

# CLIL in Spain



CLIL in Spain:  
Implementation, Results and Teacher Training

Edited by

David Lasagabaster and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training,  
Edited by David Lasagabaster and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by David Lasagabaster and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1857-7, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1857-5

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword .....	vii
Do Coyle	

Introduction .....	ix
The emergence of CLIL in Spain: An educational challenge. Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe and David Lasagabaster	

## **PART I: Implementation and Results of CLIL in Spain**

Chapter One.....	2
CLIL in Andalusia Francisco Lorenzo	

Chapter Two .....	12
CLIL in a Bilingual Community: The Basque Autonomous Community Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe and David Lasagabaster	

Chapter Three .....	30
CLIL in Catalonia: An Overview of Research Studies Teresa Navés and Mia Victori	

Chapter Four .....	55
An Insight into Galician CLIL: Provision and Results Xabier San Isidro	

Chapter Five .....	79
First Steps of CLIL in a Spanish Monolingual Community: The Case of La Rioja Almudena Fernández	

Chapter Six .....	95
Content and Language Integrated Programmes in the Madrid Region: Overview and Research Findings Ana Llinares and Emma Dafouz	

Chapter Seven.....	115
To CLIL or not to CLIL? From Bilingualism to Multilingualism in Catalan/Spanish Communities in Spain Carmen Pérez-Vidal and Maria Juan-Garau	
<b>PART II: Teacher Training</b>	
Chapter Eight.....	140
Teacher Training Programmes for CLIL in Andalusia Sagrario Salaberri	
Chapter Nine.....	162
Teacher Training for CLIL in the Basque Country: The Case of the Ikastolas - An Expediency Model Phillip Ball and Diana Lindsay	
Chapter Ten .....	188
Pre-service CLIL Teacher-education in Catalonia. Expert and Novice Practitioners Teaching and Thinking Together Cristina Escobar	
Chapter Eleven .....	219
CLIL Teacher Training in Extremadura: A Needs Analysis Perspective Rafael Alejo and Ana Piquer	
Chapter Twelve .....	243
From the Classroom to University and Back: Teacher Training for CLIL in Spain at the Universidad de Alcalá Ana Halbach	
Chapter Thirteen.....	257
Training CLIL Teachers at University Level Inmaculada Fortanet	
<b>PART III: Conclusions</b>	
Chapter Fourteen .....	278
Ways Forward in CLIL: Provision Issues and Future Planning David Lasagabaster and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe	
Contributors.....	296

# FOREWORD

DO COYLE

We are entering a new era in the development of content and language integrated learning. In the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Hugo Baetens-Beardsmore described CLIL as the *growth industry of educational linguistics*. Over the last decade there has been an explosion of interest in CLIL in Europe and beyond, as many teachers, learners, parents, researchers and policy-makers have realised the potential of CLIL and interpreted this potential in very different ways. Indeed, the fact that CLIL is open to wide interpretation is its strength since the ways in which different languages are learned and used, including the first language, need to be embedded in the local and regional learning context. There are no set formula and methods for CLIL and re-conceptualising elements of any formal curriculum at primary, secondary or tertiary levels, needs a vision which involves new and alternative opportunities for connected and connecting learning which are pertinent to the context and the individuals who work and learn in them.

However, CLIL also brings with it complex challenges which focus on the growth of effective pedagogies and the professional development of teachers who understand how to question their teaching, experiment with new approaches and put these into practice in their classrooms - after all, CLIL *per se* will not lead to sustainable changes and improvements in learner experiences and outcomes. Moreover, for CLIL to be justifiable within a regular curriculum there is a need for rigorous on-going planning, monitoring and evaluation, with clear goals and expectations. Yet change also brings with it risks. Whilst early pioneers in CLIL provided positive encouragement to experiment further with CLIL, the evidence-base upon which to disseminate CLIL practice and expand provision was limited. This too is changing as more practitioners engage in professional learning communities and gain confidence to see their own classroom as a place of inquiry. Case studies of classroom initiatives are providing practical 'lived through' CLIL experiences matched by an increasing European and transnational research agenda which seeks to adopt a scientific approach to investigating more longitudinal outcomes and specific demands of CLIL in terms of effective teaching and learning. Implementing CLIL therefore

invites teachers in all sectors of education to reflect on their own practice to engage in self-analysis and self-evaluation and to make fundamental contributions to both professional and research communities. Implementing CLIL also encourages teachers to experiment, to take risks and to have a voice to articulate what works and what doesn't work for their students and why this is so. Implementing CLIL provides an opportunity for practitioners and learners to collaborate with other stakeholders in order to understand better the complexities and implications of using languages as effective learning tools.

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

This book makes a significant and very timely contribution to furthering professional understanding of CLIL. The first part brings together the outcomes of CLIL implementation initiatives in different educational sectors in Spain which reflect regional possibilities and priorities. The second part takes a critical look at a variety of teacher education models both in-service and pre-service. Linking classroom initiatives with teacher education underlines the importance of addressing this often neglected or ignored area. Quite simply without appropriate teacher education programs the full potential of CLIL is unlikely to be realised and the approach unsustainable. This publication provides the reader with practical suggestions and raises issues for further reflection. The contributors have embraced the 'educational challenge' and in so doing have made a significant contribution to disseminating CLIL practice across Europe and further afield, by raising issues and questions which need to be addressed through future class-based inquiry and scientific research. The collection of case studies is also a celebration of the hard work, endeavour and constant drive by practitioners, teacher educators and researchers to give our young people the best linguistically-rich learning experiences they can possibly have throughout their schooling and further studies.

