Attaining inclusion in bilingual programs: Key factors for success

La atención a la diversidad en los programas bilingües: Factores clave de éxito

Marisa Luisa Pérez Cañado

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4337-696X

Universidad de Jaén

Abstract

This article carries out a comparison of frontline stakeholder perspectives in order to determine the most successful practices to cater to diversity in bilingual education. It conflates school effectiveness research and attention to diversity in CLIL programs for the first time and reports on a cross-sectional concurrent triangulation mixed methods study with 2,093 teachers and students in 36 Primary and Secondary schools across the whole of Spain. It employs data, methodological, investigator, and location triangulation in order to determine the potential of CLIL to provide diversity-sensitive teaching on the main curricular and organizational levels of bilingual programs. On the basis of this data, it then sets forth an original framework of key success factors for attention to diversity in CLIL, comprising 22 indicators, grouped into input and success factors, macro-/meso-/micro-levels, and encompassing seven main fronts which range from policy and ideological issues to school and teaching practice. Three overarching take-aways ensue from our findings. First, a conspicuous overall alignment of teacher and student views can be discerned as regards successful strategies for inclusive CLIL programs, something which points to the fact that their opinions are a realistic snapshot of grassroots practice. A second conclusion is that headway is notably being made in this area, as key factors for success have increasingly been identified as present in CLIL classrooms by both cohorts. And, finally, there are certain recurrent issues which the specialized literature has repeatedly identified as niches to be filled, but which still stand in need of being adequately addressed (e.g. time for coordination

within teachers' official timetables or the preparation of language assistants). The main pedagogical implications accruing from the data are signposted and future pathways for progression are mapped out to continue reinforcing a success-prone implementation of diversity-sensitive teaching in the CLIL classroom.

Keywords: CLIL, effectiveness, success, diversity, inclusion, differentiation

Resumen

El presente artículo realiza una comparación de las perspectivas de los participantes clave en los programas bilingües con el fin de determinar las prácticas más exitosas para atender la diversidad en AICLE. Combina la investigación sobre la eficiencia escolar con la atención a la diversidad en los programas AICLE por primera vez y realiza un estudio transversal de métodos mixtos y triangulación concurrente con 2.093 profesores y estudiantes en 36 centros de Educación Primaria y Secundaria en España. Emplea triangulación de datos, metodológica, investigadora y de lugar para determinar el potencial de AICLE para proporcionar una enseñanza sensible a la diversidad en los principales niveles curriculares y organizativos de los programas bilingües. Basándose en estos datos, establece un marco original de factores clave de éxito para la atención a la diversidad en AICLE, que comprende 22 indicadores, agrupados en factores de entrada y de éxito y macro-/meso-/micro-niveles, y que abarca siete frentes principales que oscilan desde la política e ideología hasta el centro y la práctica docente. Tres conclusiones principales emanan de nuestros hallazgos. En primer lugar, se puede discernir una armonía entre los puntos de vista de docentes y discentes con respecto a las estrategias exitosas en los programas AICLE inclusivos, algo que parece indidicar que sus opiniones son un reflejo fiel de la práctica a pie de aula. Un segunda hallazgo relevante es que se están logrando avances notables en esta área, ya que ambas cohortes identifican un número creciente de factores clave para el éxito presentes en las aulas AICLE. Y, por último, existen ciertos temas recurrentes que la literatura especializada ha identificado reiteradamente como nichos a cubrir, pero que aún necesitan ser adecuadamente abordados. Se señalan las principales implicaciones pedagógicas derivadas de los datos y se explicitan futuras áreas de mejora para continuar reforzando una implementación exitosa de la atención a la diversidad en el aula bilingüe.

Palabras clave: AICLE, eficiciencia, éxito, diversidad, inclusión, diferenciación

Introduction

Bilingual education initiatives have been decisively taking root across our continent for the past two decades. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), considered the European approach to favor plurilingualism, "has been a tremendous success story and its influence on practice is currently expanding quickly across Europe and beyond" (Meyer, 2010: 12). In its steadfast advance within the language teaching arena, it has been growing and evolving in exciting new directions, posing new challenges and throwing new curveballs to researchers, gate-keepers, practitioners, and participants alike. Two of the most conspicuous ones are undoubtedly determining the factors which shape the effectiveness of bilingual education and catering to diversity in CLIL.

Indeed, on the one hand, the variety of approaches encompassed within CLIL has led to a characterization controversy (Pérez Cañado, 2016) which continues to run deep and which prominently underscores the need to determine "what good CLIL practice should look like" (Mearns et al., 2023: 3) and to identify successful and "representative pedagogical practices" (Bruton, 2011: 5) within this approach. In turn, the increased mainstreaming of CLIL school- and program-wide (Junta de Andalucía, 2017) raises questions of whether it can truly create inclusive learning spaces, accommodate diversity, and encourage opportunity and access for all types of students. This remains "a blind spot" (Mearns et al., 2023: 13) in the specialized research. Taken in conjunction, both issues acquire a particularly sharp relief for the sustainability of CLIL programs. In Kirss et al.'s (2021: 192-3) words: "during the times of […] diversification of student populations, education policy-makers are in critical need of up-to-date and trustworthy concise information on the evidence of what works in multilingual education and what factors contribute to its effectiveness".

This is precisely the remit of the present article. It will address these two crucial aspects on the current CLIL agenda concomitantly by determining key success factors to cater for diverse student populations in bilingual education programs, an issue on which there is not as yet a structured research agenda. In doing so, it reports on a cross-sectional concurrent triangulation mixed methods study (Creswell, 2013) with 2,093 students and teachers which is distinctive on many fronts. To begin with, it polls frontline stakeholders' self-reported perceptions, which are

particularly relevant in our field, as "their interpretations and beliefs are crucial to understand how the CLIL programme is socially viewed, understood and constructed, and the expectations it raises" (Barrios Espinosa, 2019: 1). In addition, it works with most numerically and geographically representative sample to date in studies on this issue and factors in diverse types of triangulation: methodological (it not only employs questionnaires, as in prior research -Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno, 2023-, but also semi-structured interviews), data (as it polls students and teachers), and location triangulation (since it works with both Primary and Secondary Education). Moreover, it does so within a country -Spain- with a firmly entrenched monolingual tradition (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010) and which is considered to be a representative microcosm of the variegated CLIL landscape given the heterogeneity of models implemented across both its monolingual and bilingual communities (Pérez Cañado, 2012). Finally, it also extracts the chief pedagogical implications accruing from the data by distilling key success factors from an empirically valid and multifaceted perspective and drawing up and original three-pronged framework with concrete criteria which can be applied at the grassroots and policy-making levels in order to allow CLIL to continue advancing unfettered on the language education scene. After framing the investigation against the backdrop of prior research on school effectiveness research and on the challenge of diversity, the article goes on to describe the research design of the study, present and discuss its principal findings, and map out future pathways for progression through a new output-, input- and process-oriented model of key success factors for attention to diversity in CLIL.

