The integration of content and language in CLIL: a challenge for content-driven and language-driven teachers

Nerea Villabona & Jasone Cenoz

Published online: 05 Apr 2021.

Submit your article to this journal ↗

Article views: 5560

View related articles ↗

View Crossmark data ↗

Citing articles: 6 View citing articles ↗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The integration of content and language in CLIL: a challenge for content-driven and language-driven teachers

Nerea Villabona ⓘ* and Jasone Cenoz ⓘ

Department of Education Sciences, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Donostia/San Sebastian, Spain

ABSTRACT

Although the core element in CLIL and immersion programmes is the integration of content and language, it is challenging to achieve a balance between the two to meet the dual-objective of CLIL. Research on the beliefs teachers have about CLIL and the way they understand the role of content and language in their classes is crucial to achieve that balance. In the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC), a multilingual region in Spain, schools are implementing CLIL programmes in order to improve students' English proficiency and foster multilingualism. This case study aims at exploring how teachers in this particular setting conceptualise the integration of content and language in CLIL and their understanding is reflected through pedagogical practices. For that purpose, the thoughts and practices of two CLIL teachers with different teaching backgrounds are examined here. The findings show that teachers understand and implement CLIL in different ways and that there are substantial differences between the content-oriented teacher and the language-oriented teacher. This study shows that it is difficult to achieve a balance of content and language in CLIL classrooms because some classes tend to be content-oriented without enough attention given to language, while others are language-oriented without enough attention paid to content.

Introduction

Learning subject content through the medium of a second or additional language is very common in the world at present. In the case of many minority language students, immigrant or not, it is often an obligation because the language or languages used by the school are second or additional languages (Cenoz & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015). In other cases, learning through a second or additional language is a choice either for individuals or stakeholders. This is often the case for Content and Language Integrated Language (CLIL) which has seen important developments in the last decade and is nowadays

widespread in Europe and in other countries. The educational aims of CLIL have been described as twofold, as a second language is used as the medium of instruction for the learning of both content and language (Coyle et al., 2010).

According to Cenoz et al. (2013, p. 4), CLIL is considered an '"umbrella" term that includes many variants and a wide range of different approaches. Sociocultural and educational factors can influence CLIL programmes meaning that they vary from country to country, and even from classroom to classroom depending on factors such as their optional vs. compulsory status, their intensity, their content and language aims or the context (Ruiz de Zarobe & Cenoz, 2015).

Although CLIL is sometimes used as the term to exclusively refer to specific European bilingual education programmes using English as the language of instruction, CLIL shares the same essential characteristics as other Content-Based Instruction (CBI) programmes such as immersion programmes (Cenoz, 2015; Cenoz et al., 2013). In fact, CLIL and CBI programmes use a second or additional language as the language of instruction and they aim at multilingualism and not at replacing the first language with the language of instruction. Both CLIL and CBI programmes focus on pluralism and enrichment and not on assimilation as most children enrolled in these programmes speak the majority language as their first language.

The way content and language are balanced and integrated in classroom practice is equally important in both programmes. CLIL programmes are an approach to learn English or another foreign language by combining language and content subjects. In some contexts, CLIL is selective and this selection can be based on cognitive abilities or may also be linked to socio-economic backgrounds (Van Mensel et al., 2020). CLIL is also available to the whole school population in other contexts and research on CLIL can have implications for other situations where immigrant students and other minority students learn through the medium of a language that is not their home language.

In this article, the thoughts of teachers and their actual classroom practices are examined to observe the balance between language and content when comparing teachers who work in the same context but have different backgrounds and approaches. This study aims at exploring the role of content and language in CLIL settings by looking at the way teachers understand CLIL and how the balance of content and language is reflected in their pedagogical practices.

Content vs. language teachers in CLIL

The integration of content and language is one of the main characteristics of the CLIL approach, as the relationship between these two elements is at the core of any implementation (Llinares & Morton, 2017; Nikula et al., 2016; Ruiz de Zarobe & Jiménez Catalán, 2009). However, the balance between content and language is not easily achieved, and programmes can be more content-driven or language-driven (see also Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Paran, 2013; Tedick & Cammarata, 2012). Many years ago, Met (1998) proposed a continuum for different types of CBI ranging from content-driven to language-driven programmes.