## INTRODUCTION

# THE EMERGENCE OF CLIL IN SPAIN: AN EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE

YOLANDA RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ  
AND DAVID LASAGABASTER

In the last decade CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) has undergone a rapid development in the Spanish scenario. This is the result of a commitment with the European policies aimed at fostering multilingualism and a growing awareness of the need to learn foreign languages.

Nevertheless, to understand CLIL in Spain we must first take into account that Spain comprises 17 autonomous regions plus the autonomous cities of Ceuta and Melilla. The legislative frameworks guiding the Spanish education system are the Spanish Constitution (1978), the Organic Act on the Right to Education (LODE, 1978) and the Organic Law of Education 2/2006, 3rd May (Ley Orgánica de Educación LOE 2006) which develop the principles and rights established in Spain. Even though the Organic Law of Education offers the legal framework to provide and assure the right to education at national level, the autonomous communities regulate the adaptation of this Law to their territories. This fact allows them to have the power to administer the educational system within each region although the Organic Act of Education offers the core frame for the whole country.

Due to this diversity, there are as many models as regions and no single blueprint exists to take root across the country. But this could in fact be extrapolated to other communities worldwide, where different models are developed with the same main objective: to achieve communicative competence in second and foreign languages across the curriculum. Thus, the Spanish CLIL spectrum can serve as a dynamic and realistic model for other countries wanting to foster foreign language learning.

In the Spanish scenario, CLIL programmes are being implemented in mainstream schools quite frequently with direct support from educational authorities. The different models vary significantly from one region to another, but can be divided into two main contexts:

- Monolingual communities, where Spanish is the official language. In these communities, education is partly done in Spanish and also in one or two foreign languages, when CLIL is implemented.
- Bilingual communities, where Spanish is the official language together with another co-official regional language, namely Basque, Catalan, Galician and Valencian, both of which are mandatory at non-university levels. In these communities, education is undertaken in both co-official languages, plus in one or two foreign languages, when CLIL comes into force.

In the case of bilingual communities, the support granted to regional languages since the 1980s through the mainstream education systems as medium of instruction has had a double influence on education. On the one hand, the expertise gathered after years of practice in bilingual communities has provided an excellent example for the design and implementation of programmes in monolingual communities. This know-how has allowed different regions across the country to transfer their experience and by doing so, monolingual communities have been able to keep pace with bilingual communities. On the other hand, in bilingual communities CLIL has evolved as the best approach to incorporate foreign languages in a system where already two languages need to be accommodated in the curriculum. Moving from regional to foreign languages has proved to be a natural way to generalise the use of more than one language as medium of instruction. Therefore, increasing priority has been given to CLIL as the best way to foster multilingualism and language diversity, one of the aims of European policies in the last decade.

Promoting linguistic diversity means actively encouraging the teaching and learning of the widest possible range of languages in our schools, universities, adult education centres and enterprises. Taken as a whole, the range on offer should include the smaller European languages as well as all the larger ones, regional, minority and migrant languages as well as those with 'national' status, and the languages of our major trading partners throughout the world (An Action Plan 2003:9).<sup>1</sup>

This is one of the reasons why support for CLIL has witnessed such a dramatic increase in the last years in Spain. CLIL is consolidating as a trend in the autonomous education systems, which are rapidly attempting to conform to the new demands of our globalised society. However, although the variety of CLIL-type provision models has increased over the last decade, not all the autonomous regions have implemented the programme in the same way. For example, the Basque Country (see Ball and Lindsay; and Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe, both in this volume), Catalonia (see Escobar; Navés and Victori; Pérez and Juan-Garau; all in this volume), the Valencian community (see Fortanet, this volume) or Galicia (see Xan Isidro, this volume) are all bilingual communities fostering multilingualism, but following different approaches and models. In Madrid (see Halbach; Llinares and Dafouz; both in this volume) or the Balearic Islands (see Pérez and Juan-Garau, this volume) on the other hand, the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports and the British Council have signed the ‘MEC/ British Council Agreement’, to implement *the Bilingual and Bicultural Project*. This project aims at raising English language levels of children in state schools by following an official bilingual and bicultural curriculum. Other regions such as Andalusia (see Lorenzo; and Salaberri, both in this volume) are implementing *the Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo*, while in La Rioja (see Fernández, this volume) several policy lines such as *Proyectos de Innovación Lingüística en Centros* (School Language Innovation Projects) and Bilingual Sections are being set up by the regional ministry of the community of La Rioja. Last but not least, the Extremaduran Educational Authority (*Consejería de Educación. Dirección de Calidad y Equidad Educativa*) is promoting the so-called *Proyectos de Sección Bilingüe* (Bilingual Sections Projects) in order to set up CLIL experiences in Primary and Secondary schools (see Alejo and Piquer, this volume).