The theoretical backdrop: Factors influencing the effectiveness of inclusive bilingual programs

School effectiveness research (SER) has traditionally aimed to identify key factors accountable for educational success (Kirss et al., 2021). However, it "has been only marginally addressed in multilingual education contexts" (Kirss et al., 2021: 1). In fact, according to these same authors, research on school effectiveness and on bilingual education has "largely developed as separate research paradigms" (Kirss et al., 2021: 1). Therefore, current studies on effective education do not provide clear evidence or conclusions about key success factors in bilingual education, lacking

a systematic approach. This dearth of research becomes notably more conspicuous when attention to diversity within CLIL programs is factored in. Nonetheless, the conflation of SER and bilingual education has been approximated from a four-pronged prspective. To begin with, general frameworks on factors influencing the effectiveness of bilingual programs have been set forth by key figures, based on research, observation, and critical reflection. Insitutional proposals have also been conceptualized by renowned associations (e.g. the Center for Applied Linguistics in the US or the British Council in Europe). More recently, systematic reviews (both holistic and in specific contexts like The Netherlands) have also been put forward. And, finally, questionnaires at different educational levels (Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary) and countries (Spain, Austria, Germany, Finland, pan-European) have also tapped into how diversity is being successfully accommodated in CLIL programs, albeit without a specific focus on identifying key success factors. Let us now examine each of these overarching research strands in turn.

Within the first thematic block, key figures have itemized factors that need to be set in place for bilingual programs to be effective. Tabatadze (2015), basing herself on Baker (2006), has isolated five key factors influencing the effectiveness of CLIL endeavors. These include type of program, human resources and school leadership and adminsitration (a solid top-down push is necessary from educational authorities, together with legislative changes and benchmarking), teachers' professional development (through pre- and in-service teacher education programs, resources, and an incentive system), bilingual education as a shared vision of the whole school (here, the creation of a common standard of education is highly advisable), and community and parental involvement in designing and implementing biligual education initiatives (via, e.g., extensive awareness-raising). In turn, Meyer (2010) also expounds on quality criteria for successful and sustainable CLIL, with a more specific focus on teaching and learning. In this sense, he identifies six core strategies: rich (meaningful, challenging, and authentic) input, scaffolding learning (crucial to reduce the cognitive and linguistic load of the input and to support language production), abundant interaction and pushed output (triggered by tasks, whose design lies at the heart of CLIL lessons), adding the intercultural dimension (by approximating various topics from different cultural angles), fostering higher-order thinking skills

(HOTS), and favoring sustainable learning (to ensure knowledge sticks and becomes deeply rooted in students' long-term memory).

In addition to these research-based and observation-induced proposals, more institutionally substantiated frameworks have been delineated on both sides of the Atlantic. In the US, a quality scheme for the effective analsyis, development, and monitoring of dual language programs has been designed by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) through its manual Guiding Principles for Dual Education (Howard et al., 2018). It has become an essential reference for schools which implement these types of initiatives across the country. It identifies, in a flexible way, seven common strands, connected to effectiveness and firmly grounded in research outcomes, which are subdivided into concrete principles and key points, evaluated by means of progress indicators in the form of reachable levels of program alignment.

The strands span seven main dimensions. To begin with, programme structure measures the attainment of biliteracy and bilingualism, as well as of sociocultural competence, equity, leadership and ongoing planning, assessment and implementation. The curriculum is another crucial dimension, where three key principles are evaluated, namely, the revision of the curriculum, the alignment of the curriculum with standards, and the effective inclusion of technology in the process. Within instruction, the core aspects gauged include the use of student-centered methodologies, fidelity of instruction to the model, inclusion of strategies to achieve the core goals of dual education, and, once again, integration of technology in the learning process. Assessment and accountability also figure prominently in the CAL framework, and they revolve around issues such as attunement of student assessment with program objectives, language standards, and content; the introduction of infrastructure to support evaluation; the use of diverse methods in both languages for the collection and tracking of data; and the systematic measurement of student achievement with regard to the established goals. The fifth strand addresses staff quality and professional development, and assesses recruitment of high-quality teachers, professional development for dual-language education staff, and collaboration with other institutions. Family and community also acquire a sharp relief within this proposal, rating the introduction of adequate infrastructure to support relations between families and the community, the promotion of family engagement through activities, and the effective involvement of community members and families to

foster home-school links. The last factor considered affects support and resources, and it is calibrated by means of support by all stakeholders of the program, adequate and equitable funding, and the search for substantial back-up vis- à-vis program needs.

In turn, on the European continent, another recent proposal for quality assurance of bilingual programs has been propounded by the British Council, via its Self-assessment Framework for School Leadership Teams (British Council, 2021). It presents a toolkit for debate and self-assessment within schools which hinges on five main areas, usefully structured in tems of indicators and comprising features of highly effective practices, challeging questions, and a self-assessment template with strengths, areas for improvement, and future priorities. The initial tematic block pertains to self-assessment to improve schools and stresses the whole-school collaborative approach, the importance of ongoing profesional development for the entire school team, and the regular assessment, via research, of educational achievements to continue ameliorating the learning process. Leadership for learning then places the onus on sudent-centered, dialogue-based methodologies, fostered from a three-pronged perspective: via the capacity of the management team to generate an attitude of leadsership, through ongoing teacher reflection on the improvement of their pedagogical practice, and by supporting learners to become the protagonists of their own learning process. The third indicator -leadership for change- is achieved by reinforcing the social, economic, and cultural ties with the local community, by involving all key stakeholders in the stragegic planning for ongoing improvement, and by adopting a hands-on approch to practically implement changes and upgrades. In turn, leadership and staff management is linked to school management, duties, and responsibilites. It lays out a management strategy, relies on ongoing staff development, and fosters a policy of wellbeing, equity, and balance. The final indicator -resource management to promote equity- is underpinned by the equitable use of economic and material resources and by the adequate and flexible deployment of the variety of resources available (with digital ones being particularly emphasized) to create a motivating learning environment.

