



---

**TRABAJO DE FINAL DE MÁSTER**  
**MÁSTER EN EDUCACIÓN BILINGÜE PARA PRIMARIA Y**  
**SECUNDARIA**  
**FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN**



**A bilingual programme in Secondary Education:  
non-CLIL teachers' voices and  
proposals for improvement**

Alumno: MARCOS NORIEGA PORTERO

Director: Prof. Dr. Juan de Dios Martínez Agudo

Departamento de CC. Sociales, Lengua y Literatura

CURSO 2015/2016

BADAJOS

Convocatoria: Junio 2016

## Table of contents

1.	Abstract .....	3
2.	Resumen .....	4
3.	Theoretical framework .....	5
3.1.	The CLIL trajectory in Extremadura .....	5
3.2.	Obstacles for CLIL implementation and development .....	10
3.2.1.	A shortage of appropriately qualified teachers .....	10
3.2.2.	Lack of coordination, time and materials .....	14
3.2.3.	An elitist view of CLIL and other misconceptions .....	16
4.	Research design.....	19
4.1.	Research aims.....	19
4.2.	Context and participants .....	20
4.3.	Data collection instrument and procedure .....	24
4.4.	Results and discussion .....	27
4.4.1.	Perceptions about the implementation of bilingual sections .....	27
4.4.2.	'Privileges' attached to CLIL teachers .....	31
4.4.3.	The negative side of being a CLIL teacher .....	34
4.4.4.	Coordination inside and outside the CLIL programme .....	39
4.4.5.	Elitism in bilingual sections .....	41
4.4.6.	Proposals for improvement .....	44
5.	Conclusions .....	47
6.	Acknowledgments .....	50
7.	References .....	51
8.	Appendix.....	56

## 1. Abstract

The widespread expansion of CLIL across Europe is mirrored by the establishment of bilingual sections in Extremadura, which has rapidly grown over the last years. There is no doubt that promoting bilingualism in the region from the authorities is a very positive action, but at the same time this has led to introduce drastic changes in schools to work effectively as a whole, referred to organization, coordination and even the image and the identity of an educational institution itself.

Moreover, assessment to check the progress and success of a bilingual programme is difficult to be carried out. This implies that, intentionally or not, only stakeholders inside the CLIL project have been analyzed through some research, considering that CLIL teachers and students are the main protagonists and the most appropriate to be asked when evaluating the project.

But what about the other agents directly or indirectly involved in the implementation and the evolution of a bilingual programme? Have parents, school administrators, management teams and non-CLIL teachers anything to say before expanding the CLIL phenomenon more and more?

The present study tries to put voice to non-CLIL teachers' perspectives about the reality lived in a high school where a CLIL programme is being developed, including the management team's perceptions. Fringe benefits but also possible drawbacks applied to CLIL teachers will be the key to understand positions from both Secondary and Vocational Training levels. The ultimate aim is to offer suggestions on how to improve bilingual education in our region.

*Key words:* CLIL, Extremadura, Secondary education, Vocational Training, non-CLIL teachers, coordination, elitism.

## 2. Resumen

La expansión generalizada del AICLE en toda Europa tiene su reflejo en el establecimiento de secciones bilingües en Extremadura, que ha crecido rápidamente en los últimos años. No cabe duda de que la promoción del bilingüismo en la región por parte de las autoridades es una acción muy positiva, pero al mismo tiempo esto ha conducido a la introducción de profundos cambios en las escuelas para trabajar como un todo de manera efectiva, en lo que se refiere a organización, coordinación e incluso a la imagen y a la identidad del propio centro educativo.

Además, la evaluación para comprobar el progreso y el éxito de un programa bilingüe es difícil de llevar a cabo. Esto implica que, intencionadamente o no, sólo los participantes en el proyecto AICLE han sido objeto de análisis e investigación, considerando que los profesores y los alumnos AICLE son los principales protagonistas y los más apropiados para ser preguntados a la hora de evaluar el proyecto.

¿Pero qué pasa con los otros agentes directa o indirectamente implicados en la implantación y la evolución de un programa bilingüe? ¿Tienen los padres, los administradores escolares, los equipos directivos y los profesores que no imparten AICLE algo que decir antes de seguir expandiendo el fenómeno AICLE más y más?

Este estudio intenta poner voz a las perspectivas de los profesores que no imparten AICLE sobre la realidad vivida en un instituto en el que se desarrolla un programa AICLE, incluyendo las percepciones del equipo directivo. Los beneficios complementarios que tienen los profesores AICLE, así como sus posibles desventajas, serán claves para entender las posiciones adoptadas desde la Educación Secundaria y la Formación Profesional. El fin último es ofrecer propuestas de cómo mejorar la educación bilingüe en nuestra región.

*Palabras clave:* AICLE, Extremadura, Educación Secundaria, Formación Profesional, profesores que no imparten AICLE, coordinación, elitismo.

### **3. Theoretical framework**

#### **3.1. The CLIL trajectory in Extremadura**

The concept of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) represents the European strategy for bilingual education in a framework where multilingualism is being increasingly promoted. The importance of this phenomenon in our continent is well documented by Figel in the Eurydice report (2006):

"Multilingualism is at the very heart of European identity, since languages are a fundamental aspect of the cultural identity of every European." (p. 3)

Marsh (2012), among other authors, details in depth the contribution of multilingualism to creativity in a context in which educational neurosciences are becoming more and more important in our society.

The difference between multilingualism and plurilingualism is explained in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001) as follows:

"Plurilingualism differs from multilingualism, which is the knowledge of a number of languages, or the co-existence of different languages in a given society. Multilingualism may be attained by simply diversifying the languages on offer in a particular school or educational system, or by encouraging pupils to learn more than one foreign language, or reducing the dominant position of English in international communication. Beyond this, the plurilingual approach emphasises the fact that as an individual person's experience of language in its cultural contexts expands, [...] he or she does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact." (p. 4)

Anyway, the reasons to be aware of the relevance of languages are always based on the idea of improving 'opportunities for all young people in order to increase European cohesion and competitiveness' (Mehisto et al. 2008: 10). Mobility for citizens within Europe and globalization, both physical and virtual,

referred to key words such as culture, economy and new technologies, can change all spheres of our lives. For instance, the adoption of English as the medium of instruction at universities has a impact in Secondary stage and vice versa (Dafouz et al. 2007). Thus, changes taking place in education are absolutely evident in this century and the design of language education policies in Europe to cover this linguistic diversity is now seen as a must (Baker 2001; Council of Europe 2007a).

To truly understand the essence of CLIL methodology, Mehisto et al. (2008, 29-30) summarize its core features in a very clear way: multiple focus, safe and enriching learning environment, authenticity, active learning, scaffolding, co-operation. Additionally, these authors highlight 'the flexibility of the approach' depending on the exposure to teaching or learning through the second language (from low- to high-intensity) and the curricular level (Primary, Secondary, Vocational, Higher education), resulting in many faces of CLIL: language showers, CLIL camps, student exchanges, local projects, international projects, family stays, modules, work-study abroad, one or more subjects, partial immersion, total immersion, two-way immersion, double immersion...

Since the moment the term 'CLIL' was coined in the 1990s by a group of experts, 'its usage has soared and it appears to continue accelerating' (Pérez-Cañado, 2012: 315). However, many different models and interpretations have been proposed in order to reach this approach, depending on the country, as documented in the 2006 Eurydice survey (see also Lorenzo et al. 2007). With the exception of some European countries where there is no CLIL provision, the conception of CLIL as an 'umbrella term' (Mehisto et al. 2008) tries to fit this flexibility into a wide range of linguistic modalities and programmes carried out across the entire continent (Comunidad de Madrid 2010; Pérez-Cañado 2012).

Talking about the case of our country, Fernández (2009) describes extensively the Spanish linguistic map and the official initiatives carried out in our geography to understand the CLIL provision (see also Comunidad de Madrid 2010; Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe 2010). In short, as Coyle (2010: viii) argues, 'Spain is rapidly becoming one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research.' English language is ranked first in the CLIL

programmes established in our nation but the rest of features defining the way the Spanish CLIL is being implemented are not uniform because of two reasons, as Pérez-Cañado (2012) details:

"First, it encompasses a diversity of models practically tantamount to the number of regions where it is applied, given the decentralization of our educational system, which transfers educational powers to each autonomous community. [...] And second, dual-focused education has been developed in Spain with both second (co-official) and foreign (other European) languages, and in both bilingual communities where English is a third language taught through CLIL [...] and in monolingual communities conspicuous for their lack of tradition in foreign language teaching (e.g. Extremadura, Castilla-La Mancha, or Andalusia)." (p. 327)

As stated above, the situation of Extremadura in terms of CLIL provision and research has a shorter path compared to those followed by other bilingual regions. In this sense, it is even more remarkable the effort made by autonomous communities such as Extremadura 'since there is little or no extramural exposure to the target language, which is ultimately confined to the CLIL classroom' (Pérez-Cañado 2012: 328).

In Alejo and Piquer (2010) it is described the evolution of CLIL programmes in our region. Considering the origins of bilingualism only in some Primary schools in 1996, the element that matters most to contextualize our paper refers to the moment (2005) in which 'the Extremaduran Authority [...] promoted the so-called "Proyectos de Sección Bilingüe" (Bilingual Sections Projects) [...] in order to set up CLIL experiences in Primary and Secondary schools', taking place the 'Big Bang' of CLIL hence. Additionally, the intention of anchoring the language learning from bilingual to multilingual programmes was shaped through a more ambitious plan, *Linguaex 2009-2015*. These two mentions are so relevant for the understanding of this study that deserve a special treatment.

Since the first regulation concerning the implementation of bilingual sections projects at high schools was established in 2005 (*Orden de 19 de mayo de 2005*, DOE núm 59 de 24 de mayo de 2005, 7031-7042), some changes have been progressively introduced in order to achieve better programmes in our

region. Along this way of extense and additional normative, the recent *Orden de 31 de marzo de 2015* (DOE núm 69. de 13 de abril de 2015, 11449-11478) includes the possibility of participation in the CLIL programmes for the Vocational Training Stages, apart from its consolidation in Primary and Secondary (though in this last case only for compulsory Secondary, not Baccalaureate). Basically, the main features are still being similar as documented in Alejo and Piquer (2010: 228-229) though some differences are manifest, as further discussed below.

First, it is the educational institution who voluntarily applies for a 'bilingual section project' to the authorities, provided all the requirements of regulations are met. In return, the school is in charge of monitoring the implementation, facilitating its progressive development, integrating the programme into a specific Linguistic Project ("Proyecto Lingüístico de Centro") and running an annual internal assessment of the experience. It is also set out the possibility of interrupting the programme if the decision is proposed by both the teachers community and the local school board or if the bilingual posts are impossible to be covered by qualified teachers according to the educational authorities. In this last case, the order followed to find candidates will flow from permanent staff to temporary staff and finally extraordinary calls could be announced to recruit teachers when the lists have been depleted.