All these large-scale programmes mentioned above have been accompanied by teacher training schemes to provide teachers with the necessary linguistic and methodological skills to implement CLIL, a major challenge for both central and regional boards of education. These schemes include language and methodology courses in Spain and periods of study abroad. They are usually funded both by the central and regional governments to give teaching professionals the necessary linguistic and methodological skills to improve communicative competence and methodological issues. But again, situations vary greatly in the different communities. In those communities where immersion programmes in the minority language have had a long tradition, such as the Basque Country or Catalonia, CLIL teachers have been able to transfer the methodological

procedures gathered in sound immersion programmes, stepping from regional to foreign languages. In other communities, the teaching curve both for teachers and administrators has been steep, and different methodological procedures have been implemented across these autonomous communities.

This volume aims to provide a coherent account of these two dimensions of CLIL in Spain, where content-based instruction is firmly entrenching itself as a preferred educational approach across the country, but where different models and scenarios are found depending on the community in hand. The volume is divided into two main parts: Part 1 describes how CLIL is being implemented in different monolingual and bilingual communities in Spain, focusing on the results obtained in the different contexts under analysis. The second part will be devoted to one of the key issues of CLIL mentioned above, namely the teacher training programmes designed to cater for this new reality.

The first part, *Implementation and Results of CLIL in Spain*, is devoted to theoretical and implementation issues related to CLIL in Spain and consists of 7 chapters.

Chapter 1, *On drafting language policies from scratch: from bilingual teaching to communicative first language education*, by Francisco Lorenzo, works on a number of facts pertaining to language change and language planning in Andalusia. It highlights the *Plan to Promote Plurilingualism* (Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo), which in 2006 earned the European Language Label award for its contribution to multilingualism. The Plan comprises 72 actions and has developed a CLIL school network of over 400 institutions, becoming the cornerstone of new language policies. The last part of the chapter reports on new aims put forward by the administration concerning a revision of L1 educational policies after their success in bilingual implementation.

Chapter 2, *CLIL in a bilingual community: The Basque Autonomous Community*, by Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe and David Lasagabaster, focuses on the CLIL experiences implemented in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC) both in the private and public sectors. Similarly to other bilingual communities, immersion programmes have helped to pave the way to the CLIL approach and this has led to the blossoming of CLIL programmes in the last few years. After reviewing how CLIL has been put into practice in different schools, empirical results are provided, encompassing both linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes. These results show that CLIL has a positive impact on different aspects, such as the four

language skills, communicative competence, motivation or language attitudes.

In the next chapter, *CLIL in Catalonia: An overview of research studies*, Teresa Navés and Mia Victori provide a description of CLIL courses in both public and private Catalan schools from primary to tertiary education. The authors critically examine the research studies on CLIL that have been conducted in Catalonia and the recent empirical research on CLIL conducted by the Catalan research group GRAL (Catalan acronym for Research Group on Language Acquisition) which suggests the benefits of CLIL over non-CLIL classes, in line with previous research studies in immersion, bilingual education, content-based and CLIL contexts. On the basis of these analyses, the chapter concludes with suggestions for the implementation of CLIL programmes and further research on CLIL in Catalonia.

In Chapter 5, *To CLIL or not to CLIL? From bilingualism to multilingualism in Catalan/Spanish communities in Spain*, Carmen Pérez Vidal and Maria Juan-Garau focus on the cultural, pedagogical and sociolinguistic impact of CLIL approaches to education in communities where the Catalan language is co-official, namely Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, and the Valencian Community. In the last decade, the three autonomous communities have been developing multilingual policies, where, despite the differences in the strands offered, important similarities appear: the combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches to the implementation of programmes and the emphasis on heavily funded teacher education schemes. Although most of CLIL programmes emphasise the importance of innovation in the school system, and innovation has often been geared by bottom-up initiatives, the results of European reports on Spain's performance with languages in different domains appear to suggest that top-down foreign-language multilingual policies should also be established.

In his contribution, *An insight into Galician CLIL: Provision and results*, Xabier San Isidro describes the revitalisation of foreign language learning by the introduction of CLIL in Galicia, a region in the north-western region of Spain, a bilingual (Spanish/Galician) community placed in a Spanish-Portuguese intercultural enclave. With this context in mind, San Isidro analyses the actions carried out by the Galician Administration aiming at improving foreign language skills of teachers and students, focusing on CLIL implementation and all parallel courses of action: immersion programmes, creation of a teacher network and teacher-training programmes mixing in-service training, immersion and materials design.

He further analyses the results of the 2009 general objective testing comparing CLIL and non-CLIL students.

In the following chapter, *First steps of CLIL in a Spanish monolingual community: The case of La Rioja*, Almudena Fernández describes the policy lines set by the regional ministry of the community of La Rioja to enhance foreign language learning in this Spanish monolingual region, such as the early introduction of English as a foreign language in the second cycle of infant education, specific official language schools programmes addressing secondary school learners, or immersion-based stays abroad by 6<sup>th</sup> primary school learners, among others. Special attention is paid to the development of two projects: PILC, or *Proyectos de Innovación Lingüística en Centros* (School Language Innovation Projects) and Bilingual Sections.

