

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

Content and Language Integrated Learning: A Duoethnographic Study about CLIL Pre-Service Teacher Education in Argentina and Spain

RELC Journal

1–14

© The Author(s) 2020


Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0033688220930442

journals.sagepub.com/home/rel



Darío Luis Banegas 
University of Strathclyde, UK

Marta del Pozo Beamud
University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Abstract

Content and language integrated learning is a dual-focused approach that promotes the learning of curricular content in tandem with an additional language, usually English. Since its inception in the 1990s in Europe, CLIL provision has mushroomed not only in Europe but also in other contexts such as Latin America given its purported benefits in terms of motivation, cognitive skills development, and language awareness. However, little is known about how future teachers, i.e. pre-service teachers, are prepared to teach through CLIL. The aim of this paper is to address this gap by describing how two CLIL teachers educators, based in Argentina and Spain, offer CLIL courses. Through duoethnography, the authors show how they plan and implement CLIL input and what lessons they have learnt drawing on reflective practice in interaction. Analysis of their interaction illustrates how CLIL is conceived and

operationalised and what CLIL competences are prioritised in their practices. Pedagogical implications are included.

Keywords: CLIL; teacher education; pre-service; duoethnography; lesson planning

Introduction

The field of English language teacher education (ELTE) continues growing as the number of learners rises across contexts and levels of education (Walsh and Mann, 2020). With this growth, educational systems around the world are under constant pressure to prepare future teachers who can offer context-responsive pedagogies informed by different language learning approaches. One approach which is finding traction across settings is content and language integrated learning (CLIL).

CLIL research has paid particular attention to parents, learners, and teachers' perceptions of CLIL (e.g. McDougald, 2015; Pérez Cañado, 2016), professional development opportunities for CLIL with in-service teachers (AUTHOR 2020), and the subjective wellbeing of CLIL teachers (Hofstadler, Babic, Lämmerer, Mercer and Oberdorfer, 2020). Nonetheless, there is a paucity of studies which examine CLIL teacher education with future teachers. In other words, little is known about how pre-service ELTE programmes prepare future teachers to implement CLIL in different contexts (Guo, Tao, and Gao, 2019).

The aim of this duoethnography-based study is to examine how two teacher-educators from two different settings (an ELTE programme in Argentina and an ELTE programme in Spain) plan and deliver grounding on CLIL to future teachers of English as a foreign language according to different context-responsive needs. While in the Argentinian

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

programme, future teachers approach CLIL as a language teaching approach (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010), in the Spanish programme, CLIL is directed at the teaching of school subjects through English, that is to say, CLIL as an educational/content-driven approach (Cenoz, 2015).

In the sections below, we first review the recent literature on CLIL teacher education. We then describe the research methodology (duoethnography) and present the findings. Last, we discuss such findings under the light of the literature and put forward conclusions and implications that may resonate with other contexts.

CLIL and CLIL teacher education

It may suffice to define CLIL an approach with the dual purpose of teaching learners curriculum content and a second language, usually English, in an integrated manner (Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010; Coyle and Meyer, 2020; Díaz Pérez, Fields, and Marsh, 2018; Nikula, Dafouz, Moore, and Smit, 2016). For example, in practice this may entail enabling learners to acquire content such as geography together with a second language (English). As CLIL spreads around the world, experts report on CLIL benefits in terms of motivation, autonomy, linguistic development, intercultural awareness, and thinking skills (AUTHOR AND COLLABORATOR in press; Martínez Agudo, 2019). Such benefits, alongside challenges, have been investigated with young learners (e.g. Fazzi and Lasagabaster, 2020; Pérez Cañado, 2018) and higher education students (e.g. Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014; Vega and Moscoso, 2019).