Secondly, three modalities for a CLIL project can be adopted: at least two content subjects using a foreign language; at least two content subjects but using two different foreign languages; only one CLIL subject to be taught in a foreign language. This situation is very different from that idea of limiting to 'a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 3 content subjects' (Alejo and Piquer 2010: 229), as proposed initially in 2005.

It is also interesting to check the lack of concrete details in this regulation to effectively establish CLIL programmes at Vocational Training stages. It is worth mentioning that the impact of bilingual programmes affecting the Vocational Training, still very rudimentary in Extremadura, is not well-documented because of its relatively newness; in fact, only Primary and Secondary stages are detailed in Alejo and Piquer (2010). Additionally, the lack of information and data

provided by the educational authorities seem to suggest that just a few high schools over the entire region are carrying out a bilingual section project concerning Vocational Training studies. However, other monolingual Autonomous Communities in our country (e.g. Madrid and Andalucía) are solidly betting on this academic level to implement CLIL instruction, just as these regions did in the origins of the Spanish CLIL (Fernández 2009). Therefore, Vocational Training and multilingualism form a binomial which deserves special attention and therefore new research lines could be opened in the future. Anyway, it is noted in the document that at least 30% of the total hours at Vocational Training instruction must be taught using the foreign language distributed into two academic years.

This *Orden de 31 de marzo de 2015* also refers to some of the characteristics that affect the participating students, being very important to contextualize this paper. It is cited a minimum of 10 students to form a group in Secondary but for Vocational Training the bilingual programme must cover a complete group. Moreover, if there are too many students interested in the project, the admission criteria when selecting them must be consensed at a previous school board and published before admitting students in order to gain objectivity and equality. The way of grouping must tend to form mixed classrooms but that organization depends on the management team according to the particular conditions that the school meets. CLIL students are committed not to exit the programme, except in duly justified cases. Some references to CLIL teachers' professional competences are expressed in the text as well but we will analyze them in depth in next section.

It is maintained the intention of finding a balance between rural and urban areas holding CLIL within the regional context. But now it is explicitly mentioned that those programmes in Portuguese will be considered prioritaire. The point is that English is still being the undisputed "king" of foreign languages, but this wink at our neighbours' culture has become much more relevant over the last years, since the launching of *Linguaex 2009-2015*. However, until 2010 bilingual sections projects in Portuguese were not a reality yet (Comunidad de Madrid 2010: 123). On the other hand, French seems to start deflating.

*Linguaex 2009-2015* tries to focus on multilingualism instead of just bilingualism through a series of action lines, well documented in Alejo and Piquer (2010): the importance given to the Portuguese language and culture, citing reasons of geographical proximity and raising that way the 1+2 languages European policy, the use of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe 2001, 2007a) and the generalization of the Portfolio at schools. The main objective is based on the idea of students achieving an A2 level by the end of Lower Secondary and a B1 by the end of Upper Secondary. As Alejo and Piquer (2010: 230) summarize, in this plan 'teachers' training needs are not specified as much, but are nonetheless also recognized as one of the major goals of the programme'. This shortage of appropriate teachers is precisely what Mehisto et al. (2008: 20) call 'a bump on the road to good practice in CLIL' and it is set out in more detail in the next section.

### **3.2. Obstacles for CLIL implementation and development**

After having analyzed the evolution of CLIL referred to our region, it is time to contextualize the main factors inhibiting both its application and its progression. In the Eurydice report (2006: 51) four reasons have been named: a shortage of appropriately qualified teachers, high costs, lack of appropriate teaching materials and a restrictive legislation. It is shown in this document that the first two are the most relevant in the case of Spain. We shall try to cover all these points to a greater or lesser extent.

#### **3.2.1. A shortage of appropriately qualified teachers**

Although this paper is referred to high schools, the quick expansion of CLIL to the different educational stages involves the necessity of recruiting a lot of teachers and with a very particular professional profile that in many cases it is complicated to be found (Marsh et al. 2010; Pavón and Ellison 2013; Pavón 2014; Tejederas 2014). Moreover, as Mehisto et al. (2008: 22) claim, 'the staffing issue is not only tied to finding suitable teachers, but to keeping them'.

The teachers' linguistic competence has traditionally become the top concern to implement a CLIL programme. Obviously a good command of the foreign language is essential to conduct classes through a combination of content and language. Starting from pilot projects demanding a lower level (B1) at the beginning (being even permissive if committing to acquire a B2), it is now a strict B2 the minimum required by educational authorities to teach in a bilingual section. Regulation in Extremadura (*Decreto 39/2014 de 18 de marzo*, DOE núm 57 de 24 de marzo de 2014, 9048-9057) clearly establishes that requirement. However, depending on the autonomous community, as Pérez-Cañado claims (2012: 327), 'the language level established for teachers and/or students to partake in a bilingual stream' is not uniform in Spain. Madrid is the most outstanding case where a certificate accrediting a C1 is the prerequisite to be a CLIL teacher.

Anyhow, it could be said that the possession of a demanded linguistic level is considered a must in bilingual education, but at the same time many experts alert that this could lead to a massive selection of candidates with no experience to teach in CLIL programmes only for the fact that they have got a B2 (Roldán 2014; Tejederas 2014). Generally speaking, this phenomenon has been spread throughout the Spanish geography, with some lines such as motivation, emotion, love of their subject or professionalism get pushed into the background. Then resentment and conflicts inside the school environment are easy to emerge.

In that sense, we should not forget that CLIL teachers in Secondary education are, above all, content-expert teachers. A similar situation is applied for the Vocational Training stages and substantially differs from the framework at Nursery and Primary levels. Secondary CLIL teachers are qualified on one subject area and this is the didactic base to be transmitted to students, being the foreign language only a tool to carry out this process. Hence, the role of the foreign language specialist, usually acting as the coordinator of the bilingual section project, is essential when providing linguistic support to subject CLIL teachers (Julián de Vega 2007: 2013). Also language assistants, who are native speakers, are thought to cover the linguistic deficiencies emerging in the CLIL classroom.

Additionally, the *Decreto 39/2014 de 18 de marzo* refers to another skill requested to conduct a CLIL classroom: a specific methodological training. The possession of this competence can be shown through either of these two means: some experience in bilingual sections projects, or a training course. Through the first way, teachers who have developed a teaching period over one academic year or at least nine months in a bilingual school are directly accredited as regard methodological competence. The second way of accreditation is attending a CLIL methodology course for at least 50 hours. This could be an opportunity to open a broad debate on the matter, considering if that training is enough concerning the number of months teaching in the bilingual programme, the number of hours attending the course, etc. There is also some criticism on how the administration has promoted the consecution of this goal: it is true that since March 2014 many training courses have been offered from the teacher-training centres (CPR, "Centros de Profesores y Recursos") but the demand for them outstrips supply and the result is that many teachers have been forced to afford a specific course offered by some trade-union or even private organizations. The lack of planning and foresight for future generations of teachers again follows this dynamic of rapid-to-implement solutions.

Anyway, this change in regulation introduced only two years ago in Extremadura shows the increasing relevance given to the methodological competence as a measure of improvement for bilingual education in our country, as well documented in Pavón and Ellison (2013). There is not the slightest doubt that some pedagogical aspects need to be reoriented from mainstream education to lessons in which the mother tongue will not be on stage. The fact of teaching and learning knowledge but using a foreign language is seen as a very demanding task, that clearly involves a qualification in adopting special techniques and resources to facilitate comprehension. In this line, a new competence brings to light: the ability to use the information and communication technology (ICT), which is often presumably inherent to this new generation of teachers interested in languages as well; what Coyle et al. (2010: 9) call 'Generation Y (1980-1995)' is now entering the profession. To carry out a successful CLIL programme, participating teachers need to know, among other

things, how to adapt texts to make them accessible to their students, how to offer visual aids in terms of materials and appropriate resources to construct new knowledge, how to develop scaffolding strategies, how to promote the work through the four skills (listening, speaking, writing and reading), or how to motivate their learners and raise interest in cultural awareness.

It is clear that the sacrifice done by teachers in order to join the CLIL world is enormous in terms of a second language acquisition and teacher training. Hence, the *Orden de 31 de marzo de 2015* treats these issues in a special section in which it is explained that they are "compensated" with specific training courses, certificates for taking part in the CLIL programmes, valid for promotions, priority to receive a language assistant at their schools and access to participation in European projects. However, more ambitious proposals such as teacher exchanges or creating enriching networkings, considered as important measures according to Mehisto et al. (2008) are not named. Compared to the regulation in 2005, it is important to highlight that popular programmes such as "*PALE*" (*Programas de Apoyo a la Enseñanza y el Aprendizaje de Lenguas Extranjeras*), including immersion courses abroad, have no mention at any time now in 2015; that was valid as well for students staying abroad to improve their linguistic competence. This could be an example of 'making the necessary readjustments' on the hand of educational authorities, as Pérez-Cañado (2012: 332) proposes 'to ascertain whether the considerable financial allocation of resources which many European countries are making to incorporate CLIL is cost-effective and worthwhile in terms of the linguistic gains it is generating'. Thus, high costs represented the second obstacle for implementing CLIL in Spain in 2006, as reflected in the Eurydice report, and are still a controversial point of criticism.

Despite this, other researchers such as Coyle et al. (2010) argue that CLIL can be of substantial benefit and an opportunity to the teaching profession, since this pedagogy stimulates the cognitive flexibility, the motivation when trying to get a successful learning, the promotion of the grammatical correctness and a way of regenerating their profession.

### **3.2.2. Lack of coordination, time and materials**

Running a successful CLIL programme in a school implicitly has a story of efficient coordination behind it (Julián de Vega 2007, 2013; Mehisto 2009; Serrano 2014). The concept of coordination can be analyzed from different perspectives under the participating agents: inside the bilingual project (relationships among the coordinator, the CLIL teachers and the language assistant), between CLIL teachers and CLIL students, between CLIL and non-CLIL teachers, between CLIL teachers and the management team, and between CLIL teachers and families. On the other hand, the term can be understood under different meanings: didactic coordination (e.g. among different CLIL departments), content coordination (e.g. between CLIL and non-CLIL staff inside the same academic department) or assessment coordination (e.g. defining tools and criteria to carry out the evaluation).

According to our regulation, the *Orden de 31 de marzo de 2015* establishes the coordinator's functions. Roughly he/she is in charge of supervising every aspect referred to the progression of the project and the stakeholders. This person has to develop ties with the language assistant, management team, academic departments involved in the programme and CLIL colleagues. In this sense, it is explicitly mentioned a function which consists in producing curricular materials based on CLIL methodology working together with the subject-content teachers.