In the final chapter of Part 1, *Content and Language Integrated Programmes in the Madrid region: Overview and research findings*, Ana Llinares and Emma Dafouz offer an overview of the main CLIL/Bilingual projects that are being officially implemented in the Madrid Autonomous Community. In Madrid, in contrast to other bilingual regions such as Catalonia or the Basque Country, the teaching of content through a foreign language (hereinafter CLIL) represents a relatively recent teaching-learning phenomenon, specifically as far as the state school system is concerned. However, when compared to other CLIL programmes in Spain and abroad there are two features that make CLIL teaching in Madrid clearly distinctive. First, its large dimension, with over 300 public schools (primary and secondary) offering a vast number of subjects through English as a foreign language. Secondly, its fast implementation rate, especially in the case of the bilingual project, with more than 250 new institutions running the programme only in the last five years. The chapter also presents research on the implementation of the programme, the positive outcomes as well as the challenges that CLIL currently faces.

Part 2: *Teacher Training* assembles 6 chapters that describe teacher-training programmes and experiences across the autonomous communities of Spain.

Chapter 9, *Teacher training programmes for CLIL in Andalusia*, by Sagrario Salaberri provides an analysis of the teacher training programmes implemented in Andalusia since bilingual programmes of English, French and German started in primary and secondary school levels. The actions undertaken by the "Consejería de Educación de la Junta de Andalucía" in order to update and upgrade the linguistic and methodological skills of the teachers involved in bilingual programmes are thoroughly described

throughout time and the main measures adopted in relation to teacher training are summarised.

In chapter 10, *Teacher training for CLIL in the Basque Country: the case of the Ikastolas – in search of parameters*, Philip Ball and Diana Lindsay describe the CLIL programme developed since 1991 by the *Ikastola* network (*Ikastolen elkartea*) for more than 70 schools in its multilingual project *Eleanitz*, although many of the inherent features reflect teacher-training issues common to other projects in the Basque Country and other communities in Spain and further afield. The chapter describes the training model developed - one that uses didactic materials as a catalyst to instigate change and development. These materials are supported by seminars, reflective meetings in schools, observation of teachers, feedback, language support courses for subject teachers and an assortment of external courses, meetings and resources.

Chapter 11. *Pre-service CLIL teacher-education in Catalonia. Expert and novice practitioners teaching and thinking together*, by Cristina Escobar reports on the main findings of a collaboration project between the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and the Universitat de Lleida for the development and piloting of a specific constituent specialised in CLIL teaching techniques. The chapter presents the final outcome of this process: a CLIL Component (CLILC), whose approach combines responsive teacher-education strategies based on three basic principles (a) the promotion of cyclical reflection in and on action in CLIL classrooms; (b) the collaboration among teachers with different profiles; and (c) the use of Empowering techniques to multi-area (language and content specialists) and multi-level (novice and expert teachers) collaboration.

The following chapter, *CLIL teacher training in Extremadura: A needs analysis perspective* by Rafael Alejo and Ana Piquer, examines the training of CLIL teachers in Extremadura, a region which opted for the implementation of this type of instruction in the academic year 2003-04. After presenting a general overview of the situation in Extremadura, the authors focus on the most important issues related to CLIL training from an institutional perspective by analyzing current regulations for eligibility (both for teachers and programmes) and the existing training programmes provided by educational authorities. Finally, they present a study of CLIL training in a group of selected schools by applying the Needs Analysis framework. As a starting point, they identify the current needs of CLIL teachers (*Present Situation Analysis*) paying attention to their profile (*participant*), their area of specialisation (*purposive domain*), the social and physical context (*setting*), the type teacher-student interaction

(*interaction*) and the resources used in the classroom (*mode*). Then this analysis is compared with their perceived training needs.

The next contribution, *From the classroom to university and back: teacher training for CLIL at the Universidad de Alcalá*, by Ana Halbach, explains the origin and the structure of a specialized training programme in bilingual teaching undertaken at the Universidad de Alcalá, that includes a specialization track in CLIL. Following the implementation in 2004 of a large-scale bilingual programme in primary schools in the Madrid area, a team of teachers and researchers at the Universidad de Alcalá (Madrid) set up a research project to find out how EFL teachers with little prior training managed to put this new teaching approach into practice. The team's effort to support teachers culminated in the creation of a Master's programme in teaching English as a foreign language. The structure and contents of this post-graduate training programme are a direct result of research carried out by the team in bilingual classrooms, and are meant to feed back precisely into this same context: bilingual classrooms.

Chapter 14, *Training CLIL teachers at university level*, by Inmaculada Fortanet describes some teacher training courses carried out at the Universitat Jaume I de Castelló, in the Comunitat Valenciana, that have been successfully implemented during the last five years. The chapter presents the previous research on classroom academic discourse, the needs analysis, and the continuous assessment which have been essential to design the appropriate course syllabi, as well as to implement the eventual modifications to adapt them to the changing needs of the discipline lecturers participating in these courses.

In the last chapter of the volume, *Ways forward in CLIL: provision issues and future planning*, David Lasagabaster and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe round up the volume by providing some conclusions and suggestions for the implementation of CLIL, teacher training guidelines and further research in this area. Although it may be too early to make definitive statements about the impact of CLIL across the country, research indicators coming from different communities point to the beneficial effects of CLIL as an efficient educational approach across the curriculum.

