Teacher Perception of the Link Between Professional Learning and Professional Identities and Confidence in Integrating Content and Language

Ruth Fielding and Lesley Harbon

Introduction

Prior research has indicated a relationship between teacher professional learning (PL) and teacher development of professional identity (Andrews & Svalberg, 2016, Sachs, 2005; Tedick & Zilmer, 2018). The current study explores this relationship between PL opportunities and teacher identity in a CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) context, where a range of primary school subjects are taught through the medium of an additional language. We use the term PL to refer to additional training and development for fully qualified teachers. In our previous research in four CLIL programmes, teachers indicated their lack of confidence in their work due to the lack of training and support they had in those initial stages of programme implementation (Fielding & Harbon, 2014). This chapter explores the relationship between confidence and teacher identity, with particular consideration of confidence in language and content integration.

Teacher confidence, although complex to define, has been argued as akin to self-efficacy (Nolan & Molla, 2017). Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy beliefs within his social cognitive theory view teacher confidence as similar to self-efficacy. This involves teachers developing confidence through social interaction with peers, colleagues, and others in their PL community. Nolan and Molla (2017) indicate that teacher professionalism and teacher confidence are closely interrelated. Drawing on this argument, we see teacher confidence as closely interrelated with teacher professional identity. We see teacher confidence and professional identity evolving alongside each other. Both confidence and professional identity rely upon teachers' agency to act upon their beliefs. PL is identified as a key factor in developing and building both confidence and related professional identity (Nolan & Molla,

2017). In this project we sought to understand first what inservice teachers had experienced specific to the integration of content and language in CLIL teaching, how prepared teachers felt after PL, and how they believed their PL related to their professional identities and their confidence in bilingual teaching.

In CLIL teaching, there is a requirement for teachers to integrate content and language learning, with student learning and teacher programming both having dual outcomes (Mehisto *et al.*, 2008). Integrating these two sets of outcomes is complex (see for example Nikula *et al.*, 2016), involving integration at the curriculum, classroom practice, and participant levels (Nikula *et al.*, 2016). Debate persists around what, exactly, content-language integration means. Some have proposed a multidimensional approach to integration (Nikula *et al.*, 2016). In this chapter, we focus upon individual teacher views of integration to understand how teachers view integration in their contexts and how their perceptions of integration link to their professional identities.

To understand how teachers felt about the PL they had access to and whether they felt that this impacted their professional identities and confidence, we gathered questionnaire and interview data from teachers at four primary schools in NSW Australia where CLIL programmes have been offered over the past 10 years (Fielding & Harbon, 2014, 2017). We follow Ball *et al.*'s (2015) conceptualisation of CLIL as ranging from soft CLIL, where language objectives are given priority, to hard CLIL, where the content area drives the delivery. We use CLIL and bilingual education interchangeably as both are referred to in this particular context and within the literature.

Background

Bilingual modes of education have attracted increasing interest in Australian schooling systems in recent years yet remain relatively rare and therefore not well-catered for

in initial or ongoing teacher education (Bower *et al.*, 2020; Fielding & Harbon, 2014, 2018; Harbon *et al.*, 2015; Smala, 2013; Turner, 2017; Turner & Fielding, 2021; Wiltshire & Harbon, 2010).

In total there are fewer than 50 programmes around Australia delivering bilingual models of education which integrate language and content. Although there are around 10 schools operating what are labelled 'bilingual education programmes' in New South Wales, the four programmes described in our research (Fielding & Harbon, 2014, 2017) are the only ones that are funded by the NSW government Department of Education.

In Victoria there are twelve primary programmes referred to as CLIL which deliver around 30% of the curriculum through an additional language at primary school level. There are a handful of secondary schools also delivering CLIL programmes. There are also several primary programmes referred to as bilingual programmes which offer 50% of the curriculum in the additional language. At the time of writing, there was one school increasing their delivery of instruction in the additional language to 80% in the first three years of primary school.

In Queensland there are primary and secondary CLIL programmes which deliver particular subject areas through an additional language. There are nine bilingual programmes in English and one of the local Aboriginal languages in different areas of the Northern Territory. These programmes offer a 50:50 model up to Year 4.

Literature Review

Teacher preparation for teaching in bilingual or CLIL programmes in Australia

Teacher professional development has not been developed specifically for the small number of bilingual education contexts in Australia, a challenge which is problematic for both implementation and ongoing teacher development. Research in the Australian context

has found that CLIL teachers need to be supported by "focused professional development opportunities" (Smala, 2013: 194). Smala's (2013) study of the needs of teachers delivering CLIL in Queensland schools in Australia indicated that the many demands placed upon CLIL teachers required specific and comprehensive support. She outlined that teacher decisions within CLIL pedagogy require them to teach subject-specific concepts hindered by a lack of teaching resources in the second language. Therefore, teachers need to translate and simplify materials to ensure students' access to learning through modified language

In our prior research in these CLIL programmes, teachers had reported that they do not feel adequately prepared for teaching in content-based classrooms (Fielding & Harbon, 2014). In each of the four schools we found that the CLIL teachers have developed their own pedagogical approaches to deal with the specific needs of their setting (Fielding & Harbon, 2017) in response to the lack of departmental guidance and a paucity of appropriate PL (Fielding & Harbon, 2014, 2017). These teachers reported having generalist primary school teacher qualifications, without specialisation in either language teaching or integration of language and content, or a secondary languages teaching education without specialisation in language and content integration (Turner & Fielding, 2020).

