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In recent decades, globalization, advanced technologies and international socio-economic trends have brought challenges to universities worldwide. Some of these have resulted in major changes in how universities are perceived within a society, operational management structures, and financing models. Some are even questioning the value of higher education degrees for the individual, and the return on investment for the societies that in the public domain, finance these institutions.

These challenges, have led to a call to audit existing operational structures and explore educational and operational adaptation, if not transformation. Driven partly by the influence of often financially or politically-driven national and international university ranking systems processes, one challenge is how to respond to comparative league tables, and the competition these encourage, through international engagement, branding and innovation. These and other challenges have driven universities to both re-define quality criteria, and have it used to build quality control frameworks, particularly with respect to international engagement.

International engagement is commonly realized through student and staff mobility, institution-industry partnerships, co-sharing taught programmes with partner universities and institutions, widening access to new ways of teaching using technologies, and strengthening research-focused cooperation projects.

The bedrock for enabling universities to respond to the challenges present, and the strategic opportunities in sight, includes the role of language. International engagement requires access to a lingua franca. Across the world at present this lingua franca is invariably English.

Using English for academic, research, and other forms of specialized interaction and communication should not be viewed as an assumed competence. The same applies to the use of any additional language. For instance, because we speak a language does not automatically mean that we can use it for expressing or exploring higher order thinking and communication. So when university staff use English for the purposes of realizing international engagement whether through teaching, research, publishing, stakeholder relations, or other forms of communication, special awareness and skills are a pre-requisite for success (Díaz Pérez & Marsh, 2017:11).

Key reasons on why European Union universities launched English-taught programmes were reported for 2014 as: removing obstacles for the enrolment of foreign students; improving the international competence of domestic students; sharpening the international profile of the institution; attracting highly talented students to the institution (both domestic and international); altruism (providing opportunities for students to study from countries receiving development aid); and compensating for shortages of the institution (see, for example Wächter & Maiworm, 2015).
It could be assumed that these would also be found in any similar study carried out during 2018-2020, but with the addition of inter-university competition (largely based on retaining public finance and attracting external funds such as through student fees), and quality (with respect to identified knowledge and competence-based outcomes, curricula, teaching, and graduation preparedness for working life).

Developing the conditions and competences for successfully launching teaching and learning sequences (modules, projects, degrees) in an additional language (such as through French in Spain) requires the use of specialized methodologies if the risk of quality deficit is to be reduced. This is because of contextual shift on the cline of student homogeneity towards greater heterogeneity (where teaching in an additional language is likely to involve greater individual variation in linguistic fluency, and more extensive intercultural diversity).

Content and Language Integrated Learning programmes in higher education require consideration of external, internal, and intrinsic forces. External forces include megatrends that are now re-shaping the role of languages, including digital literacies in higher education. Internal forces relate to features unique to the systems operating within an institution of higher education. Intrinsic forces are those considered essential for achieving quality in context-bound examples of teaching and learning.

The external forces include socio-demographic changes; scientific and technological innovation; new work and organizational cultures; new knowledge and competence demands; and competition for regional, national, international, and sector resources. The largely internal forces involve pressure to adapt and change existing systems of operation within a university, from student teaching and assessment through to organizational hierarchies, decision-making and resourcing. The intrinsic forces concern high impact practices that elicit successful learning and development performance in different contexts.

Provision of higher education in an additional language can be done through the deployment of integrated content/language practice, or through adoption of the additional language without adjustment to teaching, learning and research practices. Globally, the extent to which this type of teaching is offered ranges from highly limited (a few modules of programmes at Master or Doctoral level), to extensive (almost all courses in English).

Regardless of whether adoption of an additional language is done through bilingual or monolingual perspectives, there are specific drivers enabling higher education organizations, and individuals, to respond to the internal, extrinsic and external forces. These include adapting teaching and learning methods to suit the newly emergent cognitive, motivational and social bases of learning; utilizing technologically advanced learning environments; enabling learning through value-creating peer, community and other network relationships; timely engagement with clusters of innovation and working life; and focusing curricula on technology-based working and operating environments.

These forces are relevant to contexts taught through a national (first) language. But when an additional language is introduced quality assurance requires a choice to be made. This is to opt for the monolingual methodological option (often called English as Medium of Instruction), or the Bilingual methodological option (sometimes called Teaching Content through English).

If the bilingual option is selected a set of actions needs to be considered. Some of these are to do with competence building in integrating content and language for teaching and learning. Others are to do with using the introduction of teaching in an additional language
as a catalyst for introducing largely intrinsic and systemic change. Put together these form key change agents that can have an impact on university functions, systems and operations.

Changing the language of teaching and learning may lead to outcomes deemed more or less positive, or more or less negative. What we can see is that opting for English as the Medium of Instruction without diligence is likely to lead to negative impact, or in cases where standards were already low in first language operations, little change (see, for instance Marsh 2013). Introducing Teaching Content through English, using a CLIL-type approach, is likely to lead to some degree of disjuncture when first introduced because it can lead to changes of the status quo, especially in largely monolingual educational environments.

This disjuncture needs to be pre-empted and managed because it can lead to resistance that can hinder the development of innovative practices. Innovation practices, just as with strategy, cannot be based on assumption. The future of any innovation depends on the identification of knowledge pathways which report on existing experience, and which can inform future decision-making. These knowledge pathways are now growing because in some countries universities have a long experience of adopting an additional language for teaching and learning, and there is much to be gained from examining the positive and less positive prior experiences encountered (see, for instance, Marsh 2005).

The steps towards adoption of an additional language need to be based on a holistic understanding of how the university and its faculties operate as systems, and which parts of these systems are weak, or otherwise at risk of failing to support the introduction and eventual functioning of new practices. This understanding leads to viewing the university operations as an ecosystem where certain actions need to be taken to nurture adaptation, reduce disjuncture, and create new forms of functioning. Once this understanding is achieved, tools can be created to enable the creation of change management framework leading to, for instance, the successful introduction of teaching and research programmes through English.

The AGCEPESA project in Andalucía, which has prompted this monograph, is one example of an initiative to create such tools. Another recent example of a change performance framework has been developed through an ecosystem-based analysis of the introduction of CLIL in a Latin American higher education context (Díaz Pérez & Marsh, 2017). This has drawn on earlier work conducted on reporting of how European universities have responded to the need to introduce English-taught degree programmes with respect to the formation of a European Higher Education Area and the Bologna Declaration (Marsh, 2005), and an earlier description of framework parameters (Marsh, Pavón Vázquez, & Frigols Martin, 2013).

Marsh & Díaz Pérez (2017) have identified actions that need to be considered, and constructed these as a time-specific Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Framework. Based on development processes implemented over 2014-2018 in a large Spanish-medium public university (University of Guadalajara, Mexico - 270,000 students; 17 000 staff, 2017). The thematic categories of this KPI framework Shaping the Future: Building CLIL Environments are ‘Governance (administrative decision-making processes); Management (how processes are implemented with key stakeholders such as students and academic staff); Praxis (the methods and activities designed to enable CLIL to be realized in practice); and Performance Outcomes (in relation to the learning of both academic subjects and language).

Each framework is time-bound for a specific period, and thus indicators may vary year by year, and the weighting accorded to each subject to change. Each category has a number of indicators. A high value overall indicates a balanced ecosystem. The values
of each category indicate the nature of where and how that balance is being achieved. As the CLIL programme matures then the number of indicators is reduced but the categories remain constant.

The categories are considered as key elements in realizing a quality ecosystem where academic subject matter taught through English plays a complementary role alongside teaching, learning, research and publishing in other languages within a higher education institution.

As an example, taken from the 2017-2018 University of Guadalajara KPI Framework, Governance has nine indicators based on the introduction of courses where content is taught through English by faculty trained in CLIL. These are generalizable to other universities globally. In the case of English language, many also apply to universities in English-speaking countries that attract students who are studying in an additional language.

The set of Governance indicators cover how programming in an additional language, henceforth English, aligns with existing university international strategy. International offices may neglect consideration of pragmatic aspects of realizing internationalization such as the capacity to provide quality teaching and learning in English. This can be due to a dis-connect between staff involved with mobility and formalized memoranda of cooperation, and teaching and research departments required to implement teaching and other activities.

One means to overcome this is to establish a language policy at the university that is directly linked to the internationalization strategy. When the policy has been created, then an Action Plan stating what should be done to implement the policy over a given period is optimal. Resourcing is required, mainly for up-skilling staff in methodologies and possibly language, but also for other investments. It also applies to staff incentives and other forms of investment in human capital.

The development of programmes in English need to be linked to quality assurance and accreditation processes. This is usually driven by external requirements such as national and international analysis and ranking systems. The indicators include how offering programmes in English fits with the research and development strategy of the university. When these indicators are active and aligned, governance serves to act as a vital top-down support mechanism for systemizing, resourcing and recognizing the value of introducing programmes in English.

The thematic category of Management generally involves faculty and department decision-making processes. These include academic staff selection; scoping of methodological and language competences, teaching and learning resource accessibility and creation, facilitation and coordination of staff teamwork, ICT ease of access, usability and technical support, international staff networking, inter-organizational partnerships and ventures, provision of opportunities and appropriate conditions for staff development, and student intake processes.

The Praxis category concerns the use of content/language integration to facilitate teaching and learning in English. Identifiable programme intended outcomes, alignment of the teaching of English as a subject, use of scaffolding to support higher order thinking alongside other identified high impact teaching and learning techniques are given attention alongside plagiarism management.

The fourth category, Performance Outcomes, relates to measurable parameters of student and staff satisfaction, grade levels achieved (especially against similar courses taught in the first language of the university), and how the profile of the university is enhanced or otherwise in ranking systems.
A Key Performance Indicator Framework of the type described is geared to reducing fragmentation by systemizing the launch and long-term establishment of quality programming in English. Although initial investment is required at the outset, the need for this diminishes over time. If the push to introduce English as a medium of teaching and learning at a university neglects appropriate attention given to the overall ecosystem then opportunities may be lost, quality reduced, and an overall level of dissatisfaction by all stakeholders becomes likely.

REFERENCES


Introduction. Higher Education Bilingual Programmes: A Research Project

With the expansion of bilingual programmes in Higher Education, institutions, researchers and administrators need to design and implement programmes both in order to ensure continuity and to strive for the best academic results. This monograph, which addresses different issues related to policies, implementation issues, classroom practice and potential quality indicators for bilingual programmes also serves to outline the AGCEPESA research project, which is being carried out in universities in southern Spain with a view to designing a protocol which university administrators can use to launch bilingual programmes and to monitor and measure programme quality, impacts, outcomes etc. The monograph is organized in two parts, the first is concerned with policies and analysis of the situation, and the second explores implementation issues.

1. AGCEPESA

AGCEPESA (Análisis y Garantía de Calidad de la Educación Plurilingüe en la Educación Superior de Andalucía) is a project funded by the government of Andalusia (Junta de Andalucía, Ref. SEJ-1588) which seeks to improve plurilingual education by promoting high quality research by a team of 26 researchers from universities in all of the Andalusian provinces (University of Huelva, University of Cádiz, University of Córdoba, University of Málaga, University of Almeria, University of Jaén, University of Granada, and University Pablo de Olavide, Seville). AGCEPESA is promoting collaborative work in Andalusia, so that plurilingual programmes in Higher Education are designed and carried out in a constructive and non-competitive way among universities, by first analysing the situation to ascertain the state of the art and to pinpoint needs; and second, by designing a protocol that administrators can use to ensure quality of procedures and successful results.

This special issue has been organised to showcase some of the work being conducted by researchers within and around the project. It opens with a trio of papers which represent the fruit of the initial fact-finding and scene-setting phase of the project, before proceeding with a selection of articles reporting on research into diverse facets of university bilingual teaching and learning praxis from a more practical, empirical perspective.

Before presenting the contents of this special issue, we need to clarify a terminology question. Every time the members of AGCEPESA came together, we would find ourselves debating the terminology employed to characterize tertiary bilingual approaches. With so many members and coming from diverse fields of research and praxis (psychologists, applied and educational linguists, teacher educators and practising teachers, at all levels from primary through to tertiary) it is hardly surprising that we failed to reach a consensus. Around half of the cohort prefer the term CLIL, on the grounds that it is a widely-used denotation for integrated content/language approaches; yet the other half prefer to reserve the term CLIL for primary/secondary classrooms and employ ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) for tertiary scenarios. The argument in favour of ICLHE would be that the
context at university is different enough to warrant a separate term, for example in primary/secondary CLIL learners are also receiving separate foreign language (FL) instruction yet this is not necessarily the case at university. Rather than impose a term on the authors of the articles here presented, the decision was taken to allow writers to choose and readers of this volume will observe differentiation. Note, however, that the term EMI (English-Medium Instruction) was not so controversial since we tend to agree that, in theory at least, it implies L2 monolingual, rather than bilingual, praxis.

2. State of the Art: Programmes and Policies

The first step for AGCEPESA was to establish a general overview of the development of bilingual programmes in Europe, Spain and Andalusia, and to describe institutional, organizational, methodological, developmental and professional aspects of existing programmes with a view to pinpointing potential quality indicators. A sub-team was formed to gather information and discuss the state of the art, and we present their findings in the first three articles.

The first paper, by Julián-de-Vega and Ávila, provides an analysis of European and Spanish language policies. They revisit all the steps and actions implemented by the Council of Europe since 1992, from the Maastricht Treaty to the recent Erasmus Plus programme (2014-2020). In a nutshell, European language policies encourage the development of communicative competence in foreign languages so that there are more opportunities for language equality and respect towards different cultures and social diversity in the Member States. Moreover, the feeling is that language development will improve competitiveness in the labour market.

All these actions led to the creation of programmes and institutions, such as the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz, to cater for the development of language policies and methodologies. In parallel, bilingual programmes began to emerge in all Spanish communities at all educational levels. In Andalusia, 1998 saw the introduction of experimental Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes in French and German at secondary level. In 2005, as a result of the Regional Government’s Plurilingual Plan (Plan de Fomento de Plurilingüismo), the project witnessed significant expansion. English was introduced as a CLIL language and primary education was brought into the fold. Interestingly, things did not really take off in the tertiary sector until 2010. Since then, the emergence of bilingual programmes has continued in Spain, but as the authors note, the development in tertiary education has been slower than in the other levels.

Another milestone was the publication of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in 2001 (updated in 2018 with the Companion Volume) and the subsequent strides towards homogeneity in the Member States. Higher Education language policies were influenced and most of Spain saw the introduction of foreign language accreditation (at B1 and/or B2) as prerequisites for graduation (regardless of the degree). This in turn led to the creation of ACLES (Asociación de Centros de Lenguas en la Enseñanza Superior) to regulate the process of certifying linguistic competence.

Having established a general overview of European bilingual education, in the second article Ramos García and Pavón Vázquez explore the presence of language policies and existing bilingual programmes in Spanish universities. Language policy is the first step and arguably the most important. It would appear that Andalusia and Catalonia are the leading communities in Spain regarding visibility of language policies, yet that only 18 out of 76 Spanish public and private universities have thus far (at the time of writing) published any sort of accessible document serving as language policy (the key word here is accessible since, as the authors note, their research was restricted to publicly available documents). Ramos García and Pavón Vázquez reach the conclusion that university administrations still do not understand “the potentiality of these initiatives as a powerful driver to increase the international qualities of the university”. In general, they find that Administration and Engineering degrees are more ‘bilingually’ developed than other degrees. Irrespective of how universities develop bilingual programmes, the authors argue that the process should combine top-down decisions together with bottom-up activities. As a matter of fact, one of the key factors for success is intrinsic motivation on the part of lecturers towards language and teaching.

In the next paper, by Méndez García and Casal Madinabeitia, the focus turns to the question of provisos for the successful implementation of plurilingualism at the university by analysing issues such as conditions, programme structure, lecturer and student skills, and methodological considerations. The authors first posit a series of conditions that have to be met in order to launch a bilingual programme: first, socio-political support with the proper policies set by politicians; second, institutional support with the proper educational policies drawn up by the educational board that allow the functioning of different units (international office, teachers, etc.); third, the inclusion of funding for diverse actions (teaching load reductions for lecturers, staff development, assistants, etc.); and fourth, organizational guidelines that clarify how the programme is going to be run and who is responsible.

Subsequently, the focus should be directed to the programme structure, referred by the authors as the administration’s policy towards the degree and/or the type of recognition for students. Bilingual programmes should be verified by the administration, and the type of programme model chosen, i.e., target language(s), number of credits taught in the foreign language, etc. should be explicit.

Focusing on programmes which explicitly promote both content and language development, (i.e. not EMI) Méndez García and Casal Madinabeitia also highlight the competences that lecturers and learners should have in order to participate in a bilingual programme. A minimum level of language competence should be specified for students, and actions to help them improve the language should be incorporated (for example, with ‘buddy’ or counselling programmes). Lecturers should also have sufficient knowledge of the language to be able to conduct their lessons appropriately. In addition, the development of linguistic competences should go hand-in-hand with didactic competences for both lecturers and students, so that the former receive training in integrated content/language pedagogy and learners are aware of expectations. Multicultural competences are also included, so that there is a wider perspective for understanding of and respect towards other cultures. Finally, Méndez García and Casal Madinabeitia include a dimension relating to methodological aspects. In short, they pinpoint diverse strategies and techniques that can be used in the classroom for delivering lessons, contemplating classroom language, discourse accommodations, classroom dynamics, etc. The article ends with a useful table correlating all the provisos.
3. Implementation Issues

The second part of the monograph addresses aspects related to factors that impact on the successful implementation of bilingual programmes. Here the articles revolve around the primary protagonists of tertiary bilingual education, namely students and lecturers/teachers. The first two articles delve into learner motivation and reading competence, and the last three focus on teacher attitudes, behaviour and needs, including methodological and linguistic preparation.

Salaberri-Ramiro and Sánchez-Pérez present a qualitative study which investigates the motivations of higher education students to enrol in bilingual courses. 310 university students completed an open-ended format questionnaire with answers categorized into six thematic aspects: Lecturer and student proficiency in English; Future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice; Teaching and learning strategies; Assessment and qualification; Building students’ self-confidence and self-efficacy to avoid frustration; Critical views on the use of English as dominant language.

They found that students presented signs of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, since results suggested that student motivation progressed from the present self to a future ideal-L2 self. This operates in tandem with concern related to assessment and study recognition. Salaberri-Ramiro and Sánchez-Pérez also found that bilingual students tended to attribute responsibility for success or failure to others, which suggests that positive self-confidence and self-efficacy should be promoted to avoid stress, anxiety and frustration (a point which some of their respondents made explicitly).

In the following article, Foncubierta, Machancoses and Fonseca-Mora argue for attention to and the development of reading competences in order to guarantee successful academic results for bilingual university students, and present a study in which they examine the role of silent reading fluency (SRF) as an indicator to measure the progress and development of reading competence, and as evidence to identify student difficulties in each phase of the reading process. After exploring the theoretical bases of reading acquisition in both L1 and L2, the authors describe their study, composed of a sample of 47 university students who completed two data-gathering instruments: a reading comprehension diagnostic test (Dialang) and a silent reading fluency test (in English and Spanish, their L2 and L1, respectively).

Foncubierta, Machancoses and Fonseca-Mora found that there is a significant correlation between L1 and L2 silent reading abilities, suggesting that L1 reading abilities are transferred into L2. However, results also showed that students altered the logical reading process followed in L1 (phonological decoding and then orthographic and semantic recognition). Other results inferred the need to implement bilingual methodologies with special emphasis on reading strategies.

The next three articles are devoted to analysing different aspects of the teacher/lecturer endeavour, needs and development. Rubio-Cuenca and Moore, focus on teacher attitudes to language regarding bilingual programmes in Engineering and Science-related degrees. Adopting an action-based research approach, they gathered qualitative data from the teachers in the PEP (Plurilingual Education Programme) at the Escuela Superior de Ingenieria de Cadiz University regarding their experiences in and expectations of bilingual classrooms and identified clear indicators of Internationalization at Home. For the most part, students enrolling in bilingual programmes in Cadiz do not have high levels of L2 competence, thus...
EMI is not suitable and, consequently, ICLHE approaches are necessary. Rubio-Cuenca and Moore found that while the teachers are open to explicit bilingualism (i.e. planned L1 use in the classroom), they are still unclear as to how to implement such practice. This signals a future direction for their research.

Both lecturers and students are addressed in the next article, by Sánchez-García. The author analyses the type of interaction and cognitive engagement that results from lecturers questioning patterns in a contrastive study that compares L1 (Spanish) and the foreign language (EMI) classrooms – where the same teachers are teaching their subjects in separate courses in each language. The author first queries the extent to which the use of questions by teachers promotes interaction between classroom participants in each setting. Sánchez-García found no direct correlation between questions and interaction. She also explores the extent to which the use of questions by teachers engages students cognitively, finding that although in theory certain question types are typically regarded as more or less cognitively demanding, in practice the differences between the answers they prompt is not so striking. She concludes by suggesting that students should be exposed to a wider range of cognitively demanding situations (increasing in complexity as student competences increase).

Finally, Contero, Zayas and Arco-Tirado explore the question of teacher needs and specific methodological training. A total of 138 Andalusian university teachers completed an online questionnaire assessing teacher satisfaction and other beliefs about their bilingual teaching. Interestingly, the researchers found that the longer university teachers had been involved in bilingual teaching the more convinced they were that they had to elaborate be-spoke materials, rather than just translating from the L1 syllabi. The teachers in their study expressed concerns regarding the provision of linguistic scaffolding for students, signalling a need for attention to this question in teacher development. They also found that lectures were concerned about finding strategies to motivate their students. As a correlation, they suggest that those responsible for training CLIL university teachers should cover the following methodological areas: interaction, cooperation, student autonomy, linguistic awareness and scaffolding, all within a bilingual environment.

The primary purpose of this monograph is to disseminate the various lines of research undertaken by AGCEPESA members during the project but in doing so we also hope to contribute to debate around the question of university internationalization through bilingual teaching initiatives. This represents a growing field of interest among academics. As noted repeatedly through the monograph, universities in Andalusia (and, indeed in Spain) are being urged to internationalize and implementing bilingual programmes is often one of the first steps taken, but care needs to be taken in doing so. We hope that the articles here presented will contribute to the endeavour.
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RESUMEN: La misión de la universidad es dotar al alumnado con recursos para el mercado de trabajo y dar formación en un mundo globalizado. Las lenguas y sus culturas son instrumentos esenciales en la sociedad multilingüe en la que desarrollamos nuestro potencial como ciudadanos. Las políticas lingüísticas salvaguardan y facilitan la igualdad de oportunidades en el mercado laboral y es por este papel central por lo que se convierten en objeto de estudio en contextos educativos. El Consejo de Europa, la Comisión Europea y el Centro de Lenguas de Graz en sus recomendaciones identifican al plurilingüismo como principio básico de las políticas lingüísticas y el enfoque AICLE como itinerario eficaz para alcanzar este objetivo. España acogió con gran entusiasmo este enfoque desde sus comienzos y ha llegado a ser enclave de referencia en su implantación. En la educación superior el desarrollo ha sido heterogéneo en primera instancia. Las políticas lingüísticas europeas llegan a la educación terciaria española de la mano de la implantación previa en educación primaria y secundaria, permitiendo completar el círculo de la oferta educativa multilingüe. Las recientes medidas tomadas por la CRUE y ACLES intentan establecer un marco común en la promoción del multilingüismo en la universidad española. 
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European and Spanish Language Policies: The Road to Change in Tertiary Education

ABSTRACT: The mission of universities is to equip students with skills for the labour market and provide training for our global world. Languages and cultures are key tools in our multilingual social reality where our potential as citizens of the world is developed. Thus, language policies safeguard and facilitate the equality of opportunities, and it is in this central role they become an object of study in educational contexts. The Council of Europe, the European Commission and the European Centre of Modern Languages (Graz) recommends multilingualism as a basic principle and a central objective of language policies, and advocates CLIL as the path to reach the goal. Spain embraced multilingual projects right from the start and has become a landmark in their implementation; however, in higher education, their development has been rather heterogeneous from the beginning. Multilingual language policies were first developed in primary and secondary education, paving the way for its further expansion to tertiary education and, therefore, closing the circle of multilingual provision. Recent measures issued by the Chancellors’ Conference
and the Association of Higher Education Language Centres attempt to set the path for a common framework in the promotion of multilingualism in Spanish universities. 

**Keywords:** Language policy, multilingualism, plurilingualism, CLIL, higher education.

1. **INTRODUCCIÓN**

Vivimos en un mundo en continuo cambio donde la comunicación entre culturas se hace esencial para las relaciones internacionales, la creación de riqueza, el empleo y la capacidad de movilidad individual. Los medios de comunicación, la movilidad y las nuevas tecnologías juegan un papel esencial en la interacción que se establece entre culturas donde las idiosincrasias nacionales y regionales pasan a un segundo plano y se vive una internacionalización que diluye las diferencias creando identidades más complejas. El multilingüismo\(^1\) y, por ende, la política adoptada por las naciones con respecto a las lenguas es fundamental para entender la complejidad de las sociedades que se están fraguando y, a la vez, comprender la importancia de ampliar los horizontes de los ciudadanos del siglo XXI. Por consiguiente, el multilingüismo y la multiculturalidad se pueden considerar como parte fundamental en la construcción de la realidad social. El aprendizaje de lenguas y de sus culturas se ha establecido como uno de los grandes desafíos que se ha planteado Europa y serán las decisiones de las políticas educativas en cada país las que hagan posible convertir este reto en una realidad.

La labor de la universidad no puede estar de espaldas a estos objetivos puesto que su misión principal es preparar a su alumnado para el mercado de trabajo y dar oportunidades de formación frente a esta necesidad de competencia lingüística y multicultural en un mundo globalizado. Los esfuerzos por la internacionalización de la enseñanza terciaria pautadas por la Declaración de Bolonia (European Ministers in charge of Higher Education, 1999) marcaron un antes y un después en las políticas lingüísticas universitarias. Este artículo trata de resumir los antecedentes que han señalado el camino a estas políticas y esto no se puede entender, en el caso de España y sus comunidades autónomas, sin exponer previamente la trayectoria de las decisiones europeas, a nivel supranacional, de las nacionales y de las regionales con respecto al aprendizaje de las lenguas y sus culturas en la enseñanza no universitaria. El acogimiento de este movimiento desde la escuela ha pautado el camino a la universidad española.

2. **POLÍTICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS EN EUROPA DURANTE LAS ÚLTIMAS DÉCADAS**

La promoción de las lenguas ha estado siempre presente desde el nacimiento de la Comunidad Económica Europea, aunque no fuera de manera explícita. Al final de los años 80, el incremento de la globalización económica, la internacionalización de la ciencia y de la educación superior supuso la necesidad de políticas lingüísticas más explícitas. Además, el

\(^1\) Se utilizará el término multilingüismo como la característica de algunas zonas geográficas o sociedades que utilizan diferentes lenguas, frente a plurilingüismo que se usará como la descripción del repertorio lingüístico de un individuo. En http://www.coe.int/t/DG4/linguistic/Division_EN.asp, consultado el 24 de febrero de 2015.
desarrollo de las nuevas tecnologías y las nuevas expectativas del Mercado Único Europeo (1992) con las adscripciones de nuevos socios con diferentes lenguas y la movilidad en el mercado único de trabajo incrementaron la necesidad de considerar el multilingüismo como uno de los ejes para el desarrollo de la identidad europea.

El Tratado de Maastricht (1992) marcó un hito en las políticas lingüísticas porque, si bien consideraba que los estados miembros eran soberanos de los sistemas educativos, establecía medidas incentivadoras para la enseñanza de lenguas que respondían a la internacionalización y la necesidad de equipar a los jóvenes europeos para el mercado de trabajo y la movilidad laboral.

En 1995, la Comisión Europea establece el objetivo de que los ciudadanos europeos dominen tres lenguas comunitarias y subraya la necesidad de que los países miembros se aseguren de que el aprendizaje de lenguas no esté reservado a una élite sino que esté presente en los sistemas educativos de manera generalizada. En este momento, el multilingüismo aparece como un factor de la identidad y ciudadanía europea. En el año 2000, la Estrategia de Lisboa incluye explícitamente la necesidad de dominar tres lenguas comunitarias. A esto siguieron medidas para establecer un marco de acción como fue el lanzamiento del Sello Europeo o del Año Europeo de las Lenguas en el 2001, así como medidas para alcanzar una mayor coherencia a nivel europeo, tales como los indicadores comunes de evaluación, el Eurobarómetro de lenguas, intercambios de experiencias, la cooperación y la coordinación.

El Consejo de Barcelona en 2004 hace aún más explícita la necesidad del aprendizaje de lenguas con el logo: 1+2, una lengua materna más dos. A partir de aquí se estableció el Plan de Acción: Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-2006, que pretendía unificar las actividades e iniciativas que se estaban desarrollando en los campos educativos y formativos y establecía medidas de cooperación entre estados, esto es, a nivel supranacional, así como una financiación para el desarrollo de materiales para la enseñanza de lenguas y para el asesoramiento de expertos en aprendizaje y evaluación de lenguas. En 2005, el Marco Estratégico del Multilingüismo unió iniciativas, incluyó la importancia de las lenguas minoritarias y puso de relieve la importancia del multilingüismo como una de las competencias que ayudaba al crecimiento económico, la competitividad, la cohesión social y el crecimiento del ciudadano europeo. Esta medida marcó definitivamente las políticas europeas con respecto a las lenguas como herramientas para el desarrollo de la Unión, la internacionalización de la educación, las negociaciones entre las prioridades supranacionales y las políticas nacionales educativas, y la inclusión de la política lingüística dentro de medidas económicas y sociales de carácter general.

Aparte de las acciones de la Unión Europea, el Consejo de Europa, dado su carácter de organización intergubernamental basada en la defensa de los principios democráticos e inclusivos, ha impulsado importantes medidas también a través de la División de Políticas Lingüísticas y del Centro Europeo de Lenguas Modernas (ECML) de Graz, donde los grupos de trabajo están formados por investigadores de las universidades europeas más importantes en el campo de la lingüística aplicada y de la educación. La Conferencia de Estrasburgo en 1997 puso especial énfasis en la importancia de la comunicación intercultural y el plurilingüismo como objetivos claves. El Año Internacional de las Lenguas (2001) y la publicación del Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (2001) marcaron un antes y un después en las políticas lingüísticas
Europeas. El *Marco* proporcionó coherencia apoyando la movilidad entre naciones, el entendimiento mutuo y la cooperación. Desde ese momento, el Consejo de Europa ha orientado sus actuaciones a una serie de áreas tomando como referencia este documento. Áreas que van desde el desarrollo de instrumentos para la planificación y la evaluación conjunta, así como el reconocimiento de cualificaciones a nivel europeo, la coordinación de las medidas lingüísticas y el desarrollo de prioridades e informes al respecto, y, por último, la expansión de estas políticas no sólo a las lenguas extranjeras sino a las lenguas maternas, las lenguas oficiales y otras lenguas. En 2018, se ha publicado un nuevo documento complementario: *The CEFR Companion Volume with New Descriptors* (2018), desarrollado por la División de Políticas Lingüísticas del Consejo de Europa.