A third, and very productive, perspective from which the effectiveness of bilingual programs has been approximated is through systematic reviews of the existing literature in concrete contexts or globally. Indeed, Mearns et al. (2023) have recently canvassed three decades of

CLIL development in The Netherlands and have distilled key features of successful bilingual education in their context. Thes involve, on the linguistic front, the provision of rich comprehensible input; adjusting language to increase accessibility (e.g., through scaffolding by means of visual support or by adapting materials); offering opportunities to communicate in the target language; fostering higher-order questioning to elicit richer responses; or employing translanguaging as a pedagogical tool. Methodologically, the most success-prone techniques include encouraging learner-centeredness and engagement, conducting cross-curricular projects, ensuring differentiation, and recycling contents. Intercultural and collaborative elements also run through their identification of success factors, as international orientation, intercultural competence, and global citizenship, together with collaborative and team-teaching, are regarded as impinging on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Finally, creating a supportive and positive atmosphere and bolstering learner confidence also go a long way towards enhancing the adequate functioning of CLIL programs in Holland.

A more holistic perspective is favored by Kirss et al. (2021), who undertake a systematic review of research evidence on specific factors conducive to success in multilingual education. Theirs is an innovative and extremely useful proposal of nine key factors, classified in three levels (macro -country/region-, meso -school-, and micro -student/teacher) and three typologies (outcome, input, and process). Within outcomes measures, they suggest taking into account language proficiency, academic achievement in curriculum subjects, GPA, and dropout rate to gauge the success of a bilingual programs. In turn, four factors are subsumed within input factors. The first involves policy and ideology indicators, where aspects such as local autonomy to create programs that meet the specific needs of student populations or the possibility of adjusting regulations (e.g. to reduce class size) come prominently to the fore. Resources also acquire a sharp relief here, particularly vis-à-vis accesibility of teaching materials and ICTS, availability of funding and teaching staff with multilingual education competence, or specific training regarding multilingual education. Leadership indicators also come into play in this section, hinging primarily on commitment, cooperation, training for principals, and evidence-based management. Finally, whether the curriculum has a multilingual focus and can be adjusted according to students' needs is equally considered a relevant factor here.

Finally, another four aspects are subsumed within process factors. Climate, attitudes, and beliefs are the first one, where the multicultural linguistic landscape in the school and classroom is highly valued, together with an overall positive attitude towards multilingual education. An important cluster of school and teaching practice indicators are also proposed, involving the use of the students' L1, a cross-curricular approach to learning, evaluation systems adjusted to the multilingual needs of students, and an interactive, learner-centered, personalized, and meaningfully contextualized approach to language learning. The final two factors are related to collaboration with parents and support from the educational authorities. Within the former, involvement of parents in school life, fostering strong home-school connections, and commitment of external partners (e.g. researchers) to advance the school vision are regarded as pivotal. And vis-à-vis the latter, local governmental support for multilingual education (including support for professional training) and concrete support activities to address the linguistic, academic, and social needs of students are underscored.

The last batch of publications narrows down the scope a step further by conducting concrete studies, generally employing surveys and/or interviews, with teachers and students at Primary, Secondary and Tertiary level in order to isolate quality factors in bilingual education. Julius & Madrid (2017) do so in higher education, by polling 164 students and 27 teachers involved in bilingual teaching at undergraduate level. Their outcomes evince that the teachers' commitment to the program and L2 level are key variables for quality bilingual schemes, together with student motivation, language exchanges with native speakers, interactive oral activities, tasks and projects related to everyday language, and availability of materials and resources. More recently, Melara Gutiérrez & González López (2023) center on Primary Education teachers' needs for quality bilingual education. Of the 41 elements analyzed, only three came across as priority needs: the creation and maintenance of a local and external network of contacts for the purposes of collaboration, the promotion of intercultural communication, and the evaluation, selection, adaptation, and use of existing CLIL materials.

The remaining studies center on Secondary Education and zone in on the specific topic of attention to diversity in CLIL. Although they were not conducted with the remit of isolating success factors, but, instead, simply tap into stakeholder perceptions (teachers, parents, students) into

how differentiation is being accommodated in bilingual scenarios, they offer interesting insights to guarantee quality bilingual implementation for all. Linguistically, the purposeful use of the L1 as a lifeline transpires as beneficial for complex content comprehension (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2023; Siepmann et al., 2023). Methodologically, the incorporation of student-centered methodologies such as tasks and projects and of varied classroom layouts and arrangements, together with specific lesson design for students of differing abilities, also fosters successful attention to diversity (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2023; Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno, 2023; Siepmann et al., 2023; Nikula et al., 2023; Ramón Ramos, 2023). Varied summative and formative assessment techniques and support from multi-professional teams equally stand out as hallmarks of good practice to balance out different learning paces and ability levels (Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno, 2023). Finally, pan-European studies (Pérez Cañado, 2023) have revealed the highly beneficial nature of learning from the best practices of other countries, as key areas of expertise have been identified with can be usefully adapted to other scenarios. In this scene, Finland stands out for inclusive lesson planning, Austria is conspicuous for student-centered methodological practices, the UK excels at differentiated materials design, Italy is notable for the use of ICT options, and Spain particularly masters diversified assessment procedures.

Thus, three main take-aways accrue from this review of the specialized literature. A first lesson gleaned is that studies conflating school effectiveness and bilingual education are still thin on the ground. This is most glaringly the case when applied specifically to attention to diversity in bilingual education, as there is, to date, an absolute dearth of research into key success factors for inclusive bilingual education programs to be effective. Secondly, what research there is on effectiveness in bilingual education has set forth frameworks that, despite their multipronged and differing focus, tend to coincide in the need to set in place measures at the legislative, school, and grassroots levels, and which affect all curricular and organizational levels (language, methodology, materials, evaluation, parental involvement, multi-tiered systems of support, and teacher collaboration and development). Finally, a third valuable reading is that there is as yet no existing framework on the key success factors of bilingual programs that meet the intersectional needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students. This is precisely the niche which the present study seeks to address. Its research design is now presented below.

The study

Objectives

The broad objective of this investigation is to conduct a large-scale multi-faceted CLIL evaluation project into stakeholder perspectives of the current mise-en-scène of attention to diversity in CLIL programs in order to isolate key factors for them be successful with all types of students.

It canvasses teacher and student perceptions of the way in which CLIL methodology, types of groupings, materials and resources, assessment, and teacher collaboration and development are being deployed to cater for different abilities among CLIL students in three monolingual autonomous communities in Spain. Two key metaconcerns drive the study and serve as cornerstones for this project. They are presented and broken down into three component corollaries below:

■ *Metaconcern 1* (Program evaluation)
(1) To determine teacher perceptions of the most successful practices to cater to diversity in CLIL programs (in terms of linguistic aspects, methodology and types of groupings, materials and resources, assessment, and teacher collaboration) and of the main teacher training needs in this area.
(2) To determine student perceptions of the most successful practices to accommodate differentiation in CLIL programs (in terms of linguistic aspects, methodology and types of groupings, materials and resources, assessment, and teacher collaboration and development) at Secondary Education level.

■ *Metaconcern 2* (Framework of success factors)
(3) To design and original framework, based on the above research data, of key success factors for inclusive bilingual education.