The book is addressed to professionals, researchers, scholars and students interested in the field of bilingual and multilingual education and specifically to those interested in the CLIL approach. It will also be of interest to language teachers, teacher trainers, language planners, and all those involved in education departments.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> An Action Plan (2003) *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004–2006*. COM(2003) 449 final, Brussels, 25.07.2003. Online version: [http://ec.europa.eu/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act\\_lang\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act_lang_en.pdf), accessed Apr 14, 2008.

## Acknowledgements

The editors wish to acknowledge the funding by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation through grant HUM 2006-09775-C02-01/FILO and by the Basque Government through grant IT-202-07.

Last but not least, we would also like to wholeheartedly thank all the contributors for their interest and willingness to participate in this volume and for their thoughtful contributions.



**PART I:**  
**IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS**  
**OF CLIL IN SPAIN**

# CHAPTER ONE

## CLIL IN ANDALUSIA

FRANCISCO LORENZO

### **Introduction**

This chapter will work on a number of assumptions and facts pertaining to language change and language planning in Andalusia with the development of a CLIL school network of over 400 institutions. The paper will cover three distinctive areas: a) the language policy move underway in the region spurred by European language policies since 2002 b) the resulting swift transition from monolingualism to multilingualism in education and c) the landslide effect from L2 to L1 education policies that CLIL has brought about.

The first and second sections will show the highlights of the Plan to Promote Plurilingualism, a document issued by the Consejería de Educación that became the cornerstone of new language policies. The *Plan*, comprising 72 actions, earned the European Language Label award in 2006 for its contribution to multilingualism, for closely abiding to European language policies and for signalling a move from covert to overt language policies.

The third and fourth sections will briefly report on new aims put forward by the administration concerning a revision of L1 educational policy after their apparent successes in bilingual implementation. This time the move will be from CLIL to CIL, i.e. from Content and Language Integrated (second language) Learning to CIL (a new form of first language education based on genres rather than sentential linguistic items).

### **Local policies from the European perspective**

Within multilingual Europe, Spain provides a particularly interesting case – as what appears from outside to be a linguistically diverse country due to the influence of Basque and Catalan, is actually monolingual in most areas (Cenoz and Jessner 2000; Turrell 2001). This is perfectly

exemplified by Andalusia, an eight million strong region, more populous than any other autonomous community within Spain, and similar in size to other areas that have attracted the interest of language planning (Estonia, Greece, Wales, The Netherlands, Austria etc.). In contrast with Catalonia and the Basque Country, Andalusia is characterised by a monoglot mentality. Spanish has traditionally been the first and often sole language for virtually all the autochthonous population.

Of late, however, a series of circumstances – including immigration, tourism, North American year-abroad programmes, Erasmus mobility schemes, new communities of Europeans purchasing second residences on the coast and making the region a continental Florida – among other factors related to globalization, have resulted in a new language scenario with different languages and a revised view of multiculturalism, a notion that political rhetoric claims to be in the historical make up of the region, as pointed out in the recently-passed Andalusian *Magna Carta*:

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

Although the cultural reasons are influential, they represent only one minor force behind the launching of mostly instrumental language policies. In an attempt to strengthen the region's position within the learning society, authorities have begun to admit that efficient language teaching may be cost-effective in the long run. The fact that Spain finds itself in the penultimate position in the ranking of EU countries in terms of second language knowledge, a figure offered by the latest demolinguistic reports of the continent (Council of Europe 2005; Grin 2002), has wounded the credibility of the educational system and was seen as a real threat to future growth and development. As a result, authorities have started to focus on the promotion of L2 competences as vital for modernization and prosperity; a rationale that has already fostered aggressive and successful language planning and educational policies in other regions both within and beyond the European borders, such as Finland (Marsh 2002) or Singapore (Wee 2005). The ideal envisaged, in line with the underpinnings of Europeism, is to make students move beyond national characters and incorporate a *persona* who interprets language diversity as no threat to internal cohesion. European social

identity theories are at the backdrop of this attempt in that they foster a post-modern identity characterised by tolerance of Otherness, a shift in collective attitudes and behaviours which is deemed highly desirable in societies with frequent individual and group mobility (Sorensen 2002:25; Bloomaert 2005).

Once persuaded that a shift to a *polyglot mentality* –implying fairly major upheavals for education– was desirable, an official and powerful discourse was necessary; one so solid that few in the political arena would dare question it. European language policies came to the support of language planners and in fact when the emerging language policies were embodied as a document and this was discussed in Regional Parliament and adopted as official policy, all sectors showed that their abiding to European strategies in language planning was beyond ideological stances and that consequently, and fortuitously, it was not going to be an issue of political confrontation.