Several studies have shown that teachers find it difficult to integrate content and language (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Koopman et al., 2014; Oattes et al., 2018). After reviewing several studies, Karabassova (2018) considers that there is a 'dichotomy of

teaching the content subject and teaching the language instead of utilising an integrated approach towards teaching' (p. 2). This dichotomy exists because most teacher education degrees are oriented either to language or to content, particularly in the case of secondary education. The problem of integration could be both for content and language teachers because programmes can be more towards the content-driven or the language-driven end of Met's continuum (1998). However, as research on CLIL is mainly conducted in the field of applied linguistics, the main problems have been identified in the case of content teachers being too content-driven because they do not integrate language as much as expected. The potential problem of language teachers being too language-driven and not focusing enough on content has not received much attention, and it may be less common because content subjects are usually taught by content specialists.

When examining the lack of language orientation in CLIL classes, one of the main reasons is that content teachers believe they should give priority to content (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Karabassova, 2018; Lo, 2019). Beliefs are essential to understand how each CLIL teacher conceptualises CLIL or her/his role as a teacher in the approach. Beliefs have been described as 'a complex set of variables based on attitudes, experiences and expectations' (Skinnari & Bovellan, 2016, p. 146). Research carried out in different contexts has consistently shown that CLIL teachers often see themselves as content teachers and not as language teachers. For example, Tan (2011) found that science and math teachers in CLIL programmes in Malaysian secondary schools saw language as secondary in their lessons, because subject matter mastery was their main goal for successful performance in national exams. In the Austrian context, Hüttner et al. (2013) reported that teachers admitted that the lack of linguistic elements, specific English language aims and assessment of language created a relaxed atmosphere in the class, making it very dynamic and successful. Karabassova (2018), in her study in the trilingual context of Kazakhstan, concluded that teachers in this setting saw CLIL 'merely as just teaching through another language' (p. 1) and declined any responsibility to pay explicit attention to language. Skinnari and Bovellan (2016) also confirmed that teachers in CLIL programmes in Austria, Finland, and Spain saw their role as that of content specialists in their subjects even though they also reported some diversity in their beliefs about the role of language in their lessons.

Another reason for content teachers not to pay attention to language is their lack of awareness regarding the integration of language and content as the aim of CLIL programmes. As Lazarević (2019) reported in a study conducted on high school teachers in Serbia, 'The teachers did not consider organising instruction differently for their CLIL classes' (p. 8). Karabassova (2018), in the study already mentioned, found that teachers had little awareness of 'the pedagogical intentions behind CLIL' and of 'the role of language in learning content' (p. 9). As has already been seen, CLIL programmes share the basic idea of language and content integration, but they are implemented in different ways. In fact, practices in the classroom are linked, among others, to the teachers' previous experience and knowledge as well as to their opinions and perceptions (Lyster & Tedick, 2014). There can also be differences related to the content subjects taught (Lo, 2019). Studies on classroom practices have confirmed that explicit attention to language is not common in CLIL classes, but content-oriented teachers can encourage the active use of the language. In Pérez-Vidal (2007), classroom observations showed that students had plenty of opportunities to use the language in context, as the activities created a very

communicative setting. These interactions, however, were usually related to content matter, while focus on language moments were not identified. The Dutch teachers in Koopman et al. (2014) believed that it was the English teacher's job to focus on language and was therefore not their responsibility. However, in their analysis of CLIL classroom pedagogies, it was found that the notion of CLIL as a 'language bath', only allowing for increased exposure to English, was not the predominant idea in this context. In fact, they reported the use of pedagogical procedures supporting language learning. In the same way, studies on pedagogical practices reported by Van Kampen et al. (2018), and Oattes et al. (2018) show that while focus on form is not common in the classrooms, teachers are aware of the importance of giving students opportunities to listen, read, write and interact in English in CLIL. In Mahan et al. (2018), the math and science lessons observed were content-driven and lacked any pedagogy related to language learning. Students in these lessons were given many opportunities to use the language in interaction, but few for reading and writing in English.

Even though pedagogical practices that require the active use of the language can improve language competence, the need to pay explicit attention to language forms in CLIL has also been highlighted. Lyster's (2007, 2017) *counterbalanced approach*, for instance, defends proactive and reactive approaches, focusing on form and correcting language forms as a way to systematically integrate language and content in the classroom. Lo (2019) highlights the need for students to understand the academic language associated with the subject matter and explains that this goes beyond the teaching of specific vocabulary. In fact, there are linguistic features that are used across subjects and involve complex skills, connecting ideas logically or packing and unpacking dense information (Barr et al., 2019; Lin, 2016). These features are necessary to understand and produce language in content subjects.