As far as this staff is concerned, it is evident that 'teaching in CLIL requires more preparation time and greater co-operation among teachers' (Mehisto et al. 2008: 22). The heavy workloads and the shortage of materials have been noted as a bump in the road to good practice in CLIL; both are interwoven. It takes a lot of time finding, selecting, preserving authenticity, adapting all these materials to our reality and our diversity in the classroom. We should keep in mind that some subjects are already in the CLIL world and it is relatively easy to purchase materials or even download them for free (according to Pérez-Cañado 2012: 320, 'History, Geography, Sciences and Social Sciences, particularly in Secondary education'), but others in Secondary and especially Vocational stages are a real challenge, since textbooks are not available and those

designed for native speakers need to be contextualized according to the regional curriculum and, above all, our learners' competences. In these cases, as Mehisto et al. (2008) describe:

"The language input needs to be simple enough and presented in a reader-friendly manner so as to facilitate comprehension, while at the same time being sufficiently content-rich and cognitively challenging to capture students' interest." (p. 22)

For this reason CLIL members have free periods: three per week in the case of coordinators and two for the rest of teachers. At least one of these hours should include planned meetings among the CLIL colleagues. This reduction in time attached to CLIL teachers' schedules is a question open to debate, as it can be considered as a fair measure or as a privilege, as sufficient or not, depending on the eye of the beholder. The point is that a teacher having only one bilingual group enjoys the same number of free periods that another having five bilingual groups, and it does not seem very reasonable if the aim is to compensate the workload for CLIL teachers. On the other hand, letting all the demands and tasks related to coordination mounting at work to be solved at the weekly meeting seems like magic, since there is too much paperwork to be done and certain issues require some urgency. The result is that investing time to put so many things in common can be overwhelming.

Anyway, the professional co-operation among CLIL teachers can be interpreted as a positive way of saving time, adopting new possibilities and teaching strategies, learning from partners, sharing perceptions about students and also relieving stress. All of them are really important factors to improve working conditions and enjoy our profession.

As commented in the first paragraph of this section, it is also necessary to understand coordination in a sense of taking decisions by consensus. Organization and especially assessment criteria inside the bilingual experience are contained in Article 8, *Orden de 31 de marzo de 2015*. It is explicitly mentioned that the curriculum of every CLIL subject, as well as CLIL students' evaluation and promotion will be the same as in mainstream. However, it is stated in the document that in order to assess the language acquisition on the

part of the students, CLIL teachers will be supported by the foreign language specialist (coordinator). Additionally, the guidelines proposed by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages will be followed to assess the content in each specific subject. Then a third element appears to show that is the educational institution who has to determine what percentage is assigned to both content assessment and linguistic productions in the foreign language. Fourthly, concerning bilingual programmes at Vocational Training, it explicitly asserts that only content is the object of assessment, being the linguistic competence a plus for improving the students' final marks. Last but not least, it is said that communication skills will deserve special attention when evaluating the pupils.

Taking all these points into consideration, from a CLIL teacher's perspective, the process of assessment in CLIL programmes is really cumbersome, impractical and time-consuming, since the regulation is not clear and divides CLIL assessment into two separated items: content and language. Outside the bilingual section project, confusion as well among non-CLIL teachers is reasonable to emerge when the content to be taught is not the same comparing CLIL and non-CLIL groups. This situation leads to lose focus and the true essence of CLIL, resulting in another obstacle to CLIL implementation based on misconceptions, as explained below.

### **3.2.3. An elitist view of CLIL and other misconceptions**

Generally speaking, CLIL is seen as the perfect approach to cover the linguistic diversity at schools in Europe. In fact, many experts or CLIL advocates recognize its bounties with passion in order to 'become the lynchpin to tackle the current language deficit on our continent' (Pérez-Cañado 2012: 332). However, other authors are very critic and as Cenoz et al. (2014: 256) claim, 'there are some weaknesses in CLIL that warrant greater attention'. The first of all is related to the 'bandwagon effect', meaning that the CLIL phenomenon is trendy, is all the rage, though its effectiveness is variable depending on the context and more research is needed to be done. As Hüttner et al. (2013: 267) point out, 'the enthusiasm with which this innovation is implemented by

stakeholders and 'made a success' is not fully understood'. Attitude and preconceived ideas towards this methodology are relevant too (Marsh et al. 2010). This happens even within the CLIL staff, having concerns and uncertainties (Pavón and Rubio 2010). Also the ambiguity of the concept tends to match it with immersion or with other modalities (Cenoz et al. 2014). As a result, already in 2016, not all the people interpret what a CLIL programme really involves, referred to the participating students, to parents but also to non-CLIL teachers coexisting at the same school where a bilingual section project is implemented.

Mehisto et al. (2008) argue that age and individual interests in languages are key factors to understand why many adults think CLIL is not logical, since the difficulty in learning foreign languages for them is even higher than learning any new content. Moreover, these authors justify this hostile attitude under the fact of the education received as follows:

"After all, these people have usually come through an educational background where all subjects in the curriculum were neatly separated, and this personal experience influences their perception of how learning should be organized." (p. 20)

For this reason, even colleagues in the teaching profession do not grasp the concept of CLIL. Not only do they reject the programme as an opportunity but it is also seen as a danger or more extremely as real threat. In that sense, it is vital the mediation conducted by the management team at the school (see Mehisto 2012), who obviously has to speak the CLIL language and be aware of the implications affecting to the educational institution as a whole. And all without overlooking the rest of teachers' perceptions. As public schools are overseen by administrators, including the management team, it is considered that the support given to CLIL teachers to set out the project is a key to success, though it is necessary to have a complete backup from the regular teachers' side. This translates into different institutional and organizational measures for CLIL teachers carried out by the head teams such as a favourable design of timetables including preparation periods, the booking of spaces to meet the CLIL members, also between the participating families and the school

to effectively dialogue about their concerns trying to convince those who doubt CLIL's efficiency and on the other hand the long-term nature of committing to CLIL.

However, as Mehisto et al. (2008: 23) claim, 'new programmes are initially likely to receive additional attention and resources, which can lead to jealousy and tension within a school'. Not only referred to teachers and their professional status, but also to students and to parents. This situation of inequality between regular programmes and CLIL classes usually leads to create division and resentment, summarized in the so-called 'two-schools-in-one phenomenon'.

It is interesting to see how the bilingual education was a value related exclusively to the wealthy in the past and then CLIL tries to cover the spectrum of learners from a range of backgrounds. According to this idea, Pérez-Cañado (2012: 327) points out that 'CLIL is no longer an elitist approach in our country'. Although this researcher argues that Spain is an example of country where there are no admission criteria for CLIL, the reality seems to be different (in fact, in the *Orden de 31 de marzo de 2015* the responsibility of publishing in advance these admission criteria applied at the school is cited). The truth is that there have been a profusion of bilingual schools in a short period of time and CLIL has become more accesible, but in the eyes of many the elitism does not seem to have faded away (Pérez-Invernón 2012: 532). More pronounced in Secondary than in Primary, high schools often regulates the admission of students in the CLIL programme under a test or the marks achieved in the previous immediate academic year; especially important is the qualification referred to the foreign language. Hence, the construction of the project is apparently based on the school's strongest students. This suitability only for the brightest minds implies that the way of grouping pupils can be influenced as well, so it is necessary to develop policies to stop the spread of "guettos" inside a school.

Additionally, talking about this selection of better students, Mehisto et al. (2008) highlight a relevant feature that leads to misunderstandings:

"Common sense seems to say that students studying in a second language cannot possibly learn the same amount of content as students studying in

their first language. Some people are even convinced that CLIL students will fall behind their peers academically and that their native-language skills will suffer." (p. 20)

These authors refuse this ideology by providing data and results from research. Briefly, what is clear is that education is something more than simply content, so that elements such as motivation, participation, challenge and socio-cultural skills can shape our learners' lives more intensively.

## **4. Research design**

### **4.1. Research aims**

This paper is not an analysis of the success of CLIL programmes through the information extracted from the most active stakeholders taking part of them: CLIL teachers and students, as found in the literature (Lasagabaster 2009; Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009; Pavón and Rubio 2010; Pérez-Invernón 2012; Massler 2012; Wegner 2012; Hüttner et al. 2013). As suggested in Dalton-Puffer and Smit (2013), a different agent is in fact taking relevance within the teachers staff here. A group of non-CLIL Secondary and Vocational Training teachers have been investigated in order to capture a faithful image of the situation in many high schools in Extremadura where bilingual sections coexist with subjects that are entirely taught in Spanish.

It is therefore a qualitative research what we will show from this point. Since teachers' perceived beliefs and impressions belong to a particular high school, under a determined context, limitations should be taken into account and results may not be generalizable across the board. However, this case study can be interpreted as a down-to-earth tool in the sense that showing a reality where a bilingual education is being implemented can generate a framework to understand some experiences and problems appeared in similar academic contexts (e.g. resentment caused by elitism, discrepancies or conflicts), referred to Extremadura or outside our region. Equally important is the idea of taking the conclusions that arise from this report to rethink about the coming CLIL

programmes, above all the way they can be implemented in our Autonomous Community and to what extent bilingualism can shape the image of a complete educational institution, even affecting to the non-CLIL specialists. At the same time, this paper could also set a direction for future research reviewing bilingualism and its interferences into the school curricula, such as the effects on professional relationships among personal resources.

Bearing that in mind, the present study is aimed at:

- a) Assessing the degree of conviction and/or compliance of non-CLIL teachers with regard to the implementation of a bilingual programme in their high school.
- b) Determining if CLIL teachers take advantage of a series of benefits and privileges from the non-CLIL teachers' point of view.
- c) Analyzing the value of the coordination inside and outside the CLIL programme as well as the school development as a whole.
- d) Identifying potential problems in the educational environment generated by the implementation of a bilingual programme.
- e) Offering proposals or suggestions in order to improve the implementation of bilingual programmes from an external position.

## **4.2. Context and participants**

The qualitative study displayed in this master dissertation is based on the data collected from a group of teachers working at "Castelar High School" placed in Badajoz. The features of this public educational institution are described below and the criteria for selecting respondents later on.

"Castelar High School" is located in Badajoz, the biggest city in Extremadura (>150,000 inhabitants), which is a monolingual community, in western Spain. In this urban context, the socioeconomic level is predominantly middle and low middle income classes. Families are relatively involved in their children's education.

Regarding the pupils, it is remarkable that almost all of them come from primary schools where bilingual programmes are not implemented. This means that admission criteria to join the bilingual section project at Secondary education are quite lax in order to reach an acceptable number of students to maintain the CLIL programme.

Initially set up as a professional training centre, since 1984 the school has gone through different stages. The elements that matter most to contextualize our paper refer to the moment in which Secondary education (both Compulsory, "ESO" and Upper Secondary, "*Bachillerato*") is displayed as well as some Vocational Education streams remain active until the present day.

