

Barbara Loranc-Paszyk  
Akademia Techniczno-Humanistyczna w Bielsku-Białej

## **Old problems and new prospects in CLIL teacher training. Voices from the field and a European research agenda**

### **1. Introduction – Defining CLIL**

Over the last few decades interest in CLIL has been rapidly growing in Europe and also in other parts of the world, as many teachers, learners, parents, researchers and stake holders have been acknowledging its potential<sup>1</sup>. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), an umbrella term used to refer to any teaching of a non-language subject through the medium of a second or foreign language<sup>2</sup>, has been defined by its forefathers as: “a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for learning and teaching of both content and language”<sup>3</sup>.

The term CLIL is then relatively new, though effectively comprising some older and well-known forms of this educational paradigm, to name but a few: “immersion”, “bilingual education”, “content based language

<sup>1</sup> See more: P. Mehisto, D. Marsh, J. M. Frigols, *Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, Oxford 2008; C. Dalton-Puffer, *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) Classrooms*, Philadelphia 2007; D. Coyle, *Introduction*, [in:] D. Lasagabaster, Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, eds. *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*, Cambridge 2010; R. Kiely, *Understanding CLIL as an innovation*, “Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching” 2011, vol. 1, p. 153–171; D. L. Banegas, *Integrating content and language in English language teaching in secondary education: Models, benefits, and challenges*, “Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching” 2012, vol. 2 (1), p. 111–136.

<sup>2</sup> The term itself was created by the European Network of Administrators, Researchers and Practitioners (EUROCLIC) in 1996.

<sup>3</sup> A. Maljers, D. Marsh, D. Wolff, *Windows on CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in the European Spotlight*, Alkmaar 2007, p. 5.

learning”, “content based language instruction”, and “language enhanced content teaching”. Nevertheless, it is the term CLIL that is most universal and broad enough to comprise both immersion education with all instruction being conducted in the L2 and other types of the L2 enhanced education where students study only parts of their subject courses through L2<sup>4</sup>. As it has been claimed<sup>5</sup>, due to its flexibility, CLIL is open to different linguistic and educational contexts constituted by local, regional and national language policies. Another advantage of the CLIL term is that while sharing some elements with the abovementioned approaches, such as immersion or CBI, “its distinctiveness lies in an integrated approach, where both language and content are conceptualized on a continuum without an implied preference for either”<sup>6</sup>.

The idea of teaching subject matters through a foreign language is by no means new; being educated in a foreign language has been around for over 5000 years<sup>7</sup>, and the tradition of bilingual education in Europe goes back at least to mid 20th century (or even earlier than that in case of Luxembourg or Malta), to mention only French-German bilingual schools<sup>8</sup> or European schools funded to provide education for mobile civil servants of the European institutions. Still, for decades general education available to the ordinary citizens has been monolingual, while bilingual education became a privilege of the elites. It was only with the firm support of European Union that bilingual education stopped being so marginal<sup>9</sup>. The 1 + 2 principle, mentioned in the European Commission’s White Paper on Education and Training<sup>10</sup> (published in 1995), describes European citizens as having competences in two languages other than their mother tongues and advocates incorporation of such objectives into national curricula. As a consequence, most European states have introduced compulsory foreign language classes and are currently implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning into national education. According to the Eurydice

<sup>4</sup>K. Haataja, *A definition of CLIL as an umbrella term: A historical perspective*, [in:] *Good practice in content and language integrated learning*, ed. B. Roza González, Gijón 2007; T. Nikula, *Terminological considerations in teaching content through a foreign language*, [in:] *Aspects of Implementing Plurilingual Education*, eds. D. Marsh et al., Jyväskylä 1997, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup>D. Coyle, *Introduction...*, p. ii.

<sup>6</sup>D. Coyle, *Content and Language Integrated Learning: towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies*, “*International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*” 2007, vol. 10 (5), p. 545.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibidem*, p. 543.

<sup>8</sup>J. Iluk, *Nauczanie bilingwalne: koncepcje, praktyki*, Katowice 2002.

<sup>9</sup>H. Baetens Beardsmore, *European Models of Bilingual Education*, Clevedon 1993.

