Revista Nebrija
de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de las Lenguas

Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas (RNAEL) ISSN 1699-6569
Vol. 13 Núm. 27 (2019) doi: 10.26378/rnlael1327338
Recibido: 18/09/2019/ Aprobado: 23/10/2019
Publicado bajo licencia de Creative Commons Reconocimiento Sin Obra Derivada 4.0 Internacional

Language as the articulator of a CLIL ecosystem: the Spanish case

La lengua como articulador de un ecosistema AICLE: el caso español

Ana Isabel Otto Cantón
Universidad a Distancia de Madrid, España
anaisabel.otto@udima.es

Xabier San Isidro
Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Kazakhstan
xabier.sanisidro@nu.edu.kz

ABSTRACT
Spanish Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) provision perfectly reflects what is happening in the kaleidoscopic European language learning landscape. Even though English is the most widely used language in this type of programme, in the course of more than two decades of implementation, CLIL has adapted to the diverse and ecological language policy of the European Union through disparate models in the different regions. Despite the differences among the various contexts, CLIL implementation has morphed into the design of language policies at school level (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019), and these language policies are inextricably connected to teacher qualification, training and collaboration, along with curriculum integration. CLIL schools have thus become cross-curricular language ecosystems involving all the languages of instruction.

In this article we offer a theoretical discussion of the state of the art on CLIL as far as planning and implementation are concerned. We first provide a general overview of the Spanish challenges towards multilingualism. In the second part, we address and discuss in detail the key points in the articulation of a CLIL ecosystem: the role of language itself as an articulator, and the teachers' profiles and their roles in designing a 'language aware' project based on curriculum integration (Otto, 2017b).

Keywords: CLIL, bi/multilingual education, curriculum integration, language learning, teacher training

RESUMEN
La regulación de AICLE refleja perfectamente lo que está ocurriendo en el panorama caleidoscópico del aprendizaje de idiomas en Europa. Aunque el inglés es el idioma más utilizado en este tipo de programas, en el transcurso de más de dos décadas de implementación, AICLE se ha adaptado a la política lingüística diversa y ecológica de la Unión Europea a través de modelos dispares en las diferentes regiones. A pesar de las diferencias entre los distintos contextos, la implementación de AICLE se ha transformado en el diseño de políticas lingüísticas a nivel escolar (San Isidro y Lasagabaster, 2019), y estas políticas lingüísticas están inextricablemente relacionadas con la cualificación, la formación y la colaboración de los profesores, así como con la integración curricular de los planes de estudio. Los centros educativos que implementan AICLE se han convertido así en

ecosistemas lingüísticos interdisciplinarios en los que se tienen en cuenta todas las lenguas de instrucción.

En este artículo ofrecemos una discusión teórica sobre el estado del arte de AICLE en lo que se refiere a la planificación y la implementación. En primer lugar, ofrecemos una visión general de los retos de España con respecto al multilingüismo. En la segunda parte, abordamos y discutimos en detalle los puntos clave en la articulación de un ecosistema AICLE: el papel del lenguaje en sí mismo como articulador, y los perfiles de los profesores y su papel en el diseño de un proyecto "consciente de la lengua" basado en la integración curricular (Otto, 2017b).

Palabras clave: AICLE, educación bilingüe/multilingüe, integración curricular, aprendizaje de idiomas, formación de profesores.

1. INTRODUCTION: SPANISH CHALLENGES TOWARDS MULTILINGUALISM

Language policies carried out in multilingual Spain as a whole and in its constituent autonomous communities warrant particular attention. Throughout the last three decades, since the respective autonomous institutions were created, a wide range of language policies have been implemented. The particularities of these policies are concerned with specific sociolinguistic contexts, the civic and political resources engaged in implementing them, and the diverse historical and ideological backgrounds the issue of language has in every place. Spain makes a very interesting case for study not only due to its complexity but also because it allows us to reflect on the interaction between the law and the changing political contexts at both the local and national levels. In other words, the existence of a common provision versus diverse regional statutes evidences the contrasting historical and sociolinguistic backgrounds at each of the regions (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019).

Spanish is the official language of the country, but the issue of language policy is an important one in Spain by virtue of the recognition of other languages as co-official both in the Constitution of 1978 and in the regional statutes of 6 communities: Catalonia, the Basque Country, Galicia, the Balearic Islands, Valencia and Navarre. In these regions, the local language and Spanish coexist as official languages and a system of bilingual education operates. This recognition is the keystone of Spanish linguistic and cultural diversity. In the last couple of decades, Spain has been facing the challenge of combining this preservation-focused language policy —aimed at the use and the standardisation of minority languages— with the new needs related to multilingualism (CLIL) (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019).

As regards CLIL in Spain, it started being implemented by the end of the 1990s with no national provision and through different directives in both the monolingual and bilingual regions. Its exponential growth and the massive uptake on the part of schools and students has made Spain become one of the leading countries in both CLIL implementation and practice given the growing relevance that learning foreign languages has in a globalised society (Coyle, 2010). CLIL has become one of the cornerstones to both support multilingualism and enhance the learning of foreign languages. Nonetheless, the overall

picture is quite varied as each region can regulate and design (Guillamón-Suesta & Renau, 2015) its own provision based on its needs and interests, provided that it complies with the requirements in the legal framework set by the state educational law (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

One of the earliest undertakings to introduce CLIL in Spain was the creation of the Bilingual and Bicultural Project by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science together with the British Council back in 1996, which was based on an integrated English and Spanish curriculum (Coba Arango, 2010). It started in Madrid, but it was later extended to other regions. This pilot experience was considered to be the starting point and, possibly, the triggering effect for independent CLIL programmes in the different Spanish regions. At the moment it co-exists with the CLIL programmes of the different education departments in non-bilingual communities.

As regards regions with two co-official languages, Catalonia can be considered as one of the pioneering regions to implement CLIL in public schools throughout the *Orator Project and the Foreign Language Experimental Plan,* which took place between 1999-2008 (Navés & Victori, 2010). In Catalonia, Catalan is the main language of instruction and English is taught as the main foreign language in mainstream education, with the recent introduction of CLIL programmes in some schools (Roquet & Pérez-Vidal, 2015).