Studies on CLIL have contributed to the analysis of teachers' beliefs and practices in the classroom, but it is important to examine the specific differences between teachers with a language and a content background. This comparison can reflect different ways to understand CLIL and may have implications for improving the quality of CLIL in different subjects.

The study

This study examines teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the integration of language and content in a CLIL programme by comparing a teacher with a language background and a teacher with a content background. The research questions are the following:

RQ1. Are there differences between content and language teachers' beliefs about the role of content and language in CLIL?

RQ2. Are there differences between the two teachers regarding pedagogical practices and the explicit focus on language forms?

Context

This study is set in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC) in Spain, where Basque is the main language of instruction. The education system in the BAC has made efforts to implement programmes to foster multilingualism in Basque, Spanish and English. The

development of English has become very important in recent years, and English is the first foreign language for the majority of students in the BAC. Most children start learning English from the age of four, and a foreign language is compulsory in all grades. Programmes that involve the teaching and learning of content subjects through a foreign language, mainly English, are being implemented in the BAC as in other parts of the world. Research has mainly focused on language and content outcomes in this context (Gallardo del Puerto & Gómez Lacabex, 2013; Lasagabaster, 2008; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). In contrast, there is much less information about the process itself, that is, about the way English-medium classes are taught in Basque schools and about the way content and language are integrated in CLIL classes.

The schools that participated in this study are two Basque-medium schools that were involved in a multilingual project run by the Basque Government Department of Education called *Eleaniztasunerantz* (*Towards multilingualism*). This four-year project provides financial aid, training programmes and extra hours for teachers to establish ways to promote multilingualism in their schools. The programme allows the schools to choose the distribution of English-instructed hours, among others. In the two schools that took part in the study, students have optional CLIL subjects, that is, subjects taught through English in secondary education. The two secondary schools were public schools in close proximity to each other and with Basque as the main language of instruction. The data presented here are part of a larger multiple case study on CLIL implementation practices.

Methodology

The participants in the study are Basque-Spanish bilingual teachers, fluent in both languages, working at Basque-medium secondary schools. They both have the required level of English to be able to teach through the medium of English in the BAC, which is B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), and have limited training in CLIL. The two CLIL teachers have different educational backgrounds and experience. Teacher 1 (T1) is a biologist and teaches anatomy through English and two other subjects through the medium of Basque in the same school. He has been teaching for twenty years, and three years teaching through the medium of English. Anatomy is offered as an optional subject in the first grade of Baccalaureate and aims to deepen students' knowledge about the functions and structures of human bodies. He has had no specific training in language teaching apart from a short course offered at the school to teach through the medium of English. The students in this class have four hours per week of anatomy classes in English. Teacher 2 (T2) has a degree in English language and she is an English language teacher. She has eight years of experience and has been teaching a media workshop through the medium of English for three years. The aim of this subject is to develop students' skills in digital communication and media with the use of new technologies. This subject has two classes per week and is taught in the 3rd year of secondary school. Teacher 2 has taken several courses in language teaching and multilingualism. The teachers were selected because of their different backgrounds as content vs. language-oriented teachers.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with the CLIL teachers and classroom observations. The semi-structured interviews had 43 questions in total, which were used as a reference to steer the conversation with the teachers. These questions included some of the issues raised by the previous literature in CLIL and CBI contexts

on CLIL practices and teacher experiences (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Papaja, 2013). The questions were divided into the following seven groups of questions:

(1) Teacher's profile, so as to obtain information about their career, experience and use of English;
(2) Teachers' beliefs on the objectives of CLIL, assessment and error correction;
(3) Resources used in class for different tasks;
(4) Methodology, so as to obtain information about the differences between CLIL and teaching in the L1, and teaching strategies to enhance the comprehension of content;
(5) Teachers' language policy for the use of English and other languages in class, self-reported language use, and presence of Basque and Spanish;
(6) Class management as related specifically to CLIL; and
(7) General opinion about CLIL including advantages and disadvantages, possible effects on proficiency in the other languages, and aspects that need to be improved.

The interviews, which were conducted in Basque and lasted up to one hour each, were audio-recorded. The excerpts we include in this paper were originally in Basque and have been translated into English.