### **Language Policy-Making at a glance**

On April 25th 2005, the Andalusian Governor for Education presented a 150 page document, the *Plan de Fomento de Plurilingüismo* (henceforth the Plan) (Junta de Andalucía, 2004), to the members of the Regional Parliament. Her accompanying speech placed great emphasis on the fact that the Plan represents the first ever concerted political attempt to develop “a language policy for Andalusian society”. Aside from anything else, the Plan represents a turning point in state language policies from an economic perspective: the sum of 141 million euros was earmarked for investment in human and technical resources, teacher training, mobility and the innovation of curricula design. Europe did not only provide the language ideology, it also partly provided the money through a sizeable share of the so called “European funds”. Europe was clearly present in the Governor’s introductory speech:

With the Plan that we are presenting today, our linguistic educational policies are in total accordance with the most recent directives of the European Union and are in line with those of the European countries who are most advanced in these matters (Parlamento de Andalucía, 2005:2354).

The resources of the Plan speak of the earnestness of the measure: a network of 400 bilingual Primary and Secondary schools were created over the four year period; the hiring of some 600 teaching assistants that – at teachers’ requests – were native; 50 permanent centres to be established over the entire region whose task will be to monitor and enhance teachers’

language competences; 50,000 teachers to take in-service training in bilingual education and 30,000 students to take part in European mobility programmes over three years.

The Plan put forward an important number of varied policies and schemes. However, the one at its core was the bilingual network devised and the necessary measures around it: provision of native teachers, assessment of results and mobility. As far as native teacher provision goes, the plan fulfilled an ambition that teachers had had for a long time, not only in this context. The afore-mentioned Eurobarometer 54 European and Languages, rated “talking to a native speaker” second only to “visiting the actual country”, who was unsurprisingly first. Native teachers brought not only the language but two other effects: the possibility for students to mould their learning around native models, with the knock-on effect that authenticity always brings to motivation in the classroom and secondly, the chance for teachers to put their English into practice and improve their levels, something that content teachers highly praised. Also, assistants proved to be a very useful resource for the production of teaching materials, one of the most time consuming tasks for teachers, aggravated by the lack of published textbooks for bilingual schools.

Assessment plans incorporate the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). From the perspective of the Plan, the value of the CEFR is likely to be two-fold: on the one hand, providing a more manageable, compartmentalised description of skills development (competences); on the other, bringing consensual external evaluation criteria into the classroom. It is worth mentioning in this regard the Plan’s requirement that teachers in all the *Escuelas Oficiales de Idiomas* (an expanded network of state-funded language centres- are given CEFR training.

It was thought convenient to extend classroom language learning with mobility programmes, a measure that was a real bonus to participants in school plans. Mobility programmes were set up both for teachers and students. EU programmes such as Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, Comenius, Grundtvig and Minerva were exploited to their full potential to develop teacher training schemes, to facilitate periods of overseas immersion for teachers, to increase student exchanges and work experience opportunities, to promote school-twinning initiatives, to support curricula development and to expand the possibilities for adult education and lifelong learning.

However, as it can be seen all these programmes only made full sense in the wider contexts of the bilingual school network. Bilingual schools adopted a medium exposure Content and Language Integrated Programme and introduced the teaching of certain academic subjects in their chosen

'other' languages: French, German and more than anything else, English. The programme was bold in its embracing of bilingualism, since up to forty per cent of the school curriculum could be taught in the second language. This measure had, in the opinion of many, this author included, its risks since there was no previous formal assessment of content learning in an L2 and real risks existed of loss of content learning. In hindsight, however, this fear has proved to be unjustified. In the evaluation survey commented on below, teachers never mentioned students making less headway due to using L2 as a medium. When pressed for an answer, they almost unanimously said that they were not aware of that happening, although some mentioned having to slow their pace at times especially when content was complex or academic information was too new.

### **Outcomes and results of language policy**

The huge investment, unprecedented in the region, called for a reflection on policies and measures undertaken. This came in the form of language assessment and a formal evaluation of the bilingual centres, a task commissioned to this author and his colleagues who were gathering data for a whole school year around the entire bilingual school network.

The work of the nine-researcher team has produced two kinds of outcomes: a two-hundred page report meant as an internal memo to inform the Administration on results, progress and pitfalls and, on the other hand, two academic studies focusing on different aspects: the operational and methodological foundations of the study (Casal and Moore, 2009) and a summary of the sociological significance of the study (Lorenzo and Moore, 2009).

In a different vein, the study attracted the interest of the mass media which requested copies of the study and gave considerable coverage to its contents with an emphasis on the depth of the study. The national newspaper *El País* published the news item under the headline: *Las entrañas de los centros bilingües (The hard core of bilingual schools)* (*El País*, 11-12-2008: see reference section for main results as reported in the press). See also Lorenzo, Casal and Moore (2009) for a comprehensive review of the program results.

### **From L2 innovation to rethinking the education of the mother tongue**

Bilingual sections proved to be a successful move in education, one that brought a new spirit to state education and rendered the whole system

a dynamic one able to move with the new winds of multilingual Europe. Decision makers felt proud of meeting the new demands from the general public who wanted their children to be able to enjoy the benefits of the multilingual schools. For the first time, the public image of education was not business as usual: shortage of vacancies for students who had to leave their neighbourhoods to attend to schools far from home, insufficient substitute teachers to cover leaves of absence, and suchlike. Multilingualism provided an example as to how the public sector could be creative, dynamic and alert to new social needs.