<sup>10</sup>See more in: European Commission, *White Paper on Education and Training. Teaching and Learning – Towards the Learning Society*, Brussels, COM(95)590. Retrieved from: <<http://europa.eu.int/en/record/white/edu9511/>>. (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

Report<sup>11</sup>, most EU countries offer CLIL in secondary education. This report shows that between the years 2004 and 2005, most countries offered CLIL in mainstream secondary along with primary education as a result of imposed educational policies.

In Europe there is a wide variety of sociolinguistic contexts that serve well for CLIL, fostering language learning depending on the given context. In fact, “foreign” may be more accurately replaced by the term L2 to include a wider range of situations. Those could be:

- modern foreign language (teaching through English in most cases),
- community language (teaching through Polish in Polish speaking community of immigrants settled in the UK),
- minority language (teaching through Swedish in Finland),
- majority language (teaching through Castilian/Spanish in Catalonia),
- language of heritage (teaching through Welsh in Wales) .

Therefore, with European sociolinguistic and political contexts being so rich and diverse, CLIL may relate to any language, age and stage. There are at least 216 types of CLIL programmes<sup>12</sup> based on variables such as: compulsory status, intensity, starting age, starting linguistic level and duration.

However, along with some above mentioned benefits, there also some complex difficulties and challenges identified within the CLIL context. These would largely focus on the growth of effective pedagogies and the professional development of teachers<sup>13</sup>. Implementing CLIL entails finding methodological means to meet two types of curriculum requirements, learning both the content and L2<sup>14</sup>. The term CLIL indicates clearly that the L2 language development cannot be left to chance. It needs to be developed through proper instruction and handled with appropriate methodology. This poses challenges to CLIL teachers who need to look for new approaches and put these into practice in their classrooms. It has been claimed<sup>15</sup> that CLIL implies a new language teaching model that moves away from the form-focused approach. Thus it is clear that explicit attention to the L2 learning is essential as the subject or content learning might be hindered due to difficulties in L2 comprehension. Only when these objectives are

<sup>11</sup> See more in: Eurydice Report, *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Brussels 2006. Retrieved from: [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/resources/eurydice/pdf/0\\_integral/071EN.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/resources/eurydice/pdf/0_integral/071EN.pdf). (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

<sup>12</sup> D. Coyle, *Content and Language Integrated Learning...*, p. 543.

<sup>13</sup> D. Coyle, *Introduction...*, p. ix.

<sup>14</sup> T. Naves, *What Are the Characteristics of Successful CLIL Programmes?*, [in:] *TIE-CLIL Professional Development Course*, ed. G. Langé, Milan 2002, p. 91-94.

<sup>15</sup> F. Lorenzo, S. Casal, P. Moore, *The Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning in European Education: Key Findings from the Andalusian Bilingual Sections Evaluation Project*, “Applied Linguistics” 2009, p. 1-25.

reached, the language learning potential provided by a greater exposure to the language and natural setting for language learning in bilingual education programs will be realized<sup>16</sup>. A few successful attempts to bring forward such a framework with respect to CLIL teacher competences have recently been made and they will be discussed further in this article.

## 2. CLIL teacher competences

Experts agree that suitably trained and qualified CLIL teachers are one of the most important prerequisites of successful CLIL implementation<sup>17</sup>. Findings of the Eurydice report on CLIL<sup>18</sup> suggest that lack of qualified teachers prevent the process of introducing CLIL to European schools. The concern on how to organise pre-service and in-service teacher education programs is recurrent across different European contexts. Addressing such factors is paramount for quality assurance in CLIL<sup>19</sup>. In Germany, universities have started to offer an additional CLIL teaching qualification. In Poland due to legislative changes in 2004, graduates of teacher training departments need to be able to use a foreign language at least B2 level and have the qualifications to teach a given subject (if this is to be another foreign language the level C2 is required). Such changes in teacher training may have a positive effect on CLIL development in Poland.