Como se puede observar, el marco de políticas lingüísticas comunes proporcionó y sigue proporcionando un gran apoyo en el avance del desarrollo y conservación de lenguas en Europa. A esto se han unido también acciones prácticas que han calado en el ámbito local. Para ello, el Consejo de Europa ha estado promocionando grupos de investigación y talleres sobre diferentes temáticas relacionadas con las lenguas y, por su parte, la Unión Europea ha desarrollado programas educativos donde se ha dado apoyo a las políticas lingüísticas desarrolladas. Este es el caso de los programas *Lingua, Erasmus, Socrates, Leonardo, Comenius, el Programa de Aprendizaje Permanente (Lifelong Learning Programme)* (2007-2013) y el último *Erasmus*+ (2014-2020). Todos ellos, bien de manera puntual bien de manera transversal, han apoyado y apoyan el multilingüismo y el multiculturalismo en Europa.

Por tanto, se puede decir que el avance en políticas lingüísticas, tanto del Consejo de Europa como de la Comisión Europea, ha sido una constante en los últimos 35 años. Ha propuesto como líneas comunes: la visión de que las lenguas son necesarias para la comunicación y la movilidad (algo obvio pero que era necesario poner por escrito dentro de los documentos oficiales), el objetivo de alcanzar el multilingüismo en Europa con campañas como 1+2 (*Mother tongue plus 2*), el establecimiento de que todas las lenguas europeas tengan la misma importancia, la creencia de que el entendimiento mutuo entre países se favorece con el aprendizaje de lenguas y culturas y, por último, la convicción de que la competencia lingüística lleva al desarrollo de una mejor competitividad en el sector laboral y económico. El *Eurobarómetro 386* (2012) analiza las actitudes positivas hacia el multilingüismo por parte de los europeos. Señala que el 88% de los europeos piensa que conocer lenguas diferentes a la lengua madre es muy útil y el 98% considera que dominar una lengua extranjera es útil para el futuro de sus hijos. El *Eurostat* (2015) dice que, en 2013, 17.7 millones de alumnos de primaria de la Unión Europea (81,7%) están estudiando al menos una lengua extranjera, incluyendo el millón (4.6%) que están estudiando dos o más. La lengua más popular es el inglés, que está siendo estudiado por 16.7 millones de alumnos. Ambas publicaciones coinciden en concluir que existen indicadores al alza en la provisión de enseñanza en lenguas en los centros y un incremento de los niveles de competencia y de los instrumentos y materiales que apoyan la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de las mismas. Sin embargo, los logros en el desarrollo de lenguas hay que tomarlos con precaución, por ejemplo, con respecto al impacto de los programas educativos, como es el caso del *Lifelong Learning Programme* o de los programas del *Centro Europeo de Lenguas*, ya que se necesitan evidencias más claras para concluir que su alcance ha sido amplio y que su implementación no se ha reducido solo a los sectores que directamente se han visto implicados.
Por tanto, para comprender las políticas lingüísticas de los diferentes países europeos, hay que analizar las políticas supranacionales que las enmarcan y que han sido principalmente llevadas a cabo por la Unión Europea y el Consejo de Europa. King, Byrne, Djouadj, Lo Bianco y Stoicheva (2011) realizan un análisis de las políticas lingüísticas y los nuevos contextos que han surgido. A la vez, tratan de identificar las condiciones para posibilitar el desarrollo de un marco político coherente con respecto al avance del multilingüismo. Estos autores apuntan que la articulación del multilingüismo y su tratamiento en Europa ha evolucionado desde los años 80 y ha alcanzado logros, pero también han surgido nuevas realidades y desafíos en el siglo XXI. Nuevas formas de trabajo y de comunicación, combinadas con presiones económicas y sociales hacen que el reto del multilingüismo haya ido más allá del mero marco educativo. ‘Language in Europe is about more than education - it is social, economic and cultural significance’ (King et al., 2011:40); y concluyen que para seguir avanzando ante estos nuevos retos, seis son las áreas que se tendrían que abordar en la nueva agenda de políticas lingüísticas: la reformulación del modelo de Lisboa hacia uno más asimétrico que propicie y se adapte a las circunstancias lingüísticas de cada región y país, la exploración de los beneficios potenciales del inglés como lengua franca, la identificación de buenas prácticas en contextos educativos multilingües, el apoyo al aprendizaje de lenguas fuera de la escuela, el posible uso multilingüe de internet y la potenciación de redes para el entendimiento global.

No obstante, lo que sí se puede afirmar es que todo ello ha ayudado de manera decisiva a crear una indudable sensibilización en la ciudadanía europea sobre la importancia del aprendizaje de lenguas y culturas para la formación de un espacio común y las lenguas se erigen, así como unas de las herramientas que poseen los ciudadanos europeos para poder tener acceso de forma igualitaria a oportunidades sociales y económicas.

### 3. AICLE Y LAS POLÍTICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS EUROPEAS

La importancia que la Unión Europea ha otorgado a sus políticas lingüísticas ha provocado la promoción de enfoques y metodologías, especialmente aquellas que han demostrado su eficacia para la adquisición de lenguas. Entre ellas, el Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE) ha sido una de las iniciativas que más apoyo ha encontrado. En 1995, en la Resolución del Consejo de 31 de Marzo, se menciona como uno de los enfoques innovadores que podrían ayudar a la enseñanza de lenguas dentro de los sistemas educativos europeos. De hecho, dentro del Plan de Acción (2004-2006) que la Comisión Europea lanzó después del Consejo de Europa de Barcelona, en su comunicado (Commission of the European Communities, 2003) incluía el apoyo inequívoco a la provisión de enseñanza AICLE dentro de los sistemas educativos en las propuestas para el aprendizaje de lenguas a través de la vida y se pusieron en marcha una serie de acciones para promocionarlo, como fue la financiación a través del programa Sócrates en su acción Lingua 2, su difusión a través de conferencias para responsables de políticas educativas e

---

inspección, la publicación de estudios para aportar datos sobre la provisión (Eurydice, 2006) y la difusión de documentos para extender sus bondades dentro de los países miembro. En este mismo comunicado se expone el papel clave de las universidades para promocionar el multilingüismo a nivel social e individual, se las anima a adoptar políticas lingüísticas coherentes con la promoción de la diversidad lingüística en sus campus y a incentivar la movilidad del alumnado en países de habla extranjera. Se les aconseja también a aprovechar los recursos ya existentes (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:13).

En el simposio The Changing European Classroom: The Potential of Plurilingual Education, organizado por el Consejo de Europa en 2005, una de las principales conclusiones a las que se llegó fue a la necesidad de involucrar a alumnado y profesorado en programas AICLE para alcanzar el plurilingüismo y la pluriculturalidad en la sociedad europea. En la actualidad, la Comisión Europea hace mención especial dentro de los objetivos del programa vigente Erasmus+ (2013-2020) a mejorar la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de las lenguas y promover la amplia diversidad lingüística de la Unión Europea y la sensibilización intercultural. De igual modo, en su estrategia Education and Training 2020 (ET 2020) el aprendizaje de lenguas sigue siendo una de las metas para todos los países miembro. Cabe señalar, que entre otras medidas prioritarias, la enseñanza a través del enfoque AICLE aparece como fundamental y a tener en cuenta en los diferentes niveles de enseñanza de los sistemas europeos, especialmente de los no universitarios. Julián-de-Vega (2017) apunta que a raíz de los resultados deficitarios en el aprendizaje de lenguas (la Comisión Europea (2005) aporta los siguientes datos: sólo el 36% de los encuestados de 15 o más años de edad respondieron sentirse capaces de participar en una conversación en otro idioma distinto al materno) los países europeos empiezan a abordar la enseñanza de lenguas a través del enfoque AICLE, observándose un avance en su aprendizaje en aquellas regiones donde se ha implementado (Lorenzo, Casal y Moore, 2009). En España, será a raíz de la implantación de estos programas en las diferentes comunidades autónomas cuando las universidades empiecen a tomar las riendas y ofertar distintos programas EMI (English as Medium of Instruction) dentro de la oferta de grados para el alumnado egresado de programas AICLE en enseñanza secundaria y empezar, de esta manera, el camino al cambio dentro de las políticas lingüísticas universitarias.

4. **Políticas lingüísticas y enseñanza plurilingüe en la educación superior: el caso español**

4.1. Antecedentes

De todo lo anteriormente dicho, resulta obligado subrayar la trayectoria que sigue la implantación de los programas AICLE en las etapas de primaria y secundaria en España porque conforman los antecedentes para entender la enseñanza AICLE en la educación universitaria. Ruiz de Zarobe y Lasagabaster (2010) señalan que en la última década el desarrollo del AICLE en el territorio español ha sido considerable, fundamentalmente debido al compromiso con las políticas europeas que promueven el plurilingüismo y la conciencia de la necesidad de aprender lenguas extranjeras. El marco legal que articula el desarrollo del AICLE en España comprende desde la Constitución Española de 1978 a leyes orgánicas
como la Ley Orgánica reguladora del Derecho a la Educación (LODE) de 3 de julio de 1985, la Ley Orgánica de Educación (LOE) de 2006 y la Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa (LOMCE). El AICLE se implementa en cada una de las 17 comunidades autónomas de acuerdo a órdenes que adaptan el marco legal a las necesidades de cada comunidad; por tanto, los modelos varían de forma significativa en el territorio nacional aunque pueden dividirse en dos grandes grupos: las comunidades monolingües y las bilingües (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010). En las comunidades monolingües donde el español es la lengua oficial, la educación se imparte en español y en una o dos lenguas extranjeras (preferiblemente el inglés) cuando se implementa el enfoque AICLE. En las comunidades bilingües donde el español es la lengua co-oficial junto a otra lengua autonómica (euskera, catalán, gallego y valenciano) la educación se cursa en ambas en el estadio preuniversitario, además de las lenguas co-oficiales y cuando se adopta el enfoque AICLE se incorpora una lengua extranjera. El nivel de autonomía en la implementación de las leyes orgánicas de educación mencionadas arriba ha producido una gran riqueza en cuanto a planes AICLE y su praxis en el aula española (Lasagabaster, 2010), como muestra de análisis exhaustivos cabe mencionar en el caso andaluz los estudios sobre el Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo de la Junta de Andalucía (2004), Casal and Moore (2009), Lorenzo and Moore (2009), Lorenzo et al. (2009) y Julián-de-Vega (2017) entre otros. Queda por analizar el nivel de consecución de los objetivos curriculares a nivel nacional y su efecto en las políticas lingüísticas en la educación terciaria española.

4.2. El camino a la acreditación lingüística en la educación universitaria

De todo lo anterior se deduce, que en los últimos años ha habido una presión constante en la universidad española para que se adoptaran políticas lingüísticas acordes con los tiempos, ya que a sus puertas llegaban estudiantes con bagaje y niveles lingüísticos como para cursar materias en lenguas extranjeras y este desarrollo académico se veía interrumpido con las clases monolingües que proporcionaba la universidad.

La política y la planificación lingüística universitaria en el contexto español está determinada en el siglo XXI por la creación del EEES (Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior). Como se apuntaba en la visión diacrónica del hecho europeo en el apartado anterior, la evolución del multilingüismo y la publicación del MCERL han condicionado el status quo de la enseñanza de lenguas en España y por ende en la universidad española. Una de las competencias clave que se indican en el EEES es el dominio de una lengua extranjera. Si bien la universidad española ha aceptado las directrices que se marcan en el EESS, en aras de la autonomía, el desarrollo de la competencia en lengua extranjera es cuando menos heterogéneo en virtud principalmente de dos factores: el nivel de exigencia en el dominio de la lengua al terminar los grados universitarios y la forma en la que este objetivo se consigue.

El nivel de salida de los alumnos que cursan la enseñanza superior en su L2 (o L3 en el caso de los alumnos de comunidades bilingües) se sitúa en el B2 del MCER, no obstante, el Eurobarómetro 243 (European Commission, 2006) nos sitúa en el puesto 21 de 25 en conocimiento de lenguas extranjeras. Como se indicaba arriba, un problema lingüístico da lugar a políticas lingüísticas, así pues, en un primer nivel de concreción se encuentran las órdenes ministeriales que indican por ejemplo los niveles del marco que deben alcanzar los Maestros en Educación Infantil y los Maestros en Educación Primaria (órdenes ECI/3854/2007 y ECI/3857/2007), B1 para ambas titulaciones.
Un aspecto de candente debate es precisamente cómo conseguimos en las universidades que nuestros alumnos sean competentes en al menos una lengua extranjera; dos vías complementarias aparecen en las planificaciones educativas: los centros de lenguas modernas y la implementación del enfoque integrado de lenguas y contenidos (AICLE) que algunas universidades proponen en sus titulaciones (Dafouz, 2011). Aparte de esto, hay que considerar el papel de las facultades de educación y los programas de postgrado relacionados con la enseñanza bilingüe y con la especialización en enseñanza secundaria.

La mayoría de las universidades han instaurado como mínimo el requerimiento de la acreditación del nivel B1 para poder obtener el grado, aunque algunas universidades como la de Cantabria, la de las Islas Baleares o la Politécnica de Madrid requieren un B2 para la titulación. Como indican Halbach, Lafuente, y Guerra (2013), en el caso del requerimiento del B1, sólo se está pidiendo a los alumnos que mantengan el nivel que teóricamente tenían cuando accedieron a los estudios universitarios.

4.3 Centros de lenguas extranjeras

Prácticamente cada universidad dispone de un centro de lenguas extranjeras, que aparecen bajo distinta denominación: centro de lenguas modernas, servicios de idiomas, instituto de idiomas, etc. El funcionamiento de estas instituciones no está regulado de forma homogénea, y en función de su año de constitución y de las necesidades lingüísticas de cada institución se han ido configurando de distinta manera. La mayoría de ellos funciona como centro examinador con acreditaciones de validez meramente interna, aunque algunos de ellos ofrecen la posibilidad de acreditación por medio de agentes externos (Cambridge, Trinity, TOEFL, etc.). El hecho de que algunos de estos centros lleven décadas funcionando hace que la diversidad en cuanto a sistemas de acreditación, programas y metodología sea notoria. En 1991 se funda la Confederación Europea de Centros de Lenguas en la Enseñanza Superior (CercleS) en Estrasburgo, 22 países europeos forman parte de ella. Con posterioridad aparece en España ACLES, Asociación de Centros de Lenguas en la Enseñanza Superior, que intenta coordinar la actividad de los centros de lenguas miembros. ACLES desarrolla de forma conjunta con la CRUE (Confederación de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas) un modelo de acreditación en idiomas con la intención de homogeneizar criterios y mecanismos de acreditación de los niveles de lenguas para:

- Acceso a titulaciones
- Desarrollo de estudios universitarios
- Programas de movilidad internacional
- Obtención de títulos de Grado y Posgrado

Con el fin de alcanzar este objetivo, la CRUE ha constituido una comisión para el análisis y estudio de la acreditación y formación en idiomas y por otro lado unas mesas lingüísticas que determinan los certificados admitidos para la acreditación de los distintos niveles lingüísticos.

3 Véase http://www.crue.org/SitePages/Mesas-linguisticas.aspx para más detalle en relación con los certificados admitidos.
4.4. Facultades de Educación

La consulta de las páginas web de las facultades de ciencias de la educación resulta esclarecedora en cuanto a la importancia que se otorga a las lenguas en la educación terciaria en particular y en el sistema de toma de decisiones en general; que la formación del profesorado de las áreas lingüísticas en educación primaria es un elemento clave de la adquisición final de los aprendientes y en definitiva de la capacidad de comunicación lingüística de la sociedad resulta hoy ya un axioma incuestionable. En relación con esta evidencia nos encontramos, por ejemplo en la página web de la Universidad de Córdoba (UCO), con que la especialidad ‘Maestro en Lengua Extranjera’ aparece entre las ‘titulaciones extinguidas’; en la Universidad de Granada (UGR), se ofrece un grupo bilingüe dentro del grado en Educación Primaria, pero en la información administrativa encontramos: ‘The Degree in Primary Education Teacher Training curriculum is the same for all groups, including the bilingual group’, con lo que no existe reconocimiento oficial del esfuerzo suplementario que para el estudiante universitario ha de suponer cursar las asignaturas en una lengua extranjera. No obstante, tanto en la UGR como la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM) y la UCO, se ofrecen menciones cualificadoras de lengua extranjera (inglés y francés) donde se cursan de forma obligatoria asignaturas de didáctica de la lengua extranjera y se exige acreditar un nivel B2 para el acceso.

La Universidad de Alicante ofrece un documento interesante sobre la situación de las menciones en los grados en Educación Primaria y Educación Infantil. El Real Decreto 861/2010, de 2 de julio, en el apartado 3 del artículo 9, ‘El diseño de los títulos de Grado podrá incorporar menciones alusivas a itinerarios o intensificaciones curriculares’, y éste se completa con el Real Decreto 1002/2010, de 5 de agosto, sobre expedición de títulos universitarios oficiales, en el apartado 2 del Artículo 5, referido a los Títulos de Grado, indica que: ‘La denominación de estos títulos será: Graduado o Graduada en T, con Mención, en su caso, en M, por la Universidad U, siendo T la denominación específica del Grado, M la correspondiente a la Mención, y U la denominación de la Universidad que lo expide’.

La Orden ECI/3854/2007 y la Orden ECI/3857/2007, ambas de 27 de diciembre, por la que se establecen los requisitos para la verificación de los títulos universitarios oficiales que habiliten para el ejercicio de la profesión de Maestro en Educación Infantil y de Maestro en Educación Primaria, respectivamente, establecen que en estas enseñanzas podrán proponerse menciones cualificadoras. El artículo 2 del RD 1594/2011, sobre Especialidades docentes del Cuerpo de Maestros, establece las especialidades de lengua extranjera inglés, francés y alemán, con una atribución docente singular para cada una de dichas especialidades del Cuerpo de Maestros que resulta similar en el caso de los centros privados (RD 476/2013).

En definitiva, al amparo del proceso de adaptación de las titulaciones universitarias al Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior, de acuerdo con lo previsto en el Real Decreto 1393/2007, de 29 de octubre, por el que se establece la ordenación de las enseñanzas universitarias oficiales, modificado por el Real Decreto 861/2010, de 2 de julio, se suprime los grados de Maestro en Lengua Extranjera quedando al albur de las facultades de educación la oferta de las menciones correspondientes.

La oferta de las titulaciones de doble grado en Educación Primaria y Estudios Ingleses o Franceses parece abrir una puerta de esperanza a la enseñanza de la lengua extranjera en las edades tempranas, no obstante, hay que observar con detenimiento la implementación de estas ofertas educativas, velando porque los objetivos aparezcan coordinados y con una organización equilibrada entre los contenidos de formación pedagógica y los filológicos. En el caso de la Universidad de Sevilla (US), la oferta se limita al Doble Grado en Educación Primaria y Estudios Franceses.

4.5. Postgrado

4.5.1. Máster de Formación del Profesorado de Enseñanza Secundaria

En el siguiente nivel de especialización encontramos el Máster en Formación del Profesorado de Secundaria, Bachillerato, Formación Profesional y Enseñanza de Idiomas, (orden ECI/3858/2007, de 27 de diciembre), donde se exige el mismo requisito que para los grados; resulta curioso que no exista mención alguna a las especialidades del Máster que habilitan para la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras, donde la acreditación lingüística requerida parece ser la misma. En el apartado 4.2. de dicha orden se especifican las condiciones de acceso al Máster en las que se encuentra:

Asimismo, habrá de acreditarse el dominio de una lengua extranjera equivalente al nivel B1 del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas, de acuerdo con la Recomendación Nº R (98)6 del Comité de Ministros de Estados Miembros de 17 de octubre de 2000. (BOE núm. 312. pp 53752)

Asimismo, habrá de acreditarse el dominio de una lengua extranjera equivalente al nivel B1 del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas, de acuerdo con la Recomendación Nº R (98)6 del Comité de Ministros de Estados Miembros de 17 de octubre de 2000. (BOE núm. 312. pp 53752)

No obstante, no se hace distinción alguna para los alumnos que cursan el Máster en las especialidades de lenguas extranjeras, ni tampoco para aquellos que pudieran encaminar su carrera docente hacia la docencia en entornos bilingües; es precisamente en este punto donde podríamos contribuir a elevar el nivel instrumental de los docentes que se incorporan a los programas AICLE, que cursar el Máster de Formación del Profesorado de Enseñanza Secundaria en versión bilingüe fuera una de las posibles vías de acceso, aunque no necesariamente la única, por ejemplo los másteres en enseñanza bilingüe que se reseñan en el siguiente apartado.

4.5.2. Másteres en enseñanza Bilingüe

Distintas universidades ofrecen másteres en Enseñanza Bilingüe, con el objetivo común de formar profesores de enseñanza primaria y secundaria que impartan docencia en centros bilingües. En la RUCT, Registro de Universidades, Centros y Títulos, al introducir los términos de búsqueda ‘bilingüe’ en el apartado de Máster encontramos un total de trece másteres (dos de ellos a extinguir) adaptados al Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (EEES) y regulados por el Real Decreto 1393/2007, de 29 de octubre, y por el Real Decreto 861/2010. Estos másteres podrían servir también como vía de acceso alternativa a los programas oficiales AICLE, en cualquier caso habría que abogar por la exigencia de requisitos formativos que vayan más allá de la mera formación instrumental en la lengua meta, la mayoría de los
investigadores en el desarrollo de los programas AICLE aboga por invertir en la formación y la coordinación del profesorado para conseguir programas de integración de lenguas y contenidos efectivos (Pavón, Ávila, Gallego y Espejo, 2015; Delicado y Pavón Vázquez, 2015; Pavón Vázquez y Ellison, 2013; Frigols Martin, 2011; Novotná, Hadj-Moussová, y Hofmannová 2001).

5. CONCLUSIONES

Para entender el cambio que se está produciendo en las políticas lingüísticas terciarias, hay que tener en cuenta y comprender las políticas lingüísticas europeas a nivel supranacional y aquellas a nivel nacional y regional donde las universidades españolas se contextualizan. En los últimos años, la Comisión Europea y el Consejo de Europa han propuesto y llevado a cabo medidas que han dado el fruto esperado. No solo la opinión pública europea ha cambiado hacia un mayor favorecimiento del aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, sino que la tasa de alumnado en edad escolar que está aprendiendo al menos una lengua extranjera ha ido al alza, ejerciendo una continua presión en los programas lingüísticos y de calidad de la enseñanza terciaria. El orden ‘natural’ en el desarrollo de una política lingüística que comienza con la identificación del problema podría, una vez puestas en marcha las medidas que se consideraron oportunas en el comienzo del proceso, dar lugar a un enfoque apreciativo (Subirana y Cooperrider, 2013) donde se identifiquen las buenas prácticas y fortalezas de los procesos multilingües iniciados y se conviertan en hábitos que permitan el crecimiento. Tanto si consideramos el marco paneuropeo como si nos circunscribimos a la situación en España, se trata de asentar ahora un proceso de búsqueda colaborativa que permita el cambio hacia una sociedad multilingüe. En el caso europeo, basta con incorporar ese análisis y universalización de buenas prácticas al marco estratégico, en el caso español, este mismo proceso habría de nutrirse de las políticas nacionales y autonómicas con resultados contrastados, de manera que se puedan adaptar a cualquiera de las situaciones lingüísticas del país.

Una de las prácticas que se ha demostrado efectiva en la promoción del aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras es la enseñanza AICLE, que en el sistema educativo español se ha implantado en la educación primaria y secundaria en un gran número de comunidades con resultados esperanzadores, pero aún por contrastar en estudios rigurosos. La enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras en general y AICLE, en particular, en la educación terciaria parecen necesitar de vasos comunicantes con la educación no universitaria que permitan la transmisión de las buenas prácticas de un lugar a otro. A pesar de que se han introducido medidas con las nuevas normativas del EEES y con las históricamente adoptadas a través de los Centros de Lenguas, grados y postgrados, no parecen haber sido efectivas para aprender de experiencias fructíferas pasadas y nuevas relacionadas con otros entornos, posiblemente por estar condicionadas a su vez en virtud de la autonomía de acción en la mayoría de los casos. La extrapolación de buenas prácticas necesitaría la adaptación a las necesidades reales y podría facilitar enormemente el proceso de implantación de programas con enfoque AICLE. No obstante, en los últimos años, y a partir de la reflexión con respecto a las necesidades de los estudiantes para desenvolverse en un mundo globalizado, tanto la labor de la ACLES como de la CRUE parece abrir un nuevo episodio en la enseñanza de lenguas en la universidad española.
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ABSTRACT: The process of internationalization at university has become one of the objectives in the strategic plans of these institutions in Spain. During the last two decades this objective has included the offer of studies in English as a means of furthering the international profile of universities. This interest has led to two alternative models ideated to achieve this goal. That is, on the one hand, the motivation to increase the number of credits taught through English may have originated in the Faculties or Schools, stemming from highly motivated groups of teachers; whereas, on the other, the university as a global institution may have opted for designing an educational policy aiming at expanding this particular proposal. However, we can observe that there is a lack of identification in scientific literature of the presence of global language policies at the university level, and of the general tendencies in the offer of credits in a foreign language. In this paper, we will try to cover this gap by reviewing the current situation of Spanish universities with regards to the delineation of language policies in general and in particular regarding the implementation of bilingual degrees.
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La internacionalización lingüística en la educación superior: un estudio sobre la existencia de políticas lingüísticas y titulaciones bilingües en las universidades españolas

RESUMEN: El proceso de internacionalización de las universidades ha sido uno de los objetivos recurrentes en los planes estratégicos de las instituciones universitarias y, desde hace algunos años particularmente, este proceso ha desembocado en el interés por ofertar estudios en inglés como un medio para fomentar el perfil internacional de las universidades. Este interés ha dado lugar a dos modelos diferentes para conseguir este objetivo. Así, el incremento del número de créditos ofertados en inglés puede haber nacido directamente en los propios centros y facultades a partir de grupos de profesores altamente motivados, mientras que, por otro lado, han sido las propias universidades quienes de forma global han optado por diseñar políticas educativas encaminadas a aumentar esta oferta docente. Sin embargo, se puede observar una escasez de estudios relacionados con la presencia de políticas lingüísticas globales a nivel universitario y con las tendencias en la implantación de estudios bilingües. En este artículo intentaremos cubrir esta carencia mediante la revisión de la situación actual de las universidades españolas con respecto al diseño de políticas lingüísticas en general y en particular las encaminadas a la implantación de grados bilingües.

Palabras clave: internacionalización, educación superior, políticas lingüísticas, titulaciones bilingües.
1. Introduction

The desire to enhance the international profile of universities has become one of the most frequently pursued objectives in the Spanish context. The necessity to equip students with specific professional competences for the international market (Coleman, 2006) and the possibility of attracting international students has led to the flourishing of bilingual studies and of initiatives to promote languages other than the first language at the university (Ramos, 2013). Spanish universities, then, are trying to adapt to the professional demands of globalization and to multicultural environments in which English is the lingua franca. However, increased attention to other languages in higher education institutions (HEIs) is not unique to the Spanish context. In most of Europe, and in many other countries, universities offer studies in English, in what has been commonly labelled EMI (English-Medium Instruction) or more recently in the form of ICLHE programmes (Integration of Content and Language in Higher Education), both models with the objective of providing students with the languages necessary to face international demands (Wilkinson, 2004; Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2013; Fortanet, 2013; Smit & Dafouz, 2013; Valcke & Wilkinson, 2017). With respect to the European context, Wächter and Maiworm (2008) analysed the availability of studies in English in European universities and found that 400 universities in 2007 offered this possibility, which meant an increase of 340% with respect to the situation in 2002. Some years later, the same authors updated the information and concluded that: “the number of identified English-taught programmes went up from 725 programmes in 2001, to 2,389 in 2007 and to 8,089 in the present study” (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014: 16).

Despite the massive interest in developing a strategy to offer teaching in English, the attention of scholars has been frequently directed to the challenges of this kind of programme, focusing on how to successfully implement them. The emphasis in these studies, however, has not been on the elaboration of a general policy to assure the quality of these programmes nor on the design of a language policy transcending instruction in English, with initiatives to consolidate the use of other languages among all the stakeholders involved in the internationalization process. As an example, an analysis of the plenary sessions, talks, and poster presentations in the last three Conferences organized by the ICLHE Association in Maastricht 2013, Brussels 2015 and Copenhagen 2017, reveals that very little attention was given to the design of global language policies in universities.

There is a large number of factors influencing the implementation of a given model of bilingual education. For example, the objectives have to be carefully chosen, the universities need to rely on adequate human (teachers) and material (budget) resources, students are required to possess a minimum linguistic level, and also any initiative should be part of a well-designed and organized global plan for the whole university (Pavón & Gaustad, 2013). However, this interest should not be the only one as there are other domains that have to be enhanced equally in our desire to foster attention to languages, for example the pedagogical dimension as well, as moving towards linguistic internationalization goes beyond offering studies through English or through any other language.

Given the fact that the amount of studies regarding initiatives towards internationalization that are closely connected to the use of languages is not abundant, we believe that there is a need to identify the existence of language policies and the choice of bilingual studies in
the Spanish tertiary education. In this paper, we will look at the initiatives and decisions that Spanish universities have taken and are taking in order to enhance their international profile, particularly regarding the delineation of language policies, and at the same time depict the situation regarding the offer of bilingual studies in this context. In this analysis, we will first direct our vision to the ideation of language policies at the international and Spanish level, and to the implementation of bilingual studies in universities as one of the instruments to promote internationalization. In the second part of the article we will review the existence of such language policies in Spanish universities and we will broadly depict the current situation of bilingual studies in the same context.

2. Language policies

2.1. Global language policies

The first challenge of university authorities might be to establish, and subsequently communicate to stakeholders, solid reasons behind the need for a language policy in higher education internationalization policies. These reasons are likely to be varied and will often revolve around the need to attract international students and encourage staff and student mobility. However, as Mellion (2008) points out, the international profile of a university cannot be solely quantified in terms of the number of students or teachers involved in mobility. There are other types of internationalization processes that should be taken into consideration, for example the quality of publications and the creation of collaborative networking in professional and research areas. Together with all these aspects, therefore, the implementation of bilingual studies cannot be considered an important driver, and much less an indispensable condition, for the internationalization of higher education.

The design of language policies at the university may be a difficult undertaking since it is linked to a series of complex dimensions (Marsh & Laitinen, 2004). Scholars have frequently debated the necessity to delineate language policies at a global or national level, with specific interest on the role of the foreign languages in education (Cancino, Dam, & Jaeger, 2011; Halonen, Ihalainen, & Saarinen, 2014; Shohamy, 2006; van der Walt, 2013); but the literature on language policies at the university level is scarce (Lauridsen, 2013).

One of the attempts to delineate the actions and initiatives that universities should undergo in this process is that presented by Marsh, Pavón, and Frigols (2013). In this proposal, the authors provide a series of recommendations about the elaboration of a language policy with the objective of describing: “key actions and processes that are required to successfully launch and operate higher education degree programmes provided in English” (2013: 9). The authors divided a set of 26 recommendations (‘levers’ in their words) into several parts: governance and strategy, which includes specific advice on the creation of a language policy or plan; programme management, with special attention to the roles of students, teachers and staff coordination; professional integration, focusing on the necessity of international networking and cooperation, the use of adequate methodologies, and the obligation to use a sound quality assurance and accreditation processes; and learning in media-rich environments, particularly devoted to the importance of digital and virtual
resources, and social media. While this proposal appears complicated for HEIs, particularly at initial design stages, it provides useful information about internationalization processes and may represent an important tool in systematizing university degrees taught through the medium of English (Bamond & Strottman, 2015: 6).