The Basque Country has also made huge efforts in order to combine English, Basque and Spanish in schools. According to Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010), the provision approved by the Basque government to encourage multilingualism towards CLIL can be summarised into the following projects: Early Start to English, INEBI (English through Content in Primary Education), BHINEBI (English through Content in Secondary Education) and the Plurilingual Experience for Secondary Education and Baccalaureate. The most distinctive characteristic of its large-scale implementation is that it pursues enhancing multilingualism in a bilingual community as well as promoting the learning and use of the minority language. In the Basque Country two different modalities of CLIL are followed at present. In one of them English is taught by English language teachers through content-based units related to curricular areas (Social Sciences, Physical Education, or Maths). The second modality involves teaching content subjects in English (History, Natural Sciences, or Computer Science).

The region of Navarre, which is located near the Basque Country and presents some Basque-speaking areas, has also undertaken some CLIL pilot projects (Navés & Muñoz, 1999; Heras & Lasagabaster, 2015).

The Balearic Islands first mentioned the possibility of teaching parts of the curriculum in primary and secondary education through a foreign language in 2002 (Conselleria d'Educació i Cultura ,2002a, 2002b). Regulations were developed to unify the previous provision and promote a widespread implementation of CLIL programmes (named European Sections in the Islands) in all stages of public education (Pérez-Vidal & Juan-Garau, 2010).

In Galicia, the regulation of the use of Galician in the curriculum was taking place at the same time as CLIL was gradually embraced and regulated by the end of the 1990s. However, there seemed to be a clash of interests: protection of Galician versus the introduction of foreign languages as vehicles for learning other subjects. This dual focus in language policy led the Galician Educational Department to publish, in June 2010, a decree on Plurilingualism —Decree 79/2010 (Xunta de Galicia, 2010)—. This officially brought the use of foreign language as vehicular into public education, setting out that one third of subjects must be taught in a foreign language —mainly English— with the two remaining thirds taught in Galician and Spanish.

The Valencian Community also presents a bilingual background in which both Spanish and Valencian are co-official. Support for CLIL has witnessed a dramatic increase in the last few years (Navés & Muñoz, 1999; Pérez-Vidal, 2002). After the first Decree 127/2012 (Conselleria d'Educació, Cultura i Esport, 2012), which paved the way to subsequent teacher training regulations, a new Decree on Plurilingualism has recently been published (Generalitat Valenciana, 2018) with a view to developing a trilingual language policy.

With regard to monolingual regions, the characteristics of CLIL implementation vary in the different communities as provision and funding are different in all of them. An interesting case is Madrid, which set up its programme in 2004, as separate from the previous Bilingual and Bicultural Project with the British Council.

A different scenario is that of Andalusia and its *Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo* (2005). Its origin can be traced back to 1998 when bilingual experiences began, first with French and then with German. In the so-called bilingual and plurilingual schools, the languages used for CLIL are now English, Italian and Portuguese, in addition to French and German. The *Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo* also mandates an early start of the first foreign language in pre-school and the introduction of a second foreign language in 5th grade (Lorenzo, Casal & Moore, 2010).

Spanish CLIL provision is a faithful reflection of what is happening in the kaleidoscopic European language learning landscape. In the course of more than two decades of implementation, CLIL has adapted to the diverse and ecological language policy of the European Union through various models in the different regions. According to San Isidro & Lasagabaster (2019), despite the differences among the contexts, CLIL implementation has morphed into the design of language policies at school level. These language policies are inextricably connected to teacher qualification, training and collaboration, along with curriculum integration. CLIL schools have thus become cross-curricular language ecosystems involving all the languages of instruction.

2. THE ARTICULATION OF A CLIL ECOSYSTEM

The key principle of CLIL as an integrated pedagogic approach is straightforward – both the content and the language have to be explicitly taught together and learned in an interrelated way, which leads to deeper learning for all learners. Nevertheless, how this is done depends on a myriad of variables which are context-specific. CLIL is about developing pedagogies relevant for different contexts which provide rich learning contexts and focus on enabling the conceptual development and linguistic progression of all learners – regardless of their ability or age. According to Coyle,

> CLIL approaches have the flexibility and adaptability to make a difference to the quality of learning but only on condition that the principles upon which the pedagogies are developed are made clear and satisfy the cognitive and cultural demands of deeper learning as well as the linguistic and knowledge/skills base of schooling and the world beyond. (Coyle, as interviewed by San Isidro & Julián, 2018),

A recent report by the European Commission (2018) advocates that schools need to be 'language aware'. It is through such guidance for language policy makers that CLIL practitioners and educators can operate successfully. Language as a cognitive learning instrument as well as a pluriliteracy-development communication tool has become a hot

topic in the research literature (Morton, 2018; Coyle, 2015; Meyer et al., 2015). Linking learning to literacy development has influenced the ways of reconceptualising CLIL scenarios or ecosystems and the ways learners access, practise and develop their linguistic skills. There is a need to focus on designing the learning environment (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, forthcoming) so that the language relates transparently to the conceptual development required for learning subject matter. The key points that make language the articulator in the design of this type of learning environment are: profiling teachers in terms of qualification and training needs; the consideration of all teachers as language teachers; curriculum integration, teachers' collaboration and the delineation of teachers' roles; and making language salient.

2.1. Profiling teachers: qualification and training needs

Teaching in a CLIL programme implies certain changes regarding the methodologies being used, teachers' needs when teaching both content and language subjects, and specific training for teachers. In Spain**,** teachers' profiles are dependent on the educational stage in question. In primary schools, the typical profile of a teacher is a generalist teacher who holds a degree in primary education or a language specialist who majors in English as a Foreign Language. Contrarily, and unlike the situation in other countries such as Italy where content and language teachers can share the responsibility of teaching CLIL subjects, secondary teachers in Spain are specialists in the subject(s) they teach, be it a content subject or a language subject. Thus, CLIL subjects are the responsibility of the content experts whilst the foreign language is taught by a language specialist. In the different regions, teachers must have a language qualification in order to take part in a CLIL project. This qualification ranges now from B2 to C1, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001).

In some regions such as Madrid, teachers are expected to obtain the Linguistic Capability Certification or "habilitación lingüística" to teach subject areas through a foreign language, in the case of primary teachers, and an advanced level of English or "Advanced English Curriculum" (or an equivalent certificate in other foreign languages), in the case of secondary ones. These certificates measure teachers' linguistic skills as part of the competences they need to teach content through a vehicular language. Other regions require specific training in CLIL-related methodology (e.g. Catalonia, La Rioja, Castille and Leon, Valencia, Murcia, the Canary Islands and Extremadura) (Eurydice, 2017, p. 92).

