

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

Nardjes LABED^{*1}, Wassila GRAIA²

¹SILAD Lab Tlemcen University (Algeria),
e-mail : nardjes.labeled@univ-tlemcen.dz

² SILAD Lab Tlemcen University (Algeria)
e-mail : wassila.graia@univ-tlemcen.dz

Submitted

30/12/2024

Accepted

28/04/2025

Published

01/06/2025

Abstract: This study seeks to probe the extent of the professional symbiosis between content and language teachers in the Algerian university. Recently, the Algerian Higher Education (HE) has witnessed a sweeping change in which English was implemented as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), adopting Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach. The successful implementation of CLIL demands a set of prerequisites to ensure the attainment of its objectives. One of these major essentials is the collaboration between content and language teachers. To collect data, a case study was undertaken using an interview as an instrument of research with 15 content and language teachers from an Algerian university. The obtained results revealed that there is a limited partnership between them, almost confined to informal joint lesson planning. As recommendations that improve the synergy between teachers, the researchers underscore on regular communication, joint lesson planning, team teaching, reflective praxis, and professional development opportunities.

Keywords: *Collaboration; Content Teacher; Language Teacher; CLIL; Higher Education*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Algerian policymakers have recently urged the implementation of EMI at the tertiary level to internationalize Algerian universities and provide HE with a global premise. This has been achieved by adopting the evolving CLIL paradigm, which is gaining momentum worldwide, as a bridge towards EMI. CLIL integrates learning a foreign language, alongside content in a specific field of study, to be harmonized in practice. The Algerian stakeholders have opted for EMI, due to its international position, in the pursuit of supporting Algerian

***Corresponding author**

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

students and would-be graduates succeed in today's labour market, and facilitating their access to the social and professional opportunities in the post-tertiary stage. However, as Algeria is newly embracing the CLIL policy, research on CLIL in its context is still confined to theoretically grounded works and exploring attitudes towards its implementation. There is a notable lack of empirical studies focused on in-depth classroom investigations examining the prerequisites that ensure its successful practical execution, particularly teacher collaboration.

CLIL is an interdisciplinary educational approach in nature that necessitates teacher collaboration. In the view of Coyle et al (2010), CLIL is a junction link straddling four main aspects, which are different but complementary, particularly content, communication, culture, and cognition. The aiming points of the CLIL approach give grounds for the necessity of having effective, strategic, collaborative, and cooperative efforts between content specialists and language instructors. This combination of efforts brings together the expertise of subject teachers, along with the language proficiency and pedagogical skills of language educators. It allows the creation of a powerful synergy and a symbiotic relationship between the two teachers, which is expected to influence the learning outcomes positively. For this reason, the instructors must be aware of the essence of collaborating and be open to working together in CLIL contexts, using different cooperative strategies.

Algerian teachers may face some challenges that would prevent them from easily implementing the CLIL approach for certain reasons. Primarily, it is worth noting that the Algerian content teachers got their studies in French or Arabic as mediums of instruction, and the English for specific purposes (ESP) teachers were prepared to teach English for general purposes (EGP). That is to say, Algerian content teachers may have a linguistic barrier that would prevent them from easily shift from using French or Arabic as languages of instruction into English. Similarly, language teachers may struggle with not having adequate knowledge of the content related to the specific course being taught. Within this line of thought, the *English-mediated* CLIL is still a new threshold in Algeria, and university professors may not be quite aware of its appropriate adoption and the preconditions that ensure that, including teacher collaboration, which is one of the pillars of successful CLIL implementation. On account of the hurdles that might be encountered, having synergetic and cooperative practices between content and language teachers becomes substantial for the successful integration of CLIL at the Algerian tertiary level.

As an area of research, teacher collaboration has been widely investigated in the European and Asian contexts, but it is witnessing a void in the Algerian

academic literature. Despite the eager interest in adopting CLIL pedagogy, the academic landscape lacks empirical studies, particularly pertinent to teacher collaboration. Therefore, the interdisciplinary nature of the CLIL approach, the novelty of its implementation, and the under-researched status of teacher collaboration in the Algerian CLIL settings give rationale to conducting the present study. The current research is purely original in scope and focus. It tends to investigate a critical research gap that would contribute to the academic knowledge on CLIL in Algeria and serve both the national and the global academic communities. Research on teacher collaboration in Algeria has received limited academic attention, focusing on the synergy of teachers from the same disciplines in isolation from any of their interconnectedness across different domains. For instance, there are studies examining ESP teachers' collaboration for promoting their pedagogical practices, or subject specialists for content matter instruction. However, research on CLIL teachers from distinct fields exploring their readiness, preparedness, attitudes, and endeavours to design, plan, and deliver integrated instruction remains an under-researched area in the Algerian context. The originality of the research being undertaken makes it significant due to its contribution in taking the initiative in investigating an unexplored research gap in the local studies.