Another interesting proposal aimed at identifying the aspects that have to be addressed in the process of constructing language policies is what Smit and Dafouz (2014) call EMEMUS (English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings). These authors suggest that the implementation of English-taught studies should be based on the design of a theoretically grounded framework of several core dimensions (2014: 2). The six dimensions identified are accessed individually from the central notion of discourse, and cover: a) roles of English, describing the central role of English, whether as a subject in English for Academic Purposes or in English-medium instruction; b) academic disciplines, the crucial relevance of working with the different types of discourse related to the diverse disciplinary areas; c) language management, or the need to avoid a lack of explicit regulations in universities regarding languages; d) agents, the consideration of the variety of agents involved in the planning and implementation of language policies; e) practices and processes, mostly regarding the construction of knowledge and the development of academic literacy skills; and f) internationalization and ‘glocalization’, the obligation for the university to move beyond student and teacher mobility in order to provide access to multilingual and multicultural competences.

The EMEMUS model presents a coherent elaboration of the theoretical background, concepts and key dimensions, and provides a truly comprehensive rationale for a potential dynamic application; but as the authors recognize in their concluding remarks, the framework also needs to be tested and applied in real contexts.

2.2. Language policies in the Spanish context

The elaboration of language policies in Spanish universities has been a matter of individual efforts and initiatives rather than of the existence of common regulations or guidelines. In fact, as Fernández-Costales and González-Riaño (2015) point out, the political, academic or linguistic decisions have been mostly isolated and not generally based on the existence of empirical studies. With the exception of some bilingual regions (where the application of language policies in order to help the development of the two official languages has been a political and social objective during several decades), in monolingual regions there have not been many attempts to implement language policies. Only during the last few years has the internationalization process at Spanish universities indirectly forced many of them to look into the development of languages, especially English, other than the first language.

Again, these initiatives represented insulated attempts to draw global attention to languages as a means of enhancing the process of internationalization. However, there has been a growing interest in deciding important aspects, such as the linguistic accreditation of students, the training of suitable teachers, or specific internationalization preparation for administrative staff. The creation of ACLES, the Spanish Association of Language Centres at Spanish universities, and the shaping of different language groups (mesas lingüísticas) within the CRUE (Board of Rectors of Spanish Universities - Conferencia de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas), have become decisive milestones in the process of recognizing the importance of languages. Additionally, the publication of the strategies
for the internationalization of the Spanish universities (MECD, 2014: 23), recommended increasing the number of studies taught in English and promoting the learning of English for university stakeholders (Action 2.4.).

All these actions fostered an interest to establish common guidelines, objectives and procedures in order to devise a common language policy in different Spanish universities. As a result, in 2017 the CRUE published a document for the implementation of a language policy in Spain (Bazo et al., 2017), in which the main objective was to organize shared initiatives and to apply homogeneous criteria in order to promote linguistic internationalization. The document is divided in three separate sections: accreditation, training and incentives, which at the same time cover each of the three important groups of stakeholders (students, teachers and administrative staff). In accreditation, the document presents the importance of possessing adequate linguistic levels for students and teachers in the case of mobility programmes or for the participation of both groups in bilingual studies, as well as the linguistic requirements for administration staff to contribute to the internationalization profile of the university. The second dimension addressed, describes the challenges of the three groups of stakeholders with respect to the training actions that would be needed in order to equip them with the necessary competences to manipulate complex academic contents, to participate in mobility programmes, and to effectively function in different professional and multicultural contexts. This section also includes a proposal of courses and training activities specific for each one of the stakeholders. The third area proposes a series of suggestions for the creation of a global programme of incentives for students, teachers and administrative staff in order to encourage their participation in the actions towards the process of internationalization and in order to reward their efforts. Although the document emanates from the CRUE and has been developed with the objective of establishing a series of uniform guidelines for all Spanish universities, the authors clearly state that it has to be used as a framework of reference and not as a checklist, and, most importantly, it should be supported and applied by the different universities according to their characteristics and contexts: “The recommendations proposed here would need the overt backing and the coordination from those more directly involved in decision-making at the universities” (2017: 21).

2.3. Implementation of bilingual studies: objectives and models

In addition to the most evident and previously mentioned reasons behind the creation of HEI bilingual policies, we can identify a further series of pedagogical motives. These motives include the acquisition of multicultural competences by students, which will be useful for their professional lives (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014); the improvement in the cognitive processes deriving from the oral and written manipulation of highly complex academic material (Smith, 2004); and, the contribution to the professional development of teachers (González-Álvarez, O’Dowd & Valcke, 2015). Thus, educational policy regarding languages at the European Union explicitly supports the implementation of innovative educational initiatives towards the teaching of curricular contents using other additional languages at all levels, including Higher Education (European Commission, 2012).

Along with the decision regarding the reasons, motivations, and consequently, the objectives, another relevant resolution is related to the choice of model of bilingual education selected. The two main types of bilingual programmes adopted by Spanish universities are:
a) ‘English-taught studies’, in which 100% of the curriculum is taught through the foreign language; and b) ‘bilingual studies’, in which 50% of the credits are taught through the foreign language. Irrespective of the kind of programme selected, one of the most controversial decisions lies in the choice of instruction. Some may opt for an English-medium instruction (EMI) model (Dearden, 2014), whereas others prefer to apply an Integration of Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE) model (Smit & Dafouz, 2013), which is the adaptation for the university level of the CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) approach (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). This becomes a pivotal determination as it involves crucial structural and methodological implications. Whereas EMI is the most frequently chosen option in contexts where the development of the language is not an objective for consideration, ICLHE is the preferred model when one of the goals is, explicitly or implicitly, to support and promote the use of the academic language of the students.

The decision whether to use one model or the other is particularly important because it must be based on the objectives and the characteristics of the context (Pavón & Gaustad, 2013). For example, the cultural acceptance of these programmes, or the linguistic proficiency of the students are factors that have to be analysed and weighed carefully. These factors may heavily influence the outcomes of the programme and must be considered in decision-making processes pertaining to model selection. Moreover, in EMI the vehicle of instruction used by both teachers and students simply implies switching from one language to another, which means that all agents should possess a high proficiency in that language. In contrast, with ICLHE the attention to the development of the language means that collaboration between content specialists and language teachers becomes an indispensable element for the success of the programme. The qualifications of language teachers are particularly relevant with regards to the use of text typologies (Lorenzo, 2008), which is an area that is crucial for the manipulation of the academic language necessary for the passive and active verbalization of content; it is also optimal for the pedagogical dimension because teachers need to deploy methodological instruments to compensate for the risks of using a language that is not mastered at the same level as the first language (Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015). Language teachers with experience in the field of languages for specific purposes are invaluable in ICLHE contexts, as they can help and advise content specialists on the most effective strategies to deal with complex academic material.

3. Method

3.1. Objectives

The main objective of this study is to identify the existence of initiatives towards the delineation of language policies in Spanish universities and, at the same time, to depict the general tendencies of the implementation of bilingual degrees in the same context. In order to do so, two specific objectives have been elaborated:

a) to identify the presence and main characteristics of language policies evolved in the Spanish universities;

b) to give an account of the general nature of bilingual degrees offered by the universities in Spain.
3.2. Context

All the Spanish universities that have participated in this study are members of the CRUE. A total number of 76 universities have been analysed, 50 state universities and 26 private universities. The universities with language policies, including the guidelines to design bilingual studies, have developed them according to criteria originating from their own plans and objectives; therefore, the different plans are fairly heterogeneous.

3.3. Data collection procedure

Accessing the data presented a series of initial problems. The most important one was that in the majority of the cases universities did not have an internal institution devoted to ideate and evince the initiatives concerning the role of languages. Embryonic or full language policies and lists of courses offered in foreign languages were difficult to find. Secondly, this information was normally included in other sections or internal institutions, mainly in the internationalization offices. In order to preserve the objectivity of the data gathering procedure, in other words, that the process was the same for all the universities, we opted for the same model of accessing the data. Following this principle, the main process utilized for gathering the data has been inspection of the information shown by the universities and complemented by the information given by the Spanish Service for Education Internationalization (Servicio Español Para la Internacionalización de la Educación [SEPIE]) in their websites. However, in the cases where there was no information regarding the presence of documents or information related to the delineation of language policies, initiatives towards linguistic internationalization, or to present the availability of bilingual degrees, we proceeded to gather the information through direct contact, whenever possible, with the internationalization and teaching organization services.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Language policies

The analysis of the data gathered provides us with relevant information relative to: a) the existence and type of university language policies; and b) the distribution of degrees around the country (complemented with information about the languages chosen for instruction/teaching). It should be said that an examination of the language policies encountered reveals that most universities have started their particular bilingual teaching and learning initiatives without specific guidelines and regulations directly or indirectly related to the existence of a sound language policy (see Table 1 below).

In recent years, as internationalization has become a key issue university institutions are directing their attention to the design of their own language policies. However, these

1 SEPIE website: https://www.educacion.gob.es/uct/consultaestudios?actual=estudios
preliminary policies are, in the majority of the examples analysed, no more than a set of mixed intentions offering some brief guidelines. In many of the cases, then, the delineation of the language policy is just a mere statement of intentions that does not have the form of a systematic language policy, it does not apply to the whole institution, in most of the cases it has not been published as such, and when it has, it does not follow the guidelines provided by CRUE. As far as a simple numerical analysis is concerned, the review of the existence of language policies shows that only 18 out of 76 universities in Spain have published any sort of accessible document serving as language policy: A Coruña, Alicante, Almería, Autónoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Cádiz, Córdoba, Girona, Granada, La Laguna, Lleida, Málaga, Pablo de Olavide, Rovira y Virgili, Salamanca, San Jorge, Sevilla, and Vic.

Table 1. Distribution of language policies in the different regions in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalucía</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragón</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canarias</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla y León</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla y León</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataluña</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunidad Valenciana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After analysing the different documents in the cases where the language policy was published, it may be stated that the criteria established by CRUE (Bazo et al., 2017) have been followed to a certain extent in the seven most recent plans (those published in 2016/2017): Almería, Barcelona, Córdoba, La Laguna, Rovira y Virgili, and Salamanca. Therefore, they emphasize the three main aforementioned issues: accreditation, training and incentives for those involved in the process (students, teachers and administrative staff). The University Pablo de Olavide has recently approved a language policy, but the text is not yet available. Older language policies or ‘plans’ present different structures and measures to be adopted in the trend set by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) mainstream. Hence, they usually attempt to foster language learning (mainly English, but also mention other languages such as French, Italian, and German), training, language accreditation, and using languages either as a vehicle for communication or research dissemination (Cádiz, Málaga, San Jorge). Some of those documents emphasize the role of English as a lingua franca in HEIs and there is a tendency to publish supplementary instructions ‘promotion plans’ in order to foster the teaching through English and other languages (Alicante, Autónoma de Barcelona, Salamanca, Vic) and e-learning (Sevilla).

2 Regions are maintained in Spanish.
Therefore, universities have started to implement different measures towards internationalization (mostly internationalization ‘at home’) without planning a global language policy for the institution as a whole, as previously mentioned. In most cases, the spread of EMI or ICLHE started as a bottom-up process in Faculties or Schools before there was a clear common policy.

The reasons why there are many universities that still have not delineated language policies are diverse, but the main difficulty is probably caused by the inability of university authorities to foresee the potentiality of these initiatives as a powerful driver to increase the international qualities of the university. In addition, we find a lack of specialists in this area or, worse, the universities are not listening to them and do not commonly have the necessary confidence in their expertise to ideate and pilot such policies and programmes.

In other cases, two different causes can explain why many universities are failing to move towards internationalization. In some cases, there would appear to be a certain degree of reluctance to implement bilingual programmes when outcomes are uncertain. In some others, the opponents to offering subjects in a foreign language may exert a notable influence and may contribute to slowing down the implementation of these policies. This extreme is proven by the fact that most universities still lack a language policy statement nowadays (n=58). Nevertheless, some of those HEIs refer to their language policy or to the importance of languages in the institution itself, or may have produced certain guidelines referring to teaching through other languages different from Spanish, but those instances were not considered in the study as no document has been passed as a language policy.

Finally, it should be said that there is a tradition of fostering language policies and language normalization initiatives from institutions in bilingual regions. Universities in these contexts have traditionally developed a linguistic policy, although the interpretation is slightly different, as they usually refer to the co-official language(s) in the first place and other languages receive a secondary or additional consideration. An example of how bilingual regions organize themselves linguistically is the joint Pla de política lingüística (Language policy plan) from Xarxa Vives d’universitats, a group formed by all Catalan-speaking universities in Cataluña, Comunidad Valenciana and Baleares, or the interuniversity plan for the three Galician universities.

4.2. Bilingual Degrees

The second objective of this study was to account for Spanish bilingual degrees. It should be noted that degrees inextricably related to languages (Modern Languages or Translation and Interpreting, for example, among many others) and/or subjects related to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) have been omitted because they have traditionally been delivered in different languages, and the attention is driven in this study to teaching in English (or any other language) in non-linguistic disciplines.

Most universities prefer English but there are some that allow students to choose from several courses delivered in different languages such as English, Italian, French, or German. Those degrees have been included under the label ‘bilingual’. As mentioned previously, those
degrees offer half of their subjects in English and half in Spanish. The label ‘English’-or any other language- is used to describe in those cases in which the whole degree is delivered in that language.

Methodological interpretations are not clear as the distinction between EMI or ICLHE may be not accurately distinguished among participants in those experiences. Some universities allocate a percentage of ‘bilingualism’ (sometimes progressive, i.e. increasing as the programme expands) with the intention of reaching a specific degree of language use in coexistence with the mainstream language. Others refer to courses in English (no matter which methodological approach is selected for the experience). Therefore, from the data gathered, it can be tentatively stated that labelling is not as exact as it should be from a methodological point of view and this issue causes some difficulties when classifying information. With these constraints in mind, Table 2 provides the number of degree courses identified (single, double and triple bachelor’s degrees) which are currently taught in Spain through languages other than Spanish.

**Table 2. Degrees taught in other languages in Spain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>In English</th>
<th>In French</th>
<th>In Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that there are 292 bilingual degrees, 39 are fully delivered in English, and one in French and another in Italian; 63 double degrees that are bilingual, 17 in English and 4 triple bilingual degrees. The number may not be considered high if compared to the total amount of degrees delivered in Spanish universities, but according to 2016 data they ascend to 402. However, the tendency shows that the increase has been (and still is) rapidly growing (Ramos, 2013).

The most popular degree to be implemented in other languages is Business Administration and Management (Grado en Administración y Dirección de Empresas) as is shown in Table 3 below. This popularity seems to be predictable given the importance of languages (in particular English) in the fields of economy and finance. As can be observed from the information shown, there are 16 Business Administration degrees and 6 double degrees that are bilingual (50/50 Spanish and English). These data are complemented with the fact that there are a significant number of double degrees that are taught fully in English (13). It exemplifies the distribution inside the field of Business Administration (single and double degrees) and the modalities in which it is taught (bilingual or fully in English).
Table 3. Distribution in a degree: bilingual and English-taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>In English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration and Management (BA)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Bachelor’s Degree in Business Management and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Economics + International Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Computer Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Industrial Technologies Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Management Programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + International Managerial Profile Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + International Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Marketing and Commercial Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + Tourism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + European Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double degree in BA + International Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of bilingual experiences is quite unbalanced among fields or branches of knowledge: Arts & Humanities, Engineering & Architecture, Health Sciences, Science, and Social Sciences and Law; it particularly favours Social Sciences and Law (see Table 4). On a different and additional note, it should be noted that language-related degrees have not been included here.
Table 4. Bilingual experiences in fields of knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>In English</th>
<th>In French</th>
<th>In Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Law</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degrees included in Engineering and Architecture and Science have mainly been designed to offer several subjects in English (or other languages as German or Italian). Therefore, we have included them in the bilingual setting, as most of the times universities design modules together with semesters abroad to have a wider range of subjects.

Social Sciences and Law degrees seem to be the most popular to be partially implemented in English. Thus, it could be inferred that those degrees might be more in demand in the labour market within a globalized and multicultural world. All the different engineering degrees and Engineering Schools have led the move towards bilingual education. In most cases they follow the aforementioned trend of offering many different subjects in English. Some schools have a wide option and some others a scarce one.
5. Conclusion

Visibility of internationalization measures through official websites seems to be the crux of the matter for higher education institutions in Spain even nowadays (Ramos, 2013). The current scenario is that in many cases state universities are trying to follow some of the examples coming from private universities, where the language of delivery of the subjects is clearly and unequivocally stated for every degree. Access to information regarding English-taught subjects or degrees is extremely easy from the main official webpage in the latter, and they effectively use the bilingual studies as their flagship to attract potential students. As for state universities, they are gradually trying to catch up, but for many others this is simply an unfinished endeavour. That said, a significant increase in the number of English-taught programmes has been observed since the Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture launched a set of strategies towards internationalization in 2014 (MECD, 2014), but there is still a substantial amount of work ahead as far as enhancing the visibility of these actions is concerned. Although some universities have a list of subjects taught in English that can be consulted, whether publicly accessible or not, and a description of the methodological approaches, in many cases this information cannot be found as it either may not have been developed or it may not be published.

As we have seen, the number of universities in Spain with a consolidated and visible language policy is scarce, although they are gradually taking notice of the need to regulate initiatives towards internationalization and to give languages a more relevant role. However, in our view, the analysis of the data gathered suggests that many institutions have decided to refer to their language policy in an attempt to be politically correct, in the sense of trying to appear committed to the implementation of these initiatives and acting as if they were truly implementing that kind of policy. The reasons supporting the necessity to plan a global language policy for the university are many. To begin with, it is vital to articulate adequate measures to recruit qualified teachers and to train them correctly if needed. In addition, the accreditation process of language levels for both students and teachers should be defined with clarity. Finally, a programme of incentives for these two groups should be offered to compensate the extra effort invested. At the same time, any language policy must have a global projection and be grounded on principles of homogeneity and equity for all the Faculties, Schools, and type of courses. Additionally, planning, decisions, and initiatives should be organized and taken on the basis of a careful analysis of the material and human resources available; this is the only way to assure quality and sustainability. Finally, it is necessary that the university help and support particular proposals coming from schools or groups of teachers, with the commitment of activating appropriate mechanisms and providing adequate resources so that these initiatives could aspire to complement the offer of the whole university.

With regard to the implementation of bilingual studies, it is clear that Spanish universities are increasingly considering the potentiality of these studies as one of the main drivers for the internationalization profile of the university. Along with the benefits that these programmes can bring, we must also remember the contribution of graduate students to the professional market and to society in general. This means that employability should be one of the factors that has to be carefully considered before deciding which areas will be offered as bilingual courses. As a particular case, the escalating number of bilingual education programmes at
the pre-university level is provoking a huge demand for professionals specifically trained for this purpose (Delicado & Pavón, 2016). The identification of the objectives is, therefore, one of the paramount decisions prior to the planning of bilingual studies. It is not only that the universities must have a clear idea of why they are designing language policies, but also that there should be a previous and thoughtful consideration of the goals that have to be set for the language policy in general and for the bilingual studies in particular. Also, the pedagogical model that has been chosen and the methodologies and strategies utilized should be strictly adapted to the context to make them effective. Thus, it may be the case that a given university decides to ideate a global language policy in which the main idea is to offer bilingual studies but without starting from a careful and detailed analysis of the necessities and available resources. On the other hand, there may be groups of teachers in particular contexts interested in piloting experiences related to teaching through a foreign language, or even Faculty and School plans elaborated with the objective to promote this kind of teaching as a means to improve students’ professional competencies. These two initiatives, notwithstanding their potential positive effects, may have no effect in the long term if they are not combined. On the one hand the universities cannot oblige or even convince teachers to teach through another language, and on the other Faculties and Schools cannot sustain alone a quality programme without being supported by the university. Global language policies must combine both kinds of initiatives: top-down decisions and bottom-up activities should be part of the same process.

It has to be noted that the description and analysis of the language policies and bilingual studies carried out in this paper owes much to the possibility of accessing the data. By no means do the authors intend to picture the situation as the current scenario, but just as the current scenario that could be accessed. Quite often, embryonic projects and programmes were found in institutions and organizations with no direct connection to languages or internationalization agencies, and hence it must be the case that some of the initiatives could not be accessed.

Finally, we think that this is a potentially fruitful field of research as there is a mismatch between the effort that the HEIs are placing on internationalization and language policy making and its visibility. Similarly, the information gathered and analysed allows us to tentatively conclude that there are discrepancies between the number of credits taught in English, which increase remarkably every year, and the information available from universities webpages.
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Identificación de Estipulaciones Clave para la Implantación del Plurilingüismo en la Educación Superior

RESUMEN: La progresiva internacionalización de las universidades españolas en aras de una mayor competitividad ha favorecido la introducción del enfoque ICLHE (Integración de Contenido y Lengua en la Educación Superior), donde se aúna el aprendizaje de una materia concreta con el desarrollo de la competencia en comunicación lingüística en una lengua extranjera. Las investigaciones previas a este estudio se han centrado en factores que tienen un claro efecto en la puesta en marcha de ICLHE, como el nivel de la lengua utilizada en el aula por los docentes o el uso de estrategias de enseñanza efectivas. Sin embargo, prácticamente no existen investigaciones que determinen el conjunto de especificaciones o factores que ayudan a llevar a cabo una puesta en marcha efectiva del plurilingüismo en la educación superior. Este artículo contribuye a cubrir ese vacío de información, examinando los principales parámetros que contribuyen a llevar a cabo un enfoque ICLHE de calidad y que han sido clasificados en cuatro grandes bloques: condiciones, estructura de los programas, destrezas de docentes y estudiantes, y consideraciones metodológicas. Los resultados del artículo se presentan en una tabla-resumen que especifica las categorías y subcategorías con las estipulaciones clave para guiar la implantación de titulaciones o itinerarios plurilingües en la educación superior.

Palabras clave: plurilingüismo, ICLHE, competencia en comunicación lingüística, condiciones / estipulaciones.
1. INTRODUCTION

The effort Spanish universities are making to promote internationalization, from courses oriented to developing written and spoken communication to offering content subjects in an L2, is part of a European effort, where there has been an increase of 340% in programmes in English from 2002 to 2007 (Doiz et al., 2013). Content subjects taught in an L2 at university follow, in many cases, an ICLHE (Integration of Content and Language in Higher Education) approach, which stems from CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) at primary and secondary levels, a markedly European phenomenon. As Pérez Cañado observed (2012: 318): “CLIL is considered ‘the European label for bilingual education’ (Lorenzo, 2007: 28), as it is deeply rooted in the linguistic needs of the EU (Muñoz, 2007) and thus strongly European-oriented (Wolff, 2005).”

The rationale behind CLIL / ICLHE is that any subject may be taught through an L2. The objective of CLIL/ICLHE is dual: learning an L2 and learning content. This is reached through interactions between the oral, written and audio-visual material provided in the L2 and the participants in the teaching/learning process (Pavón and Rubio, 2010). The language component is secondary to the content and does not follow a strict order of functions, structures or vocabulary, but is rather one of the results to be achieved (Arnold, 2010).

CLIL / ICLHE is enclosed within the umbrella term coined by the Council of Europe “Languages of School Education” (LE), which comprehends three main areas:

a) “Language as a subject” (LS) in itself, traditionally related to the teaching of the first, second and foreign languages (FL), including classical languages;

b) “Language across the curriculum” (LAC), the language(s) employed as a means of instruction in other subjects;

c) “Language curriculum” (LC), the overarching language curriculum that comprises all the languages at students’ disposal during their schooling, a variety of languages as a subject (first, second and/or foreign) and across the curriculum (Martyniuk, 2008).

As can be observed from the definitions above, CLIL / ICLHE are closely intertwined with LAC, embrace LS, and have a profound effect on LC. This intertwining of concepts has effects on CLIL / ICLHE’s implementation, which can lead up to 3,000 possibilities bearing in mind content, language and organisation structures (Lorenzo, 2007).

While some research observing CLIL at primary and secondary levels indicates that the content addressed may be negatively affected (e.g. Bonnet 2012; Costa and D’Angelo 2011), other studies assert that the subject content is not only unaffected, but that learning through an additional language enhances learners’ linguistic competency in the vehicular language(s), boosts learners’ self-confidence and facilitates the development of a positive attitude towards the L2 (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014). Linguistic competences that seem to particularly benefit from CLIL tuition are receptive tasks, oral comprehension and production skills, vocabulary acquisition and use, lexical richness (chiefly specialised vocabulary), lexical transfer and written production. Contrarily, morphosyntax, pronunciation/accents, informal and non-technical language, and sentence-level writing do not seem to be heightened through CLIL (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014).
Although little is known about ICLHE, lecturers’ mastery of the language of instruction and effective lecturing skills prove to be paramount. Lecturers have been reported to display a possibly deficient ICLHE language competency – a less expressive, redundant and clear use of the language, less emphasis on necessary elements like reiteration and repetition of ideas and concepts, or reduced metadiscursive devices and stylistic lecturing variety. Likewise, there is some evidence that students face comprehension difficulties due to lecturers’ inadequate pronunciation and use of unfamiliar vocabulary, which seems to induce a more superficial understanding of content. Furthermore, research shows that the lack of academic skills deployed in the mother tongue (L1) is similarly reflected in the ICLHE language (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014).

In light of these considerations, a wide array of factors seems to be crucial in the implementation of ICLHE. While research has been carried out for quality indicators in English Language Teaching at secondary education (Hughes, 2007), the literature review regarding ICLHE shows a lack of research that would ideally shed light on the linguistic, academic and political decisions to be taken at tertiary level (Fernández-Costales & González-Riaño, 2015). It is our aim to suggest some specifications that could lead to a common language policy in Spanish universities in the future, an issue which has recently been addressed by the Spanish CRUE (Conferencia de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas) (Bazo Martínez, González Álvarez, Centellas Rodrigo, Dafouz Milne, Fernández Costales & Pavón, 2017). These specifications will be analysed in the next sections organized into the following categories: conditions, programme structure, lecturers and students, and methodological considerations.

2. Conditions

The implementation of ICLHE is contingent on conditions that Mellion (2008) encapsulates in four dimensions. First, the socio-political dimension greatly determines the feasibility of ICLHE tuition as it rests on the stance and the support of both government and society concerning the internationalization of education and the use of languages other than the official language(s) of the country as means of instruction; additionally, the location of the institution (for instance, its proximity to another country or area where a different language is spoken) may influence the selection of the ICLHE language.

Second, the strategies put into practice by the university’s board and personnel, making decisions and developing policies on international education, reveal their attitudes and support for an international orientation, which needs to be evident to the educational community through, for example, ICLHE pilot programmes, help from the international office, or acknowledgement of the official status of the programme. Third, funding for designing international curricula is pivotal for material development (translations of course descriptions, study guides and exam regulations) and staff stability, recruitment and training (hiring additional teaching staff or personnel for the international office, and training in the ICLHE language, including the fee for registering for exams). Fourth, organizational aspects such as publication of guidelines for recruiting international students, processing applications, providing overseas students with practical information about, for example, how to obtain or extend a visa, offering them accommodation or favouring effective and smooth communication are essential.
Further requirements include the need to ensure collaboration among all stakeholders involved, the necessity to guarantee the continuity of the programme, both at an institutional and personal level, at all the stages of the process – from planning training programmes to administration (Mellion, 2008) and the establishment of a follow-up programme or protocol (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014).

In Spain, some decisions at autonomous government level have helped towards the consolidation of ICLHE. This is the case of universities in the Canary Islands, where the autonomous government has established that 12 credits in new degrees (5%) be taught in a language of the European Union other than Spanish, English preferably. In a similar vein, Catalan universities have invested 32 million euros in the accreditation of a B2 level in English for their graduates (Halbach et al., 2013).

3. Programme Structure

Prior to the introduction of ICLHE, it is paramount to work towards an acknowledgment of the official status of the ICLHE programme through a degree of verification. This may be the case when ICLHE intends to be implemented in a new degree, or else, when there is a necessity to issue a Diploma Supplement if ICLHE is to be incorporated into an existing degree.

A highly important decision, though not exclusively for organizational, teaching and recruiting purposes, is the ICLHE model to be implemented. Toledo, Rubio & Hermosín (2012) depict three models present in Spanish universities: 1) content subjects taught in the FL with a progressive increase in the number of credits; 2) choosing between following subjects in Spanish or in the FL; 3) agreements with foreign universities to enrol in content subjects abroad.

It follows that institutions need to specify whether the tuition they offer entails a full or a partial integration of the ICLHE language because teaching all the courses in the FL substantially differs from carrying out some of them through it (Karabinar, 2008). Full integration models are based on the assumption that all participants in the process master the FL and can pursue content courses in it. In this environment, the FL seems to constitute a “replacement language” (Alexander, 2008).

As for partial integration models, the L1 plays a relevant role; Karabinar (2008: 62) upholds that it promotes higher self-concepts in content and “is an important tool for learning the content since native language-medium courses are a better predictor for content knowledge when the students are provided with both native and foreign language-medium courses.” In this model of ICLHE, the alternation of languages or code-switching, including the learners’ L1, is primal. Since a specialised and competent use of a FL is required (Myers, 2008), research conducted on students’ L1 seems to indicate that content knowledge is likely to be better predicted in native and FL-medium courses (Karabinar, 2008). Nevertheless, the feasibility of this assumption needs to be questioned as, among other aspects, code-switching does not seem to be operational in international contexts with students deploying a wide array of mother tongues and exhibiting from a varying to a lacking or even non-existent command of the local language. Partial integration courses may also deter international students who
are not well versed in both languages from registering in them. A third paradigm consisting
in using the FL as an “additional” language in some courses to expedite the transition of
international students to courses offered in the local language may be implemented in order
to compensate this lack of proficiency in the local language (Alexander, 2008).

The subjects taught in the FL likewise constitute essential aspects. In partial integration
models, students may not select an optional subject if they perceive an apparent additional
difficulty. In a similar vein, for compulsory subjects, if there are several groups, students
may opt for the group that does not use the FL or even decide to change to this group
if they perceive a higher difficulty; whereas, if there is a unique group, the necessities of
students who wish to pursue their degree in their L1 may simply not be met. When there are
several groups, lecturing staff who teach in their L1 may not be overtly cooperative if they
believe that ICLHE affects content comprehension negatively (Fortanet, 2008). Therefore,
the success of partial integration programmes may rest on both, the selection of courses
taught through ICLHE, and the provision of alternative subjects, groups and/or itineraries for
students who wish to pursue their degree in their L1. ICLHE tuition needs to be established
progressively and course selection may be justified according to practical criteria (subjects
whose materials are written in the FL or expected use of the FL in students’ academic and/
or prospective professional contexts) (Fortanet, 2008).

Additionally, plurilingualism in higher education benefits from the internationalization
of teaching experiences through, for instance, the promotion of teaching exchanges among
lecturers from different contexts and the invitation extended to overseas lecturers to teach in
the programme (Fortanet, 2008) either onsite or online through, for example, videoconferences
or online sessions or workshops.