On a separate issue, it was only five years ago, in the academic year 2011-2012, when the bilingual section project was established according to the Extremaduran educational regulation. This decision was, therefore, 'elective', as stated in Alejo and Piquer (2010: 228), meaning that the high school voluntarily applied for the CLIL programme, after the agreement was reached at some previous school board meetings. It is also noticeable that while the coordinator of the bilingual programme is still being the same person (she teaches English to all the CLIL groups), CLIL teachers, subjects and grades have gradually changed along these years. This is very related to the fact that all but one of these CLIL teachers are not permanent staff, though it is true that in order to consolidate the bilingual education offered by the institution, the growing CLIL project has increasingly joined more academic-content departments through time: Physical Education, Mathematics, Arts, Geography and History, Biology and Geology.

Taking the academic year 2015-2016 as a reference, "Castelar High School" has 59 people on its staff. The list of the different academic departments associated to Secondary education is detailed as follows (the number of teachers is specified in brackets): Arts (1 CLIL teacher); Biology and Geology (2 + 1 CLIL teacher); Classical Culture (1); Economics (1); English (3 + 1 CLIL coordinator); French (1); Geography and History (4 + 1 CLIL teacher); Mathematics (4 + 1 CLIL teacher); Music (1); Orientation (4); Philosophy (1); Physical Education (1 CLIL teacher); Physics and Chemistry (3); Portuguese

(1); Religion (1); Spanish Language and Literature (3); Technology (2). Regarding the distribution at the Vocational Training level, teachers are divided into these categories: Training and Professional Development (1), Computer Systems (11) and Healthcare Processes (9).

It is therefore a large institution, receiving a total of about 650 students. Data reveal that Vocational Training has enough importance in the school as a whole, remaining its primitive essence, both in terms of numbers of students (about two thirds of the total study at Basic, Intermediate or Advanced Grade Vocational Training, existing a morning shift and an afternoon shift) but also in terms of teachers staff (about one third of the total works at that teaching level). Contrary to that, only 6 teachers (including the coordinator) carry out the bilingual programme. These rates will help us to understand and discuss some comments in section 4.4 of this dissertation.

Another striking data is the high percentage of permanent teachers in this high school, that is to say, staff members who have passed a public competitive examination being "Castelar High School" their definitive workplace: about 70%, which is not strange but a shared characteristic by most of educational centres in urban areas over Extremadura. This is very linked to the fact that these workers have generally many years of teaching experience and, at the same time, a very weak competence in foreign languages, as we will examine later on.

Concerning the selected sample, although the original intention was to explore mainly non-CLIL teachers sharing academic department with CLIL members, finding candidates willing to participate in the study proved to be problematic, especially in some departments where teachers' available time, access and disposition turned out to be significant limitations. Because of that reason, the questionnaire was designed to be delivered to non-CLIL teachers in general, on the understanding that they could provide a wider and richer view of the bilingual section project from an external position.

Despite that, only teachers who volunteered to participate in the study when they were asked for conformed the final list of comments ready to parse. Hence, results may be considered to some extent as selective and consequently biased. To compensate this apparent weakness, it has tried to cover the maximum number of teaching levels and disciplines in order to represent a wide range of perspectives inside the school environment.

Taking all that into consideration, Table 1 reflects the main characteristics of the twenty participants: eleven of them are Secondary teachers while the rest belong to the Vocational Training level, resulting in a total number of twelve different academic departments expressing their opinions. Three of them (Mathematics, Geography and History, Biology and Geology) are represented by non-CLIL members whose colleagues do actually teach the subject through English. Particularly relevant is the column that refers to staff who, apart from teaching, belong to the management team so that implies they work as 'intra-school administrators' too; we will discuss then the importance of that aspect when extracting conclusions. Also age, teaching experience (especially gained at this high school to check the effect of establishing the bilingual section project) and competence in foreign languages will become crucial points in some cases when analyzing the comments.

Table 1

*Characteristics of the sample of the study*

TEACHER	SEX	AGE	YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE (IN THIS SCHOOL)	TEACHING LEVEL	DEPARTMENT	CLIL MEMBERS IN THE DEPARTMENT	MANAGEMENT TEAM	FOREIGN LANGUAGE (LEVEL)
T1	Fem	50	25 (15)	Secondary Education	Geography and History	Yes	Yes	No
T2	Fem	40	17 (2)	Secondary Education	Orientation	No	Yes	English (B1)
T3	Male	53	26 (6)	Secondary Education	Mathematics	Yes	Yes	No
T4	Fem	45	19 (16)	Secondary Education	Music	No	No	English (B1)
T5	Male	46	22 (2)	Secondary Education	Mathematics	Yes	No	No

T6	Fem	53	29 (23)	Secondary Education	Biology and Geology	Yes	No	No
T7	Fem	47	19 (1)	Secondary Education	Physics and Chemistry	No	No	No
T8	Fem	54	29 (15)	Secondary Education	Philosophy	No	No	No
T9	Male	52	25 (18)	Secondary Education	Technology	No	No	No
T10	Male	57	33 (32)	Secondary Education	Spanish Language and Literature	No	No	English (B2) Portug. (B2) French (B1)
T11	Male	52	21 (8)	Secondary Education	Spanish Language and Literature	No	No	English (B1) Portug. (A2)
T12	Fem	33	8 (4)	Vocational Training	Healthcare Processes	No	No	English (B1)
T13	Fem	51	23 (18)	Vocational Training	Healthcare Processes	No	No	No
T14	Fem	56	14 (3)	Vocational Training	Healthcare Processes	No	No	English (B1)
T15	Fem	57	28 (23)	Vocational Training	Healthcare Processes	No	No	No
T16	Fem	53	27 (23)	Vocational Training	Healthcare Processes	No	No	No
T17	Fem	54	22 (20)	Vocational Training	Healthcare Processes	No	No	No
T18	Male	47	24 (10)	Vocational Training	Computer Systems	No	Yes	No
T19	Male	40	5 (1)	Vocational Training	Computer Systems	No	No	No
T20	Fem	44	5 (2)	Vocational Training	Training and Professional Development	No	No	No

### 4.3. Data collection instrument and procedure

Given the type of study we wanted to carry out, a questionnaire (see Appendix) was designed to be completed by as many teachers as possible. This elicitation tool perfectly fits the qualitative methodology, planned to study a specific context by interpreting in detail participants' thoughts and attitudes.

It is clear that Spanish was the language used along all the questions since the respondents were non-CLIL teachers and needed to understand the statements to express their views and feelings in depth.

The exploration of teachers' beliefs was conducted through closed questions (yes/no questions) and open-ended questions. Concerning the design of the questionnaire, it is structured in eight different sections following this order:

- An introductory section for gathering essential information referred to professional data from the participants: teaching level, academic-content department they belong to and possible CLIL partners, years of experience and in particular teaching experience in "Castelar High School", membership of the management team. It also includes blanks to determine their interest in foreign languages and their degree of conviction in CLIL methodology: linguistic competence, stays abroad, children successfully attending a bilingual programme.
- The first question is: "What are your perceptions with regard to the implementation of bilingual programmes in Extremadura and in this school in particular?"
- The second question is: "Do you consider CLIL teachers take advantage of a series of benefits and privileges when compared to the rest of teachers? Do you find them reasonable and/or fair?" To enable a better understanding, a list of different ideas is showed: "Related to a selection of some groups of students"; "related to a salary increase"; "related to a reduction of hours"; "related to a professional recognition (status)"; "What other privileges or benefits do you think CLIL teachers take advantage of?"
- After that, the following question is posed: "Do you think that participating in the bilingual section project implies a series of disadvantages for CLIL teachers?" Then a list of different points is displayed: "Related to language competence, do you think that the level of linguistic competence in English (B2) demanded to teach CLIL is sufficient?"; "related to planning a different methodology for the CLIL classroom"; "related to the time spent in finding,

selecting and adapting resources and materials"; "related to the attention to diversity in the CLIL classroom".

- The next section tries to positionate the participant for or against CLIL: "If you had the opportunity to join the bilingual programme in this high school, would you do it? Why? What do you like most about this? And what do you least like?"

- Coordination is the key element in the next part. "When the bilingual section is operating, do you consider there is enough coordination among CLIL members (English teacher, language assistant and content-subject teachers)? Between CLIL teachers and the management team in the high school? Between CLIL teachers and non-CLIL teachers? Would you like to become more involved in the bilingual programme carried out in the school? In which ways might this be achieved? What about coordination between CLIL teachers and families?"

- Then some questions about elitism are formulated: "Do you consider the model of bilingual school implemented in Extremadura and in this educational institution in particular is related to the word 'elitism'? Do you think it is generating or it would generate stress and resentment between bilingual schools and non-bilingual schools? Between bilingual academic departments and non-bilingual academic departments? Between CLIL teachers and non-CLIL teachers? Between CLIL students and non-CLIL students? Between families whose children belong to the bilingual programme and those who do not?"

- Finally, the last section is devoted to offer solutions and proposals for improvement regarding the real situation of the bilingual programme in that particular centre and over the region: "Are you in accordance with the approach and the implementation of the bilingual programme in this school? What do you suggest to improve the quality of the bilingual education?"

Questionnaires were administered in the autumn of 2015. Once the data were compiled, an inductive approach, reasoning from the particular to the

general, has been considered to be the most suitable method to data analysis. A processing through main categories and also subthemes assigned to each of the main categories has been carried out.

Furthermore, some illustrative opinions have been extracted from the questionnaires and literally transcribed into English to clarify the issues.

#### **4.4. Results and discussion**

To address the research aims raised in this study, we will deal with the different data sections separately.

First of all, the perceptions about the implementation of bilingual sections will be analyzed, reporting on a general idea of the context in which CLIL is being spread across our region. Secondly, the supposed benefits and privileges of CLIL teachers will be discussed from the non-CLIL participants' perspectives. Equally important will be the exploration, according to their views, of some negative points when belonging to a bilingual programme. The way in which coordination affects the CLIL project itself but also the school as a whole will be addressed in the fourth part. Results concerning 'elitism' as a synonym of bilingual education will reveal striking impressions. The last section will reflect the participating non-CLIL teachers' views with the sole purpose of improving bilingual education.

##### **4.4.1. Perceptions about the implementation of bilingual sections**

Non-CLIL teachers' comments about the evolution of establishing bilingual sections over Extremadura are very diverse. Most of them underline the importance of this type of programmes to develop skills in foreign languages on the part of students. The idea of living in a globalized world where English is a powerful tool for competitiveness and economy (Mehisto et al. 2008) is quite repeated, as table 2 reflects.

Table 2

*Non-CLIL teachers' opinions about the importance of bilingual sections projects*

T1	"The main advantage is that students' linguistic competence improves substantially."
T2	"Through bilingual programmes, the 'fear' to learn a new language dissapears. That allows students the possibility to travel abroad looking for more opportunities."
T5	"It is positive for the development of the students' linguistic competence so that they can carry out certain activities when travelling abroad."
T8	"Given the current globalization we live in, languages are important but not indispensable."
T10	"Obviously, speaking other languages is important, as well as cultural enrichment, but not at any price."
T20	"I think the implementation of bilingual programmes is extremely important because knowing languages in general, not only English, is essential at present."