The CLIL classes were observed for six months for a total of 49 h. A template based on several protocols on effective teaching (De Graaff et al., 2007; Echevarria et al., 2013; Grossman et al., 2013) was specifically developed for recording the observations in these classes. The researcher took detailed field notes on the following aspects:

(1) Task type,
(2) Opportunity to use English in the task,
(3) Teacher explanations,
(4) Materials and resources used,
(5) Focus on language moment,
(6) Error correction in interaction,
(7) Comprehension checks and problems, and
(8) Use of Basque or Spanish.

Some of the classes were also audio recorded in order to obtain longer extracts from classroom interaction for later analysis. The data gathered from the interviews and observations were transcribed and later analysed through qualitative thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to answer the two research questions.

Findings

The data from the interviews and the classroom observations were analysed, and the two main themes corresponding to the two research questions are reported in this section.

Beliefs about the role of content and language in CLIL

In order to answer the first research question, the beliefs that the content background teacher and the language background teacher expressed in the interviews were analysed.

One of the aspects underlined by the CLIL teachers when asked about their thoughts on the role of English in their classrooms was the idea of using 'English as a tool' for learning content. However, this idea was reflected from slightly different perspectives. The importance of comprehension and being able to use previous English knowledge to achieve content goals was underlined by the anatomy teacher, who at the same time distanced himself from the idea of seeing English as an aim in his lessons taught through English:

> Whether students get a good level of English doesn't bother me that much … So it's something like the means: 'I use what I know to achieve something, to achieve anatomy', it's using English to achieve a good level of anatomy. Yes, it's like a tool. **Teacher 1, excerpt 2.29**

This teacher had clear ideas about the fact that English is a useful and necessary tool, but that it was just a tool, and he does not see that improving the level of English is his task at all.

The language teacher (T2) also shared the view of English being a tool for learning content but did not see that as the only role of the foreign language. In fact, she explained how important it was for her to focus on language and language awareness:

> In these optional subjects, it's like I want to teach them some specific content and that specific content is an excuse to use the language. So both. I often try to make them aware of the English language and language use, always with content as an excuse. We learn something new and the way, or the tool, is English. I also try to increase their motivation. **Teacher 2, excerpt 3.4**

In the same way, and in contrast with the anatomy teacher, the language teacher believed English was also an aim in her CLIL subject:

> Well, and this is something that we tell them at the beginning of the term … that one of the aims of this is to learn English. (…) It is also something they ask for, and many of them have enrolled in this subject for that reason. We try to improve our communicative skills in English on a daily basis. **Teacher 2, excerpt 3.19**

In fact, in the media workshops taught in English by this teacher, the language had a role other than being the means of conveying information. Classroom observations and the syllabus of the subject showed how language was included in some of the assessment rubrics, and language competence was evaluated in the tasks.

In sum, the data from the interviews show that English is only a tool for Teacher 1 and a tool and an aim for Teacher 2.

Pedagogical practices

In order to answer the second research question, the pedagogical practices related to language input and opportunities to use the foreign language were analysed.

The language input given and the output opportunities presented in the class were also linked to the teachers' understanding of the aims and the role of language in CLIL. In fact, the methodologies chosen for the different CLIL subjects affected both input and output options. The anatomy teacher followed a traditional teacher-centered class, which offered input through the teacher's explanations and materials in text format. In these lessons, it was common for Teacher 1 to provide rich explanations on a specific

topic, following his PowerPoint slides, while students listened. Sometimes, the teacher interrupted his presentation so that students could complete some exercises, although the answers to be discussed were usually short. After each unit, students worked in groups on a 'practical case' where they had to read and understand a situation and try to discuss and answer some questions. The traditional teacher-centered methodologies followed by Teacher 1 did not focus on giving space for students to write extensively or to use English orally. From the anatomy teacher's point of view, giving students opportunities to work on oral presentations, for instance, would mean more focus on language than on content:

> (…) I've tried it before, and it becomes quite artificial. I mean, they learn something by heart, so there we would achieve certain goals that are not exactly what I want. It wouldn't be like understanding, or reading, it'd be like 'you have to learn this text', so the link would be with the language instead of with the topic itself. **Teacher 1, excerpt 2.32**