In contexts in which ICLHE is beginning to be incorporated or in contexts where it
is not possible to implement it in all the years of the degree, the crux of the matter lies
in temporalization. Lecturing staff seems to prefer tuition in the FL in the later years of
undergraduate programmes, when students are more mature (Fortanet, 2008). This is why,
in some institutions, ICLHE programmes have first been offered in postgraduate courses
(Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014). Nonetheless, the transition to plurilingual programme may be
facilitated through “English for Specific Purposes” courses.

4. Lecturers and Students

Lecturers and students need to develop a series of competencies which Mellion (2008)
assigns to three main categories: linguistic, didactic/learning and multicultural. Mellion
(2008) emphasises that linguistic competency and confidence are intertwined since they
involve mastery of the language of instruction, the display of positive attitudes towards it
and the confidence to employ it as a vehicular language in the teaching and learning process.
Furthermore, the nature of ICLHE makes the development of lecturers’ didactic competencies
and students’ learning competencies in the FL inherent components of this paradigm in tertiary
education. Similarly, the internationalization of higher education requires multicultural and
intercultural competencies that favour intercultural dialogue and understanding among local
and international lecturers and students. Hence, ICLHE needs to contemplate provisions to
provide lecturing staff and students with opportunities to enhance their linguistic, didactic/learning and multicultural competencies. As mentioned above, one possibility to enhance ICLHE participants’ competencies and to acknowledge their efforts is to give them priority in exchange programmes (Fortanet, 2008).

Given the high relevance of linguistic competency, establishing a threshold level may be advisable or even become established as a requirement for students, since it seems that ICLHE may be more advantageous for learners with a below-intermediate level (for example, in the development of oral comprehension skills and grammar competency) (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014). Likewise, institutions may wish to establish an optimal or minimum language proficiency level for lecturers in the FL to guarantee a beneficial effect on students’ language proficiency since, if lecturers’ language competency is limited, the improvement of students’ linguistic competency may be threatened (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2014).

A buddy or counselling system involving students from non-language degrees and C1 level students completing a degree in philological or translation areas, along with tailor-made language courses specially designed for students taking a specific ICLHE degree, could be activated in order to compensate for lacks in students’ linguistic competency. However, quoting García’s words: “Language is an important aspect, although by no means the most important, in considering the topic of bilingual education … We focus here not on language per se but on the multiple discursive practices that constitute what we call languaging” (García 2009:40). This would suggest the importance of quality discursive exchanges between participants. In this sense, the enhancement of students’ discovery and learning to learn skills, on the one hand, and presentation and academic writing skills, on the other, becomes particularly relevant (Zegers, 2008). Participation in ICLHE demands commitment and an active stance on the part of students, including the development of autonomy, cooperative learning and pro-active attitudes when it comes to selecting topics and tasks (Pavón & Rubio, 2010).

As far as commitment of the teaching faculty is concerned, lecturers need to perceive smooth communication channels and feel the support of the educational community (Mellion, 2008); the commitment of all stakeholders is clearly the cornerstone of any educational initiative. Commitment is also heightened through explicit institutional support and incentives awarded to lecturing staff engaged in ICLHE, such as funding for material production and/or teaching load reductions (Fernández-Costales & González-Riaño, 2015), awarding extra credits to Departments whose lecturers participate in plurilingual tuition, giving ICLHE lecturers priority when it comes to awarding teaching innovation projects, or giving them priority to receive guest teachers from other universities in the realm of the ICLHE programme (Fortanet, 2008).

Commitment needs to be accompanied with in-service staff preparation and training. Training in several possible fields, ideally both within and away from lecturers’ institutions, has to be guaranteed in English for Academic Purposes (Fortanet, 2008), the pedagogical essentials of ICLHE (see next section), awareness of the basics of second language acquisition processes and intercultural communication – as lecturers need to cater for non-native speakers of the ICLHE and local languages (Klaassen, 2008; Mellion, 2008) – and C1 language courses – it is estimated that a minimum 4-6 week intensive course constitutes a requirement to improve language proficiency (Klaassen, 2008).

Indeed, language proficiency in the FL may become an entry requirement for new teaching personnel (Klaassen, 2008). Teaching faculty should be able to: 1) explain academic content
in the FL with ease and confidence and be able to detect possible language difficulties; 2) design adapted and attractive material for students; 3) identify the language objectives of a given lesson plan (Arnold, 2010). Furthermore, the use of the FL by non-native teachers requires the university’s agreement on language policy, the specification of guidelines for quality control of teaching in the FL and in-service training (Kling & Hjulmand, 2008).

An additional key aspect is the support offered to ICLHE lecturers to plan their subjects through, for instance, the design of a common tool or template for the syllabus of all ICLHE subjects (Fortanet, 2008), professional revision of the materials prepared in the ICLHE language, the provision of internships to help lecturers translate their materials and/or Powerpoint presentations (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014), or favouring the interdepartmental and interdisciplinary collaboration of content and language lecturers from different areas (Friedenberg and Schneider, 2008; Mellion, 2008). Collaboration among teaching personnel is one of the most serious problems ICLHE models can face, since isolation and lack of coordination and communication tend to be the rule (Fernández-Costales & González-Riaño, 2015).

5. Methodological aspects

The starting point for lecturers in order to make methodological decisions should probably be to assess their students’ needs in detail, comparing students’ proclaimed needs with lecturers’ perceived estimate of these needs (Zegers, 2008). This analysis would lead to the identification and formulation of clear goals, expectations and (learning) outcomes of both the ICLHE degrees in general and the particular subjects taught through ICLHE and assessment of the feasibility and/or desirability of alternating languages (FL and local language) or code-switching (Zegers, 2008).

Mastering the ICLHE language is not enough. It needs to be coupled with other elements such as exhibiting academic skills; i.e., skills to deliver oral presentations in the FL (Kling & Hjulmand, 2008) and the knowledge of the components and language structures required to write a research report or paper (Lim, 2008). Consequently, lecturers not only need to master these elements, but also have to be able to offer guidelines to aid students’ delivery of oral presentations and writing of research reports in the ICLHE language. Moreover, Klaassen (2008) singles out the need to encourage discussion and interaction in the classroom.

ICLHE has a profound effect on students’ attention and rhythm of the class and ICLHE students’ attention span seems to be significantly shorter than when the lesson is taught in the L1. Therefore, the use of a language distinct from students’ L1 in ICLHE tuition calls for lecturers to incorporate compensation mechanisms related to the following fields:

a) Skills to manage different groupings in class and boost group work, cooperative work, project work (Bonnet, 2012) and a task-based approach (Poisel, 2012).

b) Classroom dynamics and abilities to increase students’ input in the FL and encourage them to use the FL as much as possible.

c) Variety and diversity of materials and approaches.

d) Predominance of visual elements such as signposting, illustrations, diagrams (Klaassen, 2008) and mind maps.
e) Non-verbal communication like gestures or keeping eye-contact.

f) Detailed explanation of concepts – including explanations of new terminology and explanations of terms or procedures in new ways – and the inclusion of clear and illustrative examples (Klaassen, 2008).

g) Emphasis on pronunciation elements affecting comprehension (like speed or placing emphasis), mastery of attention-pitch (Valcke & Pavón, 2015) and suitable intonation patterns (Klaassen, 2008).

h) Specialised vocabulary, summary words (Klaassen, 2008) and glossaries.

i) Specialised discourse and grammar structures, notably phrases and sentence structures in the FL and, in particular, in connection with genres (argumentative, narrative, descriptive or expository) (Cendoya & Di Bin, 2010).

j) Promotion of students’ discovery skills and learning to learn skills.

k) Alternative assessment tools and criteria adapted to ICLHE teaching.

l) Emphasis on scaffolding language techniques to foster language use (such as modelling or contextualising) and to facilitate its understanding (like rephrasing, maximisation of redundancy, exemplifying, schema building, comparison, or use of synonyms and antonyms) (van de Pol, Volman & Beishuizen, 2010; Walqui, 2006). Information and communication technologies (ICT) constitute a powerful resource to expedite linguistic scaffolding processes (Koenraa et al., 2008).

Designing ICLHE materials, though time-consuming and, therefore, expensive, is pivotal. For ICLHE contexts involving non-native speakers of the language, such as immigrants or international students, Friedenberg and Schneider (2008) put forward a “sheltered instruction” model in which language and content specialists collaborate, for example, in the simplification of the language structures or in the creation of simplified supplementary tasks that keep the intellectual integrity of the material. In heterogeneous groups with participants from diverse disciplines and areas a possibility is the selection of common general themes that allow students to carry out an analysis of the topic in question from their own disciplines: an example is immigration, an issue that medical students can address from a medical perspective whereas law students may look at the legal aspects of the phenomenon (Breeze, 2008).

The implementation of approaches that favour student reflection becomes a sine qua non in higher education. Reflection may be stimulated through portfolios submitted at the end of the term or semester accompanied by students’ informed reports. Lecturers may orientate students by proposing prompts for a semi-guided informed and critical reflection on, for instance, the process, learning goals and methods employed to meet the goals. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001) may be employed as a benchmark (Haines & Ashworth, 2008).

6. CONCLUSIONS

This article has aimed at suggesting provisos for the implementation of plurilingualism at tertiary level. Table 1 provides a summary of these divided into categories and subcategories. As extended research for this first approach to quality ICLHE implementation, it would be
enriching to plan and execute empirical studies that would shed light on factors that need further consideration such as whether additional requirements need to be pondered, whether these specifications are imperative in all contexts of ICLHE in higher education, or whether their relevance varies across higher education settings.

Table 1. Overview of provisos for plurilingual education in higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and subcategories</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-political dimension</td>
<td>- Stance taken by and support of the government concerning the internat...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stance taken by and support of society concerning the internationalization of education and the use of second/foreign languages as means of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Location of the institution and its effect on the selection of the ICLHE language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies employed</td>
<td>- Attitudes towards and support of an international orientation (i.e., pilot programmes, help from the international office, or acknowledgement of the official status of the programme) on the part of the university’s board and decision-makers concerning policy in international education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensuring collaboration among all stakeholders involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Guaranteeing the continuity of the programme, both at an institutional and personal level, in all the stages of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establishment of a follow-up programme or protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>- Funding for material development (translations of course descriptions, study guides and exam regulations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding for staff stability, recruiting and training (hiring additional teaching staff or personnel for the international office, and training in the ICLHE language).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>- Guidelines for recruiting international students, processing applications, providing overseas students with information about, for example, how to obtain or extend a visa, offering them accommodation, or favouring effective/smooth communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official acknowledgment</td>
<td>- Acknowledgment of the official status of the ICLHE programme though a degree verification or the issue of a Diploma Supplement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLHE model</td>
<td>- Specification of the ICLHE model: a) full integration of the ICLHE language; b) partial integration of the foreign language, c) use of the foreign language as an “additional” language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subjects
- For partial integration programmes, specification of the subjects, optional and/or compulsory, taught in the foreign language.
- For partial integration programmes, provision of alternative subjects, groups and/or itineraries for students who wish to pursue their degree in their mother tongue.
- For partial integration programmes, progressive establishment of the programme.
- For partial integration programmes, selection of the courses taught through ICLHE based on practical criteria (subjects whose materials are written in the FL or expected use of the FL in students’ academic and/or prospective professional contexts).
- Facilitating the transition to the ICLHE programme through, for instance, “English for Specific Purposes” courses.
- Internationalization of teaching experiences in ICLHE programme/subjects through, for instance, the promotion of teaching exchanges and the invitation extended to overseas lecturers to participate onsite or online (i.e. videoconferences or online sessions or workshops).

### Temporalization
- If ICLHE cannot be implemented in all the years of the degree, tuition in the FL offered according to students’ maturity (i.e. last years of undergraduate or postgraduate programmes).

### Lecturers and Students

#### Competencies
- Lecturers and students’ linguistic competency in the language of instruction.
- Institutional provisions to offer lecturing staff and students opportunities to enhance their linguistic competencies.
- Lecturers’ didactic competencies / students’ learning competencies in the FL.
- Institutional provisions to offer lecturing staff and students opportunities to enhance their didactic/learning competencies.
- Lecturers and students’ multicultural/intercultural competencies.
- Institutional provisions to offer lecturing staff and students opportunities to enhance their multicultural/intercultural competencies.

#### Recognition / Incentive
- Lecturers and students’ priority to take part in exchange programmes.

### Threshold Levels
- Establishment of an optimal/minimum language proficiency level for lecturers.
- Establishment of a threshold language proficiency level for students.

### Students

#### Commitment
- Commitment in the ICLHE programme and active attitude.

#### Language Training
- Tailor-made language courses especially designed for students doing a specific ICLHE degree.

#### Further Linguistic Support
- Buddy or counselling system involving students from non-language degrees and C1 level students completing a degree in philological or translation areas.

#### Skills
- Enhancement of discovery and learning to learn skills.
- Enhancement of presentation skills.
- Enhancement of academic writing skills.
- Development of autonomy.

- Pro-active attitudes when it comes to selecting topics and tasks.
**LECTURERS**

| Commitment | - Commitment of the teaching faculty. |
| Relation with the educational community | - Smooth communication with and support of the educational community to the lecturers. |
| Recognition | - Incentives awarded to lecturers involved in ICLHE (i.e. funding for material production, allowable teaching load reduction, awarding extra credits to Departments whose lecturers participate in ICLHE, giving ICLHE lecturers priority in the award of teaching innovation projects or giving them priority to receive guest teachers from other/foreign universities). |
| Training | - Guaranteeing training, ideally within and away from lecturers’ institution.  
- Training in *English for Academic Purposes*.  
- Training in the *pedagogical essentials of ICLHE*.  
- Training in the basics of *second language acquisition processes*.  
- Training in *intercultural communication*.  
- *C1 language courses* in the ICLHE language. |
| Support to plan ICLHE subjects | - Availability of a *common tool or template for the syllabus* of all ICLHE subjects.  
- Professional translators’ or translator centres’ *revision of the materials* prepared in the ICLHE language.  
- Provision of internships to help lecturers *translate their materials* and/or Power-point presentations.  
- Favouring the *collaboration among lecturers* from different disciplines. |
| Entry requirements | - *Language proficiency* in the FL becomes an entry requirement for new teaching personnel. |
| Quality control of teaching | - University’s agreement on a policy and specification of guidelines for quality control of *teaching in the FL*.  
- University’s agreement on a policy and specification of guidelines for quality control of *in-service training*. |

**METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

| Needs analysis | - Detailed assessment of students’ needs.  
- Comparison between students’ proclaimed needs and lecturers’ perceived estimate of their students’ needs.  
- Formulation of clear goals, expectations and outcomes of both the ICLHE degrees in general and the particular subjects taught through ICLHE. |
<p>| Code-switching | - Assessment of the feasibility and/or desirability of alternating languages (FL and local language) or <em>code-switching</em>. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation mechanisms and lecturers’ skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Skills to manage different groupings in class and boost <em>group</em> work, <em>cooperative</em> work, <em>project</em> work and a <em>task-based</em> approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Liveliness</em> and abilities to <em>increase students’ input</em> in the FL and <em>encourage them to use</em> the FL as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Variety</em> and diversity of materials and approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Non-verbal communication</em> (gestures or eye-contact).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Predominance of <em>visual elements</em> such as signposting, illustrations, diagrams and mind maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed <em>explanation of concepts and explanations of things in new ways accompanied by clear and illustrative examples</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasis on <em>pronunciation</em> elements affecting comprehension (speed or placing emphasis), mastery of <em>attention-pitch</em> and suitable <em>intonation</em> patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specialised <em>vocabulary</em>, summary words and glossaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specialised discourse and grammar structures (phrases and sentence structures) in the FL and, in particular, in connection with the genres (argumentative, narrative, descriptive or expository).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of students’ <em>discovery</em> skills and <em>learning to learn</em> skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alternative assessment tools and criteria adapted to ICLHE teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasis on <em>scaffolding content techniques</em> to facilitate understanding (rephrasing, maximising redundancy, exemplifying, comparing, or using synonyms and antonyms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasis on <em>scaffolding language techniques</em> to foment language use (i.e. modelling or contextualizing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of <em>ICT</em> to facilitate linguistic scaffolding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exhibiting <em>academic skills</em>: skills to deliver oral presentations and knowledge of the components and language structures required to write a research report or paper in the FL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offering <em>guidelines</em> to aid students deliver oral presentations and write a research report in the ICLHE language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dexterity to encourage discussion and <em>interaction</em> in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ability to stimulate <em>students’ reflection</em> on, for instance, the learning process, learning goals and methods employed to meet the goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials design and resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- In ICLHE contexts involving non-native speakers of the language, <em>collaboration</em> among language and content specialists (“sheltered instruction” model) in the <em>simplification</em> of the language structures or in the creation of simplified supplementary tasks that keep the intellectual integrity of the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In heterogeneous groups with participants from diverse disciplines, <em>selection of common general themes</em> that allow students to carry out an analysis of the topic in question from their own disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of students’ <em>portfolios</em> accompanied by an informed report on the portfolios to promote informed and critical reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT: This paper addresses the views on motivation of students who participated in higher education bilingual programmes in a Spanish state university for two academic years and were asked to inform on the experiences that they found more motivating and the changes they would introduce to feel more enthused to participate in a similar programme in the future. Qualitative data were gathered through a questionnaire administered to 310 students that included two open questions related to motivating factors. The responses were coded in relation to 6 fields that emerged consistently and were converted into percentages. The obtained results show evidence that students display signals of motivation that are related to aspects of the L2 motivational self-system. The relevance of this study lies on the voice of the students participating in an EMI context in HE as well as on the new paths shown on the benefits of self-confidence and self-efficacy, the need to focus on professional opportunities and communities of practice, and a consideration of critical views on current practice and overwhelming use of English.
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Motivaciones de estudiantes de educación superior para participar en programas bilingües

RESUMEN: Este estudio investiga las opiniones sobre motivación de estudiantes que han participado en programas bilingües de educación superior en una universidad pública española durante dos cursos académicos a los que se les pidió que informaran sobre las experiencias que encontraron más motivadoras y los cambios que incorporarían para participar en programas similares en el futuro. Se recogieron datos cualitativos a través de un cuestionario al que contestaron 310 estudiantes y que incluía dos preguntas abiertas relativas a factores motivacionales. Se codificaron las respuestas en relación con seis campos que surgieron de forma consistente y se calcularon los porcentajes. Los resultados obtenidos evidencian que los estudiantes muestran señales de motivación que se relacionan con aspectos del sistema motivacional del yo en L2. La relevancia de este estudio radica en la voz de los estudiantes participantes en un contexto EMI en educación superior, así como en las nuevas líneas planteadas sobre los beneficios de la autoconfianza y autoeficacia, la necesidad de centrarse en oportunidades profesionales y comunidades de práctica y la consideración de una mirada crítica hacia la práctica actual y uso dominante del inglés.

Palabras clave: bilingüismo, enseñanza a través del inglés, educación superior, estudiantes, motivación.
1. INTRODUCTION

In the field of second language success, motivation has been considered an influential factor and a lot of research has focused on its effect on language learning and acquisition. Gardner (1985: 10) provides a definition of motivation in relation to language learning as “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity” and offers a formula describing motivation as a blend of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of language learning plus positive attitudes towards it. Corder (1967: 164) has even suggested that “given motivation, it is inevitable that a human being will learn a second language if he [sic] is exposed to the language data”, and Skehan (1989) identifies motivation as one of the individual differences to be considered important in language learning and language success.

Different types of motivation have been identified as significant in language learning. Gardner and Lambert (1972) make a distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation, the first involving interest and participation in the culture of the people who speak the second language, and the second related to useful drives like occupation or professional promotion among others. Two other basic types of motivation early connected with second language learning are described as intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is connected with the individual’s own satisfaction with learning, enjoyment with learning tasks and feeling of competence. This feeling of competence is related to the concept of self-efficacy defined by Bandura (1997) and adapted to this research context as students’ beliefs about their abilities to successfully perform academic tasks. Extrinsic motivation is derived from external factors like grades or rewards that are not intrinsically associated to learning itself. Although intrinsic motivation seems to connect more closely with language success, research has shown evidence that external rewards can affect intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy. The theory of the L2 motivational self-system (L2 MSS) by Dörnyei (2005, 2009) has proved to have a great influence on second language learning considering its three components -ideal L2 self, ought to L2 self and L2 learning experience-. The ideal L2 self refers to the desirable L2 user one would like to be in the future and the motivation to improve proficiency in languages. The ought-to L2 self concerns the characteristics one believes that one should possess to meet the expectations of others and the L2 learning experience focuses on the learner’s current experience. The desire to move from one’s current self to the ideal self and synchronize both is considered to be an influential L2 learning motivator that can be appropriate when bilingual programmes are implemented in tertiary education.

With the changes brought by globalization in the teaching of languages in general, the implementation of international curricula in higher education (HE) has flourished in Europe and other parts of the world with a tendency to the overwhelming use of English as the medium of instruction (EMI). This fact supports a view of language learning and education which affects motivation for learning languages other than English (LOTEs) and reinforces the role of the student as consumer of employability skills for future integration in the work market (Ushioda, 2017). This strengthens the idea that changes like the one brought by EMI may happen in a short period of time and studies in context are necessary to analyse motivational factors that may vary in a short span (Lasagabaster, 2017). The purpose of this study is to give voices to participants in bilingual courses to discover sources of motivation regarding their recent experience in bilingual HE and changes that would encourage them to participate in future bilingual experiences.
2. **LITERATURE REVIEW**

2.1. **Student Motivation in Bilingual Education**

Research on motivation related to foreign language (FL) learning has been driven by many approaches based on different models and theories in accordance with certain focuses of interests (Bernaus, Wilson & Gardner, 2009; Madrid & Pérez-Cañado, 2001). Despite the widespread literature on bilingual education in Europe in the last decade, not many studies have focused on students’ motivation regarding their participation in bilingual programmes (Lasagabaster, 2013). Among the few studies developed, the following can be highlighted: Cazabon, Lambert and Hall (1993) investigated a bilingual programme implemented in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in which students showed their satisfaction from an academic and social perspective. Ramos (2007) analysed student opinions about a bilingual programme developed in Andalusia. Results showed that students are generally motivated towards bilingualism and the bilingual programme; nevertheless, less satisfactory opinions concerning the intellectual and cognitive benefits of FL learning were reported. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) conducted a study in the Basque Country regarding students’ attitudes towards EFL in a CLIL secondary context and found that CLIL increases student exposure to the FL and its use in meaningful contexts and authentic situations which encourages positive attitudes towards FL learning. Likewise, Genera and Ramírez-Verdugo (2014) analysed student attitudes towards bilingualism and bilingual programmes in Madrid concluding that the students’ impression was that these programmes helped to improve their communicative and social abilities.

As can be observed from these studies, students are, in general, motivated towards bilingual programmes, as they consider that bilingual education fosters their linguistic, cultural and social competences, as well as their academic proficiency (Salaberri & Sánchez-Pérez, 2012; Sevilla, 2016). This is of special relevance in our study focused on students’ motivations to enrol in bilingual programmes.

2.2. **Students’ Motivation in Bilingual Education at Tertiary Level**

The implementation of bilingual and EMI programmes in Europe has been strongly significant in the last decade. The outcomes of these programmes have been reported as successful in some European countries as English proficiency is enhanced (Paseka, 2000). In other geographical areas, these programmes have not reached such satisfactory outcomes, resulting, in some cases, in student exclusion and high university dropout rates (Marsh, 2006). Students participating in bilingual programmes in HE have reported both positive and negative results. Among the positive results, these programmes arouse general satisfaction and motivation in students (Byun *et al.*, 2011), as they perceive an improvement in their FL proficiency, especially in terms of receptive skills (Tatzl, 2011). Among the negative outcomes, bilingual programmes can lead to an increased workload for teachers and students and less comprehension of course content (Byun *et al.*, 2011; Evans and Morrison, 2011; Tatzl, 2011).

With regard to the students’ motivation to participate in bilingual programmes in HE, there is still a limited amount of research, hence the relevance of the present study. Only a few studies have been conducted at this level, such as the one developed by Byun *et al.*
(2011) in a Korean institution, which shows a general motivation towards an EMI programme on the part of the students as it helps to improve their competence in the FL, although the insufficient lecturers’ pedagogical EMI proficiency and the scarce support system resulted in low students’ involvement and reduced content learning. Some other studies conducted in Taiwan also reveal a generally positive attitude towards EMI programmes, especially in terms of motivation for learning and English proficiency (Chen and Kraklow, 2015). Among the studies conducted in Europe, the one developed by Gorges, Kandler and Bohner (2012) in Germany shows that university students strongly interested in acquiring new language skills have a more positive attitude towards EMI programmes. More recently, Radu (2015) identified students’ reasons for choosing a course taught in English in a Romanian university. These include their desire to study abroad, future career opportunities in international environments or access to international materials.

Fewer studies have been developed in Spain concerning students’ motivation towards bilingual programmes in HE. Among them, the study conducted by Aguilar and Rodríguez (2012) should be highlighted, finding evidence that students felt motivated towards an EMI programme, and perceiving improvement of specialized vocabulary and oral skills. Students, however, reported lecturers’ insufficient English proficiency. Another study conducted by Maíz-Arévalo and Domínguez-Romero (2013) analysed the students’ response to CLIL implementation in Economics and Business Administration at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid regarding the following aspects: language skill improvement, strategies to improve English language level, degree of motivation and participation in EMI lessons, content acquisition and academic achievement. Results evidenced a high rate of student motivation when participating in EMI programmes, although one third of the participants expressed their concern about failing the courses. The present study intends to fill a research gap by providing empirical data on the students’ motivation regarding their participation in bilingual programmes at tertiary level where there are only a few studies on this matter, especially in Spain.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Questions

There are two main research questions that qualitatively inquire into the factors that affect students’ motivation: 1) What are the main motivations and concerns identified by students in their two-year bilingual experience in HE?; 2) What are the changes that would make them feel more motivated to participate in future bilingual programmes in HE?

3.2. Context and Participants

The participants were 310 students who attended bilingual courses at the University of Almeria (Spain) for two academic years as part of a plan of internationalization that promoted teaching content through foreign languages, with the prevalence of English over other languages. In fact, all the students participating in this study were attending courses in English. Most of them were on undergraduate courses (285) and fewer students were post-graduate (Masters) (25).
The participation in bilingual courses involved some benefits for the students with the aim of encouraging their participation: 1) Students who follow courses in English that cover half of the total number of credits either in the home university or a university abroad obtain a bilingual certificate in their final qualification (European Diploma Supplement); 2) They are prioritized with respect to study abroad scholarships, etc.

3.3. Instrument for Data Gathering

Two open questions incorporated into a wider questionnaire that contained nine more Likert-style questions plus lines for comments supporting their answers were used to collect the data: 1) What are the factors that motivated you to participate in a bilingual course? 2) What changes would you introduce to feel more motivated to participate in bilingual courses in the future? The nine questions not analysed in this study collected students’ responses also related to their HE bilingual experience in fields like use of English on the part of lecturers, teaching material and strategies, tutorials, etc.

The students received the questionnaire individually by email using the online platform Limesurvey and answered all the questions. The qualitative responses collected from the two open questions were managed using MAXQDA-10 software following several steps. First, responses were listed to be treated as textual data and imported to MAXQDA-10 software for data analysis. Then data were read a few times and assigned codes based on the identification of key words, phrases and segments of lexical combinations, finding also relationships among codes, which provided a set of thematic categories. The coding system was tested on a text sample before codifying all the texts. Finally, relevant quotes were imported to illustrate the results. The six main fields were converted into frequency tables:

1) Lecturers and students’ proficiency in English;
2) Future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice;
3) Teaching and learning strategies;
4) Assessment and qualification;
5) Building students’ self-confidence and self-efficacy to avoid frustration;
6) Critical views on the use of English as dominant language.

4. Results and Discussion

This study draws on a qualitative analysis of aspects that the students found motivating in their HE bilingual experience together with their main concerns and changes that would increase their motivation to enrol in bilingual courses in the future. The six parameters described above were identified responding to the two research questions, although students reacted more deeply to some of the fields which will be supported by the descriptions below and quotations from students to illustrate their comments and opinions.
The responses obtained for the first question related to the first research question provided less information from the students than the second question, that is, students seemed to be more worried about changes in their future experiences than the past ones. Table 1 shows the percentage of students concerned about each of the six coded fields.

**Table 1. Percentage of students’ motivations and concerns about each of the six fields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Percentage of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Lecturers and students’ proficiency in English</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Assessment and qualification</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Building students’ self-confidence to avoid frustration</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Critical views on the use of English as dominant language.</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first emerging field refers to the lecturers and students’ proficiency in English. As can be observed in table 1, most of the surveyed students reported their motivations and concerns about this topic (71%), although they mainly focused on concerns. They report that the experience was initially motivating as they expected to have great opportunities to improve their English language competence with benefits in the interaction with experienced lecturers and classmates with a good command of the FL, but they later discovered drawbacks that concerned them. Quite a few comments state that some lecturers make mistakes when communicating in the FL and do not promote oral communication in the classroom: “My expectations about improving my English disappeared in some classes as the lecturers do not have a high command of English and avoid oral interaction. They just follow the slides and handouts that they have prepared” (Student 131). Regarding the students’ proficiency, they describe different episodes of frustration when trying to communicate content knowledge in English and when interacting with lower proficient students: “I found differences between students who come from bilingual schools and can communicate more easily in English and others like me who don’t come from bilingual schools” (Student 210). These results confirm what other studies have reported about inadequate language skills of both lecturers and students to cope with bilingual programmes at tertiary level (Smith, 2004; Studer, 2015; Tatzl, 2011; Yusof, Tayib & Mansor, 2004, among others).

Issues about their future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998) were reported by 41% of the surveyed students. As a motivating factor, they value the previous information received from administration and lecturers on the future benefits of attending bilingual courses including priority for scholarships abroad, qualifications with a bilingual certificate, and more possibilities of sharing classes with students from abroad. They highly appreciate the use of specific text genres connected with future jobs (Sánchez-Pérez & Salaberri, 2015): “We have been working with texts that we will need in the future when we get a job like technical designs and descriptions...
of greenhouses or adverts on type and quality of plastic covering material” (Student 287). Rather than concerns about this issue they suggest other ways of increasing opportunities in the answers to question 2.

As for the third field, reported by 47% of the students, they value the use of teaching and learning strategies as highly motivating and they explicitly appraise active, interactive and participative classes as engaging in the learning process. They especially mention the use of group work and other forms of classroom management that promote higher participation, evaluating positively the use of teaching strategies to compensate the low proficiency of lecturers and students: “A bad teacher in L1 is also a bad teacher in L2 and the other way round.” (Student 245). This confirms results from other studies (e.g. Studer, 2015) in which students perceive that good classroom dynamics may compensate for the lecturers’ low level of proficiency. This strengthens the need for an integrated teacher training model, not only in terms of foreign language competence, but also in appropriate EMI methodologies to be used in higher education contexts (Sánchez-Pérez & Salaberri, 2017). Their main concerns refer to the classroom performance of lecturers who do not implement the above-mentioned strategies.

Assessment and qualifications are both motivating but also a great concern for students (61%) who, on the one hand, recognize as motivating the action of teachers who considered classroom work as part of the final mark and broke down summative assessment into smaller chunks that are spaced over the course, as well as the lecturers’ focus on formative assessment providing feedback to improve the learning process. On the other hand, they feel that the process of learning in bilingual courses might have an influence on their final marks because they have difficulties to express themselves in English and it has a great impact on their exam answers.