Research on teacher PL and teacher knowledge for content-based classrooms

The complexity of the task of integrating language and content is not well understood in the Australian context, with teachers having to work out their own version of best practice in many cases (Fielding & Harbon, 2014, 2017). It is therefore necessary to turn to the international literature on immersion and CLIL to understand what has been established in terms of language and content integration.

Lyster and Ballinger (2011: 286) indicated that many of the challenges faced by teachers in content-based settings could be ameliorated by "more systematic professional development that is both research-based and practitioner-informed." Cammarata and Ó

Ceallaigh (2018) argue that helping teachers to better integrate content and language may go some way in ameliorating the imbalance in terms of the success of such programmes. Some prior research has looked at how teachers might better integrate language and content (Lyster, 2007; Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Ó Ceallaigh *et al.*, 2016), yet only a small number of studies have made initial explorations of a link between PL and teacher identity in immersion or CLIL contexts (He, this volume; Leavy *et al.*, 2018; Ó Ceallaigh *et al.*, this volume; Tedick & Zilmer, 2018). Drawing on research looking at teacher knowledge in immersion contexts, Cammarata and Tedick (2012: 254) noted that teacher pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) involves a "dynamic amalgam" of representing and presenting subject matter and language that involve learners using language.

Similarities can be drawn to the PCK (Shulman, 1986, 1987) that CLIL teachers require. Teachers need to consider the local curriculum outcomes in subjects such as mathematics, geography, and science as well as the language needed to deliver and elicit evidence of student understanding of that content. To do so, teachers must also consider the cognition strategies involved for students to navigate both language and content outcomes adequately (Coyle, 2008). Nonetheless, teacher education programme models in Australia do not cater directly for this type of PCK. There is rarely space for specialisation in CLIL or immersion in the strictly accredited preservice teacher education courses in Australia. Teacher PL for specialisation in CLIL or other bilingual education styles, therefore, needs to be catered for via inservice PL programmes.

Language knowledge

A number of recent studies have sought to better understand the types of language knowledge that content-based teachers need in order to integrate language and content (He & Lin, 2018; Morton, 2016, 2018). Studies have focussed upon the language development of teachers who primarily view themselves as content teachers. He and Lin (2018) use a teacher

language awareness model of three stages of CLIL teachers' language awareness: language user, language analyst, CLIL teacher. They indicate that teachers report feeling like content teachers and therefore need to develop the language aspect of their role (He & Lin, 2018). Morton (2016; 2018) has developed a model to understand the types of language needed as part of teachers' repertoire of skills. He argues that each aspect of teacher language needs specific teacher development (Morton, 2018).

It is acknowledged across a range of research that many bilingual teachers focus on the content outcomes for their learners, assuming that language may take care of itself (Cammarata & Ó Ceallaigh, 2018; He & Lin, 2018). A study by Fortune *et al.* (2008) found that even though teachers believed they were constantly integrating language, they were not doing so in a systematic manner, and language outcomes were more overlooked than teachers realised. It is clear that the integration of language and content is complex for teachers, and this is intertwined with their identity development as teachers in bilingual settings.

Bilingual teacher identity

In order to understand teacher identity in bilingual contexts, we must also understand the broader literature on teacher professional identity. Teacher professional identity has been explored by Sachs (2005: 15) who defines it as "not something that is fixed nor is it imposed; rather it is negotiated through experience and the sense that is made of that experience." Sachs (2005) says that unsurprisingly, teacher professional identity is impacted by the experiences of each teacher, and that these experiences should be incorporated into targeted PL. This reflects the assertions made in relation to the need for targeted CLIL and immersion teacher PL (He, this volume; Lin *et al.*, this volume; Morton, 2018; Smala, 2013). Barkhuizen (2017: 4) proposes a definition of language teacher identities (LTIs) as:

> cognitive, social, emotional, ideological, and historical … both *inside* the teacher *and outside* in the social, material and technological world..… core and peripheral, personal and professional, they are dynamic, multiple, and hybrid, and they are foregrounded and backgrounded. And LTIs change, short-term and over time—discursively in social interaction with teacher educators, learners, teachers, administrators, and the wider community.

Barkhuizen's definition is in line with many post-structural conceptualisations of a dynamic and complex multilingual identity (Block, 2015; Fielding, 2015, 2021; Fisher *et al.*, 2020; Henry, 2017; Norton, 2014a, 2014b). The interaction between the teacher and their professional educators and the wider community is also a key aspect of this conceptualisation of LTI.

Teacher identity and language and content integration

It is of particular importance to further understand bilingual teacher identities, because teachers' identities as language users are essential to their PCK in the classroom (Andrews & Svalberg, 2016). In settings which take bilingual approaches to integrate language and content, teacher identity is a key factor in relation to teacher confidence. In the immersion context, Cammarata and Tedick (2012) have shown that immersion teachers more commonly identify as content teachers due to their formal qualifications and training. Immersion teachers do not always consider themselves responsible for students' language learning and instead consider themselves to be responsible for content. They may undergo a transformation of their teacher identity through focused learning about content and language integration (Cammarata & Ó Ceallaigh, 2018; Ó Ceallaigh *et al.*, this volume). Other research has echoed the finding that teachers most commonly see themselves as subject specialists

first and foremost with the language aspect less highlighted in their self-perception (Fortune *et al.*, 2008; Ní Thuairisg, 2018). A teacher's confidence and their associated identity may be impacted by the uncertainty of which focus to emphasise, content or language.