Research design

This investigation is an instance of primary, survey research, since it employs interviews and questionnaires (Brown, 2001). According to this

author, it is mid-way between qualitative and statistical research, as it can make use of both these techniques. In addition, it incorporates multiple triangulation (Denzin, 1970), concretely, of the following four types:

(1) Data triangulation, as diverse groups of stakeholders with different roles in the language teaching context have been polled: students and teachers (and within the latter, non-linguistic area teachers, English language teachers, and teaching assistants) [1].

(2) Methodological triangulation, since a variety of instruments has been employed to gather the data: questionnaires, interviews, and observation (although only the results pertaining to the questionnaires and interviews will be reported on herein).

(3) Investigator triangulation, due to the fact that different researchers have analyzed the open data in the questionnaire and interviews, identified salient themes, and collated their findings

(4) Location triangulation, given that stakeholder opinions have been culled from multiple data-gathering sites: 10 Primary schools and 26 Secondary schools.

Sample

The project has worked with a substantial cohort of students and teachers, and parents in three monolingual autonomous communities which span Spain from north to south to west (Andalusia, Madrid, and Extremadura). The return rate has been significant, as the surveys have been administered to a total of 2,676 informants. The most numerous cohort has been that of students (with 1,774 participants), followed by parents (583 in all) and teachers (319). In terms of gender, women (53%) outnumber their male counterparts (46%).

If we focus specifically on the two cohorts considered for this specific study (2,093 respondents), the bulk of the students are from Madrid (53%), followed by Andalusia (36%) and Extremadura (11%). Roughly equal percentages are in the 11-12 (39.3%) and 15-16 (40.3%) age

---

1 Parents were also polled in this study, but have not been included due to space constraints and also because they were not interviewed (they were only administered the questionnaire), as opposed to the other two cohorts who are reported on in this study, who were subjected to focus group interviews

brackets, something which points to a balance in the amount of respondents from the two educational levels considered: the last grades of Primary and Secondary Education. An equilibrium is also detected between female (50%) and male (49%) stduents, with 1% ascribing their gender to "other".

In turn, most of the respondents within the teacher cohort are from Andalusia (51%), followed by Madrid (29%) and Extremadura (20%).

However, in this second cohort there is more of an imbalance in terms of gender, as there are more female (69.1%) than male (30.9%) practitioners, and educational level, where Secondary teachers (67%) outnumber their Primary (33%) counterparts. Most are in the 41-50 (30.9%) and 31-40 (26.5%) age brackets and have mainly a B2 (34.6%) or C1 (25%) level of the target language. There is a majority of content teachers (52.2%), followed closely by language ones (36.8%), with language assistants (LAs) amounting only to a 9.6%. They are mostly civil servants with a stable job at their schools (55.9%) and have mostly 1-10 (39.7%) or 11–20 years (32.4%) of overall teaching experience. However, only 1-5 (39.7%) or 6-10 years (32.4%) of that time has been spent in a bilingual school.

Variables

The study has worked with a series of identification (subject) variables, connected to the individual traits of the two different stakeholders who have been polled through the questionnaire and interview.

The identification variables for each cohort are specified below:

Teachers
- Grade
- Age
- Gender
- Autonomous community
- Type of teacher
- Employment situation
- Level in the FL taught
- Overall teaching experience
- Teaching experience in a bilingual school

Students
- — Grade
- — Class
- — Age
- — Gender
- — Autonomous community
- — Language(s) spoken at home
- — Years in a bilingual program
- — Amount of exposure to English within the bilingual program

Instruments

The study has employed self- and group-administered questionnaires and semi-structured focus group interviews, categorized by Brown (2001) as survey tools, to carry out the targeted program evaluation. Three sets of questionnaires (one for each of the cohorts) have been designed and validated in English, Spanish, German, Italian, and Finnish. A double-fold pilot procedure has been followed in editing and validating the questionnaires, which has entailed, firstly, the expert ratings approach (with 30 external evaluators from Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Education) and, subsequently, a pilot phase with a representative sample of respondents (234 informants with the same features as the target respondents).

Extremely high Cronbach alpha coefficients have been obtained for the three questionnaires: 0.871 for the student one, 0.858 for the teacher equivalent, and 0.940 for the parent survey. The interview protocols, in turn, have been designed for teachers and students following a parallel structure for comparability across instruments and contexts (cf. Pérez Cañado, Rascón Moreno, and Cueva López 2023 for a detailed rendering of the design and validation process and for access to the final versions of both surveys and interview protocols for each of the cohorts).

Both instruments comprise a total of five thematic blocks: linguistic aspects (9 items for the teacher questionnaire, 5 for students, and 4 for the parents); methodology and types of groupings (12 items for the teachers, students, and parents); materials and resources (7 items for the teacher questionnaire, 5 for students, and 3 for parents); assessment (10 items for teachers and 11 for both students and parents); and, finally, teacher collaboration and development (15 items in the teacher questionnaire,

7 in the student survey, and 8 in that corresponding to parents). The parent survey only consists of four blocks because the items relating to materials and resources were merged into the methodology and types of groupings owing to the results of the statistical analyses obtained during the validation process. Finally, the interview protocol comprises one final block on overall appraisal of catering to diversity in the bilingual classroom. It was only administered to teachers and students.

Data analysis: statistical methodology

The data obtained on the questionnaires has been analyzed statistically, using the SPSS program in its 25.0 version. Descriptive statistics have been used to report on the global cohort results for each research question. Both central tendency (mean, median and mode) and dispersion measures (range, low-high, standard deviation) have been calculated.

In turn, to determine the existence of statistically significant differences across the three cohorts, assessment of normality and homoscedasticity has been carried out via the Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Levene's test, respectively. Parametric tests have been run, using one-way ANOVA and the t test, employing the Bonferroni correction for post-hoc analysis, and calculating effect sizes as eta squared and Cohen's d. In turn, Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) has been employed for the open data on the semi-structured interviews. The data has been subjected to qualitative analysis for commonly recurring themes by transcribing it, coding and collating it through NVivo, and identifying, refining, and naming themes.