As rightly discussed in Pérez Cañado (2018), successful CLIL provision depends on teacher preparation not only in relation to pedagogy but also to professional identity (Morton,

2019). Even when teachers find CLIL motivating and rewarding (e.g. Fernández and Halbach, 2010; Infante, Benvenuto and Lastrucci, 2009), experienced and novice teachers assert that careful training is needed in order that they can respond to CLIL challenges with context-sensitive pedagogical decisions. Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff and Frigols (2012) suggest that CLIL teachers may be expected to develop the following competences to succeed in CLIL implementation: personal reflection, CLIL fundamentals, content and language awareness, methodology and assessment, research and evaluation, learning resources and environment, classroom management and CLIL management. In this section we review recent publications on CLIL teacher education with in-service as well pre-service teachers.

Different authors have described how in-service teachers are supported in CLIL implementation. For example, in a mixed-method study carried out with teachers, teacher educators, and school coordinators across several European countries, Pérez Cañado (2014) concluded that content teachers experienced more challenges than language teachers as regards linguistic and intercultural competences alongside creating materials and managing resources. In the Catalan context, Pladevall-Ballester (2014) found that teachers consider the CLIL experience to be positive, since they have observed how the motivation of students has raised and how students learn in a meaningful way almost without realising it. However, they acknowledged that they needed support concerning lesson planning.

More recently, Lo (2020) conducted a study in Hong Kong with the aim of implementing different CLIL teacher education models based on cross-curricular collaboration among secondary school teachers. The study revealed that implementing practice-oriented, but theory-informed workshops contributed to teachers' growth in language awareness. The workshops also proved beneficial in teachers developing an identity as language educators regardless of their subject matter specialisation. The author concludes that

CLIL teachers, due to CLIL dual aim, need to develop pedagogical strategies that attend to both content and language teaching through an L2. On the issue of collaboration, Pavón, Lancaster and Callejas (2020) underline that collaboration is essential to ensure that CLIL teaching competences are deployed within and across institutions as a concerted policy for sustainable CLIL provision.

Studies contextualised in pre-service teacher education programmes have yielded similar results. In the Spanish context, authors such as Pena, Fernández, Gómez and Halbach (2005) and Pena and Porto (2008) observed that student-teachers were motivated to adopt CLIL in their future practices. Notwithstanding, they suggested that continuous support was necessary at the intersection of theoretical knowledge and implementation.

Similarly to Lo's (2020) study, student-teachers may also identify L2 proficiency and language awareness as a barrier. For example, in a case study, Escobar Urmeneta (2013) analysed a student-teacher's placement for an academic year and discovered a progressive and positive evolution thanks to different strategies such as the use of learner-convergent language, conversational strategies, and allowing the students to express themselves in their L1 (Spanish) although the student-teacher in her role as a teacher maintained the use of L2 English throughout the lesson.

In alignment with in-service teachers' concerns with lesson planning, studies with pre-service teachers have also highlighted the pivotal role that lesson planning and materials development play in shaping future CLIL teachers' situated practices. For example, in Argentina, Author 1 (2015) analysed the language-driven CLIL lesson plans developed by a cohort of student-teachers. Although the student-teachers exhibited declarative knowledge of CLIL rationale and features, they struggled with including activities that attended to both content and language. Even though these student-teachers were being trained to become

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

teachers of English, their lesson plans focused on content whereas language teaching was reduced to vocabulary teaching or recycling prior knowledge. The student-teachers also showed problems at the level of imbuing the lesson plans with opportunities for higher-order thinking skills development. However, the lesson plans were strong in displaying student-teacher-made materials.

More recently, Kao (2020) examined the effect of a CLIL module in a Taiwanese teacher education programme. Supported by lectures and seminars drawn on recent CLIL research, the student-teachers developed L2 confidence, and succeeded in designing their own teaching materials alongside authentic materials to boost learner motivation and integration of curricular content and L2 learning.

Through different models and initiatives, the studies reviewed above aim at highlighting CLIL teacher competences. Nonetheless, CLIL teachers may display declarative knowledge of such competences but fail to enact them in their situated practices particularly when they have concerns about their own content knowledge and L2 proficiency (AUTHOR 1, 2012). Such need for reassurance entails that teacher educators calibrate CLIL courses in initial teacher education in ways which are pedagogically robust and context-sensitive. With the need to understand how CLIL teacher educators address the challenge of preparing future teachers for CLIL provision in pre-service ELTE programmes, we set out the following research question: How do CLIL teacher educators understand and live the experience of designing and delivering CLIL in pre-service ELTE?