The skill to integrate the subject methodology and the language methodology is an essential feature of the CLIL teacher profile. Foreign language fluency and qualification to teach a subject are just basic requirements and even if they are met, they still do not guarantee effective CLIL classes<sup>20</sup>. Moreover, native speaker or near-native speaker competence is not so important, but it is necessary that teachers can “handle CLIL/EMILE methodologically in terms of language and non-language content and application, through use of optimal linguistic target language skills”<sup>21</sup>. Unfortunately,

<sup>16</sup> D. Wolff, *Content-based bilingual education or using foreign languages as working languages in the classroom*, [in:] *Aspects of Implementing Plurilingual Education*, eds. D. Marsh *et al.*, Jyväskylä 1997, p. 51–64; C. M. Coonan, *Some issues in implementing CLIL*, “European Language Council Bulletin” 2003.

<sup>17</sup> D. Wolff, *Approaching CLIL*, [in:] *Project D3 – CLIL Matrix – Central workshop report 6/2005*. Graz, Austria: European Centre for Modern Languages, 2005, p. 10–25. Retrieved from: <http://www.ecml.at>. (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

<sup>18</sup> See more in: Eurydice Report, *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe...*

<sup>19</sup> D. Coyle, *Content and Language Integrated Learning...*

<sup>20</sup> M. Swain, *Focus on form through conscious reflection*, [in:] *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, eds. C. Doughty, J. Williams, New York 1998, p. 64–81.

<sup>21</sup> D. Marsh, *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension. Actions, trends and foresight potential*. European Commission 2002, p. 81. Retrieved from: [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/david\\_marshall-report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/david_marshall-report.pdf). (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

it is often believed that good command of English and an expertise in subject content as sufficient prerequisites of successful CLIL implementation. found out – while researching the implementation of bilingual-CLIL programmes in 150 primary schools in Madrid – that the CLIL teachers interviewed believed their practices could be improved only if they were more proficient in English<sup>22</sup>. Besides, they also believed they did not particularly need formal training on bilingual education methodologies.

Implementing CLIL provides an opportunity for practitioners to collaborate with other stakeholders<sup>23</sup>. CLIL implies the integration of content and language, and thus it requires a cross-curricular and cross-departmental collaboration between content teachers and language teachers. Language teachers, primarily responsible for the “nuts and bolts”<sup>24</sup> might be responsible for enabling the learners to bridge the gap between the learners’ conceptual capacities and the learners’ linguistic level. Content teachers, however, may not be used to teaching language and they need to define subject specific skills, lexical framework, etc. Collaboration is strongly advocated, but the implementation of this task has not been easy. It has been suggested that the situations where team teaching may work best may occur by strengthening collaborative planning and materials development within the EFL teaching staff and the fact that frequent lack of knowledge on how to cooperate among CLIL teachers can be overcome by teachers’ coming to terms with the models outlined as a framework from which the teachers can develop their own initiatives depending on their level of institutional autonomy<sup>25</sup>.

### 3. Recent initiatives

Today case studies and action research are methods considered to be of the highest importance in in-service teacher education, professional development, especially in the process of managing changes, such as the shift from experiential to transmission teaching. Those case studies of classroom initiatives are providing practical ‘lived through’ CLIL experiences<sup>26</sup> and they also play an important part in evaluating language programs<sup>27</sup>. They

<sup>22</sup> C. Pena Díaz, C. and M. Porto Requejo, *Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project*, „Porta Linguarum“ 2008, vol. 10, p. 151–161.

<sup>23</sup> D. Coyle, *Introduction...*

<sup>24</sup> D. Marsh, G. Langé, *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*, Jyväskylä 2000, p. 3.

<sup>25</sup> D. L. Banegas, *Integrating content and language in English language teaching in secondary education: Models, benefits, and challenges*, p. 111–136.

<sup>26</sup> D. Coyle, *Introduction...*

<sup>27</sup> H. Komorowska, *Paradigms in Language Teacher Education*, [in:] *Issues in Promoting Multilingualism Teaching-Learning-Assessment*, ed. H. Komorowska, Warsaw 2011, p. 9–34.

all make a vital contribution to an increasing European and transnational research agenda. This agenda seeks to adopt a scientific approach to investigating more longitudinal outcomes and specific demands of CLIL in terms of effective teaching and learning. In the subsequent sections of this article we will take a closer look at the initiatives that aim at meeting these demands.