Teacher 2 followed a more student-centered approach, where a variety of input resources through audiovisual materials or texts in different forms was offered. In her media workshops, a task-based approach was followed, and students tended to work in groups most of the time. Students worked on different tasks such as writing an article, following a video-tutorial for a task, retrieving information from the web and then creating a video with a specific app, writing interviews, or updating the webpage of the school. Teacher 2 considered that the output opportunities provided students with tools to improve their oral skills:

> For us, this is more like training to improve our communicative skills, and that is why we chose this subject to be taught in English, to somehow avoid any negative aspects [of CLIL]. And I think we avoid them because of the way we planned this subject. For the student, attending this subject in English does not involve any suffering; they do not miss anything related to content. I don't think so. **Teacher 2, excerpt 3.38**

Classroom observations also showed some differences between the two teachers regarding the use of Basque and English in class. The following excerpt shows how Teacher 1 is interested in content during the following question-answer interaction with his students. The student answers in Basque, but Teacher 1 continues focusing on content and does not ask the student to use English.

(T1 is making sure students have understood the practical case presented and asks some questions to check their understanding)

T1: So what's the important information here?

St: Rubia dela neska. *[That the girl is blond]*

T1: OK, could be. But what has happened?

St2: Hil in da. *[She died]*

T1: OK, is there any strange thing here? **Classroom observations, excerpt 4.3**

The situation is quite different in the case of Teacher 2 in the same type of question-answer interaction and insists on using English.

St: [Teacher's name], amak galdetu zian …

[Teacher's name], my mom asked me …

T2: Can you tell me in English? We need to practice!

St: Bueno, my mom said … **Classroom observations, excerpt 23.2**

The data indicate that there were also considerable differences between the two teachers regarding the explicit focus on language.

Teacher 1, the anatomy teacher, with a strong content-aimed perspective, did not think he should pay explicit attention to language forms, so his focus is on comprehension and not on correcting grammar or spelling mistakes. For instance, he distanced himself from any kind of 'English teaching moment' in written texts, as seen in his words:

> In their written works, I don't correct them [language errors]. I don't consider them important, (…) most of the time the type of errors are, for example, using the wrong verb or orthography. When they don't really know a word, they don't write it correctly, so these don't usually have a correction. If what they want to say becomes incomprehensible, then I do correct them. **Teacher 1, excerpt 2.24**

This teacher believed it was important to show students that making mistakes in English was not going to be punished in his lessons. He thought it was important to underline the idea of having a relaxed atmosphere in the class without language pressures. His words were confirmed in classroom observations, where it could be seen that error correction and explicit focus on language forms were not part of his teaching practices. In excerpt 6.3, a reference to this idea in the anatomy classroom can be observed:

> *(T1 reads student's answer from the worksheet that says: 'she may *had a heart attack … ')*
>
> *T1:* Hemen ingeles maila hobetu dezakezu baina bueno …
>
> *You could have improved your English level here but anyway … (T1 continues reading).* **Classroom observations, excerpt 6.3**

Teacher 1 tended to avoid focusing on language explicitly. Regarding oral interaction, he had fewer opportunities to make corrections because students often switched to Basque as has been seen in excerpt 4.3. In the interview, Teacher 1 added that his students did not use English very often so there was almost no need to correct language mistakes.

Teacher 2, who saw English as an aim and thought that she should give students opportunities to practice and use the language in context, was aware of the importance of paying special attention to language forms. This teacher linked this idea to the approach used in her class:

> Sometimes… I like to pay attention to language, to give them that resource. I probably wouldn't do it if it was in Basque. This is a digital media workshop and we have to write and put a lot of our focus on expressing/producing, so we are constantly paying attention to language. **Teacher 2, excerpt 3.7**

Teacher 2 was very focused on language as the classroom observations also confirmed. In her lessons, she would use any opportunity to make students aware of the correct use of language. We could observe how she provided corrective feedback, sometimes explicitly addressing the mistake and providing the correct form or underlining the mistake, in the following excerpt:

> T2: (reads) 'He went to London and worked as an actor when the theatres get closed … '. The verb tense is not correct here. Which verb tense is 'get'? Present? Past?
>
> St: Present.
>
> T2: Present simple, so in this case we are writing about … what verb tense should be used?
>
> St: Past simple.

T2: Past simple, what is the past simple of 'get'?

St: Got

T2: OK, so change it, 'the theatres got closed because of a plague, and he started to write poems'. **Classroom observations, excerpt 32.1**

As we can see, the main focus for Teacher 1 is on content and the comprehension of content, while it is not content but language that is more important for Teacher 2.