Methodology

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

In this study we adopted a duoethnographic approach to understand in interaction our individual experiences as English language teacher educators preparing future English language teachers to teach under a CLIL approach. In this section we describe the research methodology and ourselves as both participants and co-authors.

Duoethnography refers to the combination of two autoethnographic accounts where the voices of the researchers are foregrounded (Sawer and Norris, 2013). In a recent volume, Lawrence and Lowe (2020) define duoethnography as ‘a qualitative research methodology in which two researchers utilise dialogue to juxtapose their individual life histories in order to come to new understandings of the world’ (1). According to Starfield (2020), in autoethnography the primary data is the researcher’s personal experience. When two autoethnographies are combined in a dialogic script, the lived experiences are deconstructed and reflected upon as they unfold. Thus, this form of enquiry is dialogic in nature and it positions the researchers as active Others for the verbalisation and understanding of personal experiences as told in conversation. In this sense, in the field of language education, duoethnography can be viewed as joint reflective practice (Rose and Montakantiwong, 2018).

In this study dialogue itself became the primary source of data. However, our conversations were supported by personal journals and teaching artefacts collected between 2013 and 2020. In total, we had eight two-hour meetings over the course of two months. The meetings were held on a UK university campus as Author B visited Author A as part of a visiting academic scheme. The meetings were audiorecorded and orthographically transcribed for analysis and coding by topic. As Lowe and Kiczkowiak (2016) explain, we finally constructed the dialogues to illustrate three topics: (1) designing CLIL input, (2) teaching CLIL courses, and (3) reflecting on CLIL preparation.

What follows is a brief description of us as researchers and participants. Author 1 is an English language teacher educator based in the UK, but the CLIL teacher education

experiences presented in this study come from delivering CLIL courses in South America. In his case, he approached CLIL both as an educational approach (content-driven CLIL) and as a language learning approach (language-driven CLIL). At the time of engaging in this duoethnographic study, he had prepared pre-service and in-service teachers for CLIL for 11 years. In the dialogues which follow, he concentrates on CLIL preparation in pre-service English language teacher education programmes.

Author 2 is based in Spain, University of Castilla-La Mancha. The CLIL issue has always been part of her academic interests. Her doctorate and her research articles explore the relationship between CLIL and the affective variables. Likewise, she has taught a CLIL module to student-teachers dealing with both theoretical underpinnings and practical tasks.

Findings

Supported in dialogic introspection (Bukart, 2018), in the sections below we engage in heuristic reflection of our professional experience as CLIL teacher educators in Argentina and Spain, respectively. It should be mentioned that while Author 1 prepared future teachers for a language-driven CLIL approach, Author 2 mostly concentrated on CLIL from a content-driven perspective. In the (re)constructed interactions below we explore three topics: (1) designing CLIL input, (2) delivering CLIL courses, and (3) reflecting on teacher education for CLIL.

Designing CLIL input

Since our aim was to describe the cartography of CLIL teacher education at pre-service level, we engaged in lengthy conversations of how we (re)designed the course over the years as we gained experience and CLIL knowledge drawn from publications, courses, and conferences.

The first theme, designing CLIL input, reveals our attitudes towards collecting, curating, and designing how CLIL was presented to future teachers. Mirroring Lowe and Kiczkowiak's (2016) dialogic format for data presentation, we seek to display interaction alongside initial discussion:

Author 1: What have you taken into account for designing the CLIL module you lead?

Author 2: The aims of the module lead me in the design and curation of input. The module hopes to prepare teachers for content-driven CLIL. Thus, the aim is to provide them with CLIL rationale and pedagogical support for lesson planning, assessment, and good practices in CLIL. I've organised the module into seven units: CLIL in Europe, CLIL in Castilla-La Mancha, CLIL main concepts like the 4Cs, the language triptych, or the balance between linguistic and cognitive demands (Coyle et al., 2010), thinking skills in CLIL, activities and scaffolding, lesson planning, and last assessment in CLIL.