One of the most important initiatives in the area of establishing a framework for CLIL teacher competences has been undertaken by a body of CLIL experts<sup>28</sup>. The outcome, “The Teacher Competences Grid” was published in November 2010. It is a skills set, meant to be a tool for professional development for future and currently in-service CLIL teachers. As the authors stress „the grid offers a point of reference for discussions pertaining to CLIL teaching and teacher development. A successful CLIL teacher is not expected to have all of these competences”<sup>29</sup>. It can definitely be used by a CLIL teacher as a self-assessment tool, particularly suitable for identifying professional development needs. Furthermore, as the authors stress, due to its comprehensive nature, it is not a suitable tool for evaluating teaching practice.

The grid is divided into two sections: the first one being about underpinning CLIL; is primarily focused on the competences that are essential to establish a CLIL program<sup>30</sup>. The second section being linked with setting CLIL in motion focuses on the competences that are important to CLIL implementation. This framework for competences is specifically linked with CLIL methodology, comprising a detailed list that encapsulates the prerequisites for the well-trained CLIL teacher<sup>31</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Pat Bertaux, Carmel Mary Coonan, María Jesús Frigols-Martín, Peeter Mehisto associated with CNN (CLIL Cascade Network).

<sup>29</sup> See more on: <http://ccn-clil.eu>. (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

<sup>30</sup> In the Teacher Competences Grid, Underpinning CLIL section comprises the areas of competence such as: 1. Programme parameters (defining CLIL, adopting an approach to CLIL); 2. CLIL Policy (adapting CLIL to the local context, integrating CLIL into the curriculum, linking the CLIL programme with school ethos, articulating quality assurance measures for CLIL); 3. Target language competences for teaching CLIL (using Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and using Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), using the language of classroom management, using the language of teaching, using the language of learning activities); 4. Course development (designing a course); 5. Partnerships in supporting student learning (working with others to enhance student learning, building constructive relationships with students). The detailed list of indicators of competences can be consulted on the project's website: <http://clil.uni.lu> (accessed: 01.12.2012); see also: <http://lendlentrento.eu/convegno/files/mehisto.pdf>. (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

<sup>31</sup> The Teacher Competences Grid. Setting CLIL in motion includes the following areas of competences: 1. Integration (merging content, language and learning skills into an integrated approach); 2. Implementation (lesson planning, translating plans into action, fostering outcome attainment); 3. Second Language Acquisition (knowing second language attainment levels, applying SLA knowledge in lesson preparation, applying SLA knowledge in the classroom); 4. Interculturality (promoting cultural awareness & interculturality); 5. Learning environment manage-

The second important initiative in the field of CLIL teacher education entitled: „CLIL across contexts: A scaffolding framework for teacher education” was created by 9 partners from 6 countries, with different educational systems and language cultures who joined the EU-funded project to develop a common coherent view on CLIL teacher education. It was aimed at providing consistency for CLIL teacher education and taking up the holistic approach of Coyle’s 4Cs Conceptual Framework: Content, Cognition, Communication, Culture<sup>32</sup>. The experts admitted that they were aware of the lack of a model for CLIL teacher education addressing core pedagogical issues. The wide variety of contexts made them give up aiming at the development of a complete syllabus for CLIL teacher training, they would rather develop a general framework comprising eight major aspects of teaching in content and language integrated learning contexts<sup>33</sup>. Such a framework could be used and adapted according to institutional contexts and teachers’ needs.

As all the partners were involved in secondary education, either as teacher educators or researchers, it was decided that this educational level should be the focus of the project. Besides, as the project focuses not only on English as a target language for CLIL, but it also provides examples of integrated learning and teaching in all the languages present in the partners’ school contexts. Thus, although the project is directed at the development of CLIL secondary teachers’ competences, the students learning new languages in the context of studying academic and vocational subjects were also thought as beneficiaries. The authors claimed that : „in seeing CLIL as a mainstream approach in secondary education, we firmly believe that all

ment (taking into account the affective side of learning, making the CLIL learning process efficient; 6. Learner focus in the CLIL environment (having knowledge and awareness of cognition and metacognition in the CLIL environment); 7. Learning skills focus in CLIL (having knowledge and awareness of cognition and metacognition in the CLIL environment); 8. Learning assessment and evaluation in CLIL (knowing about and applying assessment and evaluation procedures and tools); 9. Lifelong learning & Innovative teaching and learning approaches (keeping up with new developments, using ICT as a teaching resource). The detailed list of indicators of competences can be consulted on the project’s website: <http://clil.uni.lu> (accessed: 01.12.2012); see also: <http://lendtrento.eu/convegno/files/mehisto.pdf>. (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

<sup>32</sup> D. Coyle, *Meeting the challenge The 3Cs curriculum*, [in:] *New Perspectives on Teaching and Learning Modern Languages*, ed. S. Green, Clevedon 2000.