Results and Discussion

Perspectives on attention to diversity in CLIL by cohort

Teachers: Global analysis

In line with the first metaconcern (objectives 1 and 2), our study has allowed us to paint a comprehensive picture of teacher and student perspectives à propos successful practices to secure diversity-sensitive

teaching in the CLIL classroom. The teacher cohort harbors quite a self-complacent outlook of their academic language mastery (m=5.01) and also their basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) (m=4.75) to create inclusive learning spaces, a finding which chimes with those of Bauer-Marschallinger (2023), Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno (2023), and Pérez Cañado (2023). Providing scaffolding to comprehend complex content (m=4.75) shines through as a top go-to strategy. This bears out findings of prior research (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2023; Somers, 2017, 2018), according to which offering pedagogical support through scaffolding is present in CLIL classrooms to accommodate minority students' needs. This view is corroborated in the interviews, where especially visual and multimodal scaffolding comes across as a sine qua non in supporting differentiation in the CLIL classroom. The use of the L1 to clarify vocabulary or explore difficult concepts also emerges as a lifeline to make content accessible to all (m=4.79). This perspective is in compliance with that of previous studies (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2023; Pavón Vázquez & Ramos Ordóñez, 2019; Siepmann et al., 2023), where the principled and strategic use of the L1 was a recurrent and successful fall-back option. In this sense, the interviews offer a more in-depth angle on the development of this strategy. Teachers claim that the L1 offers essential support ("They do need reassurance in Spanish"), especially to explain abstract concepts, to translate key words, to leave no learner behind, and to save crucial time. Thus, in order to accommodate differentiation in the CLIL classroom, translanguaging (García & Wei, 2014) and perfunctory L1 use can be an enriching strategy, conducive to an enhanced learning of content, as Pavón Vázquez & Ramos Ordóñez (2019) have also corroborated.

Vis-à-vis methodology, teachers claim to deploy a varied repertoire of methods to accommodate different student levels and abilities (m=4.68). They uphold that student-centeredness has firmly found traction in the bilingual classroom (m=4.54) and particularly resort, as successful techniques, to peer mentoring and assistance strategies (m=4.66) and task- and project-based work (m=4.50). Personalized attention in individual and smaller groups is also capitalized on, albeit to a lesser extent (m=4.39), together with cooperative learning (m=4.33), mixed-ability groupings (m=4.24), and diverse classroom layouts (m=4.22). The least employed strategies according to this first group of stakeholders are newcomer classes (m=2.85), teacher-led instruction (m=3.38), and

multiple intelligences (m=4.10). Indeed, in the interviews, practitioners highlight that one-on-one teaching is extremely useful to determine students' level and to identify difficulties. They also consider that the use of baseline mixed-ability groups, where each student has a clearly defined role and which are employed in a stable or routine manner instill a sense of security in learners which positively impinges on their learning process. This accords with the findings of Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2023), where pair and group work, together with spontaneous peer help, were employed to balance out different learning paces and ability levels. Other student-centered methodologies which are brought to the fore in the interviews are gamification, which is held to considerably heighten motivation, and the flipped classroom, regarded as one of the most inclusive pedagogical options, since it allows students to watch the audiovisual material at home as many times as necessary in order to fully grasp it.

Materials and resources come across as one of the major roadblocks to diversity in CLIL scenarios. Indeed, very limited access to tiered-level materials is still documented (m=3.97), so that practitioners are forced to resort to either adapting (m=4.78) or creating (m=4.72) them. On the upside, ICTs are present to a greater extent in fostering methodologically diverse learning spaces (m=4.55), as is the provision of multimodal input (m=4.58). This cohort further elaborates in the interviews on the technological options they primarily employ to balance out different learning styles: Google Classroom, IWBs, or gamification via Kahoot, Quizlet, or Padlet. The absolute lack of textbook is highlighted for certain subjects such as Music, which leaves teachers at a loss. This is the area on which they claim to need most training and guidance and feel disenfranchised in finding materials: the process depends on their generosity, time, and financial investment, they claim, and they do not feel supported by administrative authorities in this area. These outcomes are in harmony with those of Fernández & Halbach (2011), Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno (2023), Pérez Cañado (2023), and Siepmann et al. (2023), where the dearth of materials and the challenge of designing and adapting them shone through, especially vis-à-vis access to ICT resources.

Although Spain particularly stood out on the assessment front as an instance of inspirational practice (Pérez Cañado, 2023), the present study slightly qualifies this trend. The current data reveal that ongoing evaluation is adapted to differing abilities (m=4.76) to a greater extent than summative assessment (m=4.70). Indeed, top strategies for

a success-prone evaluation involve, above all, adapting activities carried out in class (m=4.55) and offering detailed guidelines as extra support (m=4.5), along with personalized and regular feedback adapted to different levels of achievers (m=4.48). The only summative technique which is resorted to assiduously is providing different versions of an exam (m=4.48). Less use is made of self-assessment (m=3.14), varying grading criteria according to different abilities (m=4.25), or highlighting key words/adapting the vocabulary of exams (m=4.38). The interviews allow further insights into this topic, which comes across as major blind spot in the system, thereby disrupting previous positive trends in the research ("It's still a big mystery", as one of the respondents highlights). Teachers consider a greater effort is still required to diversify evaluation instruments and design them jointly, reinforce transparency in communicating assessment criteria, systematically work in self-assessment, deaprt from students' initial level, and adapt exams to the differing abilities of students without raising red flags. Considerable headway is thus still necessary on this front.

A final crucial issue to ensure an inclusive education agenda in CLIL affects multi-tiered systems of support, collaboration, and training. In general, teachers consider the back-up of multi-professional teams essential (m=5.15) and have largely positive outlooks on their coordination with colleagues (m=4.98). The curveball thrown by attention to diversity thus seems to have made increased coordination and collaboration a sine qua non for CLIL programs to stay afloat. However, in the interviews, they qualify these views by underscoring that time to coordinate is in need of urgent attention ("There is no time to coordinate – categorically", as one teacher claims). They have to resort to carrying out this task during recess, via WhatsApp, in the hallways, or at home in their free time, something which very negatively impacts their motivation. The figure of the guidance counsellor (m=5.47) is also vastly appreciated and appears to be firmly ingrained in the participating schools. However, parental involvement is only moderately present (m=4.66) and overall satisfaction with the support system in place is also lukewarm (m=4.49). The greatest training needs emerge on language scaffolding techniques (m=4.71), access to materials (m=4.71), and design and adaptation of the latter (m=4.64). The lowest scores can be located on teachers' needs to critically reflect on their own teaching practices (m=4.06), something which accords with the largely positive outlook they sustain on their

own abilities to step up to diversity. These findings resonate with those of Pérez Cañado (2023) and Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno (2023), where similar highs and lows were found for the afore-mentioned items, unveiling an iterative pattern which seems to point to teachers' desire to fine-tune to perfection those methodological techniques they most claim to capitalize on. Finally, the preparation of the language assistant comes across as a major niche to be filled (m=4.06). "You're basically learning on your feet", as one of these assistants underscores. Their coordination with content and language teachers is also regarded as deficient. Maximizing the full potential of the LA has been a consistent concern in the existing literature (Buckingham, 2018; Sánchez Torres, 2014; Tobin & Abello Contesse, 2013), which has not as yet been sufficiently addressed, according to our very recent data.