Author 1: In my case, CLIL is part of a larger module on how to teach English to teenagers. So, the aim is to help future teachers implement CLIL as a language-driven approach in the EFL lesson. The module has eight units, and the last two are about CLIL. Because of time constraints, I focus on CLIL definitions, models, lesson planning, and materials.

Author 2: As for sources of input, since I started teaching this module I've used the same bibliography like the Coyle et al. (2010) book or the Mehisto et al. (2008) volume. I've looked for updated material but the truth is that these titles offer the basic principles for CLIL understanding and practice. Because my subject is one term, I can afford to include these books together with books about CLIL in Spain,

and Castilla-La Mancha in particular such as Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010).

Author 1: In my case, I've given them the first units in the Coyle et al. (2010) book and then we do more reading and practice following the Bentley (2010) book as it has a combination of input and activities. Every year I try to include a paper about CLIL in practice in Argentina, for example AUTHOR and COLLABORATOR 2020, or AUTHOR 2017 about teacher-made materials development. In addition, I provide with multimedia input like interviews with CLIL teachers or experts or samples of CLIL lessons from different contexts. The fact that I teach the module online allows me to include more multimedia resources they can access at their own pace and time.

In the dialogue above we summarised our approaches to CLIL teaching by highlighting the aims behind the course/units of work. Whereas Author 2 is in a context where CLIL is placed on the content-driven side of the continuum, Author 1 approaches CLIL as a language-driven model. Despite these different aims and models, we coincided in offering student-teachers CLIL rationale on what we may call classic CLIL books such as Coyle et al. (2010), Mehisto et al. (2008) or Bentley (2010). In addition, we both included CLIL literature from our contexts in order to promote local knowledge flow and context-appropriate CLIL pedagogies. In this regard, we agreed that including CLIL practices drawn from our contexts allowed student-teachers to view CLIL as a possible approach in our educational landscape.

In our co-constructed description, we both seem to highlight that navigating CLIL starts with basic concepts before rapidly moving into practice with a focus on lesson planning

and materials development. Author 2 extended CLIL understanding to incorporate assessment, a topic which usually raises concerns among teachers (Aiello et al., 2017).

Teaching CLIL courses

The second theme delves into moving from designing to actual implementation of how we conceived and selected the input with the aim of preparing future teachers for CLIL. In the dialogue below we describe how we engage in planning and delivering CLIL at the level of sessions.

Author 2: Of course, one thing is the thinking about the macro aspects of teaching CLIL but then it's important to think about the micro, how we do the actual teaching, enabling future teachers to CLIL as a verb.

Author 1: Absolutely. The first unit on CLIL starts with a definition that's flexible enough to include content-driven and language-driven models: "CLIL refers to an approach which merges subject and (foreign) language development in educational contexts." (Nikula and Moore 2019: 237). With that definition in mind I give them some vignettes of CLIL classrooms and they need to identify what kind of CLIL model it might be. Then, they watch a video about different CLIL contexts and they complete a table identifying the context, learners' profile, lesson aims and teaching strategies. Finally, I ask them to read the Bentley (2010) book and start completing the activities at the end of each unit. The unit assignment is to write a reflective account of how they did and what lessons on CLIL they have learnt. I also use a forum to share personal experiences of learning which integrated L2 and content. For the following lessons and unit, I give them different language-driven CLIL

lesson plans and ask them to analyse them in terms of aims, tasks, outcomes, and then I ask them to improve one of them and write a rationale under the light of the material provided. I then focus on materials for CLIL. They read AUTHOR 2015, 2017 and they need to create their own examples of CLIL activities based on the tips provided. Finally, in groups they write a lesson plan for a given scenario.

Author 2: Because I teach face-to-face, I read the literature I mentioned before. I then use the PowerPoint slides to summarise the main concepts and ideas from key authors. After that input, the student-teachers work in groups. We tackle the issues presented in the slides with the objective of making theory something tangible for them. They are often asked to agree or disagree with statements related to CLIL as a theoretical framework and its implementation in the classroom. When potential problems arise, they are expected to provide a factible solution taking into account classroom complex realities. One of the activities carried out was planning a lesson about a topic in particular (e.g. women in history). They also work on a project to produce a CLIL didactic unit (a series of lesson plans). They brainstorm ideas using a mind map, and they develop the lesson plans, assessment, and rationale.