The lack of specific linguistic training was a common concern in some regions after the initial stages of programme implementation. However, once teachers were gradually proving thorough knowledge of the target language, specific training on CLIL steadily increased (Fernández & Halbach, 2011).

2.2. Every teacher is a language teacher

In a context of content and language integration, language awareness becomes part and parcel of teachers' daily activity, and this is the reason why their role in accommodating language-related issues in the subject curricula is of paramount importance. The conception of every teacher as a language teacher originally dates from the Bullock report (1975), which attempted to review the status of the teaching of the English language in the UK. The report aimed to improve English literacy levels by making language visible and explicit to students, and ensure that all of them left school with job skills such as being able to read

and write proficiently. Likewise, and as a natural follow-up of the recognition of the paramount role of language skills in mainstream education, it focused on need for teachers to take responsibility for language skills development –more specifically reading skills–in their subjects, and for making language content and academic vocabulary (CALP) more accessible in core subjects. In this sense, the Bullock Report voiced concerns about Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), which later have been translated to other contexts such as CLIL.

Appreciation of language-related issues on the part of the teachers or the so-called Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is described as a deep insight into how the language works, how to use it, and how to show a high level of proficiency (Edge, 1998, p. 10). It refers to the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively (Thornbury, 1997; Andrews, 2007), namely the knowledge about the language demands of the curriculum and the students (Gibbons, 2002; Glegg, 2007). This knowledge implies empathy for the students' difficulties in acquiring and learning a vehicular language (Andrews, 2003), and understanding the support students need in order to accomplish subject tasks through a second language (Clegg, 2007). The language demands of the curriculum are dependent on the specific subject and register and engage teachers in several processes. The first of them will be the analysis of textbooks and other teaching materials in order to identify aspects such as the spoken language demands and the types of texts students will require to read and/or listen to. This close analysis of materials is also necessary to consider the written text types and their schematic structure, the most significant grammatical aspects e.g. the use of tense that the topic demands, and the appropriate content-obligatory and content-compatible lexis for the subject matter (Gibbons, 2002, p. 22), before these aspects can be made visible for students.

As for the focus on students' difficulties, since the CLIL approach does not necessarily require students to have reached a specific level in the vehicular language, teachers must also be attentive to students' language needs. Thus, teachers can identify what might be challenging for them beforehand, and plan accordingly in collaboration with the language teacher. This emphasis on language pedagogies typical of foreign language instruction is, in fact, beneficial in CLIL contexts for a variety of reasons. On the one hand, because the specific focus on form through an overt focus on language (Pérez Vidal, 2007) might help students at the upper levels in the acquisition of the foreign language as opposed to second/foreign language acquisition in young learners who still seem to lack the abilities to contrast the vehicular language and their mother tongue. On the other hand, because if teachers are not aware of language in CLIL, students' errors could be overlooked with the subsequent lack of accuracy over fluency in the foreign language that some immersion programmes in Canada were criticized for (Lyster, 2007). Finally, by paying attention to language issues, it is easier to identify language objectives in multilingual education, align them with content ones, and thus, teachers can contribute to an integrated cross-curricular approach as will be discussed below.

2.3. Curriculum Integration and Teachers' Roles in CLIL Contexts

According to San Isidro and Lasagabaster (forthcoming), curriculum integration is one of the challenges for a teacher who first enrols on a CLIL programme and faces the structuring of the project. This is mainly due to their lack of experience and expertise in curriculum planning and, most probably, because this type of programme is based on integrated

design, which consists of setting up both linguistic and non-linguistic goals, standards, content and assessment criteria. Curricular integration (understood as the 'interdisciplinary approach' (Jones, 2009) or the 'multidisciplinary-interdisciplinary-transdisciplinary approach' (Drake & Burns, 2004) is a complex educational challenge which requires attention to content-specific disciplines and language objectives (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Lyster, 2007; Pica, 2008) along with new organizational principles regarding the way we conceive teachers' roles and subjects. From this integrated and integrative perspective, several actions need to be adopted. To start with, it is necessary to define the role of content teachers and language teachers so that they can collaborate successfully. Besides, we also need to consider subjects from a more holistic viewpoint to envision competences and content not as pertaining to individual subjects but to knowledge areas, and to engage in cross-curricular work which enriches instruction (Savage, 2011; Westwood, 2006).

The following are desired changes to be implemented for successful integration of content, language and skills according to Lorenzo, Trujillo & Vez (2011). First, in relation to term and concept unification, the incorporation of linguistic concepts into other curricular subjects requires sharing these linguistic terms, which need to be added into each subject. Contrary to what is commonly thought, and as will be explained in detail when we refer to the role of content teachers, this does not entail that the content specialist teaches grammatical concepts. Instead, integration should include higher levels in the linguistic system such as those related to social and discourse functions i.e. working with argumentative texts in history or being able to design a scientific poster in biology to promote higher literacy levels in students. Secondly, in order to help students advance in their language skills, it is also highly recommended to add some flexibility in schedules in order to organize groups of students taking into account linguistic levels, and thus make the most of students' participation and interaction in class. Third, as for term and concept integration, the integrated syllabus should be designed in such a way that linguistic goals and objectives are incorporated into the content subjects without content-related goals being compromised. In this sense, integration is considered not as an end in itself, but as a medium to achieve general and specific goals so that non-linguistic and linguistic competences are aligned. Finally, regarding assessment, it is necessary to point out that changes in assessment practice derive from the changes observed so far. In fact, successful assessment results from the teachers' awareness of the elements they take into account: only content-related issues or also language, and to what extent incomplete mastery of the foreign language can interfere with subject-related meaning-making. Likewise, when assessing language components in CLIL subjects, teachers need to know if their assessment criteria conform to the principles of second language acquisition and use so that the language is graded in a fair way, i.e. if language mastery is considered incomplete and subject to change as opposed to native-like proficiency (Lorenzo, Trujillo & Vez, 2011, p. 164).