Additionally, some teachers highlight other potential advantages of CLIL programmes such as the increase of motivation to learn and the development of cognitive skills, as is evidenced, respectively, in the two following comments: "Students seem to be more motivated and involved in the activities if they are organized inside the bilingual programme" (Teacher, henceforth T, 6); "Bilingual sections are a good option for the intellectual development of learners" (T4).

However, as shown in table 2, some favourable comments include to some extent negative nuances, above all what refers to the way of implementing CLIL programmes. In fact, many voices are strongly critical of bilingual sections projects as are actually being implemented in our region. In this sense, regarding to the educational authorities' dimension, these are some of the views on the topic:

"In general, I think it is a situation of wanting and not being able to. [...] This type of programmes is just one of many proposed by authorities aimed only at a good statistical effect." (T10)

"I think the implementation is good as intention but disastrous in terms of performing it. It is impossible to convert students into bilingual from one day to the next." (T13)

Other teachers accept the idea of establishing bilingual sections projects but partially. Hence, T2 draws attention to the model saying that "bilingual sections are good but the best way to learn a language is total immersion" while T4 claims: "I do not understand the way bilingual sections are set out, as CLIL subjects might be entirely taught in English." T20, as many others, believes that "the implementation system is right, although, like anything new, it can always be improved."

Particularly interesting is the lack of bilingual programmes in lower levels that some participants have pointed out as a key to understand criticism to those in Secondary education:

"I think bilingual sections should be carried out in a different way and always starting from Primary education." (T12)

"The only way to achieve a true bilingualism at schools is changing the system: it must start at Nursery stages and then leveling up. For example, Primary students that have not studied the future simple tense in English Grammar are, at the same time, asked to work with textbooks containing verbs in all tenses and this makes no sense." (T13)

Nevertheless, this first part of the questionnaire brings to light the most negative aspect of CLIL programmes according to many teachers: **the interference of bilingualism in the content teaching**. Surprisingly, they have mentioned it many times when it was not specifically asked for. The most representative comments are shown in table 3.

Table 3

*Non-CLIL teachers' beliefs about the interference of CLIL subjects in content teaching*

T1	"It is a disadvantage: content subject learning in the CLIL programme is almost always below the planned one."
T3	"Many teachers complaint that it is not possible to finish the complete syllabus because of the difficulties emerged using the foreign language."
T4	"In the end, concepts are neither well studied nor assimilated."
T7	"Through the bilingual programme, students learn less content. When this refers to instrumental or scientific subjects such as Mathematics or Physics and Chemistry, it makes no sense to study them using another language because of two reasons. Firstly, they are in general very difficult to understand even in Spanish. Secondly, it involves an unnecessary effort to acquire a scientific vocabulary that Secondary students will never use to survive in a foreign country in a normal context."
T10	"I do not know for sure, but I am afraid that in many cases the use of a foreign language is detrimental to the quality of the teaching-learning process: the CLIL teacher has to do 'self-translations' to explain the content and to simplify it so that the student -who does not think in another language- can assimilate the content more easily. On this long road, quality is being lost for the sake of learning basic grammatical structures and lexicon in the foreign language."

Despite the above, when the respondents make reference in some way to the immediate reality in "Castelar High School", their attitudes are more positive than negative. Criticism is smoother here than referred, in general, to bilingual programmes and many teachers -mainly the members of the management team- agree that "the implementation at the school has been done in the best possible way" (T1). In fact, the following comment summarizes the idea of delegating responsibility to educational authorities more than handing out

blame internally: "For me, to improve the bilingual education the solution must be found from a level that corresponds to our Autonomous Community, not following a school-centred focus" (T12).

We will deeply discuss suggestions for improvement in section 4.4.6, but another relevant point, having in mind the idea explained in the previous paragraph, is that **many teachers do not feel ready to judge the implementation of CLIL programmes** (referred to Extremadura and even to the educational institution they work in). This is especially striking in questionnaires filled by Vocational Training teachers, where about 70% of them admit that "since the bilingual programme has no impact on the teaching level I belong to, I am unaware of its development" (T16). This perception is going to be very present along the following chapters of the paper in one way or another. In fact, it fits very well the vision of a current reality in which Vocational Training has apparently nothing to do with bilingualism, as described in the theoretical framework. However, this profile of teacher should pay attention to significant changes taking place in other regions because a future where CLIL programmes cover Vocational Training as well is close.

#### **4.4.2. 'Privileges' attached to CLIL teachers**

Non-CLIL teachers' views about the positive side of working within a bilingual section project are not clearly defined. When they are asked to write about the possible 'privileges' a CLIL member takes advantage of, results vary depending on the specific issue. The reason for this may lie in the particular situation lived at school by each of the participants. In general, those affected by CLIL subjects inside their academic-content departments have more information to elaborate comments in detail. The same applies to teachers forming the management team.

Firstly, it is surprising that 16 in 20 respondents consider that CLIL teachers enjoy the benefit of **choosing particular groups of students**. When they are requested to defend or not this position, then the thing is less clear. On the one hand, we find annotations as table 4 shows.

Table 4

*Non-CLIL teachers' opinions about the positive selection of groups for CLIL*

---

T1	"The non-CLIL teacher, being this school his/her definitive workplace, gets a priori the worst groups of students."
T2	"CLIL groups tend to be better than non-CLIL ones. [...] I think that teaching CLIL learners, who are quite good and also homogeneous, is itself an important benefit."
T4	"Bilingual sections tend to have better students. This implies that the 'old' teachers, as they are not prepared, will always have the worst students."
T7	"It is clearly a privilege. It seems unfair for non-CLIL teachers, since there is no possibility of choice following an order based on the criteria of seniority."
T10	"There is obviously a selection of groups that is not justifiable: it is like a linguistic-academic darwinism."

---

As illustrated, some of the comments above are very critical and related to an elitist concept of bilingualism that we will deeply discuss in section 4.4.5.

Anyway, other opinions understand that one of the conditions to establish a bilingual programme is creating specific groups, arguing that "these groups are made up of better students, but the allocation of them to CLIL teachers seems very reasonable to me" (T5). Additionally, members of the headmaster team points out that "making a good distribution of CLIL students in different groups and lines" (T3), in other words, combining students into mixed groups for the non-CLIL subjects, can smooth the effects of possible conflicts among CLIL and non-CLIL teachers when it is time to choose at the beginning of the academic year.

Regarding the **salary increases** CLIL teachers receive, almost all of the participants (17 in 20) said that they just did know nothing about that and did not make an assessment. But still, some comments are coincident in expressing an idea: "This bonus is completely unfair, as they are voluntarily who

prefer those teachings" (T17). It is interesting that even the management members were surprised about that aspect considering that they work as school administrators and should consequently be aware of all implications of participating in the bilingual programme.

The **reduction of hours** that CLIL teachers experiment in their weekly timetable is seen as a privilege by many participants, but they often believe that it is something fair. Surprisingly, when the respondents are interested in English and the effort when using a new language is understood, they tend to relate this reduction to time devoted to prepare materials, as evidenced in the following two comments: "I think that preparing lessons in another language must involve much more work, so it is fair" (T2); "It would be reasonable for preparing the classes" (T4).

Other points of view reveal interesting perceptions on the topic:

"I think we should contemplate what CLIL subjects are taught by each of the CLIL teachers and therefore the reduction should be in proportion to the number of bilingual lessons carried out." (T3)

"It is a privilege. It is unfair to implement a reduction of hours only for bilingual sections and not for teachers that have to teach a subject which does not belong to their academic department, because in that case they need also extra time to adapt and prepare materials." (T7)

Referred to the **professional recognition** as a supposed benefit that CLIL teachers enjoy, many respondents claim that belonging to the bilingual section project does not imply that they are treated in a better way. And for those thinking that CLIL professionals take advantage of that aspect, comments show that "it is logic that they are more recognized" (T1), "the additional effort and training CLIL teachers make deserves this recognition" (T10), "they tend to have a higher status but of course it is fair" (T20) and even "it might be more promoted this professional recognition" (T11).

#### **4.4.3. The negative side of being a CLIL teacher**

Working within a bilingual programme also implies a series of disadvantages, according to non-CLIL teachers. The questionnaires' findings show that this section will be crucial to understand why most of teachers have absolutely no intention of joining the already implemented CLIL programme at "Castelar High School".

Firstly, when the participants are requested for the opinion of **possessing a B2 English level** as sufficient to teach in the bilingual programme, most of them have serious doubts about the topic and others admit to have no idea concerning these levels: "Honestly, I do not know given my total ignorance about this issue" (T8). In fact, we should take into account that the competence in foreign languages of the sample of the study is really low (only 6 in 20 respondents have achieved a B1), as detailed in the section referred to the context of the study. Despite this, and assuming the role of the CLIL teacher, here are some comments found:

"I think this level is not sufficient because there is a very specific terminology as well as expressions that are normally not learnt." (T4)

"The qualification asked for being a language teacher should be equally demanded for CLIL-teachers." (T7)

As we can see, the importance given to the knowledge of languages to develop CLIL lessons is evident and, for me, to some extent excessive. However, most of non-CLIL teachers agree that "mastering the content of the subject is even ahead of the level of English" (T10). In fact, this is one of the keys to understand the true concept of CLIL as 'an educational approach which is content-driven' (Coyle et al. 2010, 12).

Moving to the next point, the fact of receiving specific training in order to be able to run a CLIL classroom is not perceived as a disadvantage by most of the 20 participants, as evidenced in the following comments: "The methodology will depend on the teacher, but for me this is not a disadvantage" (T1); "The methodology will be the same, though students need to be more participative orally" (T3); "I do not understand why teaching in a new language involves

modifications in the methodology used to teach a determined subject" (T17); "I guess it will depend on the teacher: some teachers will be more hard-working when planning a different methodology but others will simply enjoy the fact of having the best students" (T10). This last opinion again brings to light the connotation of elitism inside the bilingual programme to which we will return later.

In any case, these perceptions highlight that **methodological training** is not considered as an essential competence for being a CLIL teacher, since foreign language domain is vital according to them. The idea of emphasising language more than anything else does not conform to the needs of a CLIL school at the present time. In fact, it was only two years ago when educational authorities in Extremadura proposed the *Decreto 39/2014*, giving enough importance to CLIL training as a prerequisite to teach in bilingual sections projects.

It is also very striking to check that other methodological aspects to perform a good bilingual education are not especially relevant from some of the non-CLIL teachers' perspectives. Although most of them understand that finding, selecting and adapting materials for CLIL units is a time-consuming task, others defend a position in which "the CLIL teacher should not spend more time than any other teacher doing the same for his/her non-CLIL lessons thanks to the Internet and ICT" (T13). "There is a lot of material (textbooks) for bilingual classes" (T1) shows here the simplification done of textbooks when talking about materials in the widest sense.