Discussion

The results indicate that there are crucial differences between the two teachers regarding beliefs on the role of language in CLIL, pedagogical practices and the explicit focus on English. In the case of beliefs, the anatomy teacher (T1) explicitly stated that he aimed to improve students' comprehension skills and provide them with the necessary tools to be able to work with English, but he did not see himself as a language teacher. This is the position of a content-oriented CLIL teacher who is not aware of the dual focus of CLIL. The fact that the subject is taught through English is almost seen as an obstacle that makes the teaching of anatomy more challenging than when it is taught in the first language. On the other hand, the media workshop teacher (T2) saw in her subject an opportunity for her students to use English in different activities. She gave priority to language and saw the CLIL class as an opportunity to improve different skills in English. The English language was both a tool and an aim for this language-oriented teacher. This teacher is a clear example of a language-oriented CLIL teacher who is first and foremost a language teacher and does not consider content as important as language. These substantial differences between the two teachers' beliefs about the role of language in CLIL confirm Karabassova's (2018, p. 2) dichotomy between teaching the content subject or the language. The anatomy teacher's beliefs confirm those of other studies carried out in different contexts, reporting that the priority is often content and not language (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Hüttner et al., 2013; Karabassova, 2018; Lo, 2019; Tan, 2011). The differences also show that CLIL classes have great diversity even when they are taught in the same educational context.

The anatomy classes were teacher-centered and were taught in the same way as they would have been taught in the first language (Dalton-Puffer, 2007). In fact, T1 admitted he did not change his pedagogical practices when teaching through English. T2 used a more collaborative and student-centered approach. She was more aware of the language element in CLIL and therefore tried to use all her resources in order to improve her students' English skills. This case represents a type of CLIL that pays attention to language in the content class. It looks as if both teachers teach CLIL classes in the same way they teach non-CLIL classes, and that their approaches are linked to their own background and experience. It is not only the content-oriented teacher who does not change his approach, but also the student-centered approach used by the language-oriented teacher seems to be based on her own experience as a non-CLIL teacher.

The analysis of the observations and interviews also indicated that there were substantial differences between the two teachers in the opportunities to use English. In the anatomy classes, students had few opportunities to use English in written and oral form, and when students were asked questions, only simple answers were required.

The answers were accepted even if they were not in English. In the media workshop, there were many more opportunities for output, and the teacher insisted on the use of English. The results regarding the pedagogical practices used by T1 confirm those of other studies, showing that students did not have much opportunity to use English in CLIL classes (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Mahan et al., 2018) or that the pedagogical practices were the same as when the subject was taught in the first language (Lazarević, 2019). The pedagogical practices used by T2 confirm those of another set of studies demonstrating that students were given opportunities for interaction through different types of pedagogical practices (Koopman et al., 2014; Oattes et al., 2018; Pérez-Vidal, 2007; Van Kampen et al., 2018).

There were also differences between the teachers in the way they paid attention to language and corrected language-related errors in their CLIL lessons. In this case, teachers' beliefs about their role as CLIL teachers and the integration of CLIL are also corroborated in their own classroom practices. In accordance with his words of not feeling responsible for their students' language development, the anatomy teacher (T1) did not focus on language forms or corrected students' language errors. In fact, this teacher avoids any moments where attention could be given to language. These results confirm that teachers with a content-orientation pay very little attention to language in CLIL settings (Koopman et al., 2014; Oattes et al., 2018; Van Kampen et al., 2018). On the other hand, attempts were made by the media workshop teacher (T2) to focus on language when correcting language errors both orally and in written forms. This teacher believed it was part of her job to provide students with good quality input, she showed greater language awareness and felt responsible for the correct use of language in their classes.

Conclusions

This study is exploratory and limited to analysing beliefs about the role of language in CLIL and pedagogical practices by only two teachers. With such a small sample, the findings cannot be generalised and should be taken as examples of the different possibilities existing in CLIL classes. These teachers work in the same context and teach through the medium of English but understand CLIL differently. If we consider Met's continuum (1998), Teacher 1 is towards the content end and Teacher 2 towards the language end of the continuum. The results of this study show that CLIL is certainly an 'umbrella' term that includes many variants (Cenoz et al., 2013). In fact, the teachers adapt CLIL to their realities and use the pedagogical practices that they consider to be appropriate, creating their own type of CLIL. These pedagogies are influenced by the teachers' beliefs about the role of language in CLIL. The different pedagogical practices of the two teachers are consistent with their beliefs and could probably be influenced by their educational background and teaching experience (see Skinnari & Bovellan, 2016). Another source of difference could be the specific subject taught. School subjects can differ with regards to their aims, expected results, variation in cognitive demands or optional vs. compulsory status. The language part of CLIL could be more easily integrated in the media workshop because its content is more closely related to different types of texts and communicative skills.