This all happened to be at the same time that education found itself in the spotlight with the publication of PISA results. Much like in other communities, but at a much lower level than other European countries, results in mother tongue language competence, were very low and levels remained stagnant if not worse, a situation that continues. It was well known that language education was poor, as has always happened in many other countries where functional illiteracy has been an issue, one difficult to eradicate that calls for in depth intervention in methodology, teacher training and materials (see for a recent state of affairs regarding literacy in a number of countries, Whitaker and McCabe, 2007).

On the advice of the European Parliament and their new guidelines for life-long language learning (Council of Europe, 2005 ), a turn was necessary in the teaching of languages, mother tongue included; where true communicative competence was put first. In the Andalusian tradition, as in the rest of Spain, communication in the mother tongue was taken for granted. The school communities, and teachers more than anybody else, fantasised with the idea that students were already competent in the use of mother tongue, even at the most formal levels and linguistic domains. PISA came as a shock when it opened everybody's eyes to the truth that students could recite the typology of subordinations or other rules of linguistics – rote-learned – but were unable, for instance, to compose a well structured paragraph. Crudely put, language education was producing illiterate philologists, a reflection made by one of the leading novelists and secondary school teachers Luis Landero, an influential voice in national highbrow circles.

In search for a solution to the openly bad results, decision makers knew too well that the PISA tide would return and results would hit the headlines again and again. As a result, a number of initiatives were devised based on the new trends of foreign language education. After all, communicativeness was a blueprint of foreign language education and if CLIL was working for second languages, something alike could well happen for mother tongue education. It was this train of thought that

inspired the CIL document (Junta de Andalucía: 2008). CIL stands for *Curriculum Integrado de las Lenguas* (integrated language curriculum) and the overall point was to turn upside down the bases of mother tongue education by making it communicative in such a way that students were competent in text production by the end of secondary school. Easier said than done, this meant a whole rethinking of language education, a process that had started long ago in more advanced countries – Britain and Australia to mention just a few in the English tradition – but was new to many countries with a linguistic tradition firmly ingrained in structuralism. The making of the *Curriculum Integrado de Lenguas* or *CIL document* was meant to be the first step in the change planned. The resulting work commissioned fifteen university staff and leading secondary school teachers working together for one whole year, a team that this author was honoured to be part of, and produced a nine hundred page document, freely available online, with the theoretical basis and sample lessons for the change envisaged. (Junta de Andalucía, 2008).

The first section includes a theoretical presentation of the new approach. It was intended for the document to be both based on solid theory and user-friendly to teachers on the classroom battlefield who should think of the document as a companion with clues and practical aid for their day-to-day situations. For this reason it followed a Q & A format with practical questions that teachers had and answers that were clear and to the point, promptly followed by a longer more academic explanation that those with less interest in the conceptual underpinnings could easily skip.

For lack of space, only the four key aspects which have been considered ground-breaking in the new orientation of mother tongue education will be presented.

- *Genre-based approach*: The new approach had to tie in with a new language theory, for it is known that if methods are to be changed, teachers have to reconsider the very conceptual basis. Along the lines of other renovation movements in Europe and elsewhere, the decision that systemic functional linguistics should illuminate the new approach was adopted (see Lorenzo, in press for a closer consideration of this). Functional Linguistics (Halliday and Hasan, 1989), Sociology of Language (Bernstein, 1971) and genre-based approaches to language learning as in The Sydney School models (Martin and Rose, 2003) were followed. The final aim was to design language school programmes that resulted in the production of a wide variety of texts with social and academic value (minutes, announcements, narratives,

memos, complaints forms, literary reviews, power point presentations and suchlike).

- *Task-based methods*: A new methodology, following task based principles, was recommended. This was not new to L2 teaching, but a recommendation to use a model for language learning that represents the utmost version of communicativeness for mother language learning came as a shock to erstwhile teachers of *Lengua Española* who had cut their teeth in formalism. A task based approach meant a new understanding of language items and a new presence of language in the classroom definitely oriented to enabling students for language use (see Lorenzo, 2007, 2008 for the application of task-based methodology to bilingual sections).

- *Centrality of texts*: A feeling that we all had about language education is that it was devoid of texts. A formalist approach inevitably meant that texts were scarce and always marginal in the language syllabus. This document firmly stood by the centrality of texts, the only possible way for language to be totally meaningful, and going beyond the sentence, a language unit without social value or meaning. Authors indulged in the selection of literary, authentic, commercial and otherwise meaningful texts that could draw students' attention and get them involved in language analysis and processing.

- *Continuous assessment*: As the new ways followed a process model of textual use, assessment had to be process inspired too. As opposed to the metalinguistic knowledge that was normally required from students, the document proposed a continuous assessment technique that resulted in the texts in L1 and L2 enclosed in a Language Dossier. Mother tongue education was hence linked to the *European Language Portfolio*.

It was along these lines that the commission set about developing materials that swirled around the principles above. This made up the fourth and bulkiest part of the CIL document. German, French, English and Spanish lessons were put together sharing topics, ends and similar text typologies, the linguistic backbone of the lesson plans used. Even if it is only for its availability and the originality of the whole venture – secondary school teachers, university staff and administration representatives working together – readers may want to pay a visit to the

online document. For free access to the document, readers can follow the link in the reference section (Junta de Andalucía, 2008).