2.3.1. Teachers' collaboration

According to San Isidro (2018), in a CLIL project, multilingual and integration-based collaborative teaching processes take place, since at least two teachers (a language specialist and a subject teacher) work together. When designing a 'language aware' learning environment, it is fundamental to consider the different languages of instruction and the planning of CLIL considering all those languages. According to San Isidro and Lasagabaster (forthcoming), the fact that language teachers (L1 teachers and additional language

teachers) and CLIL teachers are brought together in a training-designing-implementing experience opens up an endless range of possibilities of approaching the teaching and learning of and through languages. The innovative aspect about CLIL is that in designing a 'language aware' ecosystem, whose main goal is to develop the students' plurilingual competence, it transcends the traditional monolingual perspective in the teaching of languages in schools.

Teacher cooperation can lead to the development of more effective responses regarding students' meaning-making (San Isidro, 2018) More specifically, in CLIL provision, cooperation is vital as it helps create communities of learners in the ecosystem of the bilingual school (Lorenzo, Trujillo & Vez, 2011), and integrate content and language-related issues in an efficient manner (Bertaux, Coonan, Frigols & Mehisto, 2010; Marsh et al., 2010; Pavón & Ellison, 2013; Pavón Vázquez & Méndez García, 2017). In this context of collaboration, the joint efforts of content teachers and language teachers do not only become essential insofar as they contribute to the efficient integration of the vehicular language and content, but also to help to construct knowledge holistically.

However, it is interesting to point out the fact that content teachers —especially those who have not received specific training in language pedagogies (Muñoz-Luna, 2013; Olivares & Pena, 2013)— commonly complain about the lack of time for dealing with both content and language focus in the class (Bigelow, 2010, p. 37). These complaints might be due, on the one hand, to the teachers' limited perception of their role since they tend to think that, as content specialists, they should not be made responsible for language-related learning. On the other hand, it might also respond to common misconceptions about CLIL pedagogies and the role of vehicular languages assuming that CLIL subjects are taught *in* a foreign language, i.e. that the vehicular language is used only as the medium of instruction, not as an essential component of it. Furthermore, content teachers might feel insecure about their language level, their roles and the best way to deal with language aspects (Otto, 2017 b), probably due to the lack of previous training on CLIL and language pedagogies, which is common in some CLIL contexts (Eurydice, 2017). Regardless of teachers' profiles, language and content teachers in multilingual programmes might be confronted regarding their responsibility for language-related learning or when their functions have not been defined in advance. In this sense, it is worth noting that although at the beginning of Spanish programmes implementation, an analysis of teachers' needs (Halbach, 2010; Alejo & Piquer, 2010, Pérez) along with prior training in both language skills and CLIL was still necessary (Halbach, 2010; Salaberri Ramiro, 2010), the time has come to focus and reflect on the teachers' perceptions (Pérez Cañado, 2016b), the main challenges (Pérez Cañado, 2018), and those areas deserving closer attention such as linguistic, methodological, and reflective and developmental competences (Pérez Cañado, 2017).

As Coyle, Holmes & King (2009) point out, the swiftest solution in order to overcome language restrictions on the part of content teachers is usually to work in collaboration with a language specialist. CLIL teachers are unlikely to work on their own but rather through teamwork, sharing responsibilities for teaching and learning across subjects, and developing a broader perspective on curriculum design (Coyle, Holmes & King, 2009, p. 17). However, this is not always a frequent practice, mostly due to the dual profile of teachers, in secondary schools, teachers do not always benefit from joint planning (OECD, 2014).

Ideally, in a CLIL programme there should be language specialists together with teaching assistants or language assistants working in collaboration with subject specialists as they can exchange subject knowledge and broaden their skills and understanding across

different areas. As pointed out before, CLIL teams are commonly successful when there is a common vision of shared goals across subject disciplines. Furthermore, content teachers also benefit from the contact with language teachers who are more open to the communicative approach to language teaching and thus, do not consider themselves as mere transmitters of knowledge about language but as embracing more flexible roles as communicators, organizers and facilitators of knowledge (Baker, Lewis & Jones, 2013, p. 12).

Still, some CLIL practitioners seem to be insecure about how to organize their CLIL sessions and more specifically as to whether they should give over responsibility for her/his subject(s) to the language teachers. In fact, collaboration between language teachers and subject teachers does not imply that language teachers are subordinated to the content areas and that imbalance is found regarding curriculum authority and importance (Davison, 2006, p. 456). Instead, this collaboration aims to balance the development and support of language learning and the development and support of content learning (Coyle, Holmes & King, 2009).

But how is this collaboration made effective in daily practice? The underlying conceptual framework is thus, that of collaboration where subject area specialists and language specialists work together to design the course. Collaborative groups between members of the same didactic department are also a good option in that they function as an ecosystem for the creation of class material and other teaching resources. Besides, they can also help fellow teachers analyse learners' needs, develop efficient task-sharing and support colleagues in using innovative methodologies (Bertaux et al. 2010, p. 8).

2.3.2. The role of language teachers

Content and language teachers in Spain come from a variety of profiles. On the one hand, language teachers can be certified to teach other non-linguistic subjects or have a double degree, which is quite common in some European countries such as Belgium and Sweden (European Commission, 2012, p. 88). On the other hand, as explained above, content teachers can obtain some language certification allowing them to teach subjects through a vehicular language. For practical purposes, regarding the nature and purpose of the study, language teachers will be referred here as those specialists in language subjects regardless of the fact that they might also be specialized in other non-language subjects. Consequently, language teachers are responsible for the subject they teach, i.e. the foreign language

As regards the correct integration of content, language and skills in bilingual education, the following are necessary actions to accomplish by language teachers when they work in multilingual contexts. The language teacher is the one who must assume the responsibility for language, following the content teacher's observation about linguistic needs and deficiencies that need to be corrected, and identifying language demands in content areas so that students are able to understand and learn academic content (Davison, 2006, p. 462; Pavón & Ellison, 2013, p. 68). To do so, language teachers can help to establish clear-language focus, and analyse language demands for content areas. Secondly, their starting point should be the students' L1 and hence collaboration with L1 teachers will be instrumental in structuring the CLIL learning ecosystem. This is related to the fact that CLIL feeds on L1 (single or multiple) teaching, i.e in a CLIL multilingual scenario, language interdependence between the different languages is considered when designing curricula and lessons (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, forthcoming). Through this approach, in their CLIL and language lessons, students tend to appreciate much more keenly the role of language

and content in both understanding a range if topics, and expressing themselves intelligently in an additional language. And consequently, the things they can achieve through an additional language become inextricably intertwined with what they can do in L1. Third, they can help content teachers to plan instruction, and contribute to reporting on students' foreign language development by analysing and considering aspects such as students' prior language level in relation with the CEFR, and students' language challenges and difficulties. Fourth, language teachers can help by collecting useful materials and strategies for class support, foster cross-curricular language awareness in students, and help content teachers to use foreign language learning strategies (Davison, ibid: 462). Finally, in relation to assessment, language teachers will assess language in their subject whereas content teachers must focus on content by offering students a range of varied assessment tools so that they can show their acquisition of knowledge without their marks being biased by a higher or lower language proficiency.