Students: Global analysis

What is the outlook sustained on differentiation by the student cohort? That pertaining to linguistic aspects is commensurate with the perspective harbored by teachers. Indeed, the use of the L1 to thrash out difficult concepts is most often capitalized on, according to this second cohort (m=4.84), followed closely by language scaffolding (m=4.81). However, in the interviews, they qualify type of L1 use, as they claim to be constantly encouraged to use the target language in class, with Spanish not being resorted to immediately. First, teachers "repeat the idea as many times as necessary", paraphrase with different word, or explain in a simpler way. Translation is only relied on as a last resort, to ensure understanding of more complex ideas, key words, and concepts which have not been grasped adequately. The learners polled also evince quite a positive appreciation of their teachers BICS (m=4.52) and CALP[2] (m=4.5) to attend to diversity, a finding which accords with the findings of Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno (2023), Pérez Cañado (2023), and Ramón Ramos (2023), where students' faith in their teachers' preparation shone loud and clear.

---

2 Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

In terms of methodology and groupings, students, like teachers, acknowledge the use of variegated methods to accommodate diversity in the CLIL classroom (m=4.32) and the firm presence of student-centered options (m=4.44). These results are congruent with Pérez Cañado (2018), Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2023), and Siepmann et al. (2023), where the student-oriented nature of CLIL was ascertained as a trend which is increasingly becoming dominant in bilingual scenarios. The theory associated to CLIL methodology is thus trickling down to on-the-ground practice and becoming a hallmark of bilingual education. The most successful strategies are held to be task- and project-based work (m=4.55) and cooperative learning (m=4.41), a view which again concurs with that of teachers. However, unlike practitioners, students consider an element of teacher-frontedness still runs through CLIL programs (m=4.23).

In fact, in the interviews, students (particularly in the upper Secondary grades) worryingly report the presence of "bulimic learning" in content subjects, where they learn to memorize and "spit out", as they put it, contents which are fed to them in a homogeneous way by their teachers. Discrepant findings are also detected on the use of different types of groupings and varied layouts (m=3.92), the provision of personalized attention (m=4.07), or the use of peer assistance strategies (m=4.18), all of which are not as often deployed as teachers would have it. In the interviews the students clamor for more work in pairs and groups, as they are held to foster greater participation, interaction, and production ("we feel more comfortable and we help each other") and underscore that the language assistant is particularly prone to employing this type of classroom arrangement. Complex content, according to this cohort, is made more accessible through group work. This accords with the findings of Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2023), where pair and group work, together with spontaneous peer help, were employed to balance out different learning paces and ability levels.

Cases of successful practice with materials and resources are very meager, according to this second cohort. Indeed, multimodality is the only strategy used beneficially to a greater extent (m=4.14). However, the textbook is clearly not fitting the bill vis-à-vis diversity-sensitive contents (m=3.15). Students do not perceive that tiered-level materials are adapted (m=3.54) or created (m=3.65) by their teachers and ICTs are not sufficiently present to accommodate different learner styles and paces (m=3.82). On the upside, the diversification of materials (textbooks,

videos, presentations, Kahoot, IWBs, virtual learning environments) is foregrounded in the student interviews, something which they claim facilitates their learning process and makes it more accessible, motivating, interactive, and competitive. Their open feedback also reveals that the textbook is not adequately adapted to different ability levels, but that it is gradually being superseded and complemented with other types of more diversity-sensitive materials, which they clearly prefer. Thus, a more positive trend seems to be detected in this study, thereby departing from previous ones, in that diversification of materials is acquiring a sharper relief, with its concomitant advantages in terms of accessibility and motivation.

A similar pattern emerges for evaluation. Here, only formative assessment seems to incorporate diversity-sensitive strategies (m=4.08), but students do not perceive any differentiated practice in concrete summative or ongoing techniques, except perhaps for the provision of detailed guidelines in activities as extra support (m=3.96). These outcomes echo those of Ramón Ramos (2023) in bilingual Spanish contexts, as well as Bauer-Marschallinger et al.'s (2023) findings in the Austrian context, Siepmann et al.'s (2023) in the German one, and Nikula et al.'s (2023) in Finland, where students did not perceive their teachers' differentiation between skill levels in assessment. Nonetheless, these outcomes could well be interpreted in a positive light, as it could be the case that students are simply not aware of different levels of assessment being incorporated by their teachers, something which practitioners underscored in the interviews they strived to avoid so that learners did nor perceive any sort of differential treatment.

Finally, as regards coordination and training, while students' viewpoints of their teachers' preparation to step up to the challenge of diversity are high across the board (for language teachers -m=4.75-, content teachers -m=4.69-, and language assistants -m=4.67-), their perceptions of multi-tiered systems of support pivot towards an average satisfaction (m=4.39). They are significantly less aware than their teachers of the support provided by multi-professional teams (m=3.85), although they do appreciate the role of the guidance counselor (m=4.61) to a greater extent. In the interviews, they mention that, although coordination among their teachers is not watertight, they do witness it, especially with the language assistant. Their view of parental involvement is more negative than that of their teachers (m=4.11). These outcomes are, however,

slightly more positive for both cohorts considered than those found in the latest research (Casas Pedrosa & Rascón Moreno, 2023; Pérez Cañado, 2023), which thus points to a shy, albeit gradual amelioration of these systems, which appear to be reinforced as attention to diversity continues to take root across bilingual education.

An original framework of key success factors for inclusive bilingual education

These outcomes allow us to identify salient themes which feed into 22 key success indicators to set in place for effective diversity-sensitive CLIL programs, thereby addressing our third and final objective. Following Kirss et al.'s (2021) taxonomy, they are grouped into input and process factors. The former hinge on three main fronts (policy and ideology, resources, and curriculum decisions), while the latter affect four main aspects (namely, school climate. attitudes, and beliefs; school teaching and practice; collaboration; and support). Many of these success factors are reliant on macro-level decisions stemming from the educational

TABLE I. A framework of key success factors for inclusive bilingual education

Typology	Factor	Indicator	Level
Input	Policy and ideology	Adjustment of regulations: reduction of class size (teacher-student ratio)	Macro
	Resources	Resources and materials adapted to different student levels (especially linguistic)	Macro
		Universal access to ICTs and teacher training in digital competence	Macro
		C2 level for teachers	Macro
		Adequate language level of students guaranteed and adequate contents offered per level, mixing student levels in certain subjects	Macro