## Conclusion

Language Education is in a turmoil as a result of globalization and demands for language competence from a language in use perspective. It remains to be seen how the CLIL and CIL initiatives will work in the long term and whether they erode the formalist tradition of languages which has arguably outlived its usefulness. The new State Law of Education (LOE) brings new winds and new concepts such as Language Across the Curriculum that seems to be well seated in the law. It remains to be seen whether new legislation will result in genuine change. CLIL and CIL seem to share the same response: that when content areas overflow their traditional limits and are made more meaningful, results can be spectacular.

## Works cited

- Bernstein, B. (1971) *Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. Routledge. London.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Casal, S. and Moore, P. (2009) The Andalusian Bilingual Sections Scheme: Evaluation and Consultancy. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1. Available online at:  
<http://www.icrj.eu/index.php?vol=12&page=743>.
- Cenoz, J. and Jessner, U. (eds.) (2000) *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Council of Europe (2005) *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities
- Council of Europe (2005) Recomendaciones del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre las competencias clave para el aprendizaje permanente: online document:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/keyrec\\_es.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/keyrec_es.pdf).
- El País: Las entrañas de los centros bilingües. Available online at:  
[http://www.elpais.com/articulo/andalucia/entranas/centros/bilingues/elpepiespand/20081211elpand\\_12/Tes/](http://www.elpais.com/articulo/andalucia/entranas/centros/bilingues/elpepiespand/20081211elpand_12/Tes/).
- Grin, F. (2002) *Using Language Economics and Education. Economics in Language Education Policy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. (1989) *Language, Context and Text: a Social Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Junta de Andalucía (2004) *Plan de Fomento de Plurilingüismo*. Sevilla: Consejería de Educación. Online document at: <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/averroes/plurilinguismo/plan.pdf>.
- Junta de Andalucía: (2008) *Curriculum Integrado de las Lenguas*. Sevilla. Consejería de Educación. Online document at: <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/averroes/impe/web/contenido?pag=/contenidos/B/InnovacionEInvestigacion/ProyectosInnovadores/Plurilinguismo/Seccion/CVIntegrado/cil>.
- Lorenzo, F. (2007) An analytical framework of language integration in L2 content-based courses, *Language and Education*, 22.
- (2008) Instructional discourse in bilingual settings. An empirical study of linguistic adjustments in CLIL, *Language Learning Journal*, 36, 21-35.
- (in review) Lingüística de la comunicación, desarrollo curricular y práctica social.
- Lorenzo, F. and Moore, P. (2009) European language policies in monolingual Southern Europe: implementation and outcomes. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 1, 121-137..
- Lorenzo, F. Casal, S. y Moore, P. (2009): The Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning in European Education: Key Findings from the Andalusian Bilingual Sections Evaluation Project, *Applied Linguistics*, doi:10.1093/applin/amp041
- Marsh, David. (2002) *Content and Language Integrated Learning: The European Dimension*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä Press.
- Martin, J. R. and Rose, D. (2003) *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.
- Parlamento de Andalucía (2005) *Presentación del Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo* Diario de Sesiones. Online document at: <http://www.parlamentodeandalucia.es/webdinamica/portal-web-parlamento/pdf.do?tipodoc=diario&id=13983>.
- Parlamento de Andalucía (2006) *Estatuto de Autonomía de Andalucía*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- Sorensen, G. (2002) National Philology in a globalized world. In H. L. Hansen (ed.) *Changing Philologies* (pp. 25-33) Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Turrell, T. (2001) (ed.) *Multilingualism in Spain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Wee, L. (2005) Language policy and nationalist ideology: Statal narratives in Singapore. *Multilingua*, 24, 3, 159-183.
- Whittaker, R., McCabe, A. and O'Donnell, M. (2006) *Language and Literacy: Functional Approaches*. London: Continuum.

## CHAPTER TWO

# CLIL IN A BILINGUAL COMMUNITY: THE BASQUE AUTONOMOUS COMMUNITY

YOLANDA RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ  
AND DAVID LASAGABASTER

### **Introduction**

This chapter will focus on the CLIL experiences implemented in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC) both in the private and public sectors. The BAC is a bilingual community in which both Basque and Spanish are official languages and as such they are taught at school from the age of four and throughout compulsory education. This implies that English represents the L3 for Basque students. Similarly to other Spanish bilingual communities, immersion programmes have helped to pave the way to the CLIL approach and this has led to the blossoming of CLIL programmes in the last few years, although they are only implemented in some but not all Basque schools.

### **CLIL provision in the BAC**

In the Basque educational system there are three linguistic models available: model A, model B and model D. In model A Spanish is the main language of instruction and the Basque language is taught only as a subject, around 4 hours per week. In model B the subjects are given either in Spanish or in Basque, approximately 50% in each language. In model D all the subjects are taught in Basque, and Spanish is taught as a language subject for 3 or 4 hours per week. These models were implemented after *the Basic Law for the Normalisation of the Use of Basque* was passed in 1982. This law was supposed to guarantee the competence of the Basque language at the end of compulsory education, although it was not until