<sup>33</sup> Eight areas for the development of CLIL teacher competence; excerpts from *CLIL across Contexts*, (2009:10) include the following: identifying learner needs, planning the course, awareness of learner differences and of the special challenges that partial language skills cause, applying multimodal approaches to learning to stimulate cognitive and linguistic skills, focusing on the specific aspects of subject literacies that allow students to acquire the types of discourse required for an adequate appropriation of content, constant evaluation or assessment for learning, teachers’ own reflection, significantly enhanced through the cooperation between subject and language specialists, and a last area, which could also be the first, encompasses the omnipresent but complex issues of context and culture that underlie all learning and teaching situations.

learners have the potential to benefit from a conscious focus on the integration of content and language”<sup>34</sup>.

#### 4. CLIL teacher training in Spain

A discussion on complicated issues behind CLIL teacher education should also address the solutions and CLIL teacher education examples from Spain. This country has recently become one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research<sup>35</sup>. Its cultural and linguistic diversity has led to a wide variety of CLIL policies and practices that can be applied to contexts both within and beyond Spain. As in most of the remaining European countries, in Spain there are different forms of teacher education for CLIL, such as:

- academic undergraduate courses,
- academic master’s level courses,
- part of pre-service or initial teacher education,
- in-service teacher development for established teachers.

CLIL teacher training becomes more and more popular due to development of CLIL programmes throughout the country. Two bilingual communities, Catalonia and the Basque Country, have been implementing CLIL through English, their respective regional languages and Castilian since the mid 1990s<sup>36</sup>. Until 2005 training for teachers was provided by the British Council<sup>37</sup>. As these services offered by the British were expensive, the Spanish government introduced the new program “*Secciones Europeas*” into the region. This allowed the training for teachers to be provided through collaboration between the Ministry of Education of the central government of Spain and the regional Education Authority<sup>38</sup>.

The training course organization seems to be very modest in terms of length and quality of exposure with the trainers. The first part of the training program is intended to provide teachers with enough knowledge of the

<sup>34</sup> P. Mehisto, D. Marsh, J. M. Frigols, *Uncovering CLIL...*

<sup>35</sup> D. Coyle, *Introduction...*

<sup>36</sup> J. M. Artigal, *The Catalan Immersion Program: A European Point of View*, New Jersey 1991.

<sup>37</sup> The British Council additionally provided trainers for the English program in the Spanish state schools and also offered non-compulsory INSET training and visits to schools of primary or secondary education in the UK.

<sup>38</sup> The program (see more on: [www.educa.jccm.es](http://www.educa.jccm.es); accessed: 01.12.2012.) consists of: one month intensive language course in the Official Spanish School of Languages, *Escuela Oficial de idiomas*; then about three days of INSET training in methodologies for teaching contents through a foreign language; and finally, a stay of at least two weeks in a primary or secondary school in a country where the target language is spoken (see more in: R. Fernández Cézár, C. Aguirre Pérez, Ch. Harris, *Implementation of CLIL in Castilla-La Mancha (Spain) and teacher training*, [in:] *CLIL Practice: Perspectives from the Field*, eds. D. Marsh et al., Jyväskylä 2009, p. 21–27.

target language to teach in this language. The second part is carried out in centres that provide teachers with INSET training called *C.E.P. (Centro de Profesores)*. It permits them to be in contact with teachers belonging to centres where the program has been implemented enables them to share in-class experiences and useful information. Finally, they spend some time abroad, learning about teaching methodologies and resources in use there. The three phases of the training take place in the first year of participation in the program. The level of English required does not allow teachers with a low level of knowledge of the target language to enter the program.