Thus, it seems to be that only CLIL teachers must really notice how hard this task is and this deserves a deep reflexion. Anyway, and following the trend announced, teachers keen on learning languages tend to be more comprehensive regarding the changes in methodology and the time spent preparing the classes applied to the CLIL context:

"I think the CLIL teacher must use a different and appropriate methodology because otherwise students could get bored or lost more easily about what is being explained. [...] I guess it is more complicated trying to find videos, images, etc. in order to stimulate content learning through all the senses." (T2)

"More methodological training is necessary to adapt the new content to the previous knowledge that students already have. [...] The time spent on selecting materials, apart from the textbook, is much, and these supplementary materials are difficult to find in many cases." (T4)

The **attention to diversity in the CLIL classroom** is also a part that merits further attention. The situation is very similar to that referred to methodology in the previous paragraphs, though non-CLIL teachers' beliefs are more uniform in this regard. Hence, the more representative comments are detailed in table 5.

Table 5

*Non-CLIL teachers' opinions about attention to diversity in the CLIL classroom*

T2	"In the bilingual sections it is rare to find a lot of cases, referred to number but also to severity. Of course it will be necessary to adapt the methodology, the organization of time, work and spaces..., just like we do in non-CLIL groups."
T4	"CLIL students are all supposed to fit into the same pattern and there should be no diversity problems. It would be complicated to adapt materials to these students."
T5	"It must be more complex, although diversity in bilingual sections is narrower than inside ordinary classrooms."
T11	"I am not sure if attention to diversity is contemplated inside the bilingual sections."
T12	"I think there is too much homogeneity concerning the CLIL students."
T17	"I do not see the difference between teaching CLIL and non-CLIL groups in this regard."

As stated above, it is widely believed that students with special educational needs are not in abundance in the CLIL classroom, so it might not represent a bump in the road to develop CLIL sessions; in other words, it is surprisingly seen as an advantage, forgetting that the teacher must deal the whole group but through English. Non-CLIL teachers' insights consider that the bilingual

group is very homogeneous and it is therefore easier to respond to individual differences, an aspect that is also going to be related to an elitist view of the bilingual section project.

Taking everything into account, the balance between positive and negative points leads us to an understanding of the non-CLIL teachers' reflexions about the possibility of joining the CLIL programme already implemented at "Castelar High School" even though it is in the long term. Through this question we try to confirm the position of the participants for or against CLIL. It also highlights the most and the least attractive things if, hypothetically, they were belonging to the bilingual programme.

Roughly only a few participants (6 in 20) would be **willing to enter into a bilingual section**, although just two of them (T2 and T4) admit to have real intentions and possibilities to do it. Both teachers share a similar pattern precisely: women aged 40-45; their interest in English; they are now trying to achieve a B2 certificate; they have stayed at least once abroad in order to study the language; both of them have children participating in a bilingual section and their perceptions are that their children's English level has improved; no CLIL members in their academic departments. This last feature is remarkable in the sense that having no colleagues already teaching CLIL in their departments is a favourable situation to join new subjects to the bilingual programme, in other words, new CLIL teachers would not compete with old CLIL members (although this does not necessarily have to happen). These two teachers coincide when claiming that taking part of the bilingual section would be "a real challenge" (T2) and "an opportunity of gaining knowledge" (T4). Talking about the advantages, T2 points out "to work within a new programme, with a selected type of students" while for T4 "the most attractive thing is being able to teach content using another language". However, it is interesting to see how linguistic competence can also be considered as the worst aspect of participating in the CLIL programme: "with the B2 English level demanded to teach CLIL I would feel insecure" (T4).

As we can see, language competence is especially relevant according to them for teaching CLIL, but in any moment methodological training is

mentioned. The same applies for those four teachers who do not have acquired the language domain but are not against the CLIL programmes. The following comments evidence this idea:

"If I had the opportunity to join the bilingual programme I would do it, because it looks me very interesting the idea of teaching my subject through another language, whenever the learning of the Mathematics was not affected." (T5)

"I would join it because I think the bilingual section opens new perspectives for the students." (T11)

"I would like it but I do not have the linguistic level demanded." (T14)

"If I had the appropriate expertise, of course I would like to participate within the bilingual programme." (T20)

The rest of respondents used the language domain as the main argument to justify why they do not consider the possibility of joining the CLIL programme, as T16 testifies: "I am bad at any languages". Another factor is brought to light in some cases as well: "I would not do it, because my language level is low and my available time very limited" (T18). This comment shows the importance of effort and surprisingly age as key points to understand the position: "If I were younger and had the enthusiasm to study languages, I would do it, but now the only thing I want is to take it easy" (T8, aged 54).

Referred to Vocational Training studies, it is particularly striking that many participants report "any special interest" (T19) in considering the idea of teaching via CLIL. Others take into account the importance of languages but do not accept the idea of extending the bilingual project to all educational levels:

"I am trying to learn English now, but that does not mean that my content at Vocational Training, which is very specific, could be taught in a foreign language. It takes a lot of time to prepare the student to assimilate concepts even in the native language, so using English the learning would be delayed very much and I think it is not necessary." (T13)

This, no doubt, contributes to amplify the gap between Secondary and Vocational Training education, as described in previous sections.

#### 4.4.4. Coordination inside and outside the CLIL programme

To work efficiently and as a whole, coordination is absolutely necessary at any educational institution. And talking about a large high school such as "Castelar", it becomes essential.

When the participants are asked to explain their views about the coordination among CLIL members, specifying English teacher, language assistant and the different content-subject specialists, the more generalized answers are "I guess they are coordinated" (T15) or simply "I do not know" (T17). Only a few respondents effectively know that "at least one meeting per week is carried out inside the bilingual programme" (T4) and even going as far as to say that "coordination is present but they should have more hours in order to achieve efficiency" (T12).

A very similar thing happens with the relationships between CLIL teachers and the management team, and between CLIL teachers and families. From a non-CLIL teachers' perspective, again **the lack of knowledge determines the impossibility to make an assessment**, as they are not involved in the bilingual section project. However, it is interesting to check how those teachers that are a part of the management team think that, generally speaking, there is enough coordination in that sense. However, the following comment reported by one of them reflects that coordination could be understood in very different ways: "There are normally clarifications when planifying the CLIL teachers' timetables at the beginning of the academic year, also in June when deciding about the CLIL subjects for the next school year...[...] I guess that communication between CLIL teachers and families will be the same as established with non-CLIL teachers" (T2). Therefore, according to the participants, it seems to be that the membership to a bilingual programme by a student does not involve more coordination or special coordination than it would happen with any other student at school. This external perception is very important, because according to experts in bilingual education, CLIL implications must be analyzed and explained to all the agents participating in the bilingual section project, and the management team and families are obviously stakeholders as well.

Finally, regarding the coordination between CLIL teachers and non-CLIL teachers, the effectiveness is not so clear, showing a higher degree of **disappointment**. Table 6 compiles some of the comments found.

Table 6

*Non-CLIL teachers' perceptions about the coordination with CLIL teachers*

T2	"I recognize that I have never established any type of coordination with a CLIL member, but this year we are carrying out some common activities."
T4	"I would like a stronger coordination, via Rayuela [technological platform for Education in Extremadura] or through meetings, at least one in two weeks, for example."
T11	"I do not think there is enough coordination. It would be excellent if the dichotomy between good students going to the bilingual section and bad students going to the ordinary lines disappears."
T12	"Coordination is not enough. As schedules and working hours are established, it is very complicated to find a solution."
T17	"In this high school there is absolutely no approach concerning the cooperation and participation in the CLIL programme for the non-CLIL teachers."
T13	"I think CLIL teachers do not count on us, the rest of teachers at school. There should be more coordination to participate in the project among all of us, taking decisions through the Pedagogical Coordination Commission."

These views reflect that many teachers outside the CLIL programme often feel an inner emptiness regarding the development of CLIL activities but they are willing to participate in one way or another. However, according to T10, "non-CLIL teachers and CLIL staff seem to live in two different worlds", an interesting perspective of what is actually going on. Time and adaptation stand out as determining factors in this relationship.

#### **4.4.5. Elitism in bilingual sections**

Some hints concerning an elitist perception of the CLIL world have been mentioned along the previous sections and especially in the first one. Now we will address the most outstanding features of this topic when is specifically treated in the questionnaires. Roughly many comments hide behind some type of elitism, though talking about this concrete high school things generally become eased.

The differences between bilingual schools and non-bilingual schools as a cause of possible tension are not clearly perceived among all the non-CLIL teachers. Some of them think that "there is freedom of choice" (T5) and therefore problems should not emerge when preferring a bilingual school, thus adopting a parent's position. It is also interesting to check how many respondents claim that "the implementation of bilingual sections projects over the region has been so fast that practically all schools have now a bilingual programme and that way there should be no problems" (T1). For his part, T10 points out critically that "there are umpteen bilingual schools" while T13 notes that "although the method is not suitable, it was inevitable to implement the bilingual programme at this high school, otherwise we would lag behind." This demonstrates that generalization of CLIL programmes over Extremadura is a reality and opens the debate on the celerity and overextension they have been established with in the recent years. Other teachers support the opposite idea arguing that "many educational institutions are considered as elitist just for developing a bilingual section" (T4) or simply saying "yes, I think it could generate some tension" (T14) but without providing any justification.

Controversy between CLIL academic departments and the non-CLIL ones inside the same school has little visible impact, according to most of the participants. However, some voices of criticism do state that "some departments seem to have more 'reputation' when taking part in the bilingual programme" (T4).

Surprisingly, it does not happen the same talking about the relationship between CLIL teachers and non-CLIL teachers inside a particular department. This phenomenon of interference between CLIL professionals and 'traditional'

teachers was already commented when discussing the way of implementing bilingual programmes in Extremadura and comes to light again. Very representative is the following interpretation, made by a Spanish Language and Literature teacher, who interestingly will not be affected by this possible problem inside his department because the participation of language departments are excluded from the bilingual programme:

"Young CLIL teachers are now coming to school and passing old staff regarding the choice of groups. I am not sure if there have been problems at this school, but yes, I know it is happening in others." (T10)

It is also particularly relevant the opinion expressed by the management team. From their experience, these teachers agree that "some stress could appear inside a department concerning the distribution of groups of students because they become indeed strongly different" (T2). Moreover, the fact that "young and temporary staff achieves apparently better conditions" (T1) increases the sense of **discomfort and displeasure among the non-CLIL teachers**, who are framed into a general professional profile in which English was not a must at the moment they entered service. However, things have changed since then and now possessing the required proficiency in English can mean to access a job relatively quickly, mainly for certain specialities in Secondary education such as Biology and Geology, Physics and Chemistry, Mathematics, Geography and History, Arts or Physical Education, where in some cases and depending on the Autonomous Community, extraordinary calls are announced in order to find CLIL candidates for recruitment because lists are already depleted. What is more, working as school administrators, one of these members in the management team recognizes that "some vacancies are being directly converted into bilingual posts to be covered only by CLIL teachers" (T1). This can really work as a potential challenge to generate problems inside the educational environment and deserves special attention in these days. However, it is also defended the position that takes into account that "instead of complaining, non-CLIL teachers have the possibility to try the same process of accreditation that CLIL teachers have to pass" (T3), adding value to the effort made by CLIL professionals.