2.3.3. The role of content teachers

As explained in the previous section, teachers' linguistic level can vary depending on the country and region. For instance, in some Autonomous Communities like Andalusia in Spain, content teachers only need to certify a B2 level to access teaching in CLIL education contexts. Besides, content teachers' requirements do not necessarily entail prior training in the CLIL approach or language pedagogies (Eurydice, 2017), especially in some contexts where secondary teachers are subject teachers who certified the required language level to teach CLIL subjects. Consequently, as content specialists, content teachers focus mostly on content objectives rather than linguistic ones, and they might not feel responsible for the latter, a fact that makes a deep impact on some educational stages:

> One of the challenges of CLIL education at the secondary level, in contrast to primary education, concerns teacher profiles. While teachers in primary education have a dual profile (content and language) most teachers in secondary are content experts with certified knowledge of the target language. Therefore, some of the greatest efforts from the administration are focused on both ensuring teacher competence in the foreign language as well as raising their awareness of the specific language demands and characteristics of the different subject disciplines. (Llinares & Dafouz, 2010, p. 100)

Regardless of their training, for CLIL to be effective some actions need to be taken on the part of content teachers. In general, following the recommendations from the *CLIL Teachers' Competence Grid* (2010), the content teacher should be able to take the following actions: To start with, adapt the course syllabus in order to include content, language and learning skills outcomes. Secondly, integrate the language and content area curriculum so that content is supported by language-related goals and vice versa. Then, guide students in the processing of both BICS and academic language (CALP), and select the language needed to provide rich input, and to ensure students' learning in both content and language. Finally, for learning to be meaningful, content teachers need to help students develop meta-cognitive awareness, and therefore, deepen their understanding of content subjects (Bertaux et al., 2010, p. 4).

Besides, by concentrating on the CLIL language, the content teacher becomes a language user and language promoter (Coonan, 2013), incorporating a procedural ('knowing that') and declarative ('knowing how') dimension of language in subject matter

knowledge (Andrews, 2007: 31). In becoming fully aware of language processes in CLIL, content teachers should engage in several actions apart from taking responsibility for students' content and language knowledge and skills development. First, they need to consider their own level of language awareness in the subject(s) they teach (Davison, 2006, Marsh, Marshland, Stenberg, 2001) as well as revise their language proficiency regularly. These language abilities relate to the competence to master sufficient target language knowledge and pragmatic skills of the vehicular language. Second, the CLIL teacher needs to master some linguistic principles or what s/he terms as "theory", i.e. the comprehension of the differences and similarities between the concepts of language learning and language acquisition so that s/he can deal with language-related issues effectively (Marsh et al. 2001, p. 78-80). In this sense, it is also relevant to establish clear learning goals so that language is visible for students. These learning goals can be presented in the form of vocabulary, the four language skills, grammatical structures, functions of language and learning strategies so that learners are able to acquire them in a successful way (Baecher, Funsworth & Ediger, 2014, p. 118). Third, the content teacher should be prepared to deal with learning strategies adapted to both content and language issues in the classroom. This knowledge of foreign language methodology and pedagogy is usually what teachers lack, and what leads them to focus on content-related objectives and forget about the foreign language (Arkoudis, 2006). Under this category of foreign language pedagogy, we consider, on the one hand, the ability to notice linguistic difficulties, recognize students' interlanguage, and be able to use communicative and interactive methods facilitating the understanding of meaning or subject knowledge. Among these methods, we find repetition and echoing for correction and modelling good language usage, and use dual-focused activities, which can cater for both language and subject aspects (Marsh, 2007). Furthermore, regarding the learning environment, as Marsh et al. point out (2001) the content teacher should also be willing and capable to work with learners of diverse linguistic/cultural backgrounds. Last but not least, the content teacher must also be responsible for the creation and development of materials suiting the students' needs and the CLIL purpose, and for assessment issues (Bertaux et al., 2010).

In terms of assessment, content teachers need to be able to develop and implement formative assessment tools appropriate for the CLIL scenario, including the following: (i) make connections between planned outcomes, learning skills and processes, actual outcomes, planning and negotiating strategies for future learning; (ii) use self and peer-assessment tools as recommended by formative assessment or Assessment for Learning (AfL); (iii) maintain a triple focus on language, content and learning skills, and use CLIL-specific characteristics of assessment which allow students to demonstrate their ability in terms of concepts and skills rather than catch them out on the things they are not able to do (Bertaux et al., 2010, p. 8) and (iv) prepare students for formal examinations. As is recommended by the same authors, these specific features include the following: First, to use the language for various purposes. Second, to work with authentic materials, and regular communication with speakers of the CLIL language in order to promote ongoing language growth, and some level of comfort in experimenting with language and content. Finally, to prevent the invisibility of language, and thus advance on real integration of content, language and cognition (Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2012), they have to distinguish content and language errors while carrying out assessment in the target language.

2.3.4. Making language salient in the content class

When articulating a CLIL ecosystem, it is also fundamental to focus on the strategies at the teachers' disposal to make language visible in content subjects. The language in CLIL has to be highlighted and not simply taken for granted as something students will simply "catch up by osmosis" (Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2012, p. 14). This focus on language is especially relevant since students' foreign language might be insufficient in order to express content knowledge and skills in CLIL subjects as compared to proficiency in their mother tongue or students' language proficiency in immersion contexts. Thus, in introducing the language in CLIL, teachers need to bear in mind that student learning progression in bilingual education requires more time than the mere acquisition of BICS in L2 learning (Hulstijn, 2015; Cummins, 1981). Besides, apart from the content vocabulary, academic language has special features, which deserve closer attention: It is more precise than BICS, it avoids slang, and has its own style and tone.