In the subsequent sections of the article we are going to investigate the opinions of the participants of a 3-week short pre-service and in-service training course for Spanish CLIL teachers held in the UK. We aim to explore the question of the effectiveness and relevance of such training courses with respect to the theoretical framework of the CLIL teacher competences.

## 5. Research: participants and the setting

Our questionnaire was administered at the University of Chichester in the UK after a 3-week short pre-service and in-service training course for Spanish CLIL teachers in August 2010. The training was organized for one mixed group consisting of 28 Spanish CLIL teachers and CLIL teacher trainees.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts: the first one targeted solely at CLIL practising teachers aimed at eliciting some specific information on the teachers' subject speciality, the ratio of English language exposure in an average CLIL lesson and, finally, in the form of an open-ended question, we asked the teachers to identify three biggest difficulties they face in their own CLIL classrooms. The second part of the questionnaire for both groups of teachers consisted of two sets of close-ended questions. In the first one the respondents were asked to choose from 4 options ranging from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'; in the second question, the respondents were again asked to indicate one option out of 4. The results of the questionnaire will be discussed in the subsequent sections of the article.

Within the theoretical framework outlined above the following research questions were posed:

1. How will the participants of CLIL in-service training for CLIL teachers evaluate their competences with respect to 8 areas of competences as defined by the Socrates project?

2. How will the results of the questionnaire carried out among CLIL teacher trainees and CLIL established teachers differ with respect to 8 areas of competences as defined by the Socrates project?

## 6. Questionnaire results – CLIL trainees

At the end of the training course<sup>39</sup> in the UK we gave the questionnaire to 23 primary school teacher trainees – future CLIL teachers; these were 22 females, 1 male; 78% of the group were aged between 26–35, and 12 % were aged between 36–45. They were, however, practicing primary teachers of different subjects such as Math, Spanish, Science, Art&Craft (19 people); there were also 2 music teachers and 2 PE teachers.

		Very confident	Confident to some extent	More training would be useful	100% training needed
1.	Identifying learner needs	5	16	2	
2.	Choosing student-centred approach in the classroom		5	18	
3.	Multimodal approaches to learning because of learner differences	1	2	20	
4.	Planning forms of interaction to stimulate cognitive & linguistic skills	2	8	13	
5.	A focus on the specific aspects of subject literacies	1	3	19	
6.	Learners' evaluation and assessment for learning		4	17	
7.	Cooperating with other subject and language specialists	14	7	2	
8.	Concentrating on cultural issues	1	2	20	

Table 1. The results of the questionnaire: 23 CLIL teacher trainees rating the areas for the development of CLIL teacher competence in terms of their own competences. The numbers denote the numbers of participants indicating a particular answer. The highlighted boxes indicate the dominant tendencies.

<sup>39</sup>The detailed programme of the courses can be obtained at the organizers' relevant office. See more on: [www.chich.ac.uk](http://www.chich.ac.uk). (Accessed: 01.12.2012.)

## 7. Questionnaire results – CLIL practising teachers

We also gave the questionnaire to the rest of the training participants, experienced CLIL teachers. These were 3 females 2 males; 1 teacher was aged between 26–35 years old, 4 were aged between teachers 36–45 years old. As far as their subject specialities are concerned, they were: 1 primary school teacher and 4 secondary school teachers subjects: teaching (Geography, Music, Science, Art & Craft).

		Very confident	Confident to some extent	More training would be useful	100% training needed
1.	Identifying learner needs			3	2
2.	Choosing student-centred approach in the classroom			5	
3.	Multimodal approaches to learning because of learner differences			1	4
4.	Planning forms of interaction to stimulate cognitive & linguistic skills		1	2	1
5.	A focus on the specific aspects of subject literacies		1	4	
6.	Learners' evaluation and assessment for learning			1	4
7.	Cooperating with other subject and language specialists		4	1	
8.	Concentrating on cultural issues		3	2	

Table 2. The results of the questionnaire: CLIL teachers rating the areas for the development of CLIL teacher competence in terms of their own competences. The numbers denote the numbers of participants indicating a particular answer. The highlighted boxes indicate the dominant tendencies.