Leavy *et al.* (2018) explored the dimensions of immersion teacher educator identity. They argued that there are three stages of identity development for teacher educators of immersion teachers. These stages are 1) defending content as the priority; 2) negotiating an integrated space for content and language and 3) becoming immersion responsive, or developing a raised awareness of, and response to, what is involved in immersion teaching.

In a study looking at teacher perceptions of a PL experience emphasising language-focused content instruction, Tedick and Zilmer (2008) found that teachers exhibited five different professional characteristics relating to their identity, or "learning as becoming," according to the Communities of Practice theoretical framework (e.g. Wenger, 1998) that guided the study. The themes of these five groups of teacher professional characteristics included: *intentionality*, that is, teachers explicitly planning for language outcomes in addition to content outcomes; *self-awareness/growth* – as teachers became more language aware and more able to determine a progression of content-related language; *empowerment* – where teachers identified particular experiences that had empowered them and thus helped their professional identity to develop; *becoming a collaborator* – where teachers identified collaboration as a key contributor to an evolving sense of identity; and *maintaining high expectations for student language* – where teachers indicated that they saw their own role to be instrumental in maintaining high expectations for student language production.

The findings of these two studies indicate that there is a need to guide and facilitate teacher development of identity. We draw on Nolan and Molla (2017) to highlight the link between teacher identity, self-efficacy, and confidence in their practice. Without supportive

opportunities to collaborate, teachers may not see an equal value in the content and language aspects of their teaching and may not develop confidence in their practice.

Ó Ceallaigh *et al.* (this volume) also use a frame that indicates a sense of becoming an immersion teacher. They identify three stages of becoming with teachers starting as subject specialists, moving through a stage of teacher as learner, and culminating in a stage of teacher as leader. Ó Ceallaigh *et al.* further highlight the need for PL to support the transition through various phases of teacher identity.

In the Netherlands, Dale *et al.* (2018) found that teachers in CLIL contexts face an identity "search" as they are expected to collaborate with subject specialist colleagues. These researchers developed a framework for conceptualising teacher collaboration, which when depicted in graphic format, shows teachers to be positioned within four different quadrants: (a) content and meaning focus, (b) language and form focus, (c) culture-specific focus, and (d) subject-specific focus. The framework enables teachers to position themselves based upon their priorities. This type of framework is helpful in terms of viewing the teacher roles that form their professional identity. It does not, however, account for the personal aspects of identity that impact professional identity. In the case of bilingual teachers, their own connection to language, their linguistic identity, and their associated multilingual identity will have an impact upon the way they see themselves professionally (Fielding, 2021).

Knowing that "staff development activities can play a role in helping teachers to develop strategies for gaining confidence and taking active control of their work situation, both individually and collectively" (Van Lankveld *et al.*, 2017: 325), this chapter explores how teachers in one relatively isolated context perceived the PL support available to them and how they see this relating to teacher identity and confidence. The research is guided by the following research questions:

How do teachers in four primary NSW programmes perceive the link between their access to professional learning and their professional identities and confidence as CLIL teachers? Specifically,

a. What professional learning has been provided that could potentially develop these CLIL teachers' identities, and
b. To what extent do CLIL teachers feel adequately supported through the professional learning provided?

Methodology

Context

Four government primary schools in NSW have designated government funded bilingual programmes. The teachers in this study teach in the CLIL programmes at these four schools. The programmes were developed in one of four languages: Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese, and Korean. The schools have developed their own approaches to pedagogy and assessment to suit their context and have selected the content areas that they believe work best with their programme's language following the requirement of 1–1.5 hours per day in the target language (Fielding & Harbon, 2014, 2018).

The schools began implementing the programmes in an incremental manner starting with Kindergarten and adding a grade level each academic year. Three of the four schools offer the bilingual programme as one stream within the school, with other students attending regular English-medium classes on the same campus. The fourth school is very small and therefore all students in that school participate in the bilingual programme.

The study

This qualitative study involved a questionnaire and individual interviews.[1] A link for the online questionnaire was disseminated through Qualtrics ™ directly to teacher email addresses with permission from the principal in each school, who also forwarded the survey

link to any additional teachers who did not receive the email directly. A possible pool of 22 teachers was identified. A total of eight surveys were completed out of that field. Of those eight, five respondents indicated that they were willing to be interviewed to provide further detail and insight into their experiences. These five participants were sent an email inviting them to take part in an interview. Ultimately three interviews were organised and took place. It must be noted that this data collection took place through the first outbreak of COVID-19 and through long periods of lockdown in Australia. There were also periods of time during which research involving schools and teachers was not permitted. Therefore, fewer responses were captured than initially anticipated. The small number of participants is acknowledged as a limitation of the study, and further exploration is warranted in the future with a larger group of teachers. All participants signed a consent form and received participant statements as required by the local ethics process. We note that as researchers we have an ongoing relationship with the schools where we have co-researched with the teachers over the past ten years. We therefore acknowledge this as an impact upon our analysis of the data.