At this point in our interaction, the mode of teaching (Author 1 doing distance teaching and Author 2 doing face-to-face teaching) may lead to some differences in our teacher education practices. For example, Author 1 seems to include multimedia support, discussion forums, and assigning a complete book (Bentley, 2010) for the student-teachers to read and engage in testing for learning. On the other hand, Author 2 relies on visual support (PowerPoint) to provide input. However, we both seem to start with key definitions and input before moving to learning activities usually carried out in groups such as guided lesson planning or discussion. We both noted that even when input precedes practice, we do not follow the

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

traditional lecture+seminar sequence; we integrate both input, activities, and co-construction of learning in a holistic fashion regardless of whether this is achieved synchronously (Author 2) or asynchronously (Author 1).

Reflecting on teacher education for CLIL

As in Rose and Montakantiwong (2018), a final theme in our co-constructed dialogues gravitated around our reflections on teaching CLIL in pre-service teacher education. We particularly looked back on the lessons learnt, challenges, and how we sought to overcome them.

Author 2: Over these years I have learnt to make my lessons more practical since it is what they demand and what society demands as well. That is to say, instead of them learning about figures of CLIL schools in our region (which I did at the beginning), I rather spend time discussing the actual European programmes implemented in the classroom. In that way, they could try to implement such programmes in their future practice. What I find truly challenging is maintaining their intrinsic motivation due to the fact that the vast majority is solely extrinsically motivated. At the beginning, they were willing to become English teachers because of external reasons (getting a good job/salary). Thus, shared with them some academic papers in which they warn about the “dangers” of extrinsic motivation. Once the goal/ punishment/reward disappears, this kind motivation tends to vanish. However, if teaching is their passion and they do it because they genuinely love to share their knowledge with their learners (intrinsic motivation), it may guarantee quality teaching since those

teachers are mostly preoccupied about having a positive impact on children both academically and emotionally.

Author 1: In terms of lessons learnt, like you, I've increased student-teachers' experiential opportunities by reducing the reading load. I have instead increased the number of activities around selected reading so that they can profit more from them. I've also included more activities related to lesson planning and materials development so that they can see more links between practice and concepts. I've also ensured that they challenge the articles and think of their own context. Over the years the challenge has been in relation to student-teachers' lesson planning. When they plan, they take CLIL only for language revision and they find it hard for them to introduce new language other than specific vocabulary. Thus, I give them more detailed instructions about the scenario they'll be planning for. I include a specific function and structure (e.g., describing a cycle, present passive voice) they need to teach together with new content. I've also provided them with a checklist to make sure the plan has explicit and implicit opportunities for learning new specific language, language needed to solve the tasks, and spontaneous language. It's funny because they will be language teachers, but when they plan for CLIL, they focus on content and somehow ignore language. In this respect, I make them follow the sequence of prior content, prior language, new content, and new language to ensure balance. Finally, to support them, I ask them to explain how each task or stage in the lesson responds to the lesson aims they've set out so that the plan is coherent.

Our reflections illustrate our response to a demand for further practice. However, this does not mean sacrificing input. Reading input became selective, guided, and closely associated with activities such as lesson planning and materials development. Over the years, we have

both prioritised practice, yet this practice continues to be principled and informed by publications, both international and local. In her reflections, Author 2 foregrounded student-teachers' motivation as a challenge, particularly concerning their intrinsic motivation emerging from the educational process itself and vocational goals (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011). We understood that by bringing up the issue of student-teacher motivation, Author 2 considers CLIL teacher wellbeing (Hofstadler et al., 2020) a vital dimension that needs to be embedded in CLIL teacher education. In contrast, Author 1 seems more concerned with the pedagogical dimension of his practice by emphasising student-teachers' struggles with planning for a dual purpose, content and language learning, where the latter is incorporated for purposes other than recycling prior knowledge. In this respect, the challenge has been addressed by increasing guidance by means of scenarios, checklists, and frameworks for lesson organisation (Author 1 2015, 2017).

