escasas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suficientes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
¿Cómo acceden los alumnos a los grupos bilingües?*
- Prueba de Acceso
- Conforme a su Expediente Académico
- Por propia petición
- Otro: [___]

Los grupos de alumnos en el programa bilingüe son... *

1 2 3 4 5

Pocos  ◆◆◆◆◆ Suficientes

El nivel de la mayoría de los alumnos en programas bilingües es... *

1 2 3 4 5

Bajo ◆◆◆◆◆ Adecuado

La cantidad de alumnos por clase en grupos bilingües es... *

1 2 3 4 5

Adecuada ◆◆◆◆◆ Demasiada

¿Hace uso de la lengua materna de los alumnos durante la clases en la lengua adicional del programa?*
- Sí
- No

Justifique su respuesta anterior:*
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Los materiales disponibles para clases bilingües son.....

1 2 3 4 5

Escasos ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ Suficientes

La existencia de editoriales con libros bilingües es....

1 2 3 4 5

Escasa ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ Suficiente

¿Qué materiales utiliza en sus clases?
- Libro de Texto en la lengua materna
- Libro de Texto en la lengua adicional
- Material adicional de internet
- Material adicional preparado por mi
- Otro: ____________________

¿Realiza la elaboración del material las clases?
- De manera individual
- Con los compañeros de mi departamento
- Con varios profesores de otras áreas
- Otro: ____________________

Comente un poco su forma de elaborar las clases

______________________________
4.4 Results and Discussions

The presentation of the results obtained in the survey has been arranged according to the following themes: subjects taught through CLIL, students, teachers, materials, languages and general opinion, which are the key topics of the survey.

- Subjects taught through CLIL

In the survey, teachers were asked to choose from a list of possible subjects. The following image shows the subjects taught in CLIL programmes. The most widely taught subject is Natural Science (12 respondents). Further relevant subjects are Physics and Chemist (10), Technology (9) and Social Sciences (8).
None of the respondents teaches Economy (0), only 1 teaches French, 2 teach Spanish and 3 Geography and History. A relevant piece of data is that each teacher teaches an average of 1 to 3 subjects in bilingual programmes.

As to teachers’ opinion about the number of subjects taught in CLIL programmes, the graph below indicates that the majority of teacher (43, 6%) think that the number of subject taught through CILI is well-balanced.
The last feature related with subjects is the time allocated to teaching through the foreign language. Although 41% (16) of teachers consider that it is enough, 41% (8 + 8) think that it is more than enough.

- Students

Firstly it is important to know how students access CLIL projects. In the image below, it is evident that most (61, 5%) students access CLIL programmes at their own request. However, it is relevant to highlight that in the ‘other’ option, 8 out of the 9 teachers who chose this option state that students participate in their CLIL projects because it is compulsory in their high schools.

A further important topic is students’ level of the foreign language of the CLIL programme. Most teachers (46, 2%) believe that their students’ level is enough. Although, 23, 1% of them feel that their students’ command of the foreign language is not enough. Interestingly, 20, 5% believe than their students’ command of the foreign language is more than enough.
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As to the groups involved in bilingual courses, almost the majority of the informants (46, 2%) think that there are enough groups. Here, it is significant to mention that 8 out of the 18 informants who chose this option belong to high schools where CLIL courses are compulsory for all students.

The number of students per class is the final element in this section. Some teachers (15) believe that the number of students in each class is excessive while other respondents (11) believe that it is well-balanced.
Teachers

This part deals with teachers’ role in CLIL programmes as it is paramount to know what they think about themselves and their colleagues.

This following graph displays that most teachers who filled in the survey are content teachers (26), language teachers (11) are also significant, whereas only 2 language assistants completed the survey.

*Image 18 Type of teachers*

I was interested in knowing teachers’ opinion about their colleagues’ command of the additional language. Ideally, teachers need at least a B2 level to take part in these projects. Most informants believe that their colleagues’ level enough (15) or even almost adequate (15).

*Image 19 Majority of teachers’ level in CLIL programmes*

Moreover, they were asked what they believe about teachers’ preparation for teaching in CLIL programmes because being able to teach in a foreign language is different to teach through CLIL. In the following graph half the respondents (17) believe that they are almost adequately prepared.
Materials

CLIL methodology has been recently implemented in education. Hence the available materials may be limited. A variety of answers is provided in this respect. Almost half the respondents (18) believe that the CLIL resources available for them are scarce, whereas 9 think that materials available are enough or even 12 uphold that they are almost adequate or adequate.

The following question was about the existence of publishing houses that market CLIL materials. 12 respondents point out that they know very few publishing houses that market CLIL materials, whereas only 2 informants think that the number of publishing houses marketing CLIL material is adequate.
It is also relevant to look into the materials teachers use for their classes. Almost all informants, 36 out of 39, prepare their own additional materials for their classes. The second most popular answer is searching for extra material on the internet (28). Textbooks either in students’ mother tongue (15) or in the additional language (15) are also widely used.

Teachers were also asked the way they prepare their own material. 32 informants prepare their classes and material alone. However, some of them also work with other teachers of their department or teachers of other subjects. Interestingly, one informant said that s/he prepared materials with a group of other teachers from different high schools. In that case, it was a group of mathematic teachers. Another informant commented that all teachers of the CLIL programmes met and prepared materials for all CLIL classes.
Language

A relevant aspect is whether teachers use only the foreign language or if they use both, the foreign language and students’ mother tongue. English is the most common foreign language used in CLIL programmes in the province of Jaen (38). There is only one informant who teaches CLIL in French.