Participants

The participants are outlined in the following table. Schools are not noted to preserve participant anonymity. Specific school languages are not referred to either as this would enable teachers and schools to be identified (Indonesian, Japanese, Chinese, Korean). Teachers have been allocated a code rather than a name to preserve their anonymity as best as possible. All teachers were bilingual teachers in their school, meaning that they had responsibility for both language and content outcomes and negotiated with the classroom teachers allocated to the same academic year level to determine which content they were responsible for in the target language. Classroom teachers teach all other content in English.

Table1: Participant Profiles

Teacher	*Years in the bilingual programme*	*Participated in Interview Yes/No*	*Preservice education / inservice training*
Bilingual Teacher 1	11	Y	Primary teacher education in the target language country; inservice preparation from the employer + own planned education
Bilingual Teacher 2	2	Y	Secondary [language] teacher education; inservice training from the employer
Bilingual Teacher 3	3	Y	Secondary language teacher education
Bilingual Teacher 4	Less than 1 year	N	Primary teacher education
Bilingual Teacher 5	2	N	Not stated
Bilingual Teacher 6	2	N	Not stated
Bilingual Teacher 7	More than 5 years	N	Not stated
Bilingual Teacher 8	More than 5 years	N	Not stated

Data collection

Questionnaire items comprised rating scale levels of agreement to statements (i.e. ranging from very confident to not confident at all) and open-ended response (OR) questions. The questions were devised initially by one researcher and trialled and edited by the second researcher. Due to the small pool of possible participants, it was not possible to pilot the survey with a sub-group. The semi-structured interview focussed on asking teachers to clarify and elaborate on their survey responses. In the semi-structured interviews, teacher identity, confidence associated with teaching in bilingual programmes, and confidence in relation to the integration of language and content were key focus points.

Data analysis

Data analysis followed an iterative process of data reduction via thematic identification involving repeated cross-coding and multiple stages of cross-data checking.

Themes from the interviews and surveys were examined, combined, and refined to identify common factors. The analysis followed the three stages laid out by Miles *et al.* (2014): firstly, a grounded coding where teacher voice was used to determine first level codes to represent their own experiences; secondly, open and axial coding was undertaken to group together similar ideas and codes; thirdly, selective coding was undertaken to ascertain links between codes. The two researchers analysed the data separately, compared and combined codes, and the re-analysed on the basis of the combined set of codes. Codes led researchers to identify three different phases of evolution of the teacher identities: (a) teacher as novice, (b) teacher as work-in-progress, and (c) teacher as expert.

Findings and Discussion

The findings indicate that the teachers' identities associated with the bilingual/CLIL aspects of their roles varied in their level of expertise, depending upon variable amounts of support, professional learning, and collaboration. These three variables emerged as fundamental to the development of teacher identities, with teachers identifying their identities as varying from novice through to expert.

Teachers across Australia are provided with curriculum support and guidance mainly through PL workshops delivered by a curriculum officer within their sector. The three sectors in Australia are either the government, independent, or catholic school systems. We found that the particular lack of curriculum officer guidance from departments of education on the nature of the bilingual programmes had an ensuing impact upon the teachers' identities. Teachers' confidence in their work relates closely to guidance and PL relating to bilingual education.

Our data show that the development of bilingual teacher identity is closely related to the experiences of the teacher. We present the findings under the three key types of identification found: teacher as novice, teacher as work-in-progress and teacher as expert. We

note that the study was not longitudinal and therefore we cannot consider how teachers might move from one stage to the next. Another iteration of research re-visiting these participants might enable further understanding of teacher identity as a process.

Teacher as novice

Some teacher responses indicated that they considered themselves to be novice bilingual teachers or CLIL teachers. We note that length of service does not necessarily align to the level of confidence and positioning as a novice. A few teachers viewed themselves primarily as a language teacher responsible for some content while others saw themselves as classroom teachers first (focusing on content rather than language) but the role of bilingual teacher is a more challenging identity marker for them. Here we see similarities to immersion research which has seen teachers prioritise content over language (Ní Thuairisg, 2018) and view themselves as primarily content teachers (Cammarata & Ó Ceallaigh, 2018; Fortune *et al.*, 2008). Some responses showed that teachers saw themselves as in the early stages of becoming bilingual/CLIL teachers. For example one teacher wrote in the open section of the questionnaire: "I am a leader in language teaching in both Primary and Secondary contexts. I am involved in the NSW Bilingual Schools Programme" (BT5).

This distinction between being a "leader" in language teaching and simply being "involved" in the bilingual programme is a notable clarification from this teacher, who indicated confidence and leadership in relation to the broader skill of language teaching, but less confidence in the bilingual aspects of their role. It also shows this teacher viewing their content as being language teaching, but less connected to the integrated nature of bilingual teaching involving content and language integration (Cammarata & Ó Ceallaigh, 2018; Ní Thuairisg, 2018)

Some teachers specified a difference between being a bilingual teacher and being a CLIL teacher. They perceived that a CLIL teacher has a more nuanced control over the

integration of language and content, and therefore some teachers considered themselves novice in terms of CLIL teaching, while they might consider themselves more accomplished with a more general notion of "bilingual" teaching. For example one teacher said: "I am still developing my identity as a "bilingual" teacher… I wouldn't really call myself a CLIL teacher, just due to the circumstances that I'm in" (BT2).