Discussion

In this duoethnography we sought to examine how we, two CLIL teacher educators based in two different international contexts, Argentina and Spain live the experience of preparing future teachers of English for CLIL given their pivotal place in CLIL success (Pérez Cañado, 2018). Setting-specific considerations such as how CLIL is implemented differently in both countries shaped and legitimised our understanding, practice and views of CLIL teacher education. In this section we discuss our co-constructed dialogic narrative around three foci: (1) CLIL as a concept, (2) CLIL as praxis, and (3) CLIL teacher competences.

Positioned as reflective teacher educators (Mann and Walsh, 2017), our interaction reveals that driven by our different, context-specific experiences and background, we conceptualise CLIL as a flexible approach which can accommodate a variety of models as

illustrated in our experiences above in line with the literature (e.g. Cenoz, 2015). This open perspective, which draws on international perceptions of CLIL (Pérez Cañado, 2016), can be materialised in the different definitions and literature we include in our practices. Despite setting-specific considerations and individual journeys, what we share is the firm belief that CLIL is an approach that can contribute to learning both curricular content and an additional language, and that through CLIL teachers can create a meaningful environment that promotes language as a meaning-making system, motivation, collaboration, and critical thinking (e.g. Author and collaborator, 2020; Coyle et al., 2010; Díaz et al., 2018).

The dialogues above demonstrate that as we design and implement CLIL, our drive is CLIL praxis, that is, the complex and fluid mutualism of practice and input. As we gained experience and reflected on our practices, in both cases, we became more selective in terms of sources of input and provided student-teachers with opportunities to profit from the input through activities that maximised learning in context. The input was drawn from both international as well as local publications with the aim of enabling the student-teachers to co-create their own context-sensitive CLIL models. In so doing, CLIL praxis challenges applicationist models in teacher education; instead our practices seek to empower future teachers to envisage CLIL as an approach they can shape to suit contextual demands and affordances. In particular, we both realised that we had an interest in supporting lesson planning and teacher-made materials as a way of enabling student-teachers to exercise their identity agency as CLIL teachers (Morton, 2019).

Last, we analysed our journey as CLIL teacher educators through the prism of CLIL teacher competences suggested in Marsh et al. (2012). Albeit being designed for Europe, the document covers a myriad of dimensions that can be cultivated across a multiplicity of settings. Upon comparison of our reflective practice with such competences, we noted that we help develop CLIL fundamentals, i.e., CLIL definitions and rationale, but only to provide

a working framework for CLIL practice. We also contribute to developing language awareness (Lo, 2020), as we emphasise language learning opportunities guided by, for example, the language triptych (Coyle et al., 2010). Concerning language awareness and the role that language has in CLIL, we increased our efforts in ensuring that CLIL lesson planning reflects the dual purpose the approach has regardless of models.

Drawing on needs detected in the literature (e.g. Kao, 2020; Pladevall-Ballester, 2014), we both have an interest in helping student-teachers develop competences for methodology (CLIL lesson planning), and assessment, particularly in Author's 2 case. However, what is prioritised in both settings is learning resources as we strive for creating opportunities that connect aims, practice, CLIL fundamentals, and lesson planning through the development of learning materials that cater for learners' needs and trajectories.

Upon scrutiny of the interactive narrative displayed above, over the years we have learnt to position our CLIL teacher education courses at the nexus teaching-informed research and research-based practices (Rose, 2019) as we have shifted towards lesson planning, materials development, and activities that allow student-teachers to create possible pedagogical responses for context-driven challenges based on actual scenarios (Morton, 2019). In so doing, we hope to make CLIL real and doable rather than focusing on the ideal. While the ideal provides a horizon, milestones, and a sense of improvement, it needs to be constructed and de-constructed in such a way that it comes doable rather than frustrating.