Following Bandura’s definition of self-efficacy (1997) and considering that the concept of competence comprises the concept of self-efficacy, 37% of the students describe situations connected to this issue. There are students who identify episodes in which they overcome insecurities and fear of failure relying on their self-efficacy capabilities: “Since the very beginning I was able to understand and complete the tasks although I had to use different study techniques like writing bilingual lists of words. I had to organize myself in a different way” (Student 302) which is recognized to be motivating. However, they show doubts and concerns about their confidence and efficacy to cope with bilingual courses, in general, and specific tasks, in particular: “Sometimes I feel that I can’t cope with the activity of the class. I’m lost and I can’t understand something that is important” (Student 94). It is also common to find opinions that evidence the links between causal attributions and self-efficacy when the students attribute responsibility for lack of self-efficacy to others like lecturers or classmates: “Some students do not understand what the teacher says and that interrupts the flow of the class that becomes really slow and some of us feel frustrated” (Student 176). This can be considered a concretion of the attribution theory by Weiner (1986) and Williams and Burden (1997), as far as they attribute their failure or success to circumstances that remain outside their responsibility.

Some students (29%) express concerns and negative feelings rather than motivations about the use of EMI and question it: “Why is it in English? Other foreign languages are as useful as English” (Student 122), reporting that other languages are traditionally connected
to a particular field of knowledge and research: “For those of us who study Law, English is not meaningful and we would rather prefer other languages like Italian that provides a context closer to Spanish law” (Student 61). This supports the view by Ushioda and Dörnyei (2017) that motivation for learning LOTEs is a significant issue. In the particular context of this study, courses could be taught in languages other than English, but it was the lecturer’s decision to choose the language of instruction. It is also relevant to mention that international students with knowledge of Spanish participating in the same courses complain about the shift to Spanish in classes where the vast majority of students and the lecturer share Spanish as L1: “I’m a foreign student attending a course theoretically taught in English but the lecturer and the students decided to speak Spanish in occasions. I was lost although Spanish students were satisfied. I was just looking at their faces without understanding” (Student 253), which shows evidence that the community of the class needs to have training and practice in multicompetence and translanguaging skills and not just bilingual skills, supporting the construction of ideal multilingual selves (Henry, 2017) and building a ‘linguistic multi-competence’ framework which (Cook, 2016: 2) defined as “the overall system of a mind or a community that uses more than one language”, considering also that the L1 cannot be banned from students’ minds (Cook, 2001).

The second research question refers to the students’ proposals for increasing their motivations to enrol in future bilingual courses. Table 2 shows the percentage of students’ suggestions concerning the six emerging fields.

Table 2. Percentage of students who suggest changes that would make them feel more motivated to participate in future bilingual programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Percentage of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Lecturers and students’ proficiency in English</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Assessment and qualification</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Building students’ self-confidence to avoid frustration</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Critical views on the use of English as dominant language.</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the proficiency in English of both lecturers and students, 43% of the surveyed students provide suggestions to increase their motivation for the future: group the students according to their previous bilingual experience as those who are not experienced must cope with extra difficulties, start bilingual courses in the first year to facilitate the link with their previous knowledge, offer preparatory short courses before the real content properly starts, focus on main contents avoiding details. This is a signal of motivation based on their L2 learning experience and also their internal process of identification with a future image within the ideal L2 self (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Dörnyei & Al-Hoorie, 2017). As for lecturers’ level of formality, students suggest that they should incorporate colloquial English in class.
Even though students have appreciated their current experience related to their future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice, the vast majority of the surveyed participants (79%) provide further ideas on aspects that would make them feel more motivated. They demand better dissemination of information for students before they enrol in bilingual courses to be aware of employment opportunities abroad, international associations, informal networks, career maps and business in their environment where English is used. In the teaching-learning context of the class they suggest inviting professionals that can describe their current work experience and the importance of English in their profession, creating online networks with students abroad who also attend bilingual courses to share their experience including benefits and drawbacks for their future profession and debating about current issues related to their possible jobs: “Classes could be less formal and invite professionals in our field to tell us about their experience and the need for English” (Student 302). Students also advocate that internships and placements in local business where workers communicate in English would be highly motivating to get work experience and gain employment skills as part of their bilingual experience. All these motivating proposals made by the students confirm their desire to engage in communities of practice that involve members who share common goals, participate in common activities and use a range of resources like documents or tools which correspond to the accumulated knowledge of the community (Wenger, 1998). This is connected with Lanvers’ (2017) ought and ideal motivations as they express a desire to move from the present self to an ideal L2 self and an ought to L2 self, since they would like to align themselves with a global community of practice.

As regards teaching and learning strategies in bilingual courses, 48% of the participants appreciate the use of text types like designs and descriptions of greenhouses or lab reports, but they would like to be exposed to more varied text types useful in their professional development. This emphasizes the importance of creating text and genre maps for the different fields of study in HE, what Lorenzo (2013: 376) calls a “multilingual genre map across the curriculum”. Students also suggest a more extended use of ICT resources and classroom techniques that profile good lecturers for them as supporters of cooperation and participation in class, facilitators of understanding, designers of graded learning tasks and materials, etc. Most of their feelings can be summarized in this quotation: “We feel motivated with passionate teachers who like teaching” (Student 173). These motivating expectations are based on the way lectures have been delivered and represent the students’ L2 learning experience, but they also see bilingual education as a tool that opens new paths.

Suggestions for further motivation are related to assessment and qualifications. 68% of the students show evidence that this concerns them more than teaching or learning and propose assessment in L1/L1-L2, as they do not feel confident about assessment in L2. They also think that lecturers should consider the effort students make in the final assessment, as it involves an added value: “We should be rewarded in our assessment as our effort is bigger than doing it in L1” (Student 56). The alternative that bilingual courses could be recognized as extra learning credits and even a CEFR qualification equivalent to B1, required of the students to obtain their final degree qualification, is suggested by many students. They also advocate for continuous summative and formative assessment that should be clearly stated in the course programme to replace the imbalance towards the value of final exams in HE.
This type of motivation could be analysed from Higgin’s perspective (1987) of other-ought and other-ideal as a reaction against norms of the system in coincidence with a sense of supportive influence also required from others (Lanvers, 2017) in terms of “prestige” associated to an increased value of bilingual courses participation and qualification.

Some participants (15%) propose ideas to increase their self-competence and self-efficacy in bilingual courses to avoid frustration and anxiety derived from the lack of understanding of what is going on in the classroom. Their suggestions cover different aspects like receiving glossaries of key concepts in L1 and L2, subtitled scientific videos, clear guidelines for each class to avoid getting lost, summaries, etc. They also express the need to start with simple concepts and then move to more complex ones combined with a careful selection of courses: “Starting a subject in English which is difficult in itself makes the bilingual experience quite frustrating” (Student 226). As can be observed, most of these suggestions attribute responsibility for their own self-confidence and self-efficacy to others rather than to themselves. This coincides with results obtained by Studer (2015) and Studer & Konstantinidou (2015) which conclude that students do not tend to think critically about their contribution to self-confidence and level of competence, rather they attribute reasons of their lack of self-efficacy to others like lecturers and/or course design. However, some students also praise their personal ability to overcome frustration and give advice that they consider useful for students, suggesting that they should exploit to the fullest extent what they consider to be academic skills, like effort and changes in self-organisation, confidence in performing well, socializing with others to mediate learning when coping with difficult tasks and communicative situations, lessen anxiety, etc. This last view supports Bandura’s (1986: 391) concept of self-efficacy as “people’s judgements of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances”. The types of motivation underlying the students’ views in this field show their need to move from their present self to an ideal L2 self but, involving also a revision of the other-ideal and other-ought to gain agency in their learning practice. More studies might be necessary to analyse the connection between the students’ level of self-confidence and self-efficacy and their success in bilingual courses.

Finally, critical views (44%) have raised the issue of using English as the only language of instruction and suggest motivations for the future that include the use of Spanish as L1 in bilingual classrooms: “In occasions, using Spanish in the classroom would help to clarify concepts. International students in our classes can also understand Spanish” (Student 214), and also the use of LOTEs, especially in areas of knowledge traditionally associated to other languages, like Spanish law and Italian. Students are also critical towards the extensive use of English and suggest the need to know more than one FL: “We know that English is the language of global business, but why don’t we learn also through other languages like French or Arabic? I would like to work in the north of Africa when I get the degree” (Student 189). Comments like this pose essential questions about the role of English in bilingual courses which demand further research and could be considered a motivation based on the anti-ought-to self as described by Thompson (2017) and inspired by psychological reactance (Brehm, 1966).
5. Conclusion

In this paper we have attempted to give voices to HE students participating in bilingual courses to identify their concerns and motivations derived from their current experience, and motivating factors that would encourage them to participate in future bilingual courses. The qualitative data collected through two open questions were coded and grouped around six emerging categories. These data were consistent to answer the two research questions and were converted into percentages and analysed adding relevant students’ quotations about their future motivations to illustrate the findings.

The results obtained confirm conclusions from other studies in relation to the proficiency levels of both lecturers and students and suggest new paths to improve motivation in future bilingual experiences. Teaching and learning experiences used and encouraged by lecturers seem to play an important role in their motivation and they are perceived as compensating for the lack of proficiency of both lecturers and students. The participants’ future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice are considered crucial as motivational factors to participate in further bilingual courses. They also identify drawbacks in their assessment and qualifications and suggest modifications to the system. The overwhelming use of English is also questioned by a significant number of students in relation to their current studies and future careers.

Following the L2 motivational self system framework, participants show evidence of types of motivation related to their L2 learning experience in the case of lecturers and students’ proficiency in English as well as the teaching and learning strategies used in the context of the classroom, although they manifest an internal process of identification with a future image within the ideal L2 self. The progression from the present self to an ideal L2-self is evidenced regarding self-confidence and self-efficacy, entailing a revision of the ideal-other ought for those who attributed responsibility to others. The movement from the present self to an ideal L2 user they would like to be in the future and the characteristics they ought to own in order to meet the expectations of others in the form of the internalized image they have of themselves for the future, as shown in findings about their future professional opportunities and integration in communities of practice. They also show signals of other-ideal and other-ought when they feel undervalued in their assessment and qualification procedures and react against established norms. In the same line, they manifest critical views on the dominance of an EMI approach which rejects the use of the L1 in class or inhibits the use of other foreign languages which can be considered a motivation based on the anti-ought-to self. The use of the L2 MSS model has proved to be valuable although it would require a deeper analysis of the obtained data.

Finally, the findings of this study can be considered relevant as they have given voice to students participating in an EMI context in HE and it has also opened new paths on the benefits of self-confidence and self-efficacy, the need to focus on professional opportunities and communities of practice, and a consideration of critical views on current practice and overwhelming use of English. This might suggest a move in research towards students’ awareness of their current experience and their future motivations.
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RESUMEN: La competencia lectora en lengua extranjera del alumnado en contexto AICLE (Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras) constituye una de las destrezas cruciales para afrontar el contenido. El objetivo fundamental de este artículo es el análisis de la fluidez lectora silenciosa para reconocer el comportamiento de la competencia lectora del alumnado universitario. Para ello, se han recogido datos mediante pruebas de segmentación de palabras en lengua materna y en lengua extranjera, así como datos de una prueba que diagnostica su nivel de comprensión lectora en lengua extranjera. Los principales resultados muestran el bajo nivel de competencia lectora del alumnado y plantea la utilidad de realizar mediciones de lectura silenciosa para diagnosticar sus dificultades lectoras.
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1. INTRODUCCIÓN

En un mundo cada vez más global y digitalizado, la adquisición de una buena competencia lectora plurilingüe permite al alumno universitario el acceso a un sistema laboral cada vez más dinámico y deslocalizado, así como un mejor desempeño como agente social en las diferentes sociedades receptoras. Leer con fluidez y comprender lo que se lee en una segunda lengua (L2) es una competencia transversal compleja, de naturaleza interlingüística...
y multidimensional, que requiere del dominio de diferentes destrezas. De acuerdo con el Consejo de Europa, la competencia lectora se define como “la habilidad general de comprender, usar y reflexionar sobre las distintas formas del lenguaje escrito con el objeto de alcanzar un desarrollo personal y social satisfactorio” (Eurydice, 2011: 7).

En lengua materna (L1), hay un consenso general sobre el valor correlacional de la fluidez lectora oral y la comprensión de textos escritos en la población infantil y adolescente, siendo así un indicador general de competencia lectora (Fuchs et al., 2001). Rasinski (2014) afirma que a mayor velocidad lectora corresponde una mayor capacidad de comprensión. En una segunda lengua, sin embargo, el proceso lector es aún más complejo que en L1 y la investigación sobre la fluidez lectora oral no ha arrojado aún resultados concluyentes (Lems, 2003; Jeon, 2012), a la vez que los estudios sobre el comportamiento de la fluidez en la lectura silenciosa (FLS) son aún escasos, especialmente en el nivel universitario.

El objetivo central de este estudio es examinar si la FLS podría ser un indicador de progresión y de desarrollo de la competencia lectora de los estudiantes jóvenes universitarios en un contexto AICLE, donde confluyen diferentes niveles de competencia comunicativa en inglés como segunda lengua. De los dos modos de lectura, la oral y la silenciosa, hemos decidido investigar esta última por ser el tipo de lectura natural en la vida adulta, “el modo de lectura de referencia en las sociedades basadas en el conocimiento” (Share, 2008: 594). Por ser, en definitiva, el modo de lectura competente (van den Boer, van Bergen, & de Jong, 2014).

2. Marco teórico y revisión de la literatura

2.1. La fluidez en el proceso lector

De acuerdo con el grupo de estudio RAND (2002: 11), “la comprensión lectora es el proceso de extraer y construir simultáneamente el significado a través de la interacción y la implicación con la lengua escrita”. En lengua materna (L1), hay una abundante cantidad de estudios basados en la medición de la fluidez lectora oral para identificar el desarrollo del proceso lector y a los alumnos con dificultades potenciales de aprendizaje, al ser este el modo de lectura con que los niños van adquiriendo la relación entre el código escrito y la lengua oral. En el nivel educativo elemental, cuando los lectores noveles van adquiriendo la relación grafo-fonológica y aprenden a identificar palabras en los textos escritos (decodificación), la fluidez lectora oral, entendida como una cualidad que expresa un porcentaje importante de corrección, velocidad y expresividad en la lectura (Kuhn, Schwanenflugel, Meisinger, Levy, & Rasinski, 2010; National Reading Panel, 2000; T. Rasinski & Samuels, 2011), suele correlacionar muy significativamente con la capacidad de comprender el significado de la lengua escrita. Los niños con problemas de decodificación presentan dificultades para comprender lo que leen.

En lo que respecta al estudio de la FLS, para Hiebert, Samuels, & Rasinski (2012) y Ciuffo et al. (2017), la lectura en silencio supera al desarrollo de la fluidez lectora oral, ya que el techo máximo de desarrollo y eficiencia ocupa toda la vida educativa hasta seguir
incrementándose, incluso, en el nivel universitario. Ciuffo et al., (2017: 1679) definen la FLS como “la habilidad de leer con concentración, a una velocidad adecuada y con una buena comprensión”.

En la actualidad, los sistemas de medición de la fluidez lectora son principalmente orales. Se dispone de marcos normativos con índices de lectura fluida en palabras por minuto, se practican en el contexto de la lengua materna y se emplean fundamentalmente en las escuelas. Después de la enseñanza primaria, apenas hay medición de la fluidez lectora oral y pocas veces se realizan evaluaciones de FLS en L1 y en L2.

2.2. Base teórica de la adquisición de la fluidez lectora en L1

Un modelo que ha servido de base teórica para comprender las diferencias individuales en la adquisición de las destrezas lectoras en L1 es el de Visión Simple de la Lectura (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990). Este marco teórico explica la comprensión lectora como el resultado de la interacción entre el proceso de Decodificación (identificación de palabras escritas) y la Comprensión Lingüística (oral). Dentro de este modelo simple de la lectura, la fluidez lectora actúa como componente mediador que sirve de puente hacia la comprensión lectora (Pikulski & Chard, 2005; Silverman, Speece, Harring, & Ritchey, 2013). Desde este paradigma, Hiebert et al. (2012: 36) definen la fluidez lectora como “la habilidad de decodificar y comprender en una misma fijación ocular”. Para un lector novel en L1 o un lector con dificultades de decodificación léxica, la unidad de reconocimiento visual de una palabra sería la letra (c-a-s-a) mientras que para un lector fluyente sería la palabra (casa), un indicativo de que los procesos previos para la identificación de palabras han sido automatizados. Este rasgo implica que la fluidez es una destreza relacionada con un constructo teórico crucial para su conceptualización, la automaticidad.

La base teórica cognitiva de la fluidez lectora son la Teoría de la Automaticidad de LaBerge & Samuels (1974) y la Teoría de la Eficiencia Verbal (Perfetti, 1985). En ambas, las destrezas complejas como la fluidez lectora se explican atendiendo a que la lectura fluida requiere de la ejecución coordinada y eficaz de un conjunto de subdestrezas, a la vez que los recursos cognitivos de naturaleza atencional son limitados. Los seres humanos no solemn realizan más de un proceso a la vez, salvo que realicemos una tarea y luego otra, o que una tarea esté lo suficientemente bien aprendida y automatizada como para poder situar la atención en otra. En general, la teoría de la automaticidad y de la eficiencia verbal se basan en la reubicación de los procesos atencionales para la liberación de la memoria de trabajo. Es decir, un lector eficiente emplearía 100 ms en identificar la palabra casa dejando los otros 200 ms para comprender su significado en una lectura silenciosa (Samuels, Hiebert, & Rasinski, 2014). Es decir, la fluidez lectora ha de ser entendida dentro del marco de la comprensión, porque la lectura rápida y correcta de palabras sin comprensión no sería fluidez sino velocidad (Rasinski & Samuels, 2011).

En cuanto a la lectura silenciosa, antes se pensaba que la FLS era simplemente la manifestación subyacente de una misma habilidad lectora. Hoy se sabe que son constructos similares pero diferenciados. Van den Boer et al. (2014) comparó las destrezas que subyacen a la lectura oral y a la lectura silenciosa. Partiendo de tres indicadores (conciencia fonológica,
velocidad de nombramiento y espacio de atención visual) como destrezas subyacentes, concluyó que la conciencia fonológica mostraba un comportamiento similar en ambos modos de lectura, si bien en la lectura silenciosa era menos notable su activación debido a que la forma ortográfica de las palabras podía activar directamente el significado. Por esta razón, el indicador de alcance visual resultó ser un índice importante en la lectura silenciosa, frente a la velocidad de nombramiento de palabras más vinculado con la fluidez lectora oral. Los resultados de la investigación de Zhao et al. (2016) confirman también estos hallazgos. Estos estudios, por tanto, indican que la atención visual podría ser interesante para diagnosticar problemas de lectura, así lo comprueba Gagliano et al. (2015) en el caso de la detección de la dislexia mediante la lectura fluida silenciosa.

2.3. Base teórica de la adquisición de la fluidez lectora en L2

La particularidad del proceso de adquisición de la habilidad lectora en segunda lengua recomienda mantener cierta precaución antes de extrapolar conclusiones de la L1 a la L2, porque plantea retos diferentes y añade a la compleja naturaleza del proceso lector la interacción e interferencia mutua de dos sistemas lingüísticos (Bernhardt, 2011; Fonseca-Mora & Fernández-Corbacho, 2017; Koda, 2007a, 2007b). Los individuos adultos con una alfabetización previa nunca comienzan el desarrollo de su proceso lector desde cero, siempre saben algo. De acuerdo con la Teoría de la Interdependencia Lingüística de Cummins (1979), las habilidades lectoras en L1 pueden ser transferidas a la L2. De hecho, Bernhardt (2011) estipula que alrededor del 20% de la varianza en la comprensión lectora de jóvenes adultos se podría explicar por el nivel de literacidad en L1. Por otro lado, mientras que el lector adulto en L1 ya aprendió a leer en la escuela después de haber adquirido previamente un caudal lingüístico oral importante en su lengua materna durante la infancia, el lector adulto en L2 adquiere vocabulario oral a la vez que desarrolla su competencia lectora en L2. Esto podría explicar, por ejemplo, la mayor confianza en la decodificación ortográfica (visual) que en la decodificación fonológica (oral) de los lectores no nativos en los estudios iniciales, especialmente en los casos en que la relación entre grafema y fonema en la L2 es difusa (Oh, 2016). Hay un consenso general en reconocer el factor interlingüístico en el proceso de adquisición de la competencia lectora en L2. Así, la menor o mayor distancia lingüística entre la L1 y la L2 afectará al desarrollo de la fluidez lectora oral y silenciosa. La hipótesis de la ortografía opaca de Katz & Frost (1992) sostiene que, cuando los individuos afrontan el aprendizaje de la lectura de lenguas (como el inglés), cuya relación entre grafemas y fonemas no es tan directa o transparente (como ocurre en español), su proceso de aprendizaje y la adquisición de habilidades como la fluidez lectora requieren de más tiempo.

En segundas lenguas, la investigación sobre la fluidez lectora silenciosa en adultos continúa siendo aún escasa en relación con la presencia de estudios en lengua materna. Lems (2003), en una de las primeras aproximaciones al estudio de la fluidez lectora oral y la lectura silenciosa, encontró que el nivel de conocimiento lingüístico de la L2 (gramática y vocabulario) correlacionaba de manera más significativa con la comprensión lectora mientras que la fluidez mantenía una relación significativa débil. Jeon (2012) también fracasa en su
intentó de conceptualizar el rol de la fluidez lectora en L2, el resultado de su investigación ofrece las mismas conclusiones que Lems (2003). El meta-análisis de Jeon y Yamashita (2014) refleja un panorama en el que los promedios de corrección gramatical en los estudios sobre comprensión de textos escritos en L2 correlacionan con una magnitud más fuerte que la fluidez.

Según Grabe (2010), una de las dificultades del estudio de la fluidez lectora en L2 guarda relación con un conflicto que parece estar marcadamente presente en el ámbito de la investigación en adquisición de competencia lectora en lengua extranjera: el debate entre corrección (gramática) o fluidez. En el ámbito de la L2, parece que aún sigue pendiente la respuesta a la pregunta de Alderson (1984), “Reading in a foreign language: A Reading problema or a language problem?” Jeon y Yamashita (2014) respondieron que se trata de un problema lingüístico, no cognitivo, pero obvieron aspectos como la velocidad de procesamiento (Oh, 2016), siendo ésta una habilidad cognitiva fundamental que afecta al proceso lector.

Este estado de la cuestión refleja, pues, la necesidad de estudiar la FLS atendiendo a las peculiaridades del lector de L2 de acuerdo con su nivel de competencia comunicativa en la segunda lengua y observando no solo su conocimiento del componente lingüístico de la lengua meta sino también sus habilidades lectoras en la lengua materna.

3. MÉTODO

3.1. Participantes

La muestra objeto de estudio estuvo conformada por 47 alumnos españoles de la asignatura Didáctica de la lengua extranjera, del 2º curso del grado de Educación Infantil impartida en régimen de inmersión total en inglés. En cuanto a la formación lingüística previa, el 10% había cursado únicamente inglés en contexto escolar, mientras que el 90% había recibido clases de inglés y francés durante una media de 10 años. Al no haber cursado inglés desde Bachillerato y al ser la única asignatura que cursan en inglés en la carrera, en general, el alumnado se mostró temeroso de ser capaz de comprender e interactuar en la L2.

3.2. Hipótesis

Ante la ausencia de resultados definitivos sobre la trayectoria de la FLS en diferentes niveles de comprensión lectora en L2, en este estudio se compara el comportamiento de la lectura silenciosa en L1 y en L2 del alumno AICLE, tomando como indicador predictivo de FLS la capacidad de identificar con eficiencia palabras conectadas en un texto. Al estudiar el comportamiento de la lectura en silencio de un texto en L1 (español) y otro de similares características en la L2 (inglés), nos planteamos las siguientes hipótesis:

- Existe una relación significativa entre la FLS del alumno en L1 y su FLS en L2.
- Existe una relación significativa entre la fluidez en L2 con el nivel de comprensión lectora del alumno en L2.
- Se observan diferencias significativas entre los grupos conformados por el nivel de comprensión lectora según Dialang (A1, A2, etc.) en las puntuaciones de FLS en L2.
• Se observan diferencias significativas en los niveles de comprensión en la puntuación en fluidez lectora en L2.

3.3. Instrumentos y procedimiento de recogida de datos

La recogida de datos se realizó ad hoc mediante dos pruebas: el test de diagnóstico de nivel de comprensión lectora en L2 (DIALANG) y los tests de lectura fluida silenciosa en español y en inglés. Dialang es una prueba de diagnóstico on line, creada a partir de los descriptores generales del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia (MCER) (Consejo de Europa, 2002), que permite clasificar el nivel de comprensión lectora de los usuarios desde un A1 (Etapa Usuario Básico) a un C2 (Etapa usuario competente). El test de comprensión lectora se desarrolló en tres partes. En la primera, el usuario recibió una prueba de reconocimiento léxico. En función de su resultado, el programa informático selecciona los ítems de lectura más adecuados para poder diagnosticar su nivel. Esta prueba consta de tres columnas de 25 palabras y pseudo-palabras en L2, en total, 75 elementos. El usuario decide en cada uno de ellos si es o no una palabra en L2. A continuación, la segunda parte era un cuestionario para conocer la percepción del alumno acerca de su habilidad de comprender un texto escrito en L2. Esta prueba determinó el nivel de la prueba que se proporciona al alumno. Por último, el alumno accedió a un conjunto de pruebas de comprensión, muy breves, basadas en textos de diferente naturaleza (instruccionales, informativos, argumentativos, etc.) con una tipología dinámica y variada de actividades (selección múltiple, escribir un ítem de respuesta abierta, etc.).

Los tests de lectura fluida silenciosa para el reconocimiento de palabras en L1 y en L2 son pruebas de creación propia, en un formato muy similar a otros tipos de test que han sido empleados también para conocer la naturaleza de la FLS, como es el caso del TOSCRF (Hammill, Wiederholt, & Allen, 2006). Éste es un test administrado en grupo y que se mide con referencia a una norma, aunque en L2 no se dispone de un marco normativo para discernir niveles de FLS que permita conocer su comportamiento y desarrollo a lo largo del proceso de aprendizaje. Esta prueba mide la rapidez con la que los estudiantes pueden identificar palabras individuales dentro de un texto. Las palabras impresas aparecen sin espacios ni signos de puntuación. A diferencia del TOSCRF, las letras aparecen en minúscula siguiendo el precepto de Hiebert & Reutzel (2014: 37) de que “las palabras minúsculas ofrecen al ojo lector un Skyline de las palabras”. Los estudiantes tuvieron tres minutos para reconocer tantas palabras como les fuera posible utilizando barras de separación con el bolígrafo. El resultado total fue derivado del número de palabras correctamente identificadas en el espacio de tiempo señalado. Según Hammill et al. (2006), la validez estimada de esta prueba varía de 0.67 a 0.85 en relación con otras medidas de lectura validadas.

Esta prueba fue suministrada primero en la L2 (inglés) y después en la L1 (español) con la intención de que no hubiera un efecto de anticipación. El contenido del test en L2 y L1 correspondía a extractos de la Declaración de los Derechos Humanos, cuya elección estuvo motivada por su nivel de legibilidad (texto expositivo) y por su independencia cultural.
3.4. Análisis de datos

En primer lugar se llevó a cabo un análisis de normalidad de las variables cuantitativas, observando que no seguían una distribución normal, por lo que se optó por pruebas no paramétricas (correlación de Spearman, y contrastes de Kruskal Wallis y U de Mann - Whitney) para el estudio de las relaciones entre estas variables y las diferencias entre grupos. En estos análisis se produjo una pérdida de 5 sujetos, que no llevaron a cabo las pruebas de nivel de L2, por lo que las pruebas de contraste se realizaron entre 47 sujetos. Se incluyen análisis descriptivos y de frecuencias de las variables categóricas objeto de estudio. Los datos se analizaron mediante el paquete estadístico SPSS en su versión 23.

4. RESULTADOS

La tabla 1 contiene los principales descriptivos de las variables objeto de estudio. La mayoría del alumnado posee un nivel de usuario básico de comprensión, siendo el nivel más frecuente el A1 con 25 estudiantes (48.1%).

\[ \text{Tabla 1. Estadísticos descriptivos} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mín</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>K-S</th>
<th>gl</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialang</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>403,88</td>
<td>156,331</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLSL1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>131,288</td>
<td>28,935</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.200*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLSL2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55,234</td>
<td>21,539</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.200*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Test Level (n = 47)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Válido</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Esto es un límite inferior de la significación verdadera.

Corrección de significación de Lilliefors

En cuanto a las hipótesis correlacionales, se ha llevado a cabo una Correlación no paramétrica de Spearman, observándose la existencia de una correlación significativa positiva, entre la fluidez lectora silenciosa del alumnado en ambas lenguas (r_s = .390, p = .003) con los resultados del test de lectura DIALANG (r_s = .422, p = .003).

Dada la relación significativa entre estas variables, se puso a prueba la existencia de diferencias significativas entre grupos coherentes con los descriptores del MCER (2002), con el fin de observar el desarrollo de la trayectoria de la FLS por niveles de comprensión.
LECTORA. Para ello, se agruparon los resultados de la Etapa Nivel Independiente (B1 y B2) con la Etapa Nivel Competente (Niveles C1 y C2), obteniéndose tres grupos diferenciados (A1, A2, B-C). En la tabla 2 se puede observar que existen diferencias significativas entre niveles (KW = 8.467, p = .015), más concretamente entre los niveles A1 – BC (U_{MW} = 37.5, p = .004), no existiendo diferencias entre los niveles A1 – A2 y entre los niveles A2 – BC. El tamaño del efecto observado en los contrastes entre grupos oscila entre mediano (A1 - A2) y elevado (A1 - BC).

**Tabla 2. Pruebas de contraste entre grupos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Rango promedio</th>
<th>χ² (a)</th>
<th>gl</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18,52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25,13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 - A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 - BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 - BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Los estadísticos descriptivos por grupos de nivel de comprensión lectora se incluyen en la tabla 3, observándose que las puntuaciones van ascendiendo según se asciende en el nivel de lectura.

**Tabla 3. Estadísticos descriptivos por niveles de comprensión lectora**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTL</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Mínimo</th>
<th>Máximo</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Mediana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>46,19</td>
<td>19,00</td>
<td>78,00</td>
<td>17,41</td>
<td>44,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>56,00</td>
<td>26,00</td>
<td>91,00</td>
<td>19,34</td>
<td>56,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-C</td>
<td>73,00</td>
<td>47,00</td>
<td>108,00</td>
<td>23,07</td>
<td>67,50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. DISCUSIÓN

El objetivo principal de esta investigación era determinar si la medición de la FLS en L1 y en L2 permitía conocer la transferencia de habilidades lectoras de L1 a L2 o la trayectoria de la FLS a lo largo de los niveles de competencia lectora, para poder identificar así las posibles dificultades de los estudiantes universitarios en cada fase del proceso dentro de un contexto AICLE.