When asked whether they would call themselves a CLIL teacher in the questionnaire another teacher selected "Maybe" and then elaborated by saying in the open comments: "I happen to use both languages while teaching" (BT8). This teacher's feeling that the two languages happen incidentally indicates a lack of structured decision-making in relation to the use of both languages and the integration of language and content and positions this teacher as a novice. Teachers would need specific and regular PL on aspects of teacher knowledge and integrating language and content to develop a connection to the expert teacher identity (He & Lin, 2018; Morton, 2016, 2018)

One teacher indicated a belief that they were a novice in terms of their teaching by writing in the open comments: "I usually just say I'm a primary school [language] teacher. As I've only been in this role 12 months, I am still developing my identity as a "bilingual" teacher" (BT4). In this case, the teacher was relatively new to the school, and to bilingual modes of education, having previously worked as a secondary school language teacher in a traditional language-as-school-subject programme. We see further evidence here of the connection teachers have to the content area they qualified in (in this case languages) rather than to the notion of being a bilingual teacher (Cammarata & Ó Ceallaigh, 2018; Fortune *et al.*, 2008; Ní Thuairisg, 2018).

Regarding the level of confidence that teachers felt in relation to teaching in a bilingual classroom, one teacher indicated feeling like a novice in the questionnaire. Teachers stated that their confidence was lower in the bilingual classroom than it would be in a

monolingual (English) classroom. Additionally, one teacher wrote: “Still developing techniques and resources for more L2 (second language) instruction. I find myself reverting to L1 (first language) quickly for classroom language when kids seem confused or switched off” (BT7). Another teacher indicated feeling confident with the younger-year groups but not as confident with the upper-primary years, writing: “It depends on what year level I am teaching. I would not feel very confident teaching Stage 3 (Years 5 and 6) students in the CLIL approach” (BT5). Clearly, for teachers to develop confidence in teaching the upper primary classes what is needed is more PL to develop the skills they feel are lacking for teaching older cohorts of students. The need for more PL is equally apparent in European (Pérez -Cañado, 2016; Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2020) and North American contexts. Durán-Martínez and Beltrán-Llavador (2020) explored the perceptions of 97 Spanish inservice primary teachers on four key areas of bilingual programmes: training priorities, teaching resources, school organization, and overall assessment. They found there was a need for specific language training, opportunities for teachers to interact with native speakers, and investment in ongoing learning. These results echoed findings indicated by Pérez -Cañado’s (2016) investigation of inservice teacher needs to deliver CLIL.

It is notable in this study that only one of the novice teachers volunteered to participate in the interviews. This is unfortunate because we would like to have a nuanced understanding of all levels of teachers’ self-perceived competence. The perceptions of novice teachers will therefore be important in follow-up research.

Teacher as work-in-progress

We turn next to the teachers who indicated a stronger sense of identity in relation to their teaching but who still indicated that they needed more PL and sought collaboration with other more experienced teachers. Most of the teacher responses aligned with the theme of teacher as work-in-progress. We liken this notion to the Communities of Practice view of

apprenticeship where less experienced teachers learn from more experienced teachers (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger, 1998) thereby offering collaborative learning experiences (Cammarata & Haley, 2018; Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2020). Teachers we grouped into this theme displayed a certain level of confidence in their teaching practice and therefore identified partially as bilingual teachers (sometimes CLIL teachers) although they couched responses indicating aspects of teaching they still hoped to improve.

Despite having experience in designing and delivering their curriculum these teachers did not feel an associated level of confidence. Several teachers were reluctant to call themselves experts, with a number indicating that they wanted to learn from more experienced teachers about bilingual pedagogy, practice, and planning. For example when asked what additional learning they would like one teacher said: "Connecting with classroom teachers. Working out where to put Bilingual education in at certain stages and what outcomes work best to be done bilingually (best practice examples, I suppose)" (BT6). Another teacher indicated they wanted to learn "how to teach bilingual effectively" (BT3). The teachers did not appear to consider their own practice as the effective or best practice example, demonstrating a belief that there is better practice going on elsewhere that they would like to learn from.

We note that teachers' responses indicated a desired collaborative type of PL where they might learn from more experienced others. A number of teachers indicated wanting practical guidance from more experienced teachers saying: "It would be interesting to see an example of how to develop a unit from planning to teaching to assessment. Perhaps work samples, methodology and even videos of techniques used in lessons" (BT3). Another teacher wrote: "I would like to learn more about programme making and ways to collaborate with the mainstream classroom teachers effectively" (BT6). We can see that teachers don't rate their own skills highly and would like to see other examples of effective programmes. This is a

theme found in European CLIL contexts where more PL is called for (Pérez -Cañado, 2016; Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2020) and where collaboration between new and experienced teachers is also considered a valuable future development (Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2020).

Teachers showed that they felt that the teaching of CLIL was much more complex than teaching in a monolingual mainstream classroom. One teacher wrote: "There is no curriculum support. Teachers need to design and produce their own materials over and over and over. It is a difficult job, more difficult than a classroom teacher in my opinion" (BT3). When asked specifically about their confidence and identity. One teacher said: "I'm still developing confidence" (BT6). In this way, teachers positioned themselves as a work-in-progress.