As regards the use of students’ mother tongue 34 of our informants use it while 5 of them state that they do not use it.
On one hand, the informants who use it gave different reasons. One teacher said: “Speaking in English during the whole class catches students’ attention”. Some informants use the following technique: they explain half of the class in English and, afterwards, they explain it again in Spanish to avoid misunderstandings. Another teacher stated that “it is important to use English whenever it is possible and the mother tongue whenever it is necessary”. A further opinion about the use of languages in the CLIL lesson is that “When gestures are useless to explain the meaning of words or of some grammatical structures, it is necessary to translate and explain them”. Many informants agree that the level of the students is not completely adequate to use the foreign language during the whole class.

On the other hand, the informants who do not use students’ mother tongue said that “it is mandatory in their bilingual programmes to avoid the use of the mother tongue” or that “there is 100% immersion, so we hardly ever use the mother tongue”. Further opinions are: “I am a technology teacher and it is not necessary to use the mother tongue to explain some words as we use technical words with are the same in English and Spanish” or “Classes with CLIL students are completely in English”.

In conclusion, it is reasonable to think that a good way to introduce the foreign language would be progressively: the mother tongue could be used in the lower levels, whereas the role of the foreign language and learners’ exposure to it is increased in time.

- General opinion

The last part looks into teachers’ general opinion about CLIL programmes, the last question of the survey. There are several opinions about the topic although all teachers agree that it is a great opportunity for students. They also think that the programme needs some changes: “the programme offers many opportunities, but there are still many things to improve” or “I think this methodology is gradually improving and it still needs more time.”

The majority of teachers relate CLIL programmes with political issues: “In Andalusia, bilingual projects are used as political propaganda without any institutional supports” and “It is a kind of medal that politicians wanted to win in education without taking care of the implementation of the programmes, as they did not invest in teacher training and and materials. CLIL implementation depends on teachers’ willingness.”
Others coincide that there is little institutional support: “It is a very ambitious project but without resources”. Moreover, another informant thinks “It is an outright failure as there is neither training nor resources. There is no reward for CLIL teachers. Moreover, their efforts are not valued even though they go to English classes and they spend many hours preparing materials”

Moreover, teachers’ opinions also related to students. In terms of their participation, they think that “students with a low level in the foreign language should not be forced to participate in bilingual courses”. According to learners’ willingness to learn in the classes, one said “It is a good idea but it has some basic limitations. The principal pitfall is the low predisposition of students for learning subjects in other languages. In fact, most of them leave without answering the questions put in English in the exam”. Other opinions were about students’ level, “students who do not meet a minimum requirement in terms of their command of English and do not have any interest should not be included in these programmes”.

No wonder some teachers are disappointed with their role in these programmes. “Teachers are well-qualified and motivated and they spend their time and money in training. Nevertheless, educational institutions are cutting down the resources invested in CLIL programmes and they mainly want results. Hence, all these factors lead to teachers’ demotivation”

On the one hand, there are positive opinions of this new methodology. “From my point of view, it is a necessary project that helps to naturalize English use and the development of linguistics capabilities. Besides, it might be improved”; “It is a positive method if teachers find a right balance between the use of English and the development of the subject. I think it is a useful way to enrich classes”; “Students get a better level and maturity. All of them obtain a good level in the foreign language even though they came from no bilingual primary schools. However, it is important to make some institutional changes”; “The program is very useful for students but teachers need more resources to make a good job such as training”.
On the other hand, there were some informants that have a negative opinion of CLIL: “Bilingual programmes do not work well in all secondary schools. There are some high schools, such as the school I work for, where students come from primary education with a very poor level of English. Furthermore, there are some bilingual subjects where teachers only speak in Spanish. They only use English to do some activities”; “This is a falsehood because classes are not taught completely in English and students do not learn English. Selectividad should be in English and it is a good way to check the real level of students”

4.5 Conclusion

As a conclusion of this investigation about CLIL programmes in Jaen, I would like to comment the fact that teachers are not completely satisfied with the way CLIL programmes are being implemented. They feel an extra pressure as they spend plenty of time learning the foreign language and preparing materials. They need to put an extra amount of time and energy to carry out these projects and they feel that their efforts are not being rewarded. Secondary schools seem to need further institutional support.

Nevertheless, there is also a positive overview about CLIL programmes. Most of our informants claim that CLIL programmes have the potential to allow changes to be incorporated into education. Furthermore, it is relevant to underline the advantages of CLIL: “Bilingual students finish their education with a higher level of English. Moreover, the number of bilingual subjects is increasing every year”.

5. Conclusion

The main objective of this project was to study how in-service teachers view CLIL programmes. In order to achieve that objective, CLIL methodology has been analysed from a theoretical and practical perspective.

The results obtained in the survey help fulfill the major objective set at the beginning of the study, looking into CLIL programmes and CLIL teachers’ opinion about this new approach. Nevertheless, the 39 responses gathered show only a limited vision and opinion of CLIL teachers. It would be desirable to complement this study by conducting a similar survey with a larger number of subjects in the future.
6. References


María del Mar Pérez Crespo

CLIL IN ANDALUSIA: STUDY ON TEACHERS’ VIEW