But how can this language visibility be done in practice? To start with, language objectives in a lesson or didactic unit must be made visible and explicit by teachers as referring to both the language demands of the curriculum and those of the students (Gibbons, 2002) as was pointed out in the previous section. To do so, the teachers themselves need, on the one hand, to consider language as an essential step in the planning of the lesson, and raise awareness on the language that students will need by taking into account that language functions vary from one register to another. On the other hand, they should reflect on the level of illiteracy that students show in the foreign language and plan accordingly. The biggest challenge, however, is to make teachers aware of the importance of language and literacy in their subject (Morton, 2016) so that the curriculum is not as demanding for them to devote some time and effort to deal with language issues (Airey, 2013). It might also be the case that teachers find it difficult to identify language objectives (Llinares & Whittaker, 2006, p. 28) for a variety of reasons. First, maybe because content teachers often confuse language objectives with language activities and thus, need to work further on the first, and to consider how specific they wish them to be (Baecher, Funsworth & Ediger, 2014, p. 131). Introducing language objectives in the form of functions, grammatical structures, micro-skills, specific vocabulary and the associated learning strategies in the CLIL class results in a new form of language interaction or discourse. It presents distinguishing features compared to other forms of discourse in Second Language Acquisition, and, consequently, it requires several strategies by content teachers, such as the conversion of an ideational text into a didactic one to name just a few (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001). Second, these language objectives might be blurred because there are few easily available frameworks for the integration of content and language (Morton, 2016). Finally, it might happen, as stressed above, that content teachers do not see themselves as language teachers and therefore, they do not consider they should be made responsible for language-related aspects and deal with students' use of the language (Airey, 2012). In fact, some of them also point out that they feel they might not be prepared to deal with language in content lessons as they can make occasional mistakes themselves.

As content teachers are not often trained on how to raise awareness of language in academic subjects and identify language levels and support language in CLIL, Chadwick (2012) suggests to consider the following questions when dealing with language challenges in relation to content vocabulary, functional language and language skills:

CONTENT VOCABULARY:

•What content vocabulary will my students need for the tasks in my lessons?

•How will I help my students with this vocabulary?

FUNCTIONAL LANGUAGE
•What are my students actually doing? What are the cognitive processes and creative thinking skills that they are using? What is the functional language which goes with these skills?
•How will I help my students with this language?

LANGUAGE SKILLS
•What language skills are the students using? Do I want them to read, write, speak and/or listen?
•How will this affect the support I provide?
Table 1. Raising awareness on CLIL language
(From Chadwick, 2012, p. 4)

Besides, apart from raising awareness on the CLIL language, a profound analysis of the genres in CLIL can help content teachers adapt the tasks accordingly, and design a linguistic inventory for their subjects. This will enable teachers to go beyond academic vocabulary for each topic, and provide additional information on the grammatical and discursive features from the activities and genres that students need to master in the foreign language to produce good oral and written texts (Llinares & Whittaker, 2006, p. 28-29).

Like texts, the types of tasks vary depending on the subject. In science, for example, learners need to know to hypothesize, observe experiments, and describe different procedures. In history and geography, learners read source materials, recounts, reports and case studies, and produce written and oral texts highlighting causes and effects, to name just a few. In art and music, learners read and write descriptions and explanations. Thus, regardless of the different genres and academic disciplines, by working with different, texts and the tasks associated with them, content teachers can prepare students for meaningful learning in CLIL.

3. CONCLUSIONS

In promoting multilingualism, a CLIL school is an ecosystem which features a broad range of human, material and spatial resources. Regarding personal resources, the school requires special engagement from the different professionals in the institution, namely the principal, the CLIL coordinator, the teachers and the language assistants. They all have a relevant role in that they need to work collaboratively with each other so that language, content and skills can be effectively integrated into the curriculum. As content teachers' practices (Otto, 2019) often reveal the lack of language and CLIL pedagogies typical of content teachers' background (Dalton-Puffer, 2013), more teacher training is needed in Spanish CLIL programmes in order to give the language aspects the importance they deserve. Besides, in the lack of CLIL curricular guidelines for real integration of content, language and skills, more efforts are clearly needed so that content and language teachers work in collaboration with each other. Collaboration among teachers is recommended in the Spanish current educational law (LOMCE, 2013) as one of the signs of an effectively integrated and integrative curriculum, and by CLIL research (Pavón & Ellison, 2012: Kelly, 2014; Otto, 2017a; San Isidro, 2018). Teachers' willingness to collaborate with each other, and to discuss and agree on the most effective ways to deal with multilingual education is usually commonplace. In fact, a common concern in these programmes today is how to adapt

current assessment tools used in mainstream education, and whether it is possible to use the same type of assessment as in non-CLIL groups. What teachers might lack, however, is the time to gather, the awareness of the most urgent actions to be undertaken, lack of training in language pedagogies and some clarifications on the specific roles of both content and language teachers in CLIL instruction. Thus, more coordination time is required especially at the beginning of the academic year so that content and language teachers can plan their subjects in a cross-curricular way, and for instance, identify linguistic objectives in content subjects or make connections among the different languages of instruction, so that they can be effectively presented to students. Furthermore, the whole CLIL team should plan to join efforts, design common guidelines regarding the grading of language aspects, create a holistic curriculum in which different areas could complement each other, and students holistically perceive the curriculum.

As a final conclusion, we would like to highlight that teachers' collaboration is the *sine qua non* in the articulation of a CLIL ecosystem. Language as an articulator as well as teachers' profiles and roles play the leading part in this ecosystem, which is the first step to design a school-level language policy.

REFERENCES

Airey, J 2012, 'I don't teach language'. The linguistic attitudes of physics lecturers in Sweden. In AILA Review. Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education, vol. 25, pp. 64-79.

Alejo, R. & Piquer, A. (2010). CLIL teacher training in Extremadura: A needs analysis perspective. In Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 219-42.

Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. In *Language Awareness,* 12, pp. 81- 95. DOI: 10.1080/09658410308667068

Andrews, S. (2007). *Teacher language awareness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Arkoudis, J. (2006). *Teaching International Students: Strategies to Enhance Learning.* Victoria Centre for Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.