This study clearly shows that it is difficult to achieve a balance between content and language. Integration implies that the twin aims of content acquisition and the improvement of language skills need to be worked towards simultaneously. In practice, however, research has shown that the dual-focus on content and language is challenging and hard to achieve. Teachers in CLIL and immersion contexts seem to struggle to focus on language and content at the same time and find it challenging to know how to focus on language (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Costa, 2012; Oattes et al., 2018). This is probably because most CLIL teachers 'do not have a professional background in language pedagogy' (De Graaff et al., 2007, p. 603) and therefore tend to focus on content only. Research on CLIL and CBI has underlined the idea of paying explicit attention to language forms in the classroom as a way to integrate language and content (Lyster, 2007; Lyster & Tedick, 2014). Research also shows that specific training on language awareness and language pedagogies could direct content teachers' attention to form (Gierlinger, 2017; He & Lin, 2018; Lo, 2019).

The results of this study and the studies mentioned above highlight the need to reinforce the language focus in the case of the content-oriented teachers so as to achieve the dual focus of CLIL: content and language. However, as has already been pointed out, there is a potential problem of language-oriented teachers not paying enough attention to subject content. The results of this study show that the language-oriented teacher considered that subject content is secondary and language the main focus. This position is also problematic for the balance of content and language. CLIL teachers face demanding situations and it may not be realistic to expect that content teachers suddenly become language experts or that language teachers become experts in specific subjects as well. The results of this study clearly show that the differences can be substantial.

An optimal situation that would achieve a balance between content and language is related to the educational background. It would be desirable for CLIL teachers to obtain dual-certifications combining content subjects and language. Another possibility is to have a content teacher and a language teacher working together in the class (Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012; Pavón Vázquez & Ramos Ordóñez, 2018). However, this is not the most common situation in many contexts and clear guidelines are needed at the local level, where schools could establish the basic aims of each of the subjects in the CLIL programme. The integration of language and content can be influenced by the specific content subjects, teachers' beliefs, practices and awareness, and also by the teachers' and students' level of English. The successful implementation of CLIL requires taking into account these factors so as to provide additional training when necessary.

The results of this study contribute to research on CLIL classes because they show how teachers who work in the same context can have substantial differences in the way they understand CLIL and in their pedagogical practices. The results also indicate that these differences are likely to be linked to their background and teaching experience. The findings regarding content-oriented vs. language-oriented teachers in CLIL classes are also important for situations where there are speakers of immigrant and minority languages learning through the medium of a language that is not their home language. These students need a dual focus on language and content for all school subjects in order to be successful.

Disclosure statement

Funding

ORCID

Nerea Villabona http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2665-1613
Jasone Cenoz http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9000-7510

References

Barr, C. D., Uccelli, P., & Phillips Galloway, E. (2019). Specifying the academic language skills that support text understanding in the middle grades: The design and validation of the core academic language skills construct and instrument. *Language Learning*, *69*(4), 978–1021. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12365

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*(2), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01330.x

Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: The same or different? *Language, Culture & Curriculum*, *28*(1), 8–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000922

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(3), 243–262. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011

Cenoz, J., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2015). Learning through a second or additional language: Content based instruction and CLIL in the 21st century: An introduction. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *28*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000921

Costa, F. (2012). Focus on form in ICLHE lectures in Italy: Evidence from English-medium science lectures by native speakers of Italian. *AILA Review*, *25*, 30–47. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.25.03cos

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

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.20

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and Language Integrated Learning: from practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 182–204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092

De Graaff, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 603–624. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb462.0

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, J. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model (4th edition)*. Pearson.