Another teacher who experienced some tension in identifying as a CLIL teacher emphasised how much more complex the role of the CLIL teacher is compared to a classroom teacher. This teacher said:

> I think that by being a CLIL teacher, it really changes your outlook on teaching, because it's so different. I think being a CLIL teacher has helped me as a teacher, because creating resources, you have to do that independently. And how to make activities easy to access for the students, and differentiate them, whether that be literacy groups, how you might explain things to students. I think it really sets another level where it's not just explaining but choosing the correct words and choosing words that hit on students' prior knowledge. (BT3)

This teacher believed that the complexity of the work of integrating language and content leads to better pedagogical practice in general. He referred to the language choices he must make, which aligns with Morton's (2018) Language Knowledge for Content Teaching (see also Cammarata *et al.* and Tedick *et al.*, this volume). The teacher mentioned "being a CLIL

teacher" yet later in the interview denied having a CLIL teacher identity saying that it was still developing. Despite this lack of confidence in calling himself a bilingual/ CLIL teacher due to the complex nature of the role, this particular teacher felt that he was in the process of learning how to be a CLIL teacher: "I wouldn't really call myself a CLIL teacher, just *due to the circumstances* that I'm in. I would say that I'm *working towards* wanting to deliver purely CLIL and do that, but I would probably say I'm *working towards* being a CLIL teacher" (BT3, emphasis added). We see similarities between "working towards" CLIL teacher identity and the self-awareness aspect of becoming an immersion teacher (Tedick & Zilmer, 2018). It would not be surprising to hear such a reaction from other teachers in similar situations: with the term CLIL being a rarity, with the curriculum support paying only scarce attention to the teachers, there is little wonder as to why teachers are not identifying as experts in CLIL.

Interestingly this teacher identifies contextual issues as hindering his identity development. A similar idea was shown by a second teacher who found departmental processes a hindrance to the development of bilingual teacher identity. Both can be linked to the need for empowerment identified by Tedick and Zilmer (2018) in the process of becoming an immersion teacher. Tedick and Zilmer (2018) found that teachers became empowered within their own teacher identities through professional activities that positioned them as experts. Things such as presenting at conferences, becoming teacher leaders, or providing PL for their colleagues deepened teacher identity connection through this form of empowerment. When explaining his lack of confidence this teacher said:

> when I first started, it was a lot of just doing it on my own and trying to work out how I could deliver this content, in [language], and what would be the best way to do that. So there wasn't really any professional learning that I could undertake, and the other teachers were quite busy. (BT3)

Not only was PL not available, there were also no opportunities for collaboration. This teacher could have benefitted from later providing PL to his colleagues. In the interviews, this idea of needing more support and collaboration was further emphasised:

> I felt like the first year was quite *a big struggle*, second year it was getting a little bit better, and I feel like this 3rd year is a lot better. And I do feel more confident, but I still feel that I do need support in – is this what I should be doing, *is this correct*? I think that is something that crosses my mind a lot. Am I doing the right thing? (BT3, emphasis added)

The benefits of collaboration have been highlighted in other studies looking at evolving teacher identity in immersion settings (Cammarata & Haley, 2018; Tedick & Zilmer, 2018). The need for validation that they are doing the right thing was also emphasised, indicating that teachers do not have a clear idea of what is expected of them and what constitutes good practice. Teachers wanted acknowledgement of whether they are doing well, and a form of collaborative PL could provide suitable support (Cammarata & Haley, 2018; Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2020).). At another point in the interview this teacher said that they needed much more tailored support thus re-emphasising findings of Smala (2013) and Morton (2018). The teachers had access only to what they perceived as "generic" PL:

> Whatever the other Stages are doing, I do just participate in the generic PD. It hasn't been particularly helpful to CLIL. And that's what our bilingual team has brought up. That *we don't find it that relevant* and we do need something more specific. (BT3, emphasis added)

Another teacher highlighted the lack of support he felt from within the education system. This impacted upon his sense of professional identity and confidence in his ability. He said: "My lack of confidence comes from the system" (BT6). This teacher felt that after being asked to implement an innovative programme, they had been left to work it out for

themselves, and their work had not been acknowledged by the State education department. He said he felt "We are not empowered" (BT6). This indicates a need for further support for teachers during their ongoing development as bilingual teachers and empowerment as a component of this (Tedick & Zilmer, 2018).

Teacher as expert

> Only one teacher considered themselves to be an expert CLIL teacher. She said:
>
> Now looking back at my journey as a CLIL teacher, I think it really helped me, before I became a CLIL teacher, I was a general primary school teacher. So that helped me a lot. Not just the language itself, plus I'm bilingual as well. (BT1)

Viewing herself as bilingual contributed to this teacher's identity development as a CLIL teacher. However this teacher had invested a lot of her own time, money, and dedication in building her expertise. She had instigated the application for her school to become part of the bilingual programme and therefore was invested in its success from the start. Yet she still felt there was insufficient support from the education department and insufficient PL. This teacher wrote in the open section of the questionnaire: "I undertook a two-weeks intensive CLIL course for teachers in England during school holidays. I could not afford to wait for the professional learning opportunities on CLIL" (BT1). The expert teacher elaborated in the interview:

> I was the only person who was teaching [language] and who was from Australia. The rest of the class was all languages teachers teaching English in European countries. As days went by, I realised that they were all supported by the government. I was the only one who was self-paying. So, their expense to study, accommodation, food, everything, was supported by the government. (BT1)

The expert teacher reported comparing levels of government support in other countries to the support she received in Australia, noting she felt envious of contexts where this learning and

teaching is more highly valued. A sense of not being noticed or valued was apparent. This teacher also indicated the need to be very proactive in gathering the information and support she needed. She said:

> At school, once you get into it you just have to have lots of professional learning by yourself first. And then you practice it, and you develop your own skills, and evaluate how students are learning, things like that. And you have to keep on making it evolve. (BT1)

Reflecting back on how she felt at the start of her bilingual teaching journey she said:

> I was *frantic*. I got the idea of what to do. But then *I had to teach myself* what is CLIL. Because I couldn't just wait for the professional learning to become suddenly available, and I would go and attend one or two days and then that's it. That would be very helpful, but I just needed more because I already had students with me. (BT1, emphasis added)

This quote indicates the level of personal investment this teacher put into her own development. This level of personal commitment, while admirable, indicates an issue of woefully inadequate tailored PL for teachers to develop their practice (Lyster & de Zarobe, 2018; Smala, 2013).

Implications

What professional learning has been provided that could potentially develop these CLIL teachers' identities?

Teachers reported being offered very minimal amounts of PL. There was access to generic PL but very little (if any) PL specific to content and language integration, a finding parallel to what Ballinger *et al.* (this volume) report. Teachers reported having to seek out their own PL to gain the specific skills they needed for their identities as bilingual teachers to develop.

For all but one of the teachers in our study confidence in labelling themselves bilingual or CLIL teachers was relatively low. For two teachers the lack of acknowledgement of their work by the government education department was a contributing factor to their low confidence. Although they considered their work to be 'CLIL' a number of teachers were reticent to say they were accomplished CLIL teachers.

To what extent do CLIL teachers feel adequately supported through professional learning provided?

Teachers do not feel adequately supported through PL. Teachers interviewed sought collaboration with 'expert' teachers, thus not viewing themselves as experts. Such a situation reflects similar findings in immersion contexts (e.g. Ò Ceallaigh *et al.*, this volume), which has seen teachers move through identity stages and show a reluctance to position themselves as experts. We found that the data emerging from our study is similar, although ours captures a one-point-in-time response rather than a longitudinal progression. Most teachers positioned themselves such that they were placed in the "work-in-progress" category. A form of collaborative PL with experienced teachers would benefit these teachers (Pérez -Cañado, 2016; Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2020).

Conclusion

In exploring teachers' perceptions of professional learning provided for their work in the CLIL programmes we conclude that the teachers craved much more support in the form of collaboration and appropriate PL. We notably found a lack of confidence among the teachers in referring to their practice and professional identities as CLIL or bilingual teachers. The link between this lack of tailored PL and the development of teacher identity and confidence in a CLIL context warrants further exploration with a larger pool of teachers.

Only one teacher felt that they were an expert. Teacher hesitance in calling themselves bilingual or CLIL teachers reflects the general reluctance of bilingual teachers to

rate their skill strongly (Fielding & Harbon, 2013) and supports other findings showing that bilingual teachers experience challenges in developing their identities (Ò Ceallaigh *et al.*, this volume). Support, professional learning, and collaboration were evident as three variables that are fundamental to for teacher identities to develop. Further research of a longitudinal nature would be valuable to understand the progression from novice, through work-in-progress, and emerging as expert.

We support the assertion made by Lyster and Ballinger (2011: 279) that teachers play an essential role in content-based settings and need "professional development to support them in meeting some of the challenges specific to CBLT [content-based language teaching]." We suggest more should be invested in supporting these teachers through collaborative and tailored PL.

Note

1. Please contact the lead author to request the instruments used in this study.

References

Andrews, S. and Svalberg, A.M.L. (2016). Teacher language awareness. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter and S. May (eds) *Language Awareness and Multilingualism. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 1–13). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0_17-2

Ball, P., Kelly, K. and Clegg, J. (2015) *Putting CLIL into Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997) *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control.* NY: W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.

Barkhuizen, G. (2017) *Reflections on Language Teacher Identity Research*. New York: Routledge.

Block, D. (2015) Becoming multilingual and being multilingual: Some thoughts. In J. Cenoz and D. Gorter (eds) *Multilingual Education: Between Language Learning and Translanguaging* (pp. 225–37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bower, K., Cross, R. & Coyle, D. (2020). CLIL in multilingual and English-background contexts: Expanding the potential of content and language integrated pedagogies for mainstream learning. In K. Bower, D. Coyle, R. Cross and G.N. Chambers (eds) *Curriculum Integrated Language Teaching: CLIL in Practice* (pp. 3–21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://10.1017/9781108687867.003

Cammarata L and Ò Ceallaigh, T.J. (2018) Teacher education and professional development for immersion and content-based instruction: Research on programmes, practices, and teacher educators. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 6 (2), 153–161.

Cammarata L. and Haley, C. (2018) Integrated content, language, and literacy instruction in a Canadian French immersion context: A professional development journey. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 21* (3), 332–348. https://10.1080/13670050.2017.1386617

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

Coyle, D. (2008) CLIL – A pedagogical approach from the European perspective. In N. Van-Deusen and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd edn), *Vol 4: Second and Foreign Language Education* (pp. 97–111). Singapore: Springer.