The next question analyzed is related to the tension caused between students inside and outside the bilingual programme. In this sense, half of the participants think that resentment is evident. The other half adopts a more hesitant stance. Table 7 lists some illustrative beliefs.

Table 7

*Non-CLIL teachers' perceptions about the possible resentment between CLIL and non-CLIL students*

---

T1	"CLIL students tend to think they are superior."
<hr/>	
T2	"Bilingual students think they are better than the rest while the non-bilingual students can look the others suspiciously."
<hr/>	
T3	"There is no positive selection because bilingual students are divided into different groups and mixed with non-CLIL partners. Moreover, CLIL students must make more effort."
<hr/>	
T4	"There are certain schools where some activities are prepared only for CLIL students, the 'best' ones. However, these students are under pressure and the moment they arrive at the Baccaalaureate some of them change school."
<hr/>	
T10	"Elitism is very evident when creating special groups of students: they think they are superior than the rest, they demand more effort and resources... In the end, the most negatively affected are in fact CLIL students because they lose their perspective and are finally brought down to earth with a shock."

---

As we can see, although other points of view keep in mind the extra effort students must face to when joining the bilingual programme, most of these perspectives clearly show an **elitist and consequently problematic position** from our role of teachers and "we should take these possible conflicts very into account" (T11). In this sense, consideration should be given to promoting the two-schools-in-one phenomenon carried out inside an educational institution and generated by the implementation of a CLIL programme, as Mehisto et al.

(2008) propose. According to many teachers, this idea of selecting students is not the way to ensure equal opportunities, a core principle of the public school system. **Inequalities** in terms of learning a foreign language should be addressed when, for instance, the language assistant is exclusively present in the CLIL classroom but not in the ordinary English lessons. It has to be said that non-CLIL schools are not served of course by this aid. This can be interpreted as an strategy to invest resources only in the bilingual sections projects.

In the last section, the possibility of resentment between families whose children belong to the bilingual programme and those who do not is negligible, according to the participants. Only a few teachers point out that "some type of discrimination is possible to be found" (T4) but the sensation is significantly more diffuse. To be truthful, if this question had been posed to parents, results might be probably different, so that the stakeholders involved in this concrete request do not have much more to contribute.

#### **4.4.6. Proposals for improvement**

This last section is devoted to offer some solutions regarding the real context of the bilingual education over the region but taking the situation lived at "Castelar High School" as main reference.

One of the most striking aspects derived from the non-CLIL teachers' perspectives is that a large number believe that the bilingual programme has nothing to do with them, especially those teaching at Vocational Training, as we have already commented. Because of that, trying to improve a system in which they feel having no place it is difficult and most of them admit to "have no idea of how to improve this programme" (T1). More worrying is the position of some of them, strongly radical with CLIL, saying that "I do not have any personal interest in this issue" (T17). It is clear that the reality lived by many teachers at their workplaces is very individualistic and not focused on the educational institution as a whole, as they absolutely forget the programmes carried out inside the school.

Despite these circumstances, most of them have suggested different proposals of improvement, compiled in table 8. The relevance of these solutions, according to the respondents, is shown in the table following the given order.

Table 8

*Proposals for improvement (ranked in order of importance)*

---

1. More coordination between CLIL and non-CLIL teachers with respect to teaching the same content

---

  2. Not to restrict the bilingual programme only to CLIL members and to stimulate participation on the part of non-CLIL teachers

---

  3. To extend bilingualism to Nursery and Primary Stages and ensure coordination between Primary and Secondary

---

  4. Continuity in the CLIL subjects along the Secondary education

---

  5. To open the bilingual section project to new subjects

---

  6. To maintain the students' grouping and avoid creating pure bilingual groups

---

  7. More coordination between English teachers and CLIL teachers to unify criteria (especially for students' evaluation)

---

  8. Improving CLIL teachers' linguistic competence

---

  9. More exposition to English language by increasing the number of English lessons instead of sacrificing other subjects

---

  10. More exposition to English language through the language assistant

---

  11. CLIL lessons strictly in English: only use of Spanish where necessary and justified
- 

This long list of proposals can be digested into two different parts. From the non-CLIL teachers' views, the most relevant measures are referred to possible interferences caused by the bilingual programme that can affect their work. In other words, the concern about teaching the same content inside and outside the bilingual programme comes to light again and gets the first place when proposing ideas to solve problems. Also the possible exclusion that non-CLIL teachers can experience is tried to be solved by reclaiming better participation

in the decisions adopted. Thirdly, more coordination is demanded between Primary and Secondary education to understand the true concept of bilingual programmes at high schools as they are actually implemented from the authorities' role. Giving continuity to the CLIL subjects and being ready to join new subjects are considered as proposals for improvement as well. Then another organizational question inside the educational institution is kept in mind: the process of grouping CLIL students carried out at this particular high school is seen as very positive because otherwise **pure bilingual groups are always related to elitism** and therefore some possible conflicts might emerge.

The other section of solutions, though less relevant, have in common the importance given to the competence in foreign language. Coordination between English teachers and CLIL teachers to unify criteria (especially when assessing) seems to be a very attractive measure that would deserve more attention. Then, improving the English level on the part of the teachers and increasing the exposition to this language on the part of the students are suggested too. In this last case, it can be achieved through different ways: more English lessons instead of following a CLIL approach, more interaction with the language assistant and empowering CLIL participants to truly work using English.

## 5. Conclusions

This master dissertation aims at analysing what non-CLIL teachers actually believe about the implementation of the bilingual programme in their particular educational institution but also in Extremadura. Results have shown that many of these impressions are really important to understand what is actually happening in our educational contexts.

Generally speaking, this staff understands **the importance of the CLIL programmes** as a modern and innovative way of teaching, considering the necessity of learning new languages, especially English, on the part of the students. Some advantages are named such as competitiveness in the business world, increase in motivation and development of cognitive skills. However, most of them confess that **they do not understand the way of implementing this system**, that is very *foreign* to them, their engagement is really low and they even feel the sensation of having nothing to say or to solve, especially referred to those teaching at Vocational Training. On the one hand, too much responsibility is given to the educational authorities as the main decision-makers on the possible disorganization experienced and problems derived from the bilingual programmes at these days. On the other hand, more conformist is interpreted the role performed by schools. Some negative aspects are appreciated in this implementation: lack of continuity from Primary Stages and deficiencies on the language proficiency referred to both the CLIL teachers but also the CLIL students. Although not specifically asked for, one of the main non-CLIL teachers' concerns is the **interference** (reduction) **on the content** when teaching the CLIL subjects through English. CLIL pedagogy is never mentioned and even changes in methodology are seen as not essential to participate in the bilingual section.

With respect to the supposed benefits received by CLIL teachers, the most clear idea is the possibility **to choose the 'best' groups of students**. Despite this fact, most of non-CLIL teachers assume that this is inevitable as it is a condition of the CLIL project. Salary increases awarded to CLIL teachers became a surprise for the majority of the participants in the study, even for the management team. The reduction of hours along the weekly schedule is also

seen as a privilege for CLIL teachers; only a few interested in languages or simply whose attitudes are more favourable to joining the bilingual section project seem to understand that the sacrifice done by working through a new language irretrievably demands an extra time and that it is a hard task to find, select and adapt the materials. There is no general perception of a better professional treatment for CLIL teachers although this recognition would be well accepted if applied.

Regarding the negative side of being a CLIL teacher, the **linguistic competence** is highly **overestimated** but interestingly most of non-CLIL staff admit to have absolutely no idea about the levels proposed by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and therefore do not know if a B2 is sufficient. They are not aware of the importance of the methodological training as a key competence and a prerequisite to be a CLIL teacher. An apparent disadvantage, attention to diversity in the bilingual classroom, is surprisingly converted into an evident advantage, justifying that there is too much homogeneity and no special educational needs among the CLIL pupils.

Extending the bilingual section to other levels and subjects seems to be very complicated at high schools where candidates have little or no language training, although their teaching experience and the fact that they are permanent staff work in their favour. Apart from the linguistic deficiency as the main problem, the specificity of the content in the Vocational Training is seen as a huge barrier in the road in order to expand the bilingual programme inside the school, thereby driving the two sides, Secondary education and the Vocational Training, even further apart.

From the non-CLIL teachers' position, **the process running inside the bilingual programme is very unknown**. Hence, coordination among CLIL participants (English teacher, language assistant and CLIL subject teachers), between the CLIL teachers and the management team, and also between the CLIL teachers and parents are all presumed to be a truth. The reality is that more information should be addressed to the stakeholders involved in this challenge called CLIL. The disagreement is clearer in the relationship between

CLIL and non-CLIL teachers. As a general view, it is demanded more participation in one way or another and to listen to the non-CLIL staff' voices.

Additionally, **elitist connotations** are very present in the non-CLIL teachers' minds. The segregation between bilingual and non-bilingual schools is not perceived due to the fact that practically all the educational institutions over the region are following the trend of implementing a CLIL project to not remain behind. This opens the debate of their rapid growth across Extremadura. A danger of resentment is not perceived between CLIL and non-CLIL academic departments, but things get worse when analyzing the situation inside a particular department attached to CLIL. Then, interferences referred above all to distribution of groups and content teaching are brought to light, feeding the tension between the two parts: on the one hand, the young, temporary, trained in languages teachers; on the other hand, the old, permanent and bad-at-languages staff. The relationship between CLIL and non-CLIL students seems to be also problematic if we reward the sensation of superiority labeled to CLIL groups or create discrimination between families. The analysis of these **conflicts** in the educational environment deserves special attention, being the management team aware of that potential problem.

Concerning the section devoted to offer some proposals for improvement, it is easy to determine that **solutions are difficult to be found from the non-CLIL teachers' side**. This demonstrates that the school and the internal programmes work in a very individualistic way, not as a whole as intended. In that sense, it seems to be that Vocational Training represents the highest degree of professional isolation. In any case, among all of them, the one that stands out the most is the reivindication of more coordination between CLIL and non-CLIL teachers in terms of unifying the content to teach. The second one involves adopting a more open look inside the bilingual programme in order to stimulate more external participation or at least to listen to the comments suggested by staff outside it.

To conclude, CLIL programmes have come to stay in Extremadura. Since high schools are still trying to remodel their structures referred to Secondary education, a new protagonist, the Vocational Training, is going to be affected in

a future which is closer than we realise. The importance of being informed from the part of these non-CLIL teachers about the real implications of what a CLIL programme involves must be considered before taking a step forward. Interferences inside the educational environment could be present when lack of coordination or elitism emerge. Interesting new lines to be explored would be the reality found by families and school administrators participating in our bilingual sections projects, as they become direct or indirect stakeholders and the quality of the bilingual education can be boosted through the analysis of external but constructive opinions.