We also asked CLIL practicing teachers an additional question about the amount of time of CLIL class being conducted in English. Their answers suggest relatively high exposure to foreign language as 2 teachers ticked the answer “more than 50%”; 3 teachers ticked the answer between 40–50% and nobody ticked the answer indicating lower amount of time.

There was another open-ended question in which we asked the teachers to enumerate 3 the most important difficulties that they face as CLIL teachers. The answers could be then divided into the following dominating tendencies:

1. Problems with heavy load work, time consuming preparation of CLIL lessons and materials:

- “Having time to prepare tasks, mainly in a course (3<sup>rd</sup> of ESO) that I am beginning for the first time.”
- “I have to prepare everything: all the texts, materials, activities... Fortunately, I have just find a very useful book in English.”

2. Problems resulting from lack of adequate experience/training/ expertise in teaching through CLIL, respectively content or language:

- “Not being prepared for being a CLIL teacher, but for being an English teacher.
- “Not having much experience in teaching those contents”
- “Not knowing specific vocabulary, sometimes”

3. Problems with new ways of assessment:

- “The assessment of both things, content and language. Usually I only assess the content using written tests, in English of course, but now I am considering how to assess the productive skills (oral and writing).”

## 8. Discussion of the questionnaire results

The results of the questionnaire seem to confirm the major challenges and difficulties already identified by CLIL experts. The group of CLIL teacher trainees marked the following areas of competences in which they would need more training:

1. Concentrating on the cultural issues – 20 answers;
2. Multimodal approaches to learning – 20 answers;
3. Focus on subject specific literacies – 19 answers.

On the other hand, it seems that the CLIL teacher trainees felt most self-confident in two aspects: first, with respect to cooperating with other subject and language specialists (20 participants marked the answer “self-confident”) and secondly, with respect to identifying learners’ needs (16 participants marked the answer “confident to some extent”). It can be concluded that the CLIL teacher trainees (originally subject teachers) admitted gaps in their competences that are traditionally linked with language teaching methodology (literacy and multimodality). It is worth noticing that they signalled that cultural issues need to be particularly addressed by the trainers. This might be due to the fact that as subject teachers, they

might be exposed to and trained in a given foreign language, but the cultural strand is not a common component of those courses and knowledge of the target language culture may be somehow assumed.

The participants who have already taught using CLIL have demonstrated a significantly lower degree of satisfaction on the training provided. The answers they provided signal a large need of further training in the following areas of competences:

1. Multimodal approaches to learning (4 out of 5 people marked the answer: "100% training needed")
2. Learners' evaluation and assessment for learning (4 out of 5 participants marked the answer: "100% training needed")

The answers to the open ended question in which they were asked to describe about the difficulties in CLIL confirm the overall tendency in that aspect by indicating excessive workload, problematic assessment issues and lack of adequate training.

The findings also suggest that CLIL teacher trainees are far more confident with respect to their competences as CLIL teachers, the level of self-confidence drops significantly when the same questions were asked CLIL practising teachers. We cannot draw any major conclusions from this statistically insignificant sample, but what seems to be illustrated here, is the dominant tendency to respond to questionnaire on the part of practising CLIL teachers – despite their experience and training, those teachers still feel that they need more training in most areas of competences. It can be concluded then that continuous training or ample opportunities for in-service training should be an essential part of the support supplied by the school or institutions.

Another point that can be made on the grounds of the questionnaire would deal with the training course organisation. As we could see from the answers given, the training group was mixed and not particularly tailored to the real needs of the participants – there were both secondary and primary school teachers, and there were teachers with varied subject specialities (Math, Science, Music, etc). Such a combination may impede the effectiveness of the training, as both primary and secondary teachers work with different learners and they need different methodological tools to apply in their respective classrooms. Secondly, as one of the competences enumerated by the Socrates project covered subject literacies, grouping together teachers with varied subject specialties, makes it virtually impossible to develop sufficient level of adequate subject literacy by the respective participants.

## 9. Conclusions

As a conclusion, a few things need to be mentioned. First of all, when we look at the profile of CLIL teacher, we see a large number of professional skills that are to be acquired for the teaching content through the medium of the a foreign language. The CLIL teacher competence needs to cover the language competence, the subject knowledge, skills and their application, and both the documents that we discussed above can be considered a major contribution to the establishment of some coherent framework of CLIL teacher competences.