Dale, L., Oostdam, R. and Verspoor, M. (2018) Searching for identity and focus: Towards an analytical framework for language teachers in bilingual education. International

Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 21 (3), 366–383. https://10.1080/13670050.2017.1383351

Durán-Martínez, R. and Beltrán-Llavador, F. (2020) Key issues in teachers' assessment of primary education bilingual programs in Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23 (2), 170–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1345851

Fielding, R. (2015) *Multilingualism in the Australian Suburbs: A Framework for Exploring Bilingual Identity*. Dordrecht/Singapore: Springer.

Fielding, R. (2021) A multilingual identity approach to intercultural stance in language learning. *The Language Learning Journal* 49 (4) 466–482. https://10.1080/09571736.2021.1912154

Fielding, R. & Harbon, L. (2013). Examining bilingual and bicultural identity in young students. Foreign Language Annals, 46 (4), 1 – 18. DOI: 10.1111/flan.12051

Fielding, R. and Harbon, L. (2014) Implementing a content and language integrated learning programme (CLIL) in NSW: Teacher perceptions of the challenges and opportunities. *Babel* 49 (2), 4–15.

Fielding, R. and Harbon, L. (2017) An exploration of content and language integrated pedagogy. *Babel* 52 (2-3), 32–45.

Fisher, L., Evans, M., Forbes, K., Gayton, A. and Liu, Y. (2020) Participative multilingual identity construction in the languages classroom: A multi-theoretical conceptualisation. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 17 (4), 448–66. https://10.1080/14790718.2018.1524896.

Harbon, L., Fielding, R. and Liang, J. (2015) The innovation and challenge of a content and language integrated learning approach to CFL in one Australian primary school. In R. Moloney and H.L. Xu (eds.) *Exploring Innovative Pedagogy in the Teaching and*

Learning of Chinese as a Foreign Language (pp. 193–212). Singapore: Springer Science https://10.1007/978-981-287-772-7_11

He, P. and Lin, A.M.Y. (2018) Becoming a *"language-aware"* content teacher: Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) teacher professional development as a collaborative, dynamic, and dialogic process. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 6 (2), 162–188.

Henry, A. (2017) L2 Motivation and multilingual identities. *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3) 548–65.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leavy, A., Hourigan, M. and Ó Ceallaigh, T.J. (2018) Unpacking dimensions of immersion teacher educator identity. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 6 (2), 218–243.

Lyster, R. and Ballinger, S. (2011). Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns across divergent contexts. *Language Teaching Research* 15 (3), 279–288.

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

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. and Saldaña, J. (2014) *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook.* Sage, London.

Morton, T. (2016). Conceptualizing and investigating teachers' knowledge for integrating content and language in content-based instruction. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 4 (2), 144–167.

Morton, T. (2018) Reconceptualizing and describing teachers' knowledge of language for content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual*

Education and Bilingualism 21 (3), 275–286. https://10.1080/13670050.2017.1383352

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

Ní Thuairisg, L. (2018) "It was two hours […] the same old thing and nothing came of it": Continuing professional development among teachers in Gaeltacht post-primary schools. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 6 (2), 295–320.

Nolan, A. and Molla, T. (2017) Teacher confidence and professional capital. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 62, 10-18.

Norton, B. (2014a) *Identity and Language Learning* (2nd edn). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Norton, B. (2014b) Identity, literacy, and the multilingual classroom. In S. May (ed) *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education* (pp. 102–22). New York: Routledge.

Ó Ceallaigh, T.J., Ní Mhurchú, S. and Ní Chróinín, D. (2016) Balancing content and language in CLIL: The experiences of teachers and learners. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 5 (1), 58–86. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.1.03oce.

Pérez Cañado M.L. (2016) Teacher training needs for bilingual education: In-service teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19 (3), 266–295.

Sachs, J. (2005) Teacher education and the development of professional identity: Learning to be a teacher. In P.M. Denicolo and M. Kompf (eds) *Connecting Policy and Practice:*

Challenges for Teaching and Learning in Schools and Universities (pp. 5–21). NY: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203012529

Shulman, L.S. (1986) Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher* 15 (2), 4–14.

Shulman, L.S. (1987) Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review* 57, 1–22.

Smala, S. (2013). Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) pedagogies in Queensland. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning* 8 (3), 194–205.

Tedick, D.J. and Zilmer, C. (2018) Teacher perceptions of immersion professional development experiences emphasizing language-focused content instruction. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education* 6 (2), 269–294.

Turner, M. (2017) Integrating content and language in institutionally monolingual settings: Teacher positioning and differentiation. *Bilingual Research Journal* 40 (1), 70–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1276029

Turner, M. and Fielding, R. (2021) CLIL teacher training and teachers' choices: Exploring planned language use in the Australian context. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 34 (3), 224–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1792920

Van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G. and Beishuizen, J. (2017) Developing a teacher identity in the university context: A systematic review of the literature. *Higher Education Research & Development* 36 (2), 325–342. https://10.1080/07294360.2016.1208154

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932

Wiltshire, J. and Harbon, L. (2010) French and English together in one primary school in New South Wales. *Babel* 44 (3) 14–25.