Assessment Reform Group, The (2002). *Assessment for Learning: Beyond the Black Box.* Retrieved from http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/ sites/default/files/files/beyond_blackbox.pdf

Baecher, L. Funsworth, T. & Ediger, A. (2014). The Challenges of Planning Language Objectives in Content-Based ESL Instruction. In *Language Teaching Research 2014,* vol. 18 (I), pp. 118-136.

Baker, C., Lewis, G. & Jones, B. (2013). 100 Bilingual Lessons: Distributing Two Languages in Classrooms. In R. C. Abelló-Contesse et al (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the Twenty-First Century: Building on Experience.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bertaux, P., Coonan, C.M., Frigols, M.J., Mehisto, P. (2010). *The CLIL Teacher's Competence Grid.* Retrieved from http://lendtrento.eu/convegno/files/mehisto.pdf

Bigelow, M. (2010). Learning to plan for a focus on form in CBI: The role of teacher knowledge and teaching context. In J. Davis (ed.), World language teacher education: Transitions and challenges in the twenty-first century (pp. 35-56). Greenwich, UK: Information Age Publishing.

Chadwick, T. (2012). *Language Awareness in Teaching: A Toolkit for Content and Language Teachers.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Clegg, J. (2007). Analysing the language demands of lessons taught in a second language. In *Revista española de lingüística aplicada, vol. extra 1*, pp-113-128. Retrieved from http://ateneu.xtec.cat/wikiform/wikiexport/_media/cmd/lle/clsi/modul_2/dialnetanalysingthelanguagedemandsoflessonstaughtinasecon-2575499.pdf

Coba Arango, E. (2010). Foreword. In A. Dobson, M. Pérez Murillo & R. Johnstone (Eds.), *Bilingual education project Spain. Evaluation report 5.* Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Subdirección General de Documentación y Publicaciones.

Conselleria d'Educació i Cultura. (2002a). *Decret 119/2002 de 27 setembre*. Butlletí Oficial de les Illes Balears 120, 17281-17295.

Conselleria d'Educació i Cultura. (2002b). *Decret 120/2002 de 27 setembre.* Butlletí Oficial de les Illes Balears 120, 17295-17313.

Conselleria d'Educació, Cultura i Esport (2012). *Decret 127/2012, de 3 d'agost*, DOCV num. 6834

Coonan, C.M. (2013). *The role of CLIL teachers*. Paper presented at CLO CLIL 2, Bari. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=doN8oLApaSU

Coyle, D. (2010). *Foreword*. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Coyle, D. (2015). Strengthening integrated learning: Towards a new era for pluriliteracies and intercultural learning. Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning, 8(2), 84-103. Retrieved from https://laclil.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/LACLIL/article/view/5915/pdf

Coyle, D., Holmes, B. & King, L. (2009). *Towards and Integrated Curriculum. CLIL National Statements and Guidelines.* London, UK: The Languages Company. Retrieved from http://www.rachelhawkes.com/PandT/CLIL/CLILnationalstatementandguidelines.pdf

Cummins, J. (1981). *Language Development and Academic Learning.* In L. Malave & G. Duquette, *Language, Culture and Cognition*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms. In *Applied Linguistics, Volume 31*, Issue 3, 1 July 2010, pp. 475–478.

Davison, C. M. (2006). Collaboration Between ESL and Content Teachers: How Do We Know When We Are Doing It Right? In *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, v. 9 n. 4, pp. 454-475. DOI 10.2167/beb339.0

Drake, S. & Burns, R. (2004) *Meeting Standards through Integrated Curriculum*. Alexandria: ASCD.

European Commission (2006). *The European Lifelong Learning Programme 2007-2013*. Retrieved from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/LLp

European Commission (2009). *Strategic framework - Education & Training 2020*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework_en

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2012). *Developing Key Competences at School in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities for Policy. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2017). *Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe – 2017 Edition*. *Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission (2018). Proposal for a Council Recommendation on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages. Retrieved from http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-9229-2018-ADD-2/en/pdf

Fernández, R. & Halbach, A. (2011). Analysing the Situation of Teachers in the Madrid Bilingual Project after Four Years of Implementation. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. Manuel Sierra and F. Gallardo del Puerto (eds.), *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning. Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts,* pp. 41-70. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Flowerdew, J. & Peacock, M. (2001). Issues in E. A. P.: A Preliminary Perspective. In Flowerdew & Peacock, (Eds.), *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Generalitat Valenciana (2018). LLEI 4/2018, de 21 de febrer, de la Generalitat, per la qual es regula i promou el plurilingüisme en el sistema educatiu valencià. *Diari Oficial de la Generalitat Valenciana, 8240,* pp. 7860-7873.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom.* New Hampshire, USA: Heinemann.

Guillamón-Suesta, F., & Renau, M.L. (2015). A critical vision of the CLIL approach in secondary education: A study in the Valencian Community in Spain. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning 8*(1), 1-12.

Halbach, A. (2010). From the Classroom to University and Back: Teacher Training for CLIL in Spain at the University de Alcalá. In Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 243- 256.

Heras, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2015). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research 19*, 70-88.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2015). *Language proficiency in native and non-native speakers: Theory and research*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Junta de Andalucía (2005). *Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo*. Retrieved from http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/boja/2005/65/5

Kelly, K. (2014). *COOP E-CLIL.* Retrieved from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/Language%20teachers%20working%20with%20subject%20teachers%20-%20TE.pdf

Lasagabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). *Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics 31*(3), 418-442.

Lorenzo, F., Trujillo, F. & Vez, J.M. (2011). *Educación bilingüe: integración de contenidos y segundas lenguas.* Madrid: Síntesis.

Llinares, A. and Whittaker, R. (2006). Linguistic analysis of secondary school students' oral and written production in CLIL Contexts: Studying Social Science in English. In Dalton-Puffer et al., *Current Research on CLIL, vol. 15*, 3, pp. 28-32. Retrieved from http://anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_anglist/weitere_Uploads/Views/views15_3_clil_special.pdf#page=28

Llinares A. and Dafouz, E. (2010). Content and Language Integrated Programmes in the Madrid Region: Overview and Research Findings. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 95-114.

Llinares, A., Morton, T. & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The Roles of Language in CLIL.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and Teaching Languages through Content: A Counterbalanced Approach.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins

Marsh, D., Marshland, B., & Stenberg, K. (2001). *CLIL compendium. Profiling European CLIL classrooms.* Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.