En nuestra hipótesis inicial nos planteábamos si independientemente del nivel de comprensión lectora del alumno en L2 podría observarse una transferencia de habilidades en FLS de L1 a L2. Los resultados de los tests indican que hay una relación significativa entre ambas variables, aunque la magnitud de tal correlación es débil ($r_s = .390$, $p = .003$. En la literatura especializada en adquisición del proceso lector en L2, se reconoce ampliamente la importancia de las habilidades lectoras en L1 como factor explicativo y predictivo del buen desarrollo de la competencia lectora en L2 (Ziegler & Goswami, 2006; Koda, 2007a; Bernhardt, 2011; Fonseca-Mora & Fernández-Corbacho, 2017). La novedad de nuestro estudio ha sido analizar la posible transferencia en la lectura silenciosa, observando su correlación en L1 y en L2, para tratar de entender el comportamiento del modo de lectura más habitual en individuos adultos y partiendo del supuesto de que la lectura silenciosa implica procesos similares a los de la lectura oral, pero también la existencia de comportamientos subyacentes diferentes (Hiebert et al., 2012; van den Boer et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2016). En este estudio, la FLS fue definida como la capacidad de decodificar palabras (corrección) conectadas en un texto sin espacios, dentro de un tiempo limitado de tres minutos (velocidad), y aislándola de la comprensión lectora, en cierta medida. Así, la observación de un componente predictivo de fluidez, como es el caso de la decodificación léxica (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001) nos ha permitido analizar la capacidad de los lectores de reconocer los límites ortográficos del léxico presente en el texto desde el nivel A1. El análisis de estos datos nos muestra que hay individuos con buena fluidez lectora en L1 que superan en número de palabras identificadas en L2 a otros individuos de mayor nivel de competencia lectora (B1 y B2) pero que tienen menos habilidad de reconocer palabras en L1. Esto significa que el alumno A1 puede llegar a decodificar visualmente más palabras que un B1 o un B2, pero no implica que comprenda más texto en L2. Estas evidencias se relacionan con estudios sobre la relación de la fluidez lectora oral y la comprensión en estudiantes de L2, cuyos resultados mostraban que el conocimiento lingüístico de la L2 correlaciona más fuerte que la fluidez lectora con la comprensión escrita (Jeon, 2012; Jeon & Yamashita, 2014; K. Lems, 2003; Lems, 2012a, 2012b). Estos alumnos tenían promedios muy altos de corrección gramatical (Lems, 2003; Jeon, 2012) pero unos promedios de fluidez muy bajos. Esto parece evidenciar que un mayor conocimiento de gramática en L2, junto con otros componentes importantes como el vocabulario (Oh, 2016) conducen a una mayor comprensión, pero no tiene por qué conducir a una mayor fluidez lectora. Así, para igualar la tasa de habilidad de reconocimiento de palabras entre la L1 y la L2, lo cual contribuiría a mejorar la fluidez, es probable que el alumno necesite aumentar su conocimiento de la lengua extranjera pero también es probable que necesite una mayor experiencia con la lectura en L2 para aumentar su alcance de reconocimiento visual.
No es de extrañar que un lector de L2 universitario sea capaz de transferir su habilidad de decodificación visual-ortográfica en L1 y tener así un alcance de reconocimiento visual similar al nivel de promedio obtenido por otro alumno de un nivel de competencia más alto en el test de fluidez lectora, ya que la distancia entre dos lenguas alfabéticas en la lectura silenciosa es menor que en la oralidad (español-inglés) y menor también que la distancia visual existente entre una lengua alfabética y otra logográfica (español-chino). En el ámbito de la adquisición de la lectura en L2, hay también un consenso a la hora de reconocer el impacto de la naturaleza del sistema ortográfico en el desarrollo de la fluidez lectora oral en L1 y en L2. De acuerdo con la *hipótesis de la ortografía opaca* (Katz & Frost, 1992), el proceso de la lectura es diferente cuando los sistemas ortográficos son opacos, es decir, cuando la relación entre grafía (grafema) y sonido (fonema) es difusa, como es el caso del inglés (Share, 2008).

Lo menos predecible en nuestro estudio han sido los niveles de dominio del inglés tan bajos detectados en el nivel terciario de nuestro sistema educativo. Por ello, la implementación de una metodología AICLE con especial atención a la lectura de textos nos parece altamente recomendable. Teniendo en cuenta que en clase disponemos de diversidad de niveles de competencia en L2, la lectura de textos en L2 puede ser incluso un primer paso que sirva de apoyo a la destreza de la comprensión oral. De acuerdo con los resultados de Oh (2016), el desarrollo de la competencia lectora en L2 parece ir en una dirección inversa al desarrollo de la competencia lectora en L1. En una situación de segundas lenguas, el lector de L2 no dispone del caudal de léxico oral ni del nivel de competencia lingüística que posee el lector de L1 cuando accede a aprender a leer. Por ello, aumentar su experiencia lectora con textos en L2 podría facilitar tanto su comprensión oral como su comprensión escrita.

La segunda de nuestras hipótesis se dirigía a conocer si los comportamientos en el test de FLS en L2 podrían mantener algún tipo de relación con los resultados del test de diagnóstico. Los datos de nuestro estudio nos permiten observar que hay una relación significativa entre fluidez y comprensión, pero la magnitud de la correlación es débil ($r_s = .422$, $p = .003$). Como hemos señalado anteriormente, en L1, el estudio del desarrollo de la lectura en inglés con niños reconoce la importancia de la memoria fonológica en primer lugar y de la importancia secundaria de la memoria visual u ortográfica, así, al menos, se plantea en la *hipótesis de la autoenseñanza* de Share (2008). En L2, sin embargo, tal vez esto suceda al contrario. La menor exposición del lector de L2 a la oralidad, hace que se inviertan los procesos y que el lector acceda al significado desde la decodificación ortográfica (Lems, 2003; Oh, 2016). Esto explicaría la relación débil de la correlación entre el reconocimiento eficiente de palabras en L2 y el puntaje en la prueba de comprensión lectora de acuerdo con los descriptores del MCER (2002). Esta circunstancia implicaría la posición de ventaja a nivel de comprensión que se produce en la lectura silenciosa en adultos ya alfabetizados en una L1 (Lems, 2003). Al ser una lectura que exige una mayor concentración visual, el hecho de ser lector competente en una L1 puede favorecer el reconocimiento de palabras (memoria visual) en la lectura silenciosa. En nuestro estudio los estudiantes ya habían recibido instrucción y poseen, por tanto, un conocimiento lingüístico de L2 y de vocabulario. Es posible que esta destreza haya permitido acceder directamente al significado a aquellos lectores de niveles más elementales. Obviamente, las condiciones en el aprendizaje de la
lectura en L1 son diferentes. En ese escenario los niños necesitan traducir la letra a sonidos para acceder a su lexicón mental y este procedimiento, además, demuestra ser más efectivo en el desarrollo de la habilidad lectora en L2. Así, un contexto AICLE puede crear un entorno inmersivo y proveer ese caudal sonoro que impulse el desarrollo de la competencia lectora del alumno. El componente gramatical y léxico es un fuerte predictor de comprensión lectora en L2, la habilidad lectora en L1 también contribuye en algo al desarrollo de esa competencia, pero la experiencia oral es tan fundamental como la experiencia lectora en L2 (Lems, 2017). Los lectores de L2 pueden transferir su capacidad de decodificar palabras en modo visual y saber leer algo, pero serán mejores lectores cuando desarrollen también su conciencia fonológica. Especialmente, si la lengua posee un sistema ortográfico opaco como el inglés (Fonseca-Mora y Fernández-Corbacho, 2017).

En la tercera hipótesis de nuestro estudio nos planteamos si es posible analizar la trayectoria del desarrollo de la FLS a lo largo de los diferentes niveles de comprensión lectora en L2. Los resultados no permiten observar una relación significativa de crecimiento entre la FLS y los niveles de comprensión en L2. El tamaño de nuestra muestra es reducido y desigual. Hay una concentración de alumnos en el nivel Usuario Básico (A1 y A2) con 37 representantes, un escenario más pobre en Usuario Independiente (B1 y B2) con solo 9 y una escasez enorme de Usuarios Competentes (C1 y C2) con solo 1 representante. Como decíamos al principio, los resultados del Test de Diagnóstico (DIALANG) son sorprendentes, pues no esperábamos una presencia tan numerosa de alumnos en los niveles A1 y A2. No obstante, en la Tabla 3 se puede observar un eje de crecimiento de la FLS intergrupal: A1- A2 (46, 19 - 50), B-C (73).

Nuestro test de FLS es una prueba que permite observar la eficiencia del alumno en la decodificación de palabras, pero no mide la soltura de la velocidad lectora con comprensión. Como señala Hiebert (2014), la clave parece estar en la velocidad dentro de los límites que permite la comprensión y una adecuada conciencia fonológica en L2. No hay muchas actividades de aceleración de la lectura. Taguchi, Takayasu-Maass, & Gorsuch (2004) comprobaron la validez de una técnica cuya eficacia ha sido contrastada en el ámbito de la fluidez lectora oral en L1, la lectura repetida (Repeated Reading), en el contexto de inglés L2. Esta prueba sería difícil transferirla al contexto AICLE universitario, pero el aumento de la experiencia lectora y la naturaleza casi inmersiva que proporciona este modelo podrían ser suficientes para mejorar la velocidad de la lectura en L2.

Nuestra última hipótesis se centra en conocer si es posible observar diferencias de comportamiento intergrupales de la FLS. Los resultados indican que hay una diferencia significativa entre los grupos A1 y B-C. Se observa una relación significativa moderada ($U_{MW} = 37.5, p = .004$) entre dos grupos que se encuentran en dos etapas distintas (Grupo A1- Grupo BC) pero el bajo número de participantes con niveles B1 o superior no permite aún determinar más diferencias. El análisis de los resultados en las Tablas 2 y 3 muestra un comportamiento intergrupal de la FLS bastante lento. Los resultados del Test de FLS en L1 y en L2 permitieron observar que en L2 la eficiencia en la segmentación de palabras disminuía notablemente en comparación con la eficiencia demostrada en L1 en la gran mayoría de los casos.
6. **Consideraciones finales**

El objetivo central de este estudio es observar las diferencias individuales en el logro de la comprensión escrita a partir de la observación de la FLS en L1 y en L2. En L1, un modelo teórico para conocer el comportamiento de las diferencias individuales es el de la *Visión Simple de la Lectura* (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990). Pero en una situación de L2, este modelo tiende a desestabilizarse. Una de las claves, como señala Share (2008), es el nivel de automaticidad al que ha llegado el proceso de recodificación fonológica en L1. La fluidez es un constructo que encuentra su base teórica dentro de la teoría cognitiva de la automaticidad desde los niveles inferiores de procesamiento (unidades más pequeñas como las letras, los sonidos, las palabras). En una situación de lectura silenciosa en inglés L2, puede ocurrir que en lugar de activarse en primer lugar el proceso de decodificación fonológica, también presente en la lectura silenciosa (van den Boer *et al*., 2014), el alumno active antes una estrategia de lectura de orden mayor (el reconocimiento ortográfico y semántico) para vincular palabra y significado en ausencia de una representación mental fonológica de la L2 correcta, al menos en los niveles iniciales del desarrollo de la competencia lectora en L2. En este sentido, el rol de la fluidez lectora como factor mediador de la comprensión de textos escritos es posible que se vea alterado en el contexto de la L2. Nuestro estudio es una aproximación al complejo fenómeno de la FLS en la lectura de L2 de adultos. En futuras investigaciones sobre la FLS es imprescindible también analizar el procesamiento fonológico y la velocidad de procesamiento.
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ABSTRACT: The main goal of this article is to explore the attitudes (opinions, beliefs, etc.) regarding ‘language’ of university teachers engaged in bilingual education. The context for this research is an on-going teacher development programme at the School of Engineering (Escuela Superior de Ingeniería) at the University of Cadiz. At this stage in our research, we are looking at teacher attitudes to language from three perspectives: to better understand what they think about language in their ‘normal’ i.e. Spanish/monolingual teaching; how they conceive of language per se in learning and how they feel about bilingual classrooms. Prior to their involvement in bilingual education, these teachers were likely encouraged to think of themselves as specialists in Áreas No Lingüísticas, but it would appear that they are in the process of reconceptualising both the roles of language in learning and the contributions that teachers can make. In the bilingual classrooms, most of their students are locals with limited language skills and the teachers favour an approach geared to developing both content and languages (L1 and L2) concurrently and perceive of themselves as both models and facilitators in the process. We interpret this as a good example of Internationalization at Home (IaH).

Keywords: teacher attitudes, L1/L2, language awareness, monolingual/bilingual classrooms, internationalization at home.

Actitudes de los docentes hacia el papel de la lengua en la educación bilingüe en la universidad

RESUMEN: El objetivo principal de este artículo es esbozar las actitudes (opiniones, creencias, etc.) respecto a la lengua del profesorado universitario participante en planes de enseñanza bilingüe. El contexto de esta investigación es un programa de formación permanente de docentes en la Escuela Superior de Ingeniería de la Universidad de Cádiz. En esta etapa de nuestra investigación, hemos analizado las actitudes de los docentes hacia la lengua desde tres perspectivas diferentes. Por un lado, comprender mejor lo que piensan sobre la lengua en su enseñanza “normal”, es decir, español / monolingüe. Por otro lado, cómo conciben el papel de la lengua en si en el proceso de aprendizaje. Por último, cuál es su opinión acerca de la enseñanza bilingüe. Antes de su participación en el programa de enseñanza bilingüe, estos docentes se consideraban...
a sí mismos especialistas en áreas no lingüísticas, pero tras un período extenso de formación, parecen inmersos en el proceso de re-conceptualización tanto del papel de la lengua en el aprendizaje como de las aportaciones que ellos mismos pueden hacer desde esta nueva perspectiva didáctica. En la clase bilingüe, la mayoría son estudiantes locales con capacidades lingüísticas limitadas, de ahí que la labor de los docentes se base en un enfoque orientado al desarrollo integrado de contenidos y lenguas (L1 y L2), y se perciban a sí mismos como modelos y facilitadores en el proceso de aprendizaje. Este es un buen ejemplo de internacionalización en casa.

**Palabras clave:** actitudes de los docentes, L1/L2, conciencia lingüística, clase monolingüe/bilingüe, internacionalización en casa.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The focus of this research is teacher attitudes, yet we set the scene by looking at language, students and demand. Language, from a medium of instruction perspective, is obviously a crucial factor in decision-making for prospective international students, be they short-term credit, or longer-term degree-seeking; incoming or outgoing. And a stereotypical view of internationalization would have it that, to attract international students (and staff), universities need to adopt English as a Lingua Franca via English-Medium Instruction (EMI).

That is certainly what has been happening in the North and West of Europe. Wächter and Maiworm (2014) found that 60.6% of the tertiary institutions in the Nordic countries in their study were offering English Taught Programmes (ETPs) compared to only 17.2% in the South-West (France, Italy, Portugal and Spain). Considering that the local languages of the Nordic countries: Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish, are not widely spoken, coupled with the fact that English is already very present in these countries, there is a certain logicality in their adopting EMI to attract international students.

Spanish is a very widely-spoken language, both as L1 and L2. International students coming to Spain may well be doing so because of the language. Data from an Erasmus Student Network (ESN) Study (2014) found that students choosing countries where French, German, Italian and Spanish (the “Big Four” European Foreign Languages (FLs)) are spoken, are more likely to have chosen their country precisely because of the local language and are also more likely to report progress in that language after their stay. This was true of 68.3% of Erasmus students coming to Spain in the academic year 2013-14. Along the same lines, around 50% of longer-term degree-seeking international students in Spain are from Latin America and so already speak Spanish (Olivella Nadal, 2016).

Regarding credit-seeking undergraduates, it should be remembered that most are exchange students and Erasmus data (European Commission, 2015) confirms that Spain not only receives the most in-coming students; it also sends the most out-going. This means that internationalizing local/home students is also very important. This was recognised in the recent set of guidelines published by the *Confederación de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas* (CRUE) (2017), which actively promotes Internationalization at Home (IaH) as a key strategy.
2. Context

The immediate context of this experience is the Plurilingual Education Programme (PEP) at the School of Engineering, University of Cádiz, initiated in 2012 as a by-product of the PEP previously started at the School of Education (Rubio Cuenca & Domínguez, 2016). The idea of developing a PEP for the School of Engineering is a response to the communication needs of a globalized society in which information and communication come in many formats and contexts, especially when it comes to the academic and professional context of engineering. In this sense, the PEP’s main objective is the improvement of language skills of students working in Spanish and English (‘the language of Engineering’). Both teachers and staff at the School of Engineering are very engaged with educational innovation in general. As hosts of the 2016 CUIEET (Congreso Universitario de Innovación Educativa en las Enseñanzas Técnicas) they invited Plácido Bazo Martínez (coordinator of the CRUE’s Sub-commission for Internationalization and Cooperation) to give the opening plenary: *a Linguistic Policy for 21st century Engineers*.

With the development of a PEP, the School of Engineering is contributing on at least three levels: by furthering the internationalization of the University of Cádiz, through the promotion of international mobility for outgoing and incoming students and teachers; by providing continuity for the students who are coming (in increasing numbers) from bilingual secondary education and, not least, regarding the general requirement for students to certify a minimum level (in line with the CEFR) in a European language to obtain graduation certificates and diplomas.

The teaching and awareness of English in and for Engineering amongst teaching staff at the School of Engineering in Cádiz has experienced an exponential development in the last 30 years, going from content teachers compiling lists of technical terms in English (without any planning or coordination), to specific/technical English taught by a language specialist (since the beginning of the 90s). New trends in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) at the time (e.g. Huckin & Olsen, 1983; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987) were gradually adopted according to learner needs. The 2010s (with language policy regulations issued at the University mentioning CLIL for the first time in an official document) have seen significant changes in how we view language learning and acquisition. ESP courses are now more content-oriented and are increasingly becoming subsidiary to content subjects taught through a foreign language. ESP specialists are starting to coordinate the contents of their courses with content teachers, and language and content, at least in the School of Engineering, is increasingly integrated.

3. Methodology and Participants

The teachers involved in the PEP are all participating on a voluntary basis, which of course signals interest and motivation. In line with Lortie’s (1975) “apprenticeships of observation”, teachers are likely to be influenced by their own previous experiences as learners (see also Flores & Day, 2006). Discussion confirmed that the teachers in our study had little, if any, experience as students in bilingual/other language content classrooms. Teacher development within the PEP has therefore been based on two key goals: language reinforcement and the
introduction and development of new ‘language aware’ teaching strategies. This is in line with research into student outcomes in university bilingual classes, suggesting that attention to language is necessary if linguistic gains are on the agenda (Aguilar & Muñoz, 2013; Ament & Perez Vidal, 2015).

The data we present here comes from two teacher development sessions (conducted in 2015 and 2017) and consists of two sets of teacher reflections (written) – one from each session. During the first session, teachers participated in a translanguaging activity, designed to give them experience with planned use of the L1 in the bilingual classroom (while also providing us with data). In small, self-selected groups of two to four, they were presented with a series of prompts and instructed to first translate them into and discuss them in Spanish before drafting a ‘reaction’ in English. Their reactions were composed, collaboratively in their groups, on screen and e-mailed anonymously to us at the end of the session along with demographic information via Survey Monkey. We then classified the responses into four categories: Agree/Disagree/Neither/Vague. In many cases, the whole group either agreed or disagreed with the prompt; at times, however, the group as a whole did not agree and told us so (thus Neither). On a couple of occasions, the responses were rather vague, and we were not confident enough to align them with any particular attitude. See Appendix for a breakdown of responses to each prompt.

In the second session, a reduced number of teachers (12) participated in a round-table debate during which we re-visited some of the findings from the previous session and discussed some of the questions they had thrown up. At the end of the session they were given fifteen minutes to write a text (by hand) telling us ‘where they thought they were and where they thought they were going’. All but one of the teachers in the second session were also present in the first. In both sessions the teacher reflections were submitted anonymously. This prevents comparison of individual attitudes and thus the discussion of the results below is largely qualitative.

Apart from two from the Business department, the teachers were involved in a range of Engineering, Information Technology (IT) and science-related subjects: Aerospace Engineering (1); Applied Mathematics (1); Biomedical engineering (1); Chemistry (1); Computation (3); Computer Architecture (2); Computer Science (4); Design Methodology (1); Electrical Engineering (1); Image Processing (1); Information Technology (2); Operating Systems (2); Physics (1) and Software Engineering (3). Most of them were teaching in the Computer Science Degree, but other degrees are involved to a lesser extent, such as Aerospace Engineering, Industrial Technology Engineering, Design and Product Development Engineering, and Masters in Computing Engineering and IT Security.

The group of respondents comprised 15 men and 11 women; aged between 28 and 56 (mean age 43.9); with from one to twenty-nine years of university teaching experience (average length of service 14.5 years). The age at which most of them became university teachers suggests that career academics dominate. Many of them started teaching in their mid-twenties (average 26.6) – presumably during or shortly after doctoral studies. Eleven of the teachers were already involved in bilingual teaching, ten had committed themselves to it in the next term and five were interested in the possibility and wanted to find out more. All were Spanish L1 speakers and, although we can see a cluster around B2, English levels
were heterogeneous, ranging from A2 (participants who openly declared they were doing this training as much for their English as for their teaching) to a certified C2. One respondent did not answer. We should point out that the teachers who were already in the programme were all at B2 or higher.

Table 1. Teacher English Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results and Discussion

At this stage in our research, we are looking at the teacher attitudes from three perspectives: we are trying to better understand what they think about language in their ‘normal’ i.e. Spanish/monolingual teaching; what they think about the learning process in itself and what they think about bilingual classrooms. These are, of course, enormous questions. This is very much an exploratory study: Rather than looking for answers, we are still only fine-tuning our questions.

4.1. Teacher attitudes regarding L1/monolingual learning

On the assumption that the more we knew about how they operated when teaching in ‘normal’ classes (i.e. in Spanish), the more we would be able to help their transition to L2, we began by asking them about L1 praxis. We first asked to what extent they thought monolingualism was the norm in European university classrooms (see Appendix, prompt 1). The range of responses was quite diverse and seemed to indicate that ‘monolingualism’ was not a concept to which the teachers devoted that much attention. Of course, there is a potential double entendre to ‘monolingual’. We glossed it as ‘everyone shares the same L1’, but it could equally be interpreted as no-one in the class speaks more than one language. Or even as ‘everyone in the class speaks the same language, the first and only language they ever learnt’. Since we assume that 21st century university students have at least some knowledge of other language(s), we were trying to focus on shared L1.

One group defended L1 monolingualism: “We think it is usual, because normally people are more comfortable in their mother tongue, and it is easy to learn new concepts in L1.”; another group was pro-monolingual but open to it being an L2: “Even universities with international students, they choose only one. This language doesn’t have to be the native language.” However, many of the teachers interpreted the question more from a Medium of Instruction perspective: “The majority of the European universities offer their degrees, especially master’s degrees, in English. The reason for this is double: first, because they attract more students from the international market, and second, because they help their students develop their English language skills for their professional world.”
Teachers also acknowledged sociolinguistic factors, pointing out that Europe contains multilingual regions. For example: “In some countries with multiple official languages, many groups of students have some language diversity.” Others were more geographically positioned, for example “[F]rom my experience in other countries, for example, Denmark, Norway, and so on... courses were given in English.”; and one group observed that monolingualism “occurs especially in southern European universities.”

Despite a general (European-led) move towards competence-based teaching and assessment, and the fact that one of the key competences is ‘linguistic’, there is a tendency in Spain to group technical and scientific subjects under the banner of Áreas No-Lingüísticas (ANL). At the very least, this belittles the importance of language in learning. To an applied linguist, language is incontrovertibly core to the endeavour, but should we be surprised if science and technology teachers do not subscribe to the same view? According to Halliday (2004: 78), when asked to consider their subject from a linguistic perspective, most science teachers tend to conceptualise the question of language from the perspective of vocabulary (jargon) rather than grammar. Aguilar (2017) found a similar view regarding glossaries amongst Spanish engineering lecturers undertaking EMI. When interviewing Swedish physics lecturers, Airey (2012) found that although they all agreed that teaching language per se was not part of their remit they did feel that it was their responsibility to help students become more fluent in the ‘language of mathematics’, in other words to develop disciplinary discourse. So, we asked the teachers whether they considered language when they are teaching in Spanish and how important they thought general language abilities were in learning (see Appendix, prompt 2).

The fact that most of the participants in the activity had already had some training in bilingual teaching methodology likely influenced their perceptions, rendering them more language aware than subject-matter teachers with no specific bilingual training (on this point see also Dafouz, Hüttner and Smit, 2016: 128). A few of the groups still felt that language is less important in their content domain: “We believe that the relevance of the language abilities depends on the subject. In technical studies that is less than other studies.” or “We are more interested in learning the subject than the correct use of the language.” That said, most of the groups recognized the importance of language: “Language abilities allow students to understand what they are taught and asked, so students lacking in these abilities take much longer to learn a subject and solve a problem only because it’s hard for them to understand the explanations and questions.” Nonetheless, and in line with Airey’s (2012) observation that teachers would be unlikely to correct student language errors, several groups appeared to sidestep responsibility for the language side of things: “We think that these abilities are very important, but the teachers suppose that students already have these abilities and they are not taken into account in the learning process.”; “the professor is not responsible for things such as grammar mistakes.”

When prompted about the issue of teaching new terminology (see Appendix, prompt 3), most of the groups agreed that this issue should be a priority for content teachers: “The specific terms used in a subject should be introduced by the teacher of that subject.” “In L1 learning, teachers are responsible for new terminologies.” However, two groups viewed content teachers as models and responsible for correct language use in the subject matter they teach: “The teachers of any subject also have to teach their students generic competences, such as oral and written expression.”; “Lecturers are not only responsible for teaching terminology but also for using the language correctly and making precise statements.” Finally, there was
one group who saw content teachers as language facilitators: “...the teacher can also help the students improve their language skills.” In conclusion, although the main responsibility of content teachers is teaching content, they believe they are also responsible for both teaching terminology and, to a lesser extent, serving as a model for correct use of their L1 together with teaching and/or helping students with specific language skills.

One of the declared aims of the CRUE guidelines mentioned above (published after the session we are discussing), proposed under the heading of ‘student training’, is to “improve[s] university students’ communication skills both in the mother tongue (L1) and in the foreign language (L2)” (2017: 7, our italics). We take this as confirmation that we were right to want to factor L1 into the equation. Our reading of related research suggests that the adoption of L2 teaching could be fuelling a general re-evaluation of language across the curriculum (LAC) at tertiary levels (see for example Airey, 2012; Hughes, 2016). Along those lines, Airey et al. (2017: 17) argue that teachers should be able to motivate the language choice in the courses they teach, describe the (linguistic) skills that are cultivated and detail how these skills are developed and assessed. Moreover, there should be a clear understanding of how the skills developed in a particular course relate to the overall goal—the development of disciplinary literate graduates.

4.2. Teacher attitudes regarding learning in general

Content teachers are probably not used to thinking about language from a skills perspective, although since all the teachers involved have some form of FL certification, they will have done exams which were delineated by skills. We asked whether they thought any of the skills were more important than the others (see Appendix, prompt 4). During discussion, several groups asked about the difference between skills and competences, thereby suggesting that they are thinking about the move away from fact-based and towards competence-based praxis. The mediator downplayed conceptual differences. Hyland (2013: 69) convincingly argues that writing is the backbone of academic development: “We are what we write, and we need to understand the distinctive ways our disciplines have of identifying issues, asking questions, addressing a literature, criticising colleagues and presenting arguments”. That said, none of the respondents opted for writing. Approximately half of them felt that all four skills were equally important, and several pointed out that different skills will be more important at different moments: “We cannot select an option since we think that all of them have the same importance. It depends on the task we are doing”. One group opted for reading but did not provide any justification.

As part of the ongoing development process, these teachers are being encouraged to reconsider traditional teacher-fronted monologic teaching modes and to experiment with co-operative, collaborative and dialogic modes. This is partly fuelled by the fact that research has pinpointed a series of potential problems with lecturing in an L2, ranging from a self-assessed lack of fluency (Aguilar, 2017), to a reduced use of pragmatic strategies (Björkman, 2011) and meta-discursive devices (Dafouz & Nuñez Perucha, 2010). It also conflates with a tendency in the sciences to promote argument and discussion as paths to learning (e.g.
Jonassen & Kim, 2010; Phelps Walker & Sampson, 2013). It was therefore interesting that four of the pairs felt that listening and speaking were more important “speaking and listening are more difficult to learn but maybe more useful to communicate with other people.”

Talking about skills led us to the question of input and output (see Appendix, prompt 5). From a simplistic perspective, the distinction could be interpreted as a contrast between teacher-centred (input) and student-centred (output) approaches, but most of the teachers interpreted it more literally. Some of the groups took a pragmatic stance: “the information that they receive is more important than what they produce, because if initial information is wrong the results will be bad.”; “To produce information about some topic, we think that first it is necessary to learn or receive information from some source.”

Three groups opted for output: “We think it is more important what they are capable to produce than what they receive.” One pair went a step further by asserting that without output there can be no feedback “which is essential in learning.” A couple of the groups placed more emphasis on the gloss of input in parenthesis in the prompt – the information they receive – with a defence of self-directed learning and the value of students looking for their own information. “In fact, we think that teachers should provide less input so that students are encouraged to find out on their own.”

4.3. Teacher attitudes to bilingual learning/classrooms

Regarding the content and language mix, and the importance accorded to each (see Appendix, prompt 6), the teachers naturally lean towards content as their main priority, but most are also thinking about language: “We are not language teachers. We use both languages (L1 or L2) to teach concepts related with the subject we teach. So, the content is more important than the language.”; “The subject of the course is more important than the language, even if it is taught in a second language.”; “Content is more important than language, as you have to develop the professional skills of your career. Language is a plus.”

There were also people who insisted on full integration - a 50/50 approach. A variety of reasons were proffered. From the perspective of student need, for example: “Both the content and the language are important since students need to know the meaning of the words as well as the content of the course.” One group stated: “When students chose bilingual learning, they expect to learn both, contents and language.” In some cases, it was clear that language = languages, that the teachers were also factoring L1 into the picture: “the student must learn the topic in their native language.” and also from a more conceptual viewpoint: “If it is truly bilingual then both should be equally important.”

Research into English-taught programmes has flagged a lack of heterogeneity amongst participants as a key problem (Strotmann et al., 2014: 96; Wächter & Maiworm, 2014: 22), but the Cadiz teachers were not as worried about mixed levels as they were about low levels. This echoes findings from two other Spanish studies: Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra (2011) and Fortanet-Goméz (2012), both of which found that teachers felt that low L2 competence amongst their students was hindering their progress. There did seem to be a feeling among the teachers that some students were applying a ‘two birds, one stone’ approach to content in English in the belief that signing up for bilingual classes would, in itself, magically transport them to the B1 they know they are going to need in order to
graduate, and that this could be counter-productive. In general, however, the teachers did not see mixed levels as problematic; in fact, they expected them and were learning to deal with them. They discussed grouping students to favour peer learning and some appeared to appreciate that the negotiation of meaning between groups made up of mixed levels could contribute to the development of communicative skills “it is more important to be open to listen to and understand people with more or less L2 levels.” About half of them idealized the teacher having a higher level of L2 competence than the students. At some level, then, they also see themselves as ‘model’ L2 users, and indeed have been encouraged to do so during the training programme.