Secondly, as it can be concluded from the questionnaire results, tailored training courses are essential in CLIL teacher education, and they should be designed with reference to the adequate conceptual framework of CLIL teacher competences. What also should be taken into account, is the need of precise tailoring of the training courses to the participants' needs, especially those linked with school level and subject expertise.

Last but not least, in-service teacher development for practising CLIL teachers is equally important, as they seem to be aware of the need of training to develop their skills, thus equipping them with the tools that can encourage them to develop some autonomy.

Barbara Loranc-Paszyk

### **Nierozwiązane problemy i nowe perspektywy w kształceniu nauczycieli zintegrowanego nauczania językowo-przedmiotowego (CLIL). Doświadczenia praktyków a badania europejskich ekspertów**

Artykuł omawia wybrane zagadnienia związane z kształceniem oraz rozwojem zawodowym nauczycieli pracujących z grupami dwujęzycznymi. Dawne „nauczanie dwujęzyczne” obecnie najczęściej określane jako CLIL (*Content and Language Integrated Learning*) czyli zintegrowane nauczanie językowo-przedmiotowe; od początku lat 90. błyskawicznie zdobywa popularność w Europie i na świecie, będąc oceniane przez ekspertów jako niezwykle innowacyjny i efektywny paradygmat edukacyjny. Potencjał CLIL leży przede wszystkim w znaczącym podniesieniu efektywności nauczania języków obcych w warunkach szkolnych; ta formuła edukacyjna wydaje się także być odpowiedzią na wyzwania stawiane uczniom i nauczycielom przez procesy globalizacji, integracji europejskiej czy też dominacji języka angielskiego we współczesnym świecie. Należy jednakże podkreślić, że implementacja CLIL w Europie pomimo szerokiego poparcia udzielanego przez instytucje unijne jest ograniczona przez wiele nierozwiązanych problemów metodycznych,

takich jak np. brak ujednoliconego programu kształcenia czy rozwoju zawodowego nauczycieli prowadzących takie zajęcia czy też brak odpowiednich materiałów edukacyjnych dostosowanych do poziomu językowego i poziomu wiedzy przedmiotowej uczniów danego kraju czy regionu.

W artykule przedstawiono najnowsze próby standaryzacji programu kształcenia nauczycieli CLIL oraz przykłady takiego kształcenia w wybranych krajach UE, przede wszystkim w Hiszpanii, będącej w ocenie ekspertów europejskim liderem z zakresie wdrażania programów CLIL. W części empirycznej zaprezentowano wyniki badań ankietowych przeprowadzonych wśród uczestników kursu doskonalącego dla nauczycieli CLIL z Hiszpanii (zarówno nauczycieli czynnych, jak i praktykantów) zorganizowanego przez Uniwersytet Chichester w Wielkiej Brytanii.

## Appendix

### Questionnaire for CLIL teachers and CLIL teacher trainees

#### # Part 1

1. What subject/content do you teach in English? What type of school? Please specify:
2. If you teach CLIL, how much time of your class is conducted in English?

Less than 10%	between 15–30%	between 40–50%	more than 50%

3. If you teach CLIL please enumerate 3 the most important difficulties that you face:

#### # Part 2

4. How much do you agree with the following statements:

		Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
A.	CLIL teacher's professional development is a Do-It-Yourself activity				
B.	Being a CLIL teacher is an attractive option in terms of prestige				
C.	Effective language learning is a real benefit provided by CLIL classroom				
D.	Students are more motivated in CLIL classroom because of English lg learning				
E.	CLIL is equally effective as non-CLIL classes when it comes to content learning				

5. Could you rate the areas for the development of CLIL teacher competence in terms of your own competences:

		Very confident	Confident to some extent	More training would be useful	100% training needed
1.	Identifying learner needs				
2.	Choosing student-centred approach in the classroom				
3.	Multimodal approaches to learning because of learner differences				
4.	Planning forms of interaction to stimulate cognitive & linguistic skills				
5.	A focus on the specific aspects of subject literacies				
6.	Learners' evaluation and assessment for learning				
7.	Cooperating with other subject and language specialists				
8.	Concentrating on cultural issues				