Marsh, D. (2007). Language Awareness & CLIL. In J. Cenoz, J & N. Hornberger, (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education: Knowledge about Language,* vol. 6, 2nd edition, pp. 233-246. New York & Berlin: Springer Science and Business Media.

Marsh, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D., Frigols Martin, M. J. (2010). *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education: A framework for the professional development of CLIL teachers.* Graz, Austria: European Centre for Modern Languages.

Meyer, D., Coyle, D., Halbach, A., Schuck, K., & Ting, T. (2015) A pluriliteracies approach to content and language integrated learning – mapping learner progressions in knowledge construction and meaning-making, Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28:1, 41-57,DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2014.1000924

Morton, T. (2016). *Integrating Content and Language by Design: Principles for Designing Teaching Units for Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)*. Unpublished Presentation at Nebrija University [09/29/16].

Morton, T. (2018). Reconceptualizing and describing teachers' knowledge of language for content and language integrated learning (CLIL). International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21(3), 275–286, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2017.1383352

Muñoz-Luna, R. (2013). From Drills to CLIL: The Paradigmatic and Methodological Evolution Towards the Integration of Content and Foreign Language. Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development, 16(1), 167-180.

Navés, T & Muñoz, C. (1999). Implementation of CLIL in Spain. In D. Marsh & G. Langé (Eds.), *Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning.* Jyväskyla: ER-paino & Jyväskylän yliopistapaino.

Navés, T., & Victori, M. (2010). CLIL in Catalonia: An overview of research studies. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training,* pp. 30-54. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

OECD (2014). *A Teachers' Guide to TALIS 2013. Teaching and Learning International Survey*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/TALIS-Teachers-Guide.pdf

OECD (2014). *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing. Retrieved from https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2014_eag-2014-en

Olivares, M., & Pena, C. (2013). How Do We Teach Our CLIL Teachers? A Case Study from Alcalá University. Porta Linguarum, 19, 87-99.

Otto, A.& Estrada, J.L. (2019). Towards an Understanding of CLIL in a European Context: Main Assessment Tools and the Role of Language in Content Subjects. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 2(1), 31-42. Retrieved from https://revistes.uab.cat/clil/article/view/v2-n1-otto-estrada

Otto, A. (2017a). Assessment Issues in CLIL: What You've Been Wondering but Were Afraid to Ask. In *RDIM,* n.º 1, pp. 1-13. Retrieved from https://app.rdim.es/archivos/publicacion/e8a4d38d3b45a4831eebde1c2dcbe47e.pdf

Otto, A. (2017b). Colaboración efectiva entre profesores CLIL y profesores de lengua extranjera. In *Revista CDL (Encarte lenguas extranjeras)*, n.º 268, pp. 17-19. Retrieved from https://www.cdlmadrid.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/042017.pdf

Pavón, V. & Ellison, M. (2013). Examining Teachers' Roles and Competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). In *Linguarum Arena*, *vol. 4*, pp. 65-78. Retrieved from http://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/12007.pdf

Pavón Vázquez, V. & Méndez García, M.C. (2017). Analysing teachers' roles regarding cross-curricular coordination in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *Journal of English Studies, 15*, p. 235-260. DOI: 10.18172/jes.3227

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2016b). Teacher training needs for bilingual education: In-service teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 19(3)*, 266-295. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.980778

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2017). CLIL Teacher Education: Where do we Stand and Where do we Need to Go? In M. E. Gómez Parra, & R. Johnstone (Eds.), *Bilingual Education: Educational Trends and Key Concepts* (pp. 129-144). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018). Innovations and Challenges in CLIL Teacher Training. *Theory Into Practice, 57(3)*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2018.1492238

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2002). Spain. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Modern Languages across the Curriculum,* pp. 114-130. London and New York: Routledge/ Falmer.

Pérez Vidal, C. (2007). The need of focus on form (FoR) in content and language integrated approaches: an exploratory study. In *Revista española de lingüística aplicada,* pp. 39-54. Retrieved from hispadoc.es/descarga/articulo/2575491.pdf

Pica, T. (2002). *Subject-Matter Content: How does it assist the Interactional and Linguistic Needs of Classroom Language Learners?* Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs

Roquet, H. & Pérez-Vidal, C. (2015). Do Productive Skills Improve in Content and Language Integrated Learning Contexts? The Case of Writing. *Applied Linguistics 2015*, 1-24.

Ruiz, R. (1990). *Official languages and language planning*. In K. Adams & D. Brink (eds.), Perspectives on official English. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Savage, J. (2011). *Cross-Curricular Teaching and Learning in Secondary Education.* London, UK: Routledge.

Salaberri Ramiro, S. (2010). Teacher Training Programmes for CLIL in Andalusia. In Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 140-161.

San Isidro, X. (2018). Innovations and challenges in CLIL implementation in Europe. *Theory into Practice, 57* (3), pp. 185-195.

San Isidro, X. & Julián, C. (2018). Entrevista con Do Coyle: del marco de las 4 Ces a las pluriliteracidades. *Revista TECLA 2018*(2), p 8-13. Retrieved from https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/reinounido/dam/jcr:a72b0584-6a32-4544-a3f2-2916874d2dee/2018-tecla-numero-2.pdf

San Isidro, X. & Lasagabaster, D. (2019). Monitoring of teachers' views on both CLIL and the development of pluriliteracies: a longitudinal qualitative study. *English Language Teaching, 12*(2)

San Isidro, X. & Lasagabaster, D. (forthcoming). Lessons to be learned: a professional development approach to curriculum planning in a multilingual school in Galicia. In K. Bower G. Chambers, D. Coyle & R. Cross (Eds.). In Cross-curricular language learning: Putting CLIL into practice. Cambridge University Press.

Schleppegrell, M. J., Achugar. M. & Oteíza, T. (2004). The Grammar of History: Enhancing Content-Based Instruction Through a Functional Focus on Language. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 38, 1, pp. 67-93. Retrieved from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3588259seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Thornbury, S. (1997). *About language: Tasks for English Teachers.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Westwood, P. (2006). *Teaching and Learning Difficulties: Cross-curricular Perspectives.* Camberwell, Australia: Australian Council Educational Research (ACER).