Gallardo del Puerto, F., & Gómez Lacabex, E. (2013). The impact of additional CLIL exposure on oral English production. *Journal of English Studies*, *11*, 113–131. https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.2620

Gierlinger, E. M. (2017). Teaching CLIL? Yes, but with a pinch of salt. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *5*(2), 187–213. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.2.02gie

Grossman, P., Loeb, S., Cohen, J., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). Measure for measure: The relationship between measures of instructional practice in middle school English language arts and teachers'

value-added scores. *American Journal of Education*, *119*(3), 445–470. https://doi.org/10.1086/669901

He, P., & Lin, A. (2018). Becoming a "language-aware" content teacher: Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) teacher professional development as a collaborative, dynamic, and dialogic process. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *6*(2), 162–188. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.17009.he

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 267–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777385

Karabassova, L. (2018). Teachers' conceptualization of content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Evidence from a trilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1550048

Koopman, G. J., Skeet, J., & de Graaff, R. (2014). Exploring content teachers' knowledge of language pedagogy: A report on a small-scale research project in a Dutch CLIL context. *Language Learning Journal*, *42*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889974

Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in Content and Language Integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, *1*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913500801010030

Lazarević, N. (2019). CLIL teachers' reflections and attitudes: Surviving at the deep end. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1703897

Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). *Language across the curriculum & CLIL in English as an Additional Language (EAL) contexts: Theory and practice*. Springer.

Llinares, A., & Morton, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Applied Linguistics perspectives on CLIL*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lo, Y. Y. (2019). Development of the beliefs and language awareness of content subject teachers in CLIL: Does professional development help? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(7), 818–832. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1318821

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lyster, R. (2017). *Content-based language teaching*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315103037

Lyster, R., & Tedick, D. J. (2014). Research perspectives on immersion pedagogy: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *22*(2), 210–224. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.2.04lys

Mahan, K. R., Brevik, L. M., & Ødegaard, M. (2018). Characterizing CLIL teaching: New insights from a lower secondary classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 24, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1472206

Méndez García, M. C., & Pavón Vázquez, V. (2012). Investigating the coexistence of the mother tongue and the foreign language through teacher collaboration in CLIL contexts: Perceptions and practice of the teachers involved in the plurilingual programme in Andalusia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(5), 573–592. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.670195

Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz, & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 35–63). Multilingual Matters.

Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P., & Smit, U. (Eds.) (2016). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096145

Oattes, H., Oostdam, R., de Graaff, R., Fukkink, R., & Wilschut, A. (2018). Content and Language Integrated Learning in Dutch bilingual education. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2), 156–176. https://doi.org/10.1075/dujal.18003.oat

Oattes, H., Oostdam, R., de Graaff, R., & Wilschut, A. (2018). The challenge of balancing content and language: Perceptions of Dutch bilingual education history teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *70*, 165–174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.022

Papaja, K. (2013). The role of a teacher in a CLIL classroom. *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *40*(1), 147–154. https://doi.org/10.14746/gl.2013.40.1.11

Paran, A. (2013). Content and Language Integrated Learning: panacea or policy borrowing myth? *Applied Linguistics Review*, *4*(2), 317–342. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0014

Pavón Vázquez, V., & Ramos Ordóñez, M. C. (2018). Describing the use of the L1 in CLIL: An analysis of L1 communication strategies in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(1), 35–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1511681

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2007). The need for Focus on Form (FoF) in Content and Language Integrated approaches: An exploratory study. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada (RESLA)*, *1*, 39–54.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). Written production and CLIL: An empirical study. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 191–209). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Cenoz, J. (2015). Way forward in the twenty-first century in content-based instruction: Moving towards integration. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *28*(1), 90–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000927

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. & Jiménez Catalán, R. M. (eds.). (2009). *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from research in Europe. Second Language Acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.

Skinnari, K., & Bovellan, E. (2016). CLIL teachers' beliefs about integration and about their professional roles: Perspectives from a European context. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education* (pp. 145–167). Multilingual Matters.

Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(3), 325–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811401153

Tedick, D. J., & Cammarata, L. (2012). Content and language integration in K-12 contexts: Student outcomes, teacher practices, and stakeholder perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(S1), 28–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01178.x

Van Kampen, E., Admiraal, W., & Berry, A. (2018). Content and Language Integrated Learning in the Netherlands: Teachers' self-reported pedagogical practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(2), 222–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1154004

Van Mensel, L., Hiligsmann, P., Mettewie, L., & Galand, B. (2020). CLIL, an elitist language learning approach? A background analysis of English and Dutch CLIL pupils in French-speaking Belgium. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *33*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1571078