If all the students in a classroom are locals, and they share a language other than the stipulated Medium of Instruction, unless there are strict prohibitions, it is logical and inevitable that this other language will come into play. Research in supposedly L2 monolingual settings has repeatedly found classroom practice which subverts medium of instruction norms and ‘allows’ L1 (for example in EMI, Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017; in CLIL, Moore & Nikula, 2016; and in EFL, Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). The feeling amongst the teachers seemed to be that while an English-only policy might be feasible in an EMI-type setting, with the proviso that all the participants be at a high level, that did not reflect their reality.

Underlining the fact that there are diverse potential approaches, and that each implies a range of decisions (on this point see also Aguilar and Muñoz, 2013), teachers were presented with, and we discussed, a heuristic model outlining a continuum of (university) bilingual teaching ranging from EMI to EFL as set out in the Figure 1. At either end of the continuum we present ‘hard-line’ (supposedly) English-only options: EMI as English-only content teaching and EFL as English-only Foreign Language teaching. We also included English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) since, as Ament and Pérez Vidal (2015: 51) argue, they can be interpreted as primary moves in the internationalization of higher education.

Regarding a ‘name’ for an approach which explicitly integrates content and language, we have struggled with a decision between CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) and ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) (See Rubio-Alcalá & Moore, this volume). CLIL is largely associated with primary and secondary education and we wanted to emphasize the contextual difference and so in the figure we use ICLHE.

Figure 1. Continuum of Tertiary Bilingual Education
This distinction rests on the role accorded to the L1 in the process. While EMI at one end and ESP/EAP/EFL at the other are conceptualized, in theory at least, as English-only, ICLHE is taken to factor the L1 into the equation. We suggest that Strong ICLHE implies attention to both languages, and the use of the L1 as a ‘resource’, whereas weak ICLHE will lean on L1 when necessary but not explicitly plan for it, in other words the L1 is understood as ‘recourse’. Doiz & Lasagabaster (2017: 169) found that teachers in EMI settings will turn to the L1 as a recourse, “when a breach in comprehension is feared or has already occurred” but that they may feel guilty about doing so; our goal was to ‘normalize’ the behaviour as a recognised strategy. Research has found that asking learners to engage with cognitively challenging material without recourse to their L1 can impede learning (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) and if that is true in EFL classrooms, it is probably even more so in L2 content classes.

As part of the follow-up questionnaire conducted at the end of the first session, teachers were asked to position themselves (and their teaching) on the continuum (EMI↔EFL). They were also asked to clarify their position regarding use of language in the classroom via a multiple-choice option a) only in English; b) mostly in English c) both languages. We present the results in Table 2 below. There are obvious inconsistencies here (for example EMI and Weak ICLHE with both languages; Strong ICHLE and mostly L2) but, in fact, these results proved extremely useful in planning subsequent steps.

Table 2. Correlation between positions on the continuum and beliefs regarding use of languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANCE on the continuum</th>
<th>Use of Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak ICLHE</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong ICLHE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We could see that, while teachers seemed open to some form of bilingual Integrated Content and Language approach (rather than the monolingual L2 approach implied by EMI), they were still unclear regarding the whys and wherefores of Spanish use in their classrooms. In order to go deeper, in the second session in 2017, we organized a round-table discussion on the use of the L1 in bilingual classrooms. At the outset, we revisited the results of the previous surveys reported on above and tried to untangle fuzziness around the use of language question. It emerged that the problem was largely language-related. There was a terminology problem: While in English we can make the tidy distinction between the L1 as ‘recourse’ or ‘resource’, in Spanish both can be translated as recurso, and so it had been difficult for teachers to process the distinction. This was coupled with the fact that previous discussion of the heuristic had perhaps been too perfunctory (reminding us that we are language specialists, and they are not).
Overall the teachers accepted that both languages did need to be involved. Around half of them felt that if the whole idea was to teach through English, English had to take precedence. Amongst those who opted for Weak ICLHE, opinions regarding Spanish ranged from using it as a quick fix in times of need, to restricting it to scaffolding in the presentation of more complicated ideas (thereby reducing the cognitive load). Several acknowledged a possible value in more proactive bilingualism but declared themselves hampered by time constraints. Other research has flagged this as a problem (Aguilar, 2017; Strotmann et al., 2014). The other half were more open to the idea of Strong ICLHE: explicitly bilingual classroom practice: “I can see I’m progressing from using L1 as a recourse to using it as a resource, with an intentional and planned used in the class.”; “To my mind in bilingual teaching is important to use both languages L1 and L2 because students must have the skill of using both languages in different contexts: academic, work and normal use.”

5. Conclusions

To be able to appreciate the real value of our findings, it is essential to take the specific context into account. The Plurilingual Education Programme of the School of Engineering at the University of Cádiz, is shaped by the fact that (at the moment at least) the majority of students signing up for bilingual programmes are locals with limited L2 expertise and thus the approach favoured is to integrate content and language, using both L1 and L2 as resources for lesson planning and implementation. We interpret this as an example of Internationalization at Home.

The starting point for this research was a translanguaging activity - planned use of both languages during a teacher development workshop on bilingual education, intended as a model activity which teachers could use in class. In essence, it was an opinion gap activity: Participants were asked to give their opinions about L1 learning, learning in general and bilingual learning. During a second session, the findings of the previous activity were debated.

Regarding L1 learning, we realized that, as opposed to language specialists, the different groups had only a vague notion of key terms such as L1 and monolingualism, which correlates with the tendency in Spain to group science disciplines under the banner of non-linguistic areas. However, when prompted about language abilities in learning, they proved to be more language aware than other colleagues with no specific bilingual training. Most averred both that contents prevail over language and that content teachers are not language teachers. Nonetheless, they felt that all teachers should serve as models and be responsible for the correct use of language in general, be it the L1 or a L2. In general, the teachers did not see mixed levels as problematic although they did worry about student L2 levels and considered fostering mixed-level groupings as a strategy for developing communicative skills. When asked to position themselves on a continuum between EMI and EFL, we could see that, while teachers are open to some form of bilingual Integrated Content and Language approach (i.e. strong vs. weak ICLHE), they are still working towards an understanding of Spanish use in their classrooms. This points the way for our continuing efforts.
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TRANSLANGUAGING ACTIVITY –Results

Note that the 26 participants were organized into ten groups. The data consists of written reflections (not a questionnaire) and the figures below represent group consensus (or not).

**Teacher attitudes regarding L1/monolingual learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 In most European universities classes are monolingual (i.e. Everyone shares the same L1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In L1 (monolingual) learning a student’s language abilities are largely irrelevant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 In L1 learning, the only language a content teacher is responsible for is teaching students new terminologies (associated with their subject).</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher attitudes regarding learning in general**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 In learning in general, there is at least one language skill (speaking / writing / reading / listening) which is the most important.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 In learning in general, as far as students are concerned, the input (the information they receive) is more important than the output (what they produce).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher attitudes regarding L2/bilingual learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 In bilingual learning, the content is more important than the language.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 In a bilingual classroom, it is important that everyone in the classroom (including the teacher) have the same L2 level.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 A bilingual classroom should operate a strict L2 only policy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT: This paper reports on the findings of a contrastive study exploring the use of teacher questions to gauge their cognitive demand and potential for triggering interaction between classroom participants. The data consists of a corpus of 16 lectures given in Spanish and English (eight of each) from two subjects in a Business Administration degree. Results show similarities and differences in the use of teacher questions in Spanish and EMI contexts, and highlight the importance of language awareness to help lecturers notice the impact of their discourse on students’ learning. Keywords: questions, interaction, EMI, higher education, classroom discourse, teacher training.

Las preguntas de los profesores: interacción e implicación cognitiva en el alumnado en clases impartidas en L1 y EMI en educación superior

RESUMEN: Este estudio informa de los resultados de un análisis contrastivo que explora el uso de las preguntas como recursos lingüísticos del profesor e investiga su potencial para fomentar la interacción y el desarrollo cognitivo de los alumnos. Para ello se analizan 16 clases del Grado de ADE impartidas tanto en español como en inglés. Los resultados reflejan similitudes y diferencias en el uso de las preguntas según la lengua de instrucción y destacan la importancia de concienciar a los profesores del posible impacto de su discurso en el aprendizaje de sus alumnos. Palabras clave: preguntas, interacción, educación superior, discurso del aula, formación del profesorado.

1. INTRODUCTION

A pressing need to adapt to a social context characterized by globalization is having a significant impact on universities. Nowadays, society increasingly requires more qualified and mobile professionals to be part of a much more competitive job market. This is prompting universities to move towards the attraction of fee-paying international students, gifted lecturers and researchers from around the world and talented postgraduates, not only for economic reasons, but also to boost the university’s reputation and prestige (Ramos, 2013; Dafouz, 2015). Therefore, university faculties are characterized by a more international and heterogeneous composition, in turn leading to new needs such as the internationalization
of the curriculum and the adoption of a lingua franca (typically English) as a means of communication in these educational contexts.

The Spanish system is no exception. It has been influenced by specific educational and linguistic European policies seeking member states’ unification (Pavón & Ellison, 2013: 67) and is witnessing a spread of teaching and learning academic contents through second languages (L2s), predominantly English, throughout all educational levels.

Implementing English-medium instruction (EMI) brings with it a number of challenges, including the fact that teachers now find themselves having to interact, negotiate, co-construct meaning and explain content in a language that is neither their L1, nor, often, the L1 of most of the students, or even the language spoken outside the academic context. This seems to have direct implications in the teaching and learning processes - since language provides access to academic knowledge and skills while disciplinary content provides the context for language to be conveyed (Lorenzo, 2007). In this equation, language use in the classroom acquires great importance and, thus, empirical research is called for so as to shed some light on teacher discourse practices, possible linguistic difficulties when teaching through a L2 and potential measures to help them improve from this perspective.

Although research concentrating on classroom discourse is abundant in traditional EFL classroom contexts and, by extension in primary and secondary CLIL settings, less attention has so far been paid to the discourse needs that university lecturers embarking on EMI may be facing. A relevant study acknowledging such necessities was undertaken by Martín del Pozo (2014), whose study provided insights into the use of discourse markers and academic functions to highlight the importance of metalanguage to signal lectures phases and creating interactivity.

A further study was undertaken by Dafouz and Núñez (2010), who identified the type, function and linguistic realization of metadiscursive devices deployed in L1 and L2 lecture organization as part of teacher performance. They found that there was more explicit signposting, and a wider range of stylistic choices through the L1.

The present study sets out to throw some light on this research area by complementing and trying to go beyond previous research. In doing so, it will offer a contrastive analysis of Spanish and EMI and university contexts regarding the possible similarities and differences in teacher questioning practices. It will, more specifically, focus on the extent to which teacher questions enhance students’ cognitive engagement and active participation in content subject lectures and on examining whether there is any variation in these two aspects depending on the language of instruction (L1 or L2) in which questions are formulated. To this aim, the following research questions are posed:

RQ 1. To what extent does the use of questions by teachers promote interaction between classroom participants in L1 and EMI settings?

RQ 2. To what extent does the use of questions by teachers engage students cognitively in L1 and EMI settings?

Before displaying the results obtained in the analysis and the pedagogical conclusions reached, the importance of the interaction triggered by teacher questions in the teaching and learning processes and specific information about the methodology followed in the study are detailed.
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. The role of input, interaction and output in the learning process

Input is one of the most important concepts in second language acquisition (SLA) theories since no model has managed to explain the development of language in individuals without the presence of some sort of input. For this reason, research has always been concerned about the type of input that seems to be necessary for acquisition (Mitchell & Myles, 2004). However, it has been claimed that not only the mere production of input but also its comprehension and the resulting interaction are responsible for language learning. Research seemed to confirm that interactional modifications deriving from negotiations for meaning turn out to be very effective in promoting comprehension of input (Saville-Troike & Barto, 2016). The power of interaction in learning resides in the fact that it requires, firstly, the decoding and understanding of the incoming input and, secondly, the production of output as a reaction. It is commonly claimed that comprehensible output may even be more important to learning than comprehensible input (Swain, 2000; Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2007).

Although these are SLA theories, the present study argues that their claims and implications hold true even if the ‘object’ of learning changes. In university instruction, the learning aim is placed on the knowledge of academic disciplines. This is equally true in EMI at university, where there is no explicit focus on developing the language competence of students who learn subject matter through English; although this does not mean that L2 competence is not acquired through the practice of constructing and negotiating meaning (Doiz et al., 2013; Dafouz, Hüttner & Smit, 2016). While teachers are not the only sources of information, they are frequently the prime providers of language input in the class. And disciplinary content is realized, expressed and negotiated through language as it is realized in it. Therefore, teacher discourse and the way lecturers make use of language in class is crucial for knowledge to reach students effectively and to facilitate its subsequent comprehension and learning. For this reason, teachers become classroom models, providing content and language through comprehensible (and potentially enhanced) input (Moore 2007) and the agents responsible for managing the classroom as a social event, and promoting interaction and students’ production of comprehensible output.

2.2. Interaction as a social process of meaning-making

Interest in interaction is not confined to SLA. Socio-cultural theory emphasizes the role played by the social context in which an interaction develops. This model views learning as the merging of an external-social plane and an internal-psychological one (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014; Van Compernolle, 2015). It argues that successful learning is attainable through a guided process involving an eventual transition from inter-mental to self-governing activity. Before an individual becomes self-sufficient in terms of cognitive functioning, there is a necessary reliance on a more expert or knowledgeable person who provides instruction through collaborative learning. Eventually the less skilled individual becomes capable of taking over that knowledge and/or skills and internalizing them.
Central to this theory is also the belief that the biological factors which lay the ground for human cognitive functioning are not sufficient to account for learning and thinking processes (Vygotsky, 1989). In addition, human thinking is mediated by culturally constructed tools. Thus, the process of teaching and learning at tertiary education (as at any other educational level) can be regarded as a culturally-specific situated activity (Lave & Wenger, 1991). And it is language that mediates the learning process that results from and in the communicative interaction that leads to the development of linguistic, conceptual and cognitive skills.

This line of thought makes it possible to claim that it is by means of the constructive process inherent in interaction that learning will be attained. It is then considered of great importance to provide enough classroom space for negotiations of meaning between participants since these communicative exchanges may trigger students’ development. They will allow learners to be engaged with ideas and concepts while fostering deeper and more diverse interpretations and understandings of disciplinary language and content as both inter-psychological and intra-psychological processes. Here is where teachers become powerful agents in students’ learning process, their discourse is the paramount tool mediating in its development.

2.3. Teacher questions as triggers of interaction

Among the numerous features of language comprising teacher talk, this study underlines questions as linguistic devices that are precisely capable of triggering such meaningful interaction between classroom participants; thereby possibly influencing the quantity and quality of students’ potential learning.

Questions have been the object of study for a long time and have been analysed as syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and discursive categories. This has led to a number of different taxonomies attempting to classify them and explore their forms and functions (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Chang, 2012; Sánchez-García, 2016). The present paper posits them as pivotal discourse tools, which articulate classroom talk as part of the linguistic repertoire of the teacher. They create and shape classroom interactional patterns by bringing together teachers’ input and students’ output. At the same time, they are likely to stimulate the use of a wide range of cognitive processes and may also scaffold students’ development of conceptual and linguistic understanding. Questions also seem to support students’ learning process by building collaborative meaning-making, ease students’ comprehension of the lecture, elicit information, evaluate students’ understanding and confront possible communicative breakdowns (Dafouz & Sánchez-García, 2013), to name but a few functions. Therefore, for all this potential, effective teacher questioning is likely to be a powerful discourse strategy to enrich classroom climate and enhance both teaching and learning processes.

Classroom talk tends to be full of questions. However, although all teachers make use of them, few may be really aware of how they actually employ them or of how they could exploit them more effectively for the benefit of their teaching. This is likely true in monolingual (L1) teaching and doubly so in bilingual teaching. Becoming aware of questioning practices may be even more significant in teaching scenarios where conversational interactions need to be realized through a lingua franca.
3. Methodology

3.1. Context and participants

This research is concerned with teachers’ use of questions as a fundamental discourse feature which articulates classroom interaction and, therein, disciplinary negotiations of meaning among participants. Under these circumstances, this contrastive study attempts to gain new insights into classroom practices by combining a predominantly qualitatively analysis with a quantitative perspective.

The focal participants are two university lecturers teaching content subjects belonging to a Business Administration degree offered at a Spanish university. Lecturer A teaches Consumer Behaviour (CB), and Lecturer B teaches Financial Accounting (FA). Both lecturers teach their courses in two parallel groups: One given through Spanish (the L1 of most classroom participants), and the other taught through English (an L2 for the teacher and most students). These classes provide an opportunity to analyse how the same content is negotiated. In this context, the language of communication is the main research variable; other factors such as content, dynamics, materials and evaluation criteria remain relatively stable. While both teachers have a C1 level (CEFR) of English, their teaching experience differs. At the time of the study, Lecturer A had been teaching CB for three years in both language groups and Lecturer B had been teaching FA in Spanish for fourteen years and in English for five.

3.2. Data collection and analysis

The corpus collected (Table 1) consists of 16 lectures, which are divided into two subsets of 8 classes – each subset given by one of the two lecturers. The disciplinary contents of the 8 lectures within each subset are the same, which makes them comparable to one another. All lectures differ in length and word count, but the means are included for comparative purposes. The overall data accounts for 1,305 minutes of teaching practice and a total number of 152,530 words.¹

The lectures were recorded, videotaped and later manually transcribed using the framework proposed by Du Bois et al. (1993). For analytical purposes, questions were initially identified on the basis of three features: i) syntactic form, ii) intonation and iii) utterance function. Some questions proved to be clearly multifunctional and this gave rise to a further, more context-sensitive, analysis. Therefore, questions were identified, tagged and classified in two different and separate coding processes.

¹ Results have been normalized (%o) for comparative purposes.
By their defining nature, not all questions provide space for replies. Such is, for instance, the case of self-answered and rhetorical questions (Sánchez-García, 2016). The former tend to be immediately answered by the teachers themselves, thus preventing any response from the students. Similarly, the latter are typically posed for reflection, and so an actual follow-up may not be expected. Considering this and bearing in mind that this study focuses on classroom interaction, only those questions that gave students the opportunity to contribute with a response were identified and considered for analysis.

Three principle question categories, characterized by their original interactional nature, were scrutinized in this study: Confirmation checks, display and referential questions. On
the one hand, confirmation checks include those questions aiming at ensuring students’ understanding of the lecture (e.g. “Ok?”, “Do you understand?”, “Pardon?”, “Excuse me, what do you mean by that?”, “Did you say...?”). On the other hand, display and referential questions differentiate whether the teacher asking the question actually knows the answer to it, in which case the question will be display (e.g. “What are the differences between annual report and financial statement?”), or whether the answer is unknown to the teacher in which case the question will be referential (e.g. “What sorts of ideas have you come up with?”).

These questions were further classified, as previously explained, regarding their cognitive load. For this purpose, Dalton-Puffer’s taxonomy (2007) served as the analytical tool. This model ranks questions according to their cognitive complexity, considering whether they require lower or higher cognitive skills to answer them (see Figure 1). For instance, a question which calls for a fact will place a lower cognitive load on students than asking them to develop reasoning.

Figure 1. Complexity ranking of questions / responses (adapted from Dalton-Puffer, 2007: 118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognitive Reason</th>
<th>COGNITIVE LOAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Facts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Questions as Triggers of Interaction and Cognitive Engagement: Results and Discussion

Given the importance of involving students in meaningful negotiations of meaning to enhance their linguistic, conceptual and cognitive engagement with the discipline knowledge, this study analyzes teacher questions as potential triggers of such interaction. Confirmation checks will be the first question category to be examined, followed by the display-referential dichotomy.

4.1. Confirmation Checks

Confirmation checks have often received research attention, especially within the area of SLA (Long, 1980; Pica, 2005), for their potential interactive nature and their key role in negotiations of meaning. Through their use, classroom participants engage in meaningful talk in the quest to check and, ultimately, achieve mutual comprehension of the topic at hand.

Findings of a previous study on this topic (Dafouz & Sánchez-García, 2013) seem to confirm that university lectures are particularly rich in confirmation checks. The assumption would naturally be that the prime function of checks would be to ascertain whether the
The audience is following the unfolding speech. However, a closer examination of the data collected makes it possible to argue that confirmation checks tend to lose this potential purpose and often work as automatized words that seem void of meaning:

(1) T: ¿Qué? No te he entendido
   S: Que se intenta romper la creencia que se tiene hacia que el Lidl es barato
   T: ¿Eso tratan de hacer?
   S: Tratan
   T: ¿Tratan?
   S: Sí
   T: ¿Sí?
   S: Yo creo que lo que es más caro tiene que ser mejor

(2) Lidia, do you follow me?
   S: Yes
   T: Really? So a revenue is a temporary or a permanent account?
   S: Temporary

In example 1 and 2 instances of the prototypical function of confirmation checks are displayed. As can be seen, they produce a negotiation of meaning between the lecturer and the students and seem to be produced to clarify and confirm facts so as to reach a final agreement on the two parts. However, although this is the archetypal use of such interrogative mechanisms, evidence seems to prove that it is not always rule of thumb and that another major function is also realized by confirmation checks:

(3) La contabilidad no se aprueba el último día, ¿vale? Pronto vamos a hacer un test sorpresa, ¿vale? Los ingresos y los gastos son aumentos y disminuciones de patrimonio neto. Es decir que sólo tenemos tres masas: activo, pasivo y patrimonios netos, ¿vale? Y la cuenta de pérdidas y ganancias la tenemos en el balance de situación, ¿vale?

(4) We are going to learn how to record the transaction in a company. Ok? We cannot record all the thing that happen in a firm. We are going to record only the accounting event, ok? We are going to learn the different books of accounting: the journal and the ledger. We are going to understand the rule of debit and credit, entries and then the logic of transaction. Ok?

In contrast with instances 1 and 2, in examples 3 and 4, lecturers employ confirmation checks but continue speaking without providing any thinking time or space for students to answer and corroborate understanding (or not). Lecturers are likely to utter them as discourse devices that would typically mark a speech boundary and that grant the speaker some extra time to ponder the ongoing discourse. This may signal a mechanized use of these apparently instinctive structures, which leads to argue that, more often than not, confirmation checks tend to lose their potential function to arrive at mutual comprehension, instead functioning as filler expressions.
Obviously, this finding demonstrates that confirmation checks are not always triggers of interaction. As illustrated in Table 2, confirmation checks that do not trigger any contribution from the students tend to outnumber those which do generate communicative exchanges in all lectures, regardless of the language used as vehicle of instruction. Yet, interestingly, EMI lectures are often the contexts in which this question category stimulates more negotiations of meaning among classroom participants.

**Table 2. Confirmation checks triggering interaction (n)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer A (CB)</th>
<th>L1 lectures</th>
<th>EMI lectures</th>
<th>L1 lectures</th>
<th>EMI lectures</th>
<th>Interaction Triggered (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Conf. Checks (n)</td>
<td>Triggering Interaction (n)</td>
<td>Triggering Interaction (n)</td>
<td>Triggering Interaction (n)</td>
<td>Triggering Interaction (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 lectures</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI lectures</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking at the figures in Table 2, it can be observed that only 28.92% of the confirmation checks uttered in CB L1 lectures (Lecturer A) pave the way for an actual interactive move between participants; while the tendency is higher in the EMI lectures of the same subject, in which more than half of all confirmation checks occurring (51.37%) end up in interaction. When it comes to the FA lectures, figures decline notably. Only 12.19% of confirmation checks in the EMI lessons generates students’ contributions, and a scarce 8.68% of them do the same in the L1 classes. Results then clearly bring into evidence that EMI lectures are more likely to witness student responses to confirmation checks. Besides, the data seems to suggest that since negotiations take place through a L2, the lecturer is likely to feel the need to verify whether students are reaching content comprehension or not. The use of confirmation checks highlights a reinforced commitment from the lecturer to get feedback on learner understanding more often than when they communicate through their L1. This is illustrated in example 5, where the teacher utters several confirmation checks seeking validation from the student and waits for any possible reply. However, as responses are not verbalized, she addresses a student personally and does not cease her efforts to confirm once more.

(5) T: We have used our right to pay money. Now we have already collect money. **Ok? Yes?** (...3) **Questions?** Daniel, **you don’t have any questions?**
S: No
T: **Do you follow?**
S: Yes
T: **Yes?** Ok

Such negotiation instances report yet another interesting revelation. It seems that teachers’ use of confirmation checks do trigger students’ thinking processes although not necessarily verbal ones. Possibly hoping to be interrupted if the learners ever encounter any difficulty, they do not provide time for students’ answers. So, confirmation checks could likewise work as indirect invitations and allowances to talk wherever needed.
Overall, it seems that although confirmation checks present the prime function of engendering interaction among classroom participants, unexpectedly they are not sufficiently exploited for that purpose. The question remaining here then is whether teachers do not consciously seek that interaction or whether they do and actually think that they are sparking interaction by using such questions without realizing that the way they produce them often blocks that potential for student engagement in interaction.

4.2. Display and Referential Questions

It is true that opportunities for interactional moves in the classroom are not contingent on the teacher exclusively. On a number of occasions, no output is generated by students despite lecturers’ successful use of questions. However, students’ opportunities to interact, to a great extent, seem to be largely influenced by how lecturers articulate questions, as the formulation of confirmation checks has already shown. Under these circumstances, it seems compelling to look into the relationship between teachers’ questions and students’ replies as derived from teacher’s display and referential questions (see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture A - L1 lectures</th>
<th>Lecture A - EMI lectures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer A - L1 lectures</td>
<td>Lecturer A - EMI lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Qs</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>367 / 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture B - L1 lectures</td>
<td>Lecture B - EMI lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Qs</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>451 / 282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the data shows that, on the one hand, just 188 out of 367, (51.2%), of display and referential questions taking place in the L1 CB classes end up triggering interaction; whereas only 132 out of 267, (49.4%) of these questions, allow a response from the students in the EMI CB lessons. On the other hand, 282 out of 451, (62.52%) of display and referential questions, lead to interactional exchange in L1 FA lectures, and in turn, 239 out of 380, (62.89%) of the very same question types, are interactional in EMI FA classes.

From this may follow that asking a question does not always result in obtaining an answer. In other words, the number of questions produced by lecturers is not a transparent sign of classroom interaction. In fact, what seems to be quite clear is that lectures are scenarios that offer a very extensive number of opportunities for interaction derived from the formulation of questions, but merely half of them bear fruit. This finding calls for a more exhaustive analysis of the nature and actual use of teacher display and referential questions, firstly, in terms of the kind of interactional chances they provide students with and, secondly, in terms of the cognitive demand they place on students.

4.2.1. Interaction triggered by display and referential questions

The display-referential dichotomy has traditionally generated heated debate regarding which of the two categories is more effective for learning. Display questions aim at asking for already known information by all participants in a conversation and generally require short responses to very particular issues. Hence, they often seem to restrict responses and somehow limit students’ output. For these reasons, this question type has always found detractors that often regard them as inhibitors of real communication. Conversely, referential questions are generally the most sought-after type of question. They typically resemble real-life communication as they ask for unknown information and, therefore, aim at generating meaningful communication. Due to this genuine interrogative nature, referential questions are believed to be better triggers of interaction as they lead to longer, more authentic and more personal answers from the students (Dalton-Puffer, 2007: 101). Despite these widely accepted assumptions, inspection of the data in this study reports that 25.77% of the questions are display questions and 12.92‰ are referential ones. Consequently, it is revealed that there seems to be a well-defined tendency to use a higher number of display questions instead of referential ones in all lectures (see Table 3). The educational context where these question types take place may have a say in this tendency. In the end, students’ learning is the ultimate goal in class and teachers need to make sure that their students are acquiring knowledge. Therefore, the high frequency in verifying students’ learning through display questions seems to be reasonable.

Still having to do with the defining nature of these two question categories, data reveal that the answers that display and referential questions elicit, although postulated as varying in length and grammatical complexity, are perhaps not so divergent:
Table 4. Examples of display vs. referential questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display questions</th>
<th>Referential questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T: How many accounting books do we have?</td>
<td>T: I’ve seen you have brought several examples. What have you uploaded, Ana?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS: [Three]</td>
<td>S: An add about the Olympics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Three accounting books. The journal book, then…?</td>
<td>T: And you brought as an example of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS: [ Ledger ]</td>
<td>S: Of emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: The ledger.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuál no es actividad propia del negocio principal de mi empresa?</td>
<td>T: ¿A quién seguis en Twitter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Pago de intereses</td>
<td>S: Periódicos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: ¿Por qué?</td>
<td>T: ¿Qué más páginas seguis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Porque no es de explotación</td>
<td>S: Famosos, cantantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: A futbolistas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Y, ¿eso es interesante?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 contains instances of display and referential questions together with the answers that they elicit from the students. On the one hand, display questions consist of enquiries that ask about specific contents of the lecture, which makes it clear that their prime function is to test learners’ knowledge, but principally focusing on particular factual concepts, definitions or clear-cut theoretical ideas. Consequently, students’ limited answers seem to be good enough for the teacher’s questioning purposes and, in fact, it seems that a minimal response is what lecturers are looking for. On the other hand, referential questions show how lecturers step out of classroom content and delve into students’ individual opinions and personal thoughts. This is supposed to pave the way for more sophisticated and lengthy contributions, precisely because these questions address students’ personally and allow more assorted replies, often promoting out-of-the-box critical thinking. Interestingly, students’ output remains stagnant concerning referential enquiries and does not entail any observable change concerning length or verbal complexity when compared to the answers elicited by display questions. As a result, it could be claimed that teachers may not be making the most out of the potential offered by referential questions regarding the opportunities that they provide to generate meaningful negotiations among classroom participants.

After a closer examination of all the instances of referential questions, it could be argued that the fact that students’ answers to referential enquiries tends to be confined to curtailed sentences is rooted in the characteristics of those questions. The study holds that although the display–referential dichotomy is mainly defined by whether answers to questions are known or unknown to the person asking, it is also largely determined by whether questions are open- or closed. Display enquiries tend to be closed in nature since they seek eliciting particular answers. Contrarily, referential questions are by their nature required to be open as they aspire to prompt more general, wider and freer replies. Despite this, in the lectures analyzed referential enquiries belie their true nature, since the majority of them are found to be closed.
Table 5. Open- and closed-ended questions (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturer A - L1 lectures</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturer A - EMI lectures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td>Display questions</td>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td>Display questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturer B - L1 lectures</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lecturer B - EMI lectures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td>Display questions</td>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td>Display questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows an increased presence of closed questions over open ones, irrespective of whether enquiries are display and referential. Therefore, it could be implied that the way teachers formulate questions may actually restrain students from contributing in extended discourse.
Evidence shows that often the absence of verbal responses may be due to students’ lack or uncertainty of knowledge. However, in most cases it is the teacher questioning practices which seem to impinge upon students’ active contributions. It is common to find that the time restrictions imposed by the lecturer prevent learners from collaborating either because of insufficient wait time to grasp what is being asked and respond or because wait time does not exist at all.

In a similar vein, another common pattern that supports this finding is that teachers frequently produce chains of questions that end up limiting students’ opportunities to talk. In example 6 Lecturer A demands students’ participation by asking a chain of referential questions, but she moves from open-ended to closed-ended ones. Consequently, the options provided to students range from very open questions asking about their personal opinion to just a monosyllabic answer; once again closing the door to eventual interactions.