Conclusion

In this duoethnography we described how two CLIL teacher educators, based in two different countries, understand and implement CLIL courses to meet different contextual demands in initial English language teacher education. Duoethnography has helped us cultivate a

reflective and retrospective attitude towards our different experiences as CLIL teacher educators, and in turn, respond to the gap detected in language teacher education literature (Guo et al., 2019). We believe that the relevance of our duoethnography lies in the fact that we are set in two different countries where pre-service ELTE programmes embrace CLIL as content-driven (Spain) or language-driven (Argentina); therefore, we provide accounts which describe the ends of the CLIL continuum.

We acknowledge that the research approach utilised in this paper is not free from limitations. By definition, the paper needs to be small-scale as duoethnography, quite logically, entails only two voices and contexts. We attempted to mitigate this caveat by reflecting on the totality of our CLIL teacher education experience. A second issue may be associated with the construction of our dialogues. These were based on our journals, teaching artefacts, and recorded conversations. However, it may be inevitable to alter the original voices and meanings as we summarised the narrative through dialogues that somehow fictionalised what happened in practice. Last, given our dual identity of researchers examining their own practices as teacher educators may distorted our interpretations in retrospect.

In terms of implications, our study may encourage CLIL teacher educators to investigate their practices across settings through (auto)ethnography to put forward thick and honest descriptions of challenges, successes, and failures in CLIL research and CLIL preparation. Together with CLIL, other approaches or modules in language teacher education can also be investigated through ethnographic methods. In the case of duoethnography, a teacher educator may seek a colleague based in a different setting to share professional experiences, materials, and reflections around a common denominator such as a teaching approach, a specific content, a barrier, or an example of good practice. The difference in setting could be geographical, socio-political, educational, or epistemological among other

alternatives. These two teacher educators can keep a record of audiovisual interactions (e.g., recorded face-to-face or online conversations, audio message exchanges through an online application such as WhatsApp) or share an online document in which they construct a written dialogue in response to emergent topics they identify.

We believe that for teacher educators who do not often engage in doing research or writing for publication, duoethnography may become a reasonable and practical conduit for exploring their own professional practices. By engaging in dialogic interaction and concomitant collaboration, the flow of ideas and lessons learnt in teacher educators' journeys can be bidirectional and lead to sharing such trajectories with a wider professional community of practice. In connection to this suggestion, future studies may examine how ethnography, in its various forms, can support teacher educators' research engagement and professional development.

References

Aiello J, Di Martino E, Di Sabato B (2017) Preparing teachers in Italy for CLIL: reflections on assessment, language proficiency and willingness to communicate. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20(1): 69-83.

Aguilar M, Muñoz C (2014) The effect of proficiency on CLIL benefits in Engineering students in Spain. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24(1): 1-18.

AUTHOR 2012

AUTHOR 2015

AUTHOR 2017

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

AUTHOR AND COLLABORATOR 2020

Bentley K (2010) *The TKT Course CLIL Module*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burkart T (2018) Dialogic introspection—A method of investigating experience. *Human Arenas* 1: 167–190.

Cenoz J (2015) Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: the same or different? *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 28(1): 8-24.

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

Coyle D, Meyer O (2020) Quality assurance in CLIL higher education. In: Martínez Agudo, JD (ed.) *Quality in TESOL and teacher education: From a Results Culture Towards a Quality Culture*. London: Routledge, 159-70.

Díaz Pérez W, Fields D, Marsh D (2018) Innovations and challenges: conceptualizing CLIL practice. *Theory Into Practice* 57(3): 177-184.

Dörnyei Z, Ushioda E (2011) *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow: Longman.

Escobar Urmeneta C (2013) Learning to become a CLIL teacher: teaching, reflection and professional development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16(3): 334-353.

Fazzi F, Lasagabaster D (2020) Learning beyond the classroom: students' attitudes towards the integration of CLIL and museum-based pedagogies. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, DOI: 10.1080/17501229.2020.1714630

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

Fernández R, Halbach A (2010) Analysing the situation of teachers in the CAM bilingual project after four years of implementation. Ruiz de Zarobe Y, Sierra JM and Gallardo del Puerto (eds.) *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Guo Q, Tao J, Gao X (2019) Language teacher education in *System*. *System* 82(1):132-9.