## **6. Acknowledgments**

The author wishes to express his sincerest gratitude to "Castelar High School" in Badajoz, not only to the participants for their willingness to share their perceptions about the bilingual programmes with us but also to the management team for helping and collecting the questionnaires and to the CLIL teachers for their support, ideas and suggestions to better model this work.

## 7. References

- Alejo, R. & Piquer, A.M. (2010). CLIL Teacher Training in Extremadura: A Needs Analysis Perspective. In Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.) *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training* (pp. 219-242). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F. & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 243-262.
- Comunidad de Madrid (2010). *Los programas de enseñanza bilingüe de la comunidad de Madrid. Un estudio comparado*. <http://www.madrid.org/cs/Satellite?cid=1142623372595&idConsejeria=1109266187254&idListConsj=1109265444710&idOrganismo=1109266227481&language=es&pagename=ComunidadMadrid%2FEstructura&sm=1109266100977>
- Consejería de Educación de la Junta de Extremadura (2008). *Plan Linguaex 2009-2015*. [http://recursos.educarex.es/pdf/linguaex/informacion\\_linguaex.pdf](http://recursos.educarex.es/pdf/linguaex/informacion_linguaex.pdf)
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Council of Europe (2007a). *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. Retrieved 5<sup>th</sup> February 2015 from [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Guide\\_niveau3\\_EN.asp#TopOfPage](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Guide_niveau3_EN.asp#TopOfPage)

Coyle, D. (2010). Foreword. In D. Lasagabaster and Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.) *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (pp. vii-viii). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

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

Dafouz, E., B. Nuñez, C. Sancho & D. Foran (2007). Integrating CLIL at the tertiary level: Teachers' and students' reactions. In D. Marsh & D. Wolff (eds.) *Diverse contexts - converging goals: CLIL in Europe* (pp. 91-102). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Dalton-Puffer, C. & Smit, U. (2013). Content and Language Integrated Learning: A research agenda. *Language Teaching* 46, 545-559.

España. DECRETO 39/2014, de 18 de marzo, por el que se establecen los requisitos específicos de acreditación de la competencia lingüística en lengua extranjera para impartir áreas, materias o módulos en los programas bilingües, y se regula el procedimiento para obtener la correspondiente habilitación lingüística en el ámbito de la Comunidad Autónoma de Extremadura. *DOE*, 24 de marzo de 2014, núm. 57, p. 9048-9057.

España. ORDEN de 19 de mayo de 2005 por la que se regula la convocatoria de secciones bilingües, con carácter experimental, en centros sostenidos con fondos públicos de Educación Primaria y de Educación Secundaria de Extremadura. *DOE*, 24 de mayo de 2005, núm. 59, p. 7031-7042.

España. ORDEN de 31 de marzo de 2015 por la que se regula, con carácter experimental, la convocatoria de Secciones Bilingües en Educación Primaria, Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Formación Profesional para el curso 2015/2016, en centros sostenidos con fondos públicos de la Comunidad Autónoma de Extremadura. *DOE*, 13 de abril de 2015, núm. 69, p. 11449-11478.

- Eurydice Network (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Brussels. [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/thematic\\_studies\\_archives\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/thematic_studies_archives_en.php)
- Fernández, A. (2009). Spanish CLIL: Research and Official Actions. In Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. & Jiménez Catalán, R.M. (eds.) *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 3-21). London: Multilingual Matters.
- Hüttner, J., C. Dalton-Puffer & U. Smit (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education* 16:3, 267-284.
- Julián de Vega, C. (2007). La importancia de la coordinación en la implantación de modelos AICLE. *GRETA Journal*, 15 (1 and 2), 14-19. Retrieved 19<sup>th</sup> February 2015 from [http://www.academia.edu/1074654/Julián-de-Vega\\_C.\\_2007\\_.La\\_importancia\\_de\\_la\\_coordinación\\_en\\_la\\_implantación\\_de\\_modelos\\_AICLE.\\_GRETA\\_Journal.\\_15\\_14-19](http://www.academia.edu/1074654/Julián-de-Vega_C._2007_.La_importancia_de_la_coordinación_en_la_implantación_de_modelos_AICLE._GRETA_Journal._15_14-19)
- Julián de Vega, C. (2013). La coordinación docente en modelos AICLE. *Revista Padres y Maestros*, 349, 21-24. Retrieved 11<sup>th</sup> February 2015 from <http://revistas.upcomillas.es/index.php/padresymaestros/article/view/21-24/806>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2009). The implementation of CLIL and attitudes towards trilingualism. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 157, 23-43.
- Lasagabaster, D. & J.M. Sierra (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International Journal of CLIL Research* 1.2, 4-17.
- Lasagabaster, D. & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (2010). Ways forward in CLIL: Provision issues and future planning. In *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and*

*teacher training*, ed. D. Lasagabaster and Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, 278-95. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., Quiñones, V. & Moore, P. (2007). Models and Practice in CLIL. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada. Asociación española de lingüística aplicada*. Volumen monográfico 2007.

Marsh, D. (2012). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): A Development Trajectory*. Córdoba: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Córdoba.

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

Massler, U. (2012). Primary CLIL and its stakeholders: What children, parents and teachers think of the potential merits and pitfalls of CLIL modules in primary teaching. *International CLIL Research Journal* 4, 36-46.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: MacMillan Publishers Limited.

Mehisto, P. (2009). Managing multilingual education: structuring stakeholder dialogue and collaboration. In V. Pavón; F.J. Ávila (eds.) *Aplicaciones didácticas para la enseñanza integrada de lengua y contenidos (AICLE/CLICL/ÉMILE)*. Sevilla: Consejería de Educación de la Junta de Andalucía-Universidad de Córdoba, 9-27.

Mehisto, P. (2012). *Excellence in Bilingual Education: A Guide for School Principals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Pavón, V., Rubio, F. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes. *Porta Linguarum*, 14, 45-58.
- Pavón, V., Ellison, M. (2013). Examining teacher roles and competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *L I N G V A R V M A R E N A*, 4, 65 – 78.
- Pavón, V. (2014). Perfil y competencia metodológica del profesorado para el Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE). *Revista Digital educativa Enclave Docente*, 5, 8-13.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2011). CLIL research in Europe: past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and bilingualism*. 15 (3), 315–341.
- Pérez-Invernón, A. (2012). *Evaluación de programas bilingües: análisis de resultados de las secciones experimentales de francés en el marco del Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo de Andalucía* (tesis doctoral). Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba.
- Roldán, A. (2014). Reflexiones de futuro acerca del programa bilingüe en Andalucía. *Revista Digital educativa Enclave Docente*, 5, 30-33.
- Serrano, B. (2014). La enseñanza plurilingüe: una apuesta decidida por una educación de calidad y por el refuerzo de la dimensión europea. *Revista Digital educativa Enclave Docente*, (5), 42-45.
- Tejederas, M. (2014). Reflexiones y propuestas sobre el bilingüismo. *Revista Digital educativa Enclave Docente*, (5), 18-21.
- Wegner, A. (2012). Seeing the bigger picture: What students and teachers think about CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal* 4, 29-35.

## 8. Appendix



### TRABAJO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

MÁSTER EN EDUCACIÓN BILINGÜE EN LA EDUCACIÓN SECUNDARIA

(FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN, UNIVERSIDAD DE EXTREMADURA)

#### ***Cuestionario para profesorado que no participa en la Sección Bilingüe del Centro Educativo***

Edad: _____	Sexo: _____	Cuerpo: Secundaria ____	Formación Profesional ____
Especialidad: _____			
Años de servicio (total): _____		Años de servicio en este centro: _____	
¿Forma parte del equipo directivo del centro? _____			
¿Hay algún miembro de su departamento que imparta enseñanzas bilingües? _____			
¿Ha formado parte de una sección bilingüe en algún momento de su carrera profesional? _____			
¿Tiene habilitación lingüística en algún idioma? Inglés____ Francés____ Portugués____			
Nivel de competencia lingüística: Idioma_____ C1____ B2____ B1____			
Idioma_____ C1____ B2____ B1____			
¿Ha realizado alguna estancia en algún país de habla inglesa? ____ ¿Cuántas veces?_____			
_____¿De qué duración?_____			
¿Tiene algún hijo/a matriculado en secciones bilingües?_____ En caso afirmativo, ¿cree que el nivel de idiomas de su hijo ha mejorado bastante? Sí____ No____			

1) ¿Cuáles son sus percepciones con respecto a la implantación de las secciones bilingües en Extremadura y en este centro en particular?

2) ¿Considera usted que el profesorado implicado en las secciones bilingües goza de una serie de privilegios o beneficios respecto del resto de profesores? ¿Los considera razonables y/o justos?

- En cuanto a elección de grupos.
  
- En cuanto a complemento económico.
  
- En cuanto a horas de reducción semanales.
  
- En cuanto a reconocimiento profesional (estatus).
  
- ¿Qué otros privilegios o beneficios piensa que tienen?

3) Del mismo modo, ¿cree que participar en una sección bilingüe supone una serie de desventajas para el profesorado implicado? Opine sobre estos temas y otros cuanto estime necesarios:

- En cuanto a formación en idiomas. ¿Cree que el nivel de dominio lingüístico exigido en inglés (B2) resulta suficiente para impartir la docencia a tales materias?
  
- En cuanto a la planificación de metodologías diferentes para adaptarlas al aula bilingüe.
  
- En cuanto al tiempo dedicado para buscar, seleccionar y adaptar recursos y materiales.
  
- En cuanto a la atención a la diversidad en el aula bilingüe.

4) Si usted tuviera la oportunidad de poder formar parte de la sección bilingüe del centro, ¿lo haría? ¿Por qué? ¿Qué es lo que más le atrae? ¿Y lo que menos?

5) A la hora del funcionamiento de la sección bilingüe, ¿considera que existe la suficiente coordinación entre...

...los componentes de la sección bilingüe del centro (profesor de inglés, auxiliar de conversación y profesorado que imparte las materias no lingüísticas)?

...el profesorado bilingüe y el equipo directivo del centro?

...el profesorado bilingüe y el no bilingüe del centro? ¿Le gustaría ser más partícipe del programa de educación bilingüe desarrollado en el centro? ¿De qué maneras podría conseguirse?

...el profesorado bilingüe y las familias?

6) ¿Considera que el modelo de escuela bilingüe implantado en Extremadura y en este centro se relaciona con la palabra 'elitismo'? ¿Cree que está generando o podría generar fenómenos de tensión entre...

...centros bilingües y no bilingües?

...departamentos bilingües y departamentos no bilingües?

...profesores bilingües y no bilingües?

...alumnado bilingüe y no bilingüe?

...los mismos padres del alumnado perteneciente a secciones bilingües y no bilingües?

7) ¿Está conforme con el planteamiento e implantación del programa bilingüe en el centro? ¿Qué sugerencias o propuestas de mejora plantearía para mejorar la calidad de la educación bilingüe?