(6) T: So, what’s the image you have of Benetton? Is it a brand for youngsters? Do you usually buy there? Do you do you shopping to Benetton?
S: Sometimes

From all this it may be stated that despite learners not manifesting great enthusiasm for oral engagement in class and lecturers typically finding themselves grappling with this issue to foster participation, it may be the case that lecturers encumber themselves by not formulating questions effectively, steering them away from the target in mind. If lecturers introduce referential questions as a way to include learners’ personal opinions and make the subject contents more approachable but they happen to be close-ended, the problem is likely to persist. The appropriate use of open referential enquiries could fuel brainstorms of ideas and the chances to negotiate meaning to thus promote students’ involvement. For their part, display questions seem to be the right tool to verify content knowledge and, apparently, teachers use and formulate them without any seemingly difficulty.

4.2.2. Cognitive Demand of Display and Referential Questions

Apart from looking into the possibilities offered by questions for students’ engagement in extended discourse, a further analysis to delve into the cognitive complexity that questions may demand has been carried out. Display and referential questions were further categorized along a continuum in which they range from being less to more complex in terms of cognitive load (see Figure 1 above).

CB lectures present a wider variety of cognitive questions when compared to FA classes. Yet, the bulk of questions asked in both subjects falls within the cognitively undemanding types (Figure 2 and 3). Lecturers’ questions tend to primarily address disciplinary facts, although to a certain extent they also seem to rely on students’ opinions. Asking for explanations and reasons is a quite scarce practice in these classes, and meta-cognitive questions barely take place.
Figure 2. Cognitive scale in Lecturer A’s questioning activity (n)

Figure 3. Cognitive scale in Lecturer B’s questioning activity (n)
It may then be concluded that questions could be better exploited as far as the cognitive effort that they place on students is concerned. Most of the teacher questions posed only require students to recall factual information, to navigate in a cognitively undemanding comfort zone. Teachers do not seem to be challenging learners to think and reason deeply, and to get involved with discipline knowledge as much as it seems to be possible. Promoting questions that address both lower- and higher-order thinking skills (Krathwohl, 2002) could lead to a much richer learning environment. Besides, enhancing the use of low and high cognitively demanding questions could likewise be an effective means of supporting students’ learning and scaffolding their understanding by making knowledge linguistically and cognitively accessible (Sánchez-García, 2016).

5. CONCLUSIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study was posited on the assumption that questions are a pervasive teacher discourse strategy, potentially powerful triggers of meaningful classroom communicative exchanges. Concerning RQ1, results make it possible to claim that there appears to be no direct correlation between questions and interaction, as also suggested in other previous studies (Sánchez-García, 2010; Dafouz & Sánchez-García, 2013). The majority of the questions asked by lecturers tend to go unanswered, which signals missed opportunities regarding negotiation and co-construction of meanings. The factors that seem to lead to such lack of interaction range from student not knowing answers to teachers’ unconscious prevention of replies. On the teacher front, this paper puts forward two measures that could improve this scenario: First, provision of longer wait time, so that students have more space to think and respond; and second, production of more effective open-ended questions, avoiding lecturers’ question chains that narrow down students’ opportunities for extended discourse.

Findings regarding RQ2 reveal that questions need to be further exploited in terms of cognition so that students have access to a wider range of cognitively demanding situations. Consequently, as teachers introduce the lecture and the difficulty of the content escalates, so could the cognitive complexity of questions to expose learners to an increasing learning challenge that would have a positive impact on the development of both their language and content knowledge and skills.

In addition, it has been discovered that questions tend to be deployed similarly in Spanish- and EMI contexts regarding both the cognitive demand and the interaction derived from their formulation. Under these circumstances it seems that questioning practices are likely to be determined, to a large extent, by the idiosyncrasy of the teachers and their personal discursive and teaching style and not only by their language use, which may be worthy of further study.

The main limitation of the research revolves around the fact that only two lecturers have been the object of study. This presupposes a cautious interpretation of the results since they cannot be generalized. For findings to have any real weight, the process would need to be repeated on a much larger scale.

As a final note, this research tries to contribute to teacher education by raising awareness of the relationship between questions, interaction and cognition within classroom discourse,
and encouraging concrete measures that could be implemented. One of them could entail teachers’ reflection of their own practice (Walsh & Mann, 2015). Only in this way could lecturers be aware of their questioning strategies, the critical role they play, and what could be done to exploit them more effectively in both L1 and EMI educational contexts.
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ABSTRACT: Following the launch of the project ‘Analysis and quality assurance of plurilingual Higher Education programmes in Andalusia’, diverse voices have been warning, irrespective of specific linguistic problems, about the difficulties university teachers might have in implementing a CLIL approach in the classroom. This study delves into the nature of the problem whilst studying the extent to which CLIL lecturers in different Andalusian public universities are aware of potential hurdles. The observational study intends to identify lecturers’ perceptions on their teaching skills when delivering CLIL lessons. The rapid expansion of Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education institutions requires more research into the key additional teaching skills needed in order to deliver high quality instruction. The sample consists of 138 lecturers belonging to 66 different fields of knowledge, distributed across six public universities in the Spanish region of Andalusia. A 15-item survey was designed and implemented online in the academic year of 2016/2017. The results allow us to identify methodological shortcomings among Andalusian CLIL lecturers. This analysis contributes to design a specific programme for didactic training addressed to CLIL university teachers.
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Hacia las necesidades de los docentes universitarios AICLE. Aproximaciones a una formación metodológica específica.

RESUMEN: Desde la puesta en marcha del proyecto ‘Análisis y Garantía de Calidad de la Educación Plurilingüe en la Educación Superior en Andalucía’ han sido diversas las voces que, con independencia de los problemas de carácter lingüístico, advierten sobre las dificultades en la aplicación de la modalidad AICLE para los docentes universitarios. Este estudio aborda la naturaleza de dicha problemática y revisa la medida en que el profesorado AICLE de las diferentes universidades públicas andaluzas es consciente de ello. Este estudio trata de identificar la percepción de los profesores universitarios sobre sus habilidades en su docencia AICLE. La expansión de integración de contenido y lengua en las instituciones de educación superior exige más investigación sobre las habilidades didácticas requeridas para la docencia AICLE. La muestra consistió en 138 profesores de 66 áreas de conocimiento diferentes pertenecientes a 6 universidades públicas de la región española de Andalucía. Para
ello, se diseñó una encuesta en línea con un total de 15 ítems que lanzó en el curso académico de 2016/2017. Los resultados nos permiten identificar las carencias metodológicas de los profesores AICLE en las universidades andaluzas. Este análisis nos ayuda en el diseño de un programa específico de formación didáctica para docentes AICLE en Educación Superior. 

**Palabras clave:** Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas (AICLE), Integración de Contenidos y Lenguas en Educación Superior (ICLHE), Educación bilingüe, Metodología, Formación del profesorado.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

On the global stage, as universities increasingly embrace globalization, the service provided to students is in constant evolution. Most Andalusian universities are trying to integrate foreign languages (FL) into their teaching in order to improve local students’ career prospects, encourage mobility and attract potential incoming students. The importance given to designing bilingual and plurilingual programmes in Higher Education institutions (Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2013) has increased across Spain. A recent example of the trend towards integrating a foreign language into content teaching is the Conference of Rectors of Spanish Universities (CRUE) agreement. This association has recently published guidelines for linguistic policies and the internationalization of Spanish universities. The text aims to intensify the promotion of plurilingualism and facilitate, among other initiatives (such as the improvement of FL competences among university personnel), the teaching of subjects in different languages (CRUE, 2017).

Within this context, the implementation of effective plurilingual education models is an on-going empirical process which is not without challenges at scientific, institutional and policy levels (Arco-Tirado et al. 2018). In the process of extending plurilingual programmes in Andalusian universities, teachers and researchers face a number of challenges and difficulties when dealing with methodological teaching characteristics tied to the integration of content and foreign language (CLIL). (We use the term CLIL, but see the introduction to this volume, for a brief discussion of terminology). In addition to linguistic strategies related to the integration of an L2, as suggested by Mehisto et al. (2008: 105-109), Pavón & Gaustad (2013: 87) state that:

Bilingual training courses must address methodological issues relevant to this type of teaching such as task-based learning, class management [...], assessment criteria and tools, collaborative learning, techniques to enhance teacher-student and student-student interaction, criteria for selecting academic content, structuring bilingual lessons, attention to heterogeneous classes, independent learning, designing activities and searching for course materials, use of multimedia and on-line resources (webquests, podcasts, browsing, etc.).

These specific methodological issues in the field of Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE) were already noted by Zayas & Contero (2012) and by Pérez Cañado (2013). Pérez Cañado suggested that, with or without previous didactic knowledge, and whatever their trajectory, lecturers appear to be aware of the importance of linguistic
competence. We would suggest that bilingual teaching techniques are equally important. More recently, Contero (2017) used observational data to find that 259 (pre- or in-service) university CLIL teachers agreed that their lack of specific training in bilingual teaching eventually impacted on the functioning of Content and Language Integrated Learning at university level. Other researchers like Ellison et al. (2017: 73) found that university teachers with no specific knowledge about methodological requirements for teaching in a FL, tend to prioritise linguistic problems. Their teaching experience in L1 seems to be used as an endorsement of their methodological capabilities. In fact, research has found that the transition from L1 monolingual teaching to CLIL teaching tends to be interpreted by teachers as a process of translation rather than adaptation. This is suggested in Contero’s findings (2017) which suggest that some of the methodological problems derived from the use of a FL could be linked to the fact that CLIL didactic materials are translated rather than adapted. Bilingual teaching requires specific methodological treatment and, with it, distinct training, independent from any help with language (Järvinen, 2009).

Our study indicates that lecturers may not always be aware of methodological shortcomings for CLIL teaching. This appears to vary depending on the discipline, a circumstance which can be perceived as the population of lecturers who put CLIL into practice effectively in the field of didactics is much smaller than in the faculties of business, economics, engineering, etc., even when most of the time these could be interpreted as EMI (Smit & Dafouz, 2012). However, despite the purely experimental nature of CLIL teacher development in many educational degrees (Romero & Zayas, 2017: 215-225), the perception of didactic specialists on the methodological needs for CLIL university teaching can be doubly valuable. This paper is hence aimed at identifying key methodological and/or linguistic needs in plurilingual programmes in Andalusian universities. The research questions which guide the study were: What is the typical professional profile of a plurilingual university teacher? Which scientific fields use this way of teaching the most? Are methodological intricacies clearly identified by lecturers along with linguistic ones? Are teaching styles affected by methodological and/or linguistic variables? And if so, what are these variables and to what extent do they affect university CLIL teaching styles?

This research could contribute to pave the way for CLIL development for university teachers focused on their specific methodological needs, whilst sufficiently differentiating them from the methodological needs of secondary school teachers and other educational levels (Cenoz & Etxague, 2013).

2. Methodology

2.1. Data-gathering

The sampling selection was based on a non-probabilistic sampling technique called “purposeful sampling” (Martínez, 1995), and involved the following actions: (a) deciding the eligibility criteria (i.e., lecturer with any kind of contractual relationship with a public Andalusian university, teaching subjects which were not directly related to linguistics), (b) providing the resources necessary to reach out to participants (e.g., email communication with participants on the AGCEPESPA project, website fully reliable and accessible by invitation
only, hosting the questionnaire and gathering the data in an Excel file after completion by each participant, and (c) determining the methods of participant selection (i.e., self-selection based on interest in collaborating with the study).

2.2. Instruments

The study included the design of a questionnaire on teacher perceptions regarding the methodological skills needed by CLIL lecturers. It consisted of 15 items, grouped into three sections (see Table 1, below). The first gathered demographic information from the participants, their field of knowledge, years of experience teaching CLIL as well as other items related to their CLIL teaching practice. The second focused on describing their didactic style and included two parts with three questions in each, (i.e., six questions). The third focused on self-assessment of the quality and impact of their teaching style on students’ learning and acquisition of professional competencies. In parts two and three the questionnaire measured the respondents’ level of conformity with the statements provided by means of a Likert scale which ranged from total agreement to total disagreement.

2.3. Procedure

Questionnaire design implied three stages. The first involved reviewing bibliographical references and survey models for CLIL university teachers in recent methodological research (e.g. Contero 2017; Ellison et al. 2017; Papaja, 2011; Pavesi et al. 2001). We felt that one of the most important contributions to studying methodological problems in CLIL was the work of Pavesi et al. (2001). Their research had contributed significantly to questionnaires designed by Contero (2017) and Estrada (2017), (even though the latter focuses more specifically on methodological strategies for lecturers in correcting errors in oral production (both in monolingual (i.e. Spanish) and in CLIL teaching))

Contero (2017), using both a survey and a classroom observation rubric as data collection tools, identified eight ‘problems’ which might impede successful CLIL teaching at university level:

- Problem 1: 57% of CLIL sessions observed did not include teacher-student interaction.
- Problem 2: 98% of respondents confessed that students never participated more than lecturers and 31% even rejected the possibility of systematic open participation by students.
- Problem 3: 60% of didactic materials used by CLIL lecturers were merely informative.

1 The study of Estrada (2017), like that of Contero (2017), is based on data analysis, obtained through direct observation of university teaching in a foreign language, as well as the 118 surveys that university teachers answered. The objective of this study is not, in the first instance, to identify methodological problems, but rather to identify specific aspects of behaviour in so-called linguistic related episodes (LRE), both in the field of LE teaching and also in CLIL teaching (64 of the 118 surveys received refer to CLIL university teaching). However, 4 out of the 12 questions for university teachers relate to their roles as evaluators, an issue closely linked with methodology and, in a broad sense, beliefs.
• Problem 4: 91% of teaching-learning processes took place solely within the classroom and 45% did not even consider using dynamic learning activities. Furthermore, 94% of teaching experiences observed did not show any time control over tasks and 79% of these tasks offered no continuity or link to each other.

• Problem 5: 51% of teaching moments observed had not considered the need to motivate students.

• Problem 6: More than 90% of teaching did not provoke students with humorous or (non-insulting) references to personal attitudes, political affiliation and religious beliefs or ethics.

• Problem 7: 65% of tasks provided during CLIL teaching moments did not match the previous linguistic input and over 60% of basic CALP vocabulary had not been analysed.

• Problem 8: 64% of potential CLIL teachers said they would design their didactic materials using mere translation of those employed for regular L1 teaching.

Reviewing these findings, one can see that the question of classroom interaction patterns and practices would appear to impact significantly on the endeavour. Problems 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 all revolve around questions of interaction – from the perspectives of teacher-student exchange; student participation; classroom dynamics; engagement and motivation, giving rise to the idea that cooperative and collaborative learning, posited as the most determinant and identifiable element of CLIL teaching since its inception (Papaja, 2011; Pavesi et al., 2001), may be largely absent. An over-dependence on conventional, teacher-fronted lecturing seemed to be a key obstacle, an issue that needed to be taken into account in the survey design. Combining Pavesi et al.’s (2001) hypothesis with the main obstacles highlighted in Contero’s study (2017) in order to shape the ideal didactic style of a CLIL lecturer, culminated in four main perceptions described as follows:

• Owing to the interactive and cooperative nature of CLIL, students gain self-esteem and self-confidence, and learn to work independently and be more organised.
  - My university teaching systematically contemplates interaction and cooperative work in the classroom.
  - My responsibility as a faculty member includes fostering my students’ self-esteem and self-confidence.
  - My lesson planning promotes autonomy as well as developing organisational skills.

• In CLIL it is very important to make extensive use of cooperative and investigative activities, since students need natural opportunities to use the foreign language.
  - Interaction both between my students and between students and myself plays a central role in my teaching / work.
  - My CLIL teaching at university always encourages student oral and/or written production.
Students value the opportunity to use the FL for authentic communication, focusing more on meaning and interaction than on structures and errors. I promote spontaneous use of the FL in all my classes, without penalising or judging any misuse or errors that may occur.

There is interaction in the L2 with the teacher and the other students. This way, students can put their linguistic knowledge into practice and are obliged to expand their communicative resources so that they are able to respond to specific demands of the contents they are working on.

I usually propose didactic strategies which address the linguistic abilities necessary to deal with the concepts in the subject I teach.

This was supplemented by the following issues addressed by Contero (2017), even though they did not directly correspond to any of the sections proposed by Pavesi et al. (2001):

- CLIL teaching at university level requires coherent planning for each topic.
  - My materials are designed from authentic resources in the FL.
  - My teaching is planned with attention to possible language learning on the part of students (designing linguistic scaffolding).
  - I intentionally include motivational techniques to ensure students take an active role.

- CLIL lecturers have to go through the discovery of teaching formulas that place interaction at the centre of their day to day teaching, which means giving up their traditional role as commentator and indisputable expert of the subject. Thus, they must be aware of their own didactic style.
  - I am aware that the degree of satisfaction I have obtained as a teacher in L1 may be different from that which I have in the FL.

In addition, the questionnaire incorporates fact-finding around the following concerns:

- The source of didactic resources used by lecturers whilst planning their CLIL teaching: Internet, specialized bibliographies and others.
- Usual working formula for this didactic design, namely: translation, adaptation or new elaboration.
- The time teachers invest in lesson preparation.
- Promotion of individuality or teamwork: consulting linguistic advisors or other specialists whilst designing sessions.
- Previous consideration of possible linguistic development in the classroom: analysing specific terminology.
- Possible strategies for the promotion of interaction in the classroom: fostering the use of certain types of activities.
The final version of the survey was drafted at the end of June 2017 and piloted with 20 lecturers, all of whom were enrolled in specific innovation projects for bilingual teaching at the University of Cádiz. After correcting the linguistically complex formulation of some questions, the survey was officially launched on September 7 to a total of 374 CLIL teachers from Andalusian universities. The final version included 15 questions (see Table 1, below) divided into three sections: the general teacher profile of the respondent, the definition of their didactic style as a CLIL teacher and their own assessment of the aforementioned style.

Once the survey had been launched, the URL link was sent to several researchers participating in the AGCEPESA project. They were selected due to their specific knowledge of areas or degrees at Andalusian universities where bilingual teaching is being delivered. These colleagues know the extent to which bilingual or plurilingual experiences or programmes are implemented at every institution. The data gathering process took four weeks and no reminders were sent to increase participant response rate.

Table 1. Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 1: TEACHER PROFILE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and general teaching profile:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Years of teaching experience at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional category at university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Andalusian university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Field of knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Subjects you usually teach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FL you use to teach that/those subject(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Time you have been teaching in a FL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In order to teach in a FL, do you translate the didactic resources from L1 to FL?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Subject you teach in a FL (the one you will be referring to in the next questions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 2: DIDACTIC STYLE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Didactic style of the respondent: Evaluate your level of satisfaction with your own teaching:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) My teaching perfectly fulfils the role assigned to me by society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I am fully satisfied with my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The results of my teaching are very positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Regarding the results of teaching *per se* (not the satisfaction that these could cause), we asked the respondents to value them in relation to the following statements:

   a) I am able to attend to the learning needs of my students regarding content and language.

   b) The results of my students show that, after my classes, they have improved both language and content skills.

   c) I am able to make my students more participative, active and motivated.

AREA 3: SELF ASSESSMENT OF THE AFOREMENTIONED STYLE

14. My lesson planning includes the following elements:

   a) Fostering the self-esteem and self-confidence of my students.

   b) Promoting the organisational capacities and independent work of my students.

   c) Daily interaction between my students and/or myself plays a central role and is replacing the traditional one-way theoretical exposition (teacher-centred lecturing).

   d) My classrooms include systematic cooperative work.

15. For the classes I teach in a foreign language, my lesson planning includes the following elements:

   a) Oral and/or written production by students.

   b) The spontaneous use of the foreign language, without penalising or judging any faults that may occur.

   c) Didactic strategies of a linguistic nature to deal with the concepts of the subject I teach.

   d) The conscious use of humour as a motivating technique

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 138 lecturers responded to the online questionnaire out of a total of 374 who were invited, yielding a response rate of 36.89%. With regard to gender, 59.4% were men and 40.6% women and the average age was 46.2. Table 2 summarizes participant demographic and professional characteristics. Regarding the question of status, we should point out that the Spanish system involves a rather complicated hierarchy ranging from *Catedrático*, which is the same as ‘professor’ in English, through various degrees of full-time permanent positions
(titular, doctor contratado etc) to part-time posts such as colaborador(a). According to the data, the prototypical profile of a CLIL university teacher is male, around 46 years old, a “profesor titular” (which implies someone who is a civil servant, similar to the idea of tenure), who has been teaching for more than 14 years at the university, 3.5 of them as a CLIL teacher in/through English.

Table 2. CLIL teacher profiles in Andalusian universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL DATA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PROFESSIONAL DATA |  |  |
| STATUS            | N               | PERCENTAGE      |
| Catedrático       | 18              | 13%             |
| Titular           | 56              | 40.6%           |
| Contratado Dr.    | 31              | 22.5%           |
| Ayudante Dr.      | 14              | 10.1%           |
| Sustituto         | 8               | 5.8%            |
| Colaborador       | 5               | 3.6%            |
| Other             | 6               | 4.3%            |
| TEACHING EXPERIENCE | N         | PERCENTAGE      |
| Less than 5 years | 6               | 4.3%            |
| 5 to 10 years     | 19              | 13.8%           |
| 10 to 15 years    | 27              | 19.6%           |
| More than 15 years| 86              | 62.3%           |

| CLIL DATA |  |  |
| EXPERIENCE | N | PERCENTAGE |
| Less than 1 year | 8 | 5.8% |
| 1 to 3 years    | 65 | 47.1% |
| 4 to 6 years    | 48 | 34.8% |
| More than 6 years | 17 | 12.3% |
| LANGUAGE | N | PERCENTAGE |
| English | 130 | 92.4% |
| French    | 6  | 4.3% |
| German    | 1  | 0.7% |
| Other     | 1  | 0.7% |
The 138 responses were provided by teachers from 66 different areas, therefore representing a wide variety of subjects. They can be grouped into 14 fields of science and technology as defined by the UNESCO nomenclature to more accurately show which disciplines Andalusian CLIL teachers work in. Table 3 shows how our sample is distributed among these UNESCO fields of classification. It reveals that more than 70% of Andalusian CLIL lecturing is concentrated in just 4 of these scientific fields, namely: Economy, Education, Engineering and Psychology. Some other fields worth mentioning are International Law, Arts and Chemistry, which collectively represent almost 15% of university CLIL teaching in Andalusia.

Table 3. Andalusian CLIL university teachers distributed by
UNESCO Fields of Science and Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNESCO FIELD</th>
<th>DIFFERENT AREAS WITHIN THE FIELD</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PERCENT-AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>1 – (Vegetal production)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>5 – (Fine arts theory, Architecture…)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2 – (Analytical chemistry, Organic chemistry)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Economic Sciences           | 6 – (Economic systems, Economic accounting, Organization and management of enterprises,
Economic activity, Econometrics…)                                                                | 40       | 28.98%      |
| History                     | 1 – (Ancient history)                                                                              | 1        | 0.72%       |
| Juridical Science and Law   | 4 – (International law, National law and legislation…)                                             | 7        | 5.07%       |
| Life Sciences               | 4 – (Zoology, Botany, Biochemistry and Molecular biology)                                          | 5        | 3.62%       |
| Linguistics                 | 3 – (Classical philology, Linguistic theory…)                                                      | 3        | 2.17%       |
| Mathematics                 | 3 – (Algebra, Geometry, Topology, Statistics)                                                      | 3        | 2.17%       |
| Medical Sciences            | 5 – (Clinical sciences, Pharmacology, Pharmacodynamics…)                                           | 5        | 3.62%       |
| Pedagogy                    | 11 – (Educational theory and methods, Teacher training, Education, organization and planning…)    | 25       | 18.11%      |
| Physics                     | 3 – (Physics, Applied physics, Theoretical physics)                                                | 3        | 2.17%       |
| Psychology                  | 5 – (Adolescent and child psychology, Experimental psychology, General psychology…)              | 11       | 7.97%       |
| Technological Sciences      | 12 – (Computer technology, Chemical engineering, Electronic technology…)                           | 22       | 15.94%      |
All CLIL subjects taught in French or German (5.4% of the data) belong to the field of Pedagogy, whereas English is the one and only FL used for teaching in the other three main scientific fields highlighted in Table 3.

When comparing this data with that referring to teaching styles, some other interesting findings can be presented:

Firstly, having been asked about the way they plan and prepare their classes, around half of the Andalusian CLIL lecturers in our study (47%) confessed to translating their materials directly into English from the didactic resources they regularly use in Spanish, whereas 53% defended the idea of designing them specifically for their CLIL teaching using original L2 resources. These results match Contero’s findings (2017). What we can observe now is a direct link between the trend to translate or not from Spanish with the number of years of CLIL experience obtained. Lecturers who always translate materials from L1 into L2 (12%) have an average of little more than 2 years of CLIL experience; in contrast, lecturers who do not always do this (35%) have more than 3 years of CLIL experience; and lecturers who refuse to translate at all (53%) have at least almost 4 years of CLIL teaching experience. This implies a direct correlation between practical CLIL experience and the confidence/ability to design original materials.

Secondly, more than 85% of lecturers feel generally satisfied or very satisfied with their teaching activity, stating that the social function of this work is the most highly valued feature for them. The remaining 15% are more critical of their work. Interestingly, 50% of these critical lecturers belong to the group who actively refuse to translate didactic materials, that is to say, the most experienced group of teachers. That said, there also appears to be an age factor since this critical attitude is mostly maintained by younger lecturers (up to 44 years old), whereas the ones who are generally satisfied have an average age of over 45.

This initial critical attitude towards their own teaching activity increases up to 17.6% among lecturers when asked about their ability to design lessons where both language and content are treated in an equal way. And this concern is confirmed when the question refers to the results of this balanced teaching, where more than 40% of lecturers are less satisfied.

Additionally, over 33% of lecturers recognise that they do not keep their students actively motivated and engaged. When asked about possible teaching procedure reasons for this, the following answers (table 4) emerge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Andalusian CLIL University Teachers Teaching Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO YOU PLAN YOUR LESSONS CONSIDERING…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your students’ self-confidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational skills for independent work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction as basic for learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks where systematic cooperation is required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic scaffolding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous and open intervention by students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and written use of language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining moments (or materials) for motivation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A close look at data lets us observe that linguistic scaffolding appears to continue to be the biggest obstacle for a high percentage of lecturers. A possible reason for this, apart from the stated fact that most lecturers require more and more focused methodological training, may be that the majority of them work with no assistance or advice from a foreign language teacher.

In addition to this, numerous elements in regular classes and cooperative tasks can be improved by CLIL lecturers at Andalusian universities. One area commonly identified is academic rigour displayed by serious talk or debate, since generating intentional motivation continues to be seen as a rather childish issue (Contero, 2016) that lecturers prefer to avoid for a more scientific approach.

Returning to the research questions posed at the outset, the findings here obtained suggest the following:

1. Regarding the typical professional profile of a plurilingual university teacher: Andalusian CLIL lecturers tend to be male tenured lecturers in their forties with more than 15-years teaching experience. They have mostly been teaching through CLIL for 1 to 3 years using English as their FL. It would be interesting to compare this profile with data regarding university lecturers in general – for example, to discover whether men dominate in the profession overall; but this data does not seem to be publicly available.

2. Relating to the question of scientific fields; economic sciences followed by Pedagogy/Didactics as well as Technological sciences are the UNESCO fields within which most (current) Andalusian CLIL lecturers are working. It remains to be seen whether this will remain constant as integrated content and language approaches continue to spread.

3. From the perspective of methodological intricacies clearly identified by lecturers along with linguistic ones, perhaps the most striking comment lecturers make regarding their teaching difficulties seems to revolve around the question of the identification and implementation of language scaffolding techniques. This suggests that CLIL lecturers are aware of the importance of considering language in their lesson planning, but they appear to have problems in identifying possible procedures for managing L2 integration through scaffolding strategies (on this question see also the articles by Rubio Cuenca and Moore, and Sánchez-García in this volume).

4. Considering the relationship between teaching styles and methodological and/or linguistic variables, and their potential effect on university CLIL teaching styles; five particular methodological and linguistic variables, previously identified in Contero’s research (2017), have been confirmed in the present study, leading to the proposition that proposals for more effective methodological training should pay special attention to these needs:
• Area 1. Participants’ roles and settings, where interaction, cooperation and autonomy can be considered as tools for teaching activities.
• Area 2. Scaffolding models, where teachers learn how to attend to their students’ linguistic needs regarding the content they will be dealing with.
• Area 3. Sequence planning, where control over the available time and space for CLIL teaching is essential.
• Area 4. Linguistic awareness, where specific communicative consequences of integrating FL in a content class can be considered.
• Area 5. Authenticity, not just related to cases and examples that students could be working on but also to the L2 materials and resources themselves.

4. Conclusions

While we note an increasing abundance of research papers on this emergent subdiscipline (Arco-Tirado, Fernández-Martin & Hernández-Moreno, 2016) including impact evaluation studies (e.g., Arco-Tirado, et al., 2018), we need to bear in mind that we are focusing on a didactic proposal which, particularly in university settings, is still under construction, indeed, arguably still in an initial phase of development and research.

It seems safe to suppose that research can and will pinpoint problematic areas in CLIL university teaching and will contribute to reflect on them in a practical and constructive way. Starting from the assumption already identified by several experts (Mehisto et al., 2008 and Pavón & Gaustad, 2013) that certain methodological aspects need to be included in bilingual teacher development activities designed for lecturers, the results from this study fully align with those already found by Contero (2017) and Zayas & Contero (2012).

This study aimed to identify methodological needs of lecturers from all over the region when teaching in bilingual or plurilingual programmes. In doing so, the scope of previous work in the field was widened to obtain a broader perspective of how the integration of content and foreign languages is being implemented and how this appears to be related to and affected by lecturer didactic styles.

One of the most significant findings to emerge from this study is that the more years lecturers have been involved in CLIL teaching, the more convinced they are that new and purposeful didactic materials should be designed for teaching in a FL, rather than translating from material used to teach in L1. In other words, gaining experience in integrating content and language in Higher Education reassures the teacher of the need for adaptation rather than translation from L1 to L2. In turn this suggests that perhaps the question of materials design/adaptation should feature more in on-going development than in initial, introductory programmes.

Lecturers’ concerns regarding linguistic awareness and scaffolding in CLIL teaching were also revealed as they acknowledged their considerable doubts as to whether they were covering the language skills necessary when integrating the FL into their content sessions. Since these are content teachers, coming from subject specialisations which have traditionally been regarded as ‘non-linguistic’, we should not be surprised at this uncertainty, but we clearly need to address it in teacher development.
Strengthening student motivation was another key finding in our study, as we observed that a high percentage of respondents did not feel that their students were sufficiently motivated and engaged in the learning process. This may be related to the question of providing opportunities for authentic information exchange and debate. Although, of course, we did not enquire into perceived motivation levels in L1 teaching and so we do not know if this is a specifically CLIL-related problem.

Teacher development courses that specifically address CLIL lecturers’ needs should, therefore, cover major methodological areas such as interaction, cooperation, student autonomy, linguistic awareness and scaffolding, as well as convincing lecturers to generate an authentic CLIL environment in class.
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