Hofstadler N, Babic S, Lämmerer A, Mercer S, Oberdorfer P (2020) The ecology of CLIL teachers in Austria – an ecological perspective on CLIL teachers' wellbeing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, DOI: 10.1080/17501229.2020.1739050

Infante D, Benvenuto G, Lastrucci E (2009) The effects of CLIL from the perspective of experienced teachers. *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field* 156-163.

Kao Y T (2020) Understanding and addressing the challenges of teaching an online CLIL course: a teacher education study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 1-20.

Lasagabaster D, Ruiz de Zarobe Y, eds, (2010) *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lawrence L, Lowe RJ (2020) An introduction to duoethnography. In: Lowe RJ and Lawrence L (eds.) *Duoethnography in English Language Teaching: Research, Reflection and Classroom Application*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1-28.

Lo Y (2020) *Professional Development of CLIL Teachers*. Cham: Springer.

Lowe R, Kiczkowiak M (2016) Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: a duoethnographic study. *Cogent Education* 3(1): 1264171.

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

Mann S, Walsh S (2017) *Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching: Research-Based Principles and Practices*. London/New York: Routledge.

Marsh D, Mehisto P, Wolff D, Frigols Martín MJ (2012) European framework for CLIL teacher education.

Martínez Agudo J (2019) Which instructional programme (EFL or CLIL) results in better oral communicative competence? Updated empirical evidence from a monolingual context. *Linguistics and Education* 51(1): 69-78.

Mehisto P, Marsh D, Frigols MJ (2008) *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Mcdougald S (2015) Teachers' attitudes, perceptions and experiences in CLIL: A look at content and language. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal* 17: 25-41.

Morton T (2019) Teacher education in content-based language education. In: S Walsh and S Mann, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teacher Education*. London/New York: Routledge, 169-83.

Nikula T, Dafouz E, Moore P, Smit U, eds. (2016) *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nikula, T, Moore P (2019) Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22 (2): 237-249.

Pavón VP, Lancaster, N, Callejas C B (2020) Keys issues in developing teachers' competences for CLIL in Andalusia: training, mobility and coordination. *Language Learning Journal* 48 (1): 81-98.

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

Pérez Cañado ML (2014) Teacher training needs for bilingual education: In-service teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19 (3): 266-295.

Pérez Cañado ML (2016) Are teachers ready for CLIL? Evidence from a European study. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 39(2): 202-221.

Pérez Cañado ML (2018) Innovations and challenges in CLIL teacher training. *Theory Into Practice* 57(3): 1-10.

Pena DC, Fernández RF, Gómez AG, Halbach A (2005) La implantación de proyectos educativos bilingües en la Comunidad de Madrid: las expectativas del profesorado antes de iniciar el proyecto. *Porta Linguarum: Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras* (3): 161-173

Pena DC, Porto MD (2008) Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project. *Porta Linguarum* 10: 151-161.

Pladevall-Ballester E (2015) Exploring primary school CLIL perceptions in Catalonia: students', teachers' and parents' opinions and expectations. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18(1): 45-59.

Rose H (2019) Dismantling the ivory tower in TESOL: A renewed call for teaching-informed research. *TESOL Quarterly* 53(3): 895-905.

Rose H, Montakantiwong A (2018) A tale of two teachers: A duoethnography of the realistic and idealistic successes and failures of teaching English as an international language. *RELC Journal* 49(1): 81-101.

Sawyer RD, Norris J (2013) *Duoethnography*. New York: Oxford University Press.

This is not the published version. Please visit
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688220930442>

Starfield S (2020) Autoethnography and critical ethnography. In: McKinley J and Rose H
(eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London:
Routledge, 165-75.

Vega M, Moscoso M L (2019) Challenges in the implementation of CLIL in higher
education: From ESP to CLIL in the tourism classroom. *Latin American Journal of
Content & Language Integrated Learning* 12(1): 144-176.

Walsh S, Mann, S, eds, (2020) *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teacher
Education*. London: Routledge.