TABLE I. A framework of key success factors for inclusive bilingual education

Typology	Factor	Indicator	Level
Input	Curriculum	Reduction of content load, as said contents are recycled in subsequent grades and educational stages	Macro
		Reorientation of the subjects taught in the target language, as some of them are more amenable to being taught through CLIL than others (e.g. Spanish History should be maintained in the L1)	Macro
		Provision of continuity for subjects taught through the target language, so that they are not implemented in different languages across grades	Meso
		Increase in motivation in the content subjects taught through the target language for their adequate acquisition by all students, especially at Secondary level	Micro
Process	School climate, attitudes, and beliefs	Awareness that setting diversity-sensitive measures firmly in place takes time	Meso/Micro
		Maintenance of a positive attitude towards the possibility of CLIL being for all	Micro
	School and teaching practice	Purposeful and strategic use of the L1 and analysis of the interaction between the L1 and L2	Micro
		Variety of student-centered methodologies and types of groupings (cooperative learning, tasks, projects, gamification, flipped classroom)	Micro
		Extensive use of visual and multimodal scaffolding	Micro
		Diversified, formative and summative, transparent, adapted, and commonly designed evaluation criteria and instruments, which departs from students' initial level and incorporates self-assessment	Meso
	Collaboration	Coordination through co-tutoring and co-teaching, in order to address difficulties, contrast information, and share good practices	Meso
		Time for bilingual teachers to coordinate within their in-school schedule	Meso
		Parental involvement through multi-tiered systems of support	Meso
		Coordination with language assistants	Meso
	Support	Teacher development options specifically on attention to diversity in bilingual education	Macro
		Adequate training for language assistants	Macro
		Increased support for teachers from the administration in coordination, training, and access to materials	Macro

Source: Compiled by the authors.

authorities (e.g. questions of ratio, language level certification, or the types of subjects taught through CLIL). However, another important batch of indicators depend directly on schools and teachers (including enhanced coordination, the development of student-centered methodologies, or the motivation and attitude necessary for these programs to be successful for all). Table I now presents the breakdown of the criteria, classified in terms of typology, factor, indicator, and level:

Conclusion

This study has focused on key success factors to cater for diversity in CLIL scenarios, a topic which has recently garnered heightened attention in the specialized literature, but remains as yet underexplored. Key informants (students and three types of teachers) have been polled and interviewed using four types of triangulation. Three RQs have been addressed in order to identify the linguistic, metodological, materials-oriented, assessment, coordination, and traning techniques which are best suited to accommodate differentiation in the CLIL classroom and to design a brand-new framework of success factors to guarantee they are adequately addressed in order to unlock the full potential of bilingual education for all.

Vis-à-vis our first RQ, practitioners evince self-confidence in their language level and preparation to step up to the challenge of diversity in CLIL. Multimodal scaffolding and purposeful, strategic use of the L1 are regarded as valuable strategies in this respect. A variety of student-centered methodological options also appears to be a reality to disrupt educational inequities, particularly through the use of tasks and projects, cooperative learning, gamification, the flipped classroom, and mixed-ability groupings. Materials, however, are still a major hurdle on the road to diversity, as their scarcity is clearly documented. Against this grain, ICTs appear to be used to a greater extent as a welcome solution to address diverse levels and paces. Progress equally needs to be made on assessment for differentiation (particularly in summative evaluation), to ensure it is diversified, transparent, adapted, attuned to diverse student levels, and self-assessed. Finally, our results lend credence to the fact that diversity has reinforced coordination, although it needs to be carried out within the in-school schedule. Parental involvement also needs to be

heightened and the LA's training and coordination surfaces as another niche which requires substantial reinforcement.

In turn, RQ2 has allowed us to ascertain that students' perspectives run largely parallel to teachers' on linguistic and methodological issues. Indeed, linguistic scaffolding and L1 use (albeit as a last resort) are also documented by this second cohort as successfully deployed strategies to ensure no learner is left behind. Students clearly value systematic language alternation to facilitate understanding of new content. Students' faith in their practitioners' preparation runs strong and they equally perceive student-centeredness and variegated methods as present in the CLIL classroom to cater for diversity. Some tensions have surfaced, however, betwen both cohorts' perceptions on the teacher-frontedness of CLIL lessons, which the students maintain still characterize bilingual teaching. Learners also underscore, to a greater extent than their teachers, the value of peer assistance through pair and group work. Conguent outlooks with teachers ensue for materials and resources. Multimodality and diversification of materials are ascertained, a positive finding since the textbook is not considered to be aligned with diverse needs. This tendency positively disrupts previous trends in the literature, as a timid yet firm progression seems to be characterizing resources for diversity. Differentiation seems to be less present in both formative and summative assessment, although this outcome can be positively interpreted since students' awareness might not have been raised in this respect to avoid feelings of disenfranchisement. Finally, a modest increase in coordination is also perceived by this cohort, especially with the language assistant, although parental involvement and multi-tiered systems of support are still scant.

Thus, on the basis of this track record, it is safe to say that three main tendencies are unveiled by our data. First, a conspicuous overall alignment of teacher and student views can be discerned as regards successful strategies for inclusive CLIL programs, something which points to the fact that their opinions are a realistic snapshot of grassroots practice. A second chief take-away is that headway is notably being made in this area, as key factors for success have increasingly been identified as present in CLIL classrooms by both cohorts. In this sense, it takes time for attention to diversity to become a hard-and-fast reality in our bilingual education system. And, finally, there are certain recurrent issues which the specialized literature has repeatedly identified as niches to be filled,

but which still stand in need of being adequately addressed (e.g. time for coordination within teachers' official timetables or the preparation of LAs).

These patterns necessitate new pedagogical considerations regarding the ways in which our educational system should accommodate diversity. And these didactic, evidence-based implications are precisely what have fed into an original theoretical framework (RQ3) comprising 22 success indicators, grouped into input and success factors, macro-/meso-/micro-levels, and encompassing seven main fronts which range from policy and ideological issues to school and teaching practice.

The validation of such indicators should seriously inform future investigation on bilingual education and this study hopes to be a stepping stone in mapping out future pathways for progression in this area. Indeed, more stringent and consistent research into quality assessment and bilingual education effectiveness for all will undoubedly help shed better light on the new challenges which CLIL is throwing our way, provide more substantial evidence to support changes in policy, and allow us to continue developing CLIL pedagogies attuned to the novel needs of an inscreasingly diverse bilingual learner population.

Acknowledgements

Bibliographic references

Baker, C. (2006). Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Barrios Espinosa, E. (2019). The effect of parental education level on perceptions about CLIL: A study in Andalusia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1646702.

Bauer-Marschallinger, S., Dalton-Puffer, C., Heaney, H., Katzinger, L., & Smit, U. (2023). CLIL for all? An exploratory study of reported pedagogical practices in Austrian secondary schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(9), 1050-1065. DOI :10.1080/13670050.2021.1996533.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

British Council (2021). *Herramienta de autoevaluación para dirección de centros*. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/default/files/herramienta_autoevaluacion_direc   cion_de_centros_-_web_version_final.pdf.

Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruton, A. (2011). Are the differences between CLIL and non-CLIL groups in Andalusia due to CLIL? A reply to Lorenzo, Casal and Moore (2010). *Applied Linguistics, 2011*, 1-7.

Buckingham, L. R. (2018). Language assistants' views on the training provided by bilingual programs in Madrid. Pulso. *Revista de Educación, 41*, 225-250.

Casas Pedrosa, A. V., & Rascón Moreno, D. (2023). Attention to diversity in bilingual education: students and teacher perspectives in Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 26*(9), 1111-1128. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1997902.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry & research design. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. Chicago: Aldine.

Fernández, R., & Halbach, A. (2011). Analysing the situation of teachers in the Madridautonomous community bilingual project. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. M. Sierra, & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and foreign language integrated learning: Contributions to multilingualism in European contexts* (pp. 241-270). Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Junta de Andalucía. (2017). P*lan Estratégico de Desarrollo de las Lenguas en Andalucía*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía. Retrieved from http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/educacion/webportal/abaco-portlet/content/462f16e3-c047-479f-a753-1030bf16f822.

Kirss, L., Säälik, Ü., Leijen, Ä., & Pedaste, M. (2021). School effectiveness in multilingual education: A review of success factors. *Education Science, 11*, 1-30.

Lasagabaster, D., & Doiz, A. (2017). A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on affective factors. *Applied Linguistics, 38*, 688-712.

Madrid, D., & Julius, S. M. (2017). Quality factors in bilingual education at the university level. *Porta Linguarum, 28*, 49-66.

Mearns, T., van Kampen, E., & Admiraal, W. (2023). CLIL in the Netherlands: Three decades of innovation and development. In Banegas. D. & Zappa-Hollman, S. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Content and Language Integrated Learning* (pp. 397-413). London: Routledge.

Melara Gutiérrez, F. J. & González López, I. (2023). Uncovering teachers' needs in the quest for quality bilingual education. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14(4), 1065-1072.

Meyer, O. (2010). Towards quality-CLIL: Successful planning and teaching strategies. Pulso. *Revista de Educación, 33*, 11-29.

Nikula, T., Skinnari, K., & Mård-Miettinen, K. (2023). Diversity in CLIL as experienced by Finnish CLIL teachers and students: Matters of equality and equity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(9), 1066-1079. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2022.2028125.

Pavón Vázquez, V.,, & Ramos Ordóñez, M. C. (2019). Describing the use of the L1 in CLIL: An analysis of L1 communication strategies in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(1), 35-48.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 315-341.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2016). From the CLIL craze to the CLIL conundrum: Addressing the current CLIL controversy. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 9*(1), 9-31.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018). CLIL and pedagogical innovation: Fact or fiction? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 28*, 369–390.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2023). Inclusion and diversity in bilingual education: A European comparative study. *International Journal of Bilingual*

Education and Bilingualism, 26(9), 1129-1145. DOI: 10.1080/1367 0050.2021.2013770.

Pérez Cañado, M. L., Rascón Moreno, D., & Cueva López, V. (2023). Identifying difficulties and best practices in catering to diversity *in CLIL: Instrument design and validation. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(9), 1022-1030. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1988050.

Ramón Ramos, P. (2023). Attention to diversity in bilingual education: Stakeholder perceptions in a bilingual region. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14(4), 1094-1107.*

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Lasagabaster, D. (2010). Introduction. The emergence of CLIL in Spain: An educational challenge. In Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training* (pp. ix-xvii). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sánchez Torres, J. (2014). *Los papeles que desempeñan el "auxiliar de conversación" y el "profesor-coordinador" en centros bilingües español/inglés de Sevilla. Un estudio empírico de casos.* Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

Siepmann, P., Rumlich, D., Matz, F., & Römhild, R. (2023). Attention to diversity in German CLIL classrooms: Multi-perspective research on students' and teachers' perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(9), 1080-1096. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1981821.

Somers, T. (2017). Content and Language Integrated Learning and the inclusion of immigrant minority language students: A research review. *International Review of Education*, 63, 495-520.

Somers, T. (2018). Multilingualism for Europeans, monolingualism for immigrants? Towards policy-based inclusion of immigrant minority language students in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *European Journal of Language Policy, 10*(2), 203-228.

Tabatadze, S. (2015). Factors influencing the effectiveness of bilingual educational programs: The prospects of pilot programs in Georgia. *Sino-US English Teaching, 12*(2), 93-109.

Tobin, N., &Abelló-Contesse, C. (2013). The use of native assistants as language and cultural resources in andalusia's bilingual schools. In Abelló-Contesse, C., Chandler, P. M., López-Jiménez, M. D., & Chacón Beltrán, R. (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st*

Century: Building on Experience (pp. 203-230). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pérez Cañado, M. L., Rascón Moreno, D., & Cueva López, V. (2023). Identifying difficulties and best practices in catering to diversity in *CLIL: Instrument design and validation. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(9), 1022-1030. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1988050.

Ramón Ramos, P. (2023). Attention to diversity in bilingual education: Stakeholder perceptions in a bilingual region. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14*(4), 1094-1107.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Lasagabaster, D. (2010). Introduction. The emergence of CLIL in Spain: An educational challenge. In Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (Eds.), CLIL in *Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training* (pp. ix-xvii). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sánchez Torres, J. (2014). *Los papeles que desempeñan el "auxiliar de conversación" y el "profesor-coordinador" en centros bilingües español/inglés de Sevilla. Un estudio empírico de casos*. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

Siepmann, P., Rumlich, D., Matz, F., & Römhild, R. (2023). Attention to diversity in German CLIL classrooms: Multi-perspective research on students' and teachers' perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(9), 1080-1096. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1981821.

Somers, T. (2017). Content and Language Integrated Learning and the inclusion of immigrant minority language students: A research review. *International Review of Education*, 63, 495-520.

Somers, T. (2018). Multilingualism for Europeans, monolingualism for immigrants? Towards policy-based inclusion of immigrant minority language students in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *European Journal of Language Policy, 10*(2), 203-228.

Tabatadze, S. (2015). Factors influencing the effectiveness of bilingual educational programs: The prospects of pilot programs in Georgia. *Sino-US English Teaching, 12*(2), 93-109.

Tobin, N., &Abelló-Contesse, C. (2013). The use of native assistants as language and cultural resources in andalusia's bilingual schools. In Abelló-Contesse, C., Chandler, P. M., López-Jiménez, M. D., & Chacón Beltrán, R. (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st*

Century: Building on Experience (pp. 203-230). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Information address: Maria Luisa Pérez Cañado. Universidad de Jaén, Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación, Departamento de Filología Inglesa. Paraje Las Lagunillas, s/n 23071 Jaén, Spain. email: mlperez@ujaen.es