This study would serve the CLIL practice in Algeria in many ways. It would balance between theory and practice by critically referring to the existing literature and offering practical insights on teacher collaboration practices. At its core, the present research was undertaken for the sake of examining the state of the professional interconnectedness between CLIL teachers in an Algerian university, unveiling their conceptualization, beliefs, readiness, and attitudes towards working together and the endeavors of the institution on the matter. It would contribute to shedding light on the value of the alliance between teachers in CLIL environments of EMI situations, especially in the neophyte ones like the Algerian universities. The results would also inform educational policy and institutional support for the urge to provide the necessary facilitation that promotes teacher collaboration. Ultimately, a set of practical recommendations that promote teachers' teamwork, collegiality, support, curriculum design, and professional development will be provided, paving the way for teachers to know how to appropriately approach collaboration in practice and help them overcome any collegial disconnect. In pursuance of this target, this research seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ 01: Do content and language teachers collaborate to enhance the quality of teaching and learning in CLIL settings?

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

RQ 02: What are content and language teachers' attitudes towards the effect of collaboration on their instructional practices?

RQ 03: Does the university take any initiatives that support this inter-professional collaboration?

2. Literature Review

The current section introduces the CLIL approach, its objectives, and the difference between soft and hard CLIL teachers, and the essence of their collaboration, in relation to its position in the Algerian educational realm of research.

2.1. What is CLIL?

The term Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) was first coined and adopted in 1994 (Marsh, Maljers and Hartiala, 2001), referring to any teaching approach or situation in which an additional language is used to teach a certain content. As noted by Barwell (2005), "Language and Content integration concerns the teaching and learning of both language and subject areas (e.g., Science, Mathematics, etc.) in the same classroom at the same time" (p. 143). In essence, it is a ground-breaking educational approach that combines the simultaneous acquisition of content knowledge in a specific field of study and a foreign language.

2.2. The Objectives of the CLIL Approach

According to Coyle et al (2007), CLIL targets to exert a positive influence on four main areas, namely content, communication, creativity, and cognition, which are intended to ensure a bright future for students. The educational landscape is witnessing burgeoning research, emphasizing the benefits of CLIL in relation to its objectives. Referring to the research conducted by March (2007), the findings asserted that the CLIL approach allows students to build cognitive skills related to improving risk-taking, problem solving, vocabulary learning skills, grammatical awareness, and a high spontaneity in using the language with an increased motivation. Along similar lines, students in CLIL contexts build positive attitudes towards language learning (Merisuo-Strom, 2007); they are highly motivated with a high interest in learning new languages, with reduced anxiety to learn and use them in real-world contexts (Arnold, 2011). Similar acquired skills open the door for opportunities for better income levels, and a strong ability for students to promote their identities, due to their ability to communicate in more than one language, and their high cultural and intercultural awareness. As most of the studies show that CLIL has tremendous outcomes on students and their future,

this calls content and language teachers to put hand in hand in gathering their expertise, knowledge, and skills, to achieve CLIL objectives collegially.

2.3 Soft CLIL versus Hard CLIL Teachers

According to Coyle (2010), the CLIL educational model includes two distinct teaching types, specifically hard CLIL, known as ‘type A’ CLIL, and soft CLIL, referred to as ‘type B’ CLIL. The two CLIL teaching forms undergo differentiation on the basis of their pedagogical aims and assessment criteria. Type A CLIL, primarily, emphasizes content knowledge that is taught in a foreign language and instructed by subject specialists, who are referred to as hard CLIL teachers. Assessment in hard CLIL contexts is based on content criteria, with less focus on language accuracy. Conversely, the soft CLIL provides lessons linked to the subject lessons with a focus on language proficiency. Type B CLIL is guided by language professors who act as facilitators of the content curriculum, and its assessment is based on language criteria. In light of this, there are two types of CLIL instructors: soft CLIL and hard CLIL specialists.

2.4 The Essence of Collaborating in CLIL Contexts

The successful implementation of any educational approach requires connection, collaboration, and coordination among all the educational stakeholders (Viebrock, 2012), and the CLIL approach makes no exception to the rule. The nature of the CLIL approach requires the intervention of both content and language specialists in any CLIL instruction, either soft or hard. As expressed by Pastor & Perry (2010),

We believe that CLIL should be taught as a single subject being based on close cooperation between content teachers and language teachers. Some researchers into this approach consider that the language teacher's role is merely that of ‘assistant’ to the content teacher. In our view, both content and language are of equal importance, and both the content and language teachers collaborate to produce specific materials that allow different aspects to be focused on. (Pastor & Perry, 2010, p. 72)

It can be inferred that both content and language teachers should raise their awareness of their expected roles as CLIL practitioners, by clearly knowing the pedagogical objectives they have to attain in CLIL settings. From the standpoint of Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), the ESP (Soft CLIL) practitioner is expected to play five main roles, including teacher, collaborator, researcher, evaluator, course designer, and materials provider, using an approach that improves students’ communicative skills. In the same token, according to Whitty (1996: 89-90), hard CLIL teachers should have a set of prerequisite qualities, including “professional values, professional development, communication, subject

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

knowledge, understanding of learners and their learning”. The high loads on each teacher justify the indispensability of their collaboration.

In light of this consideration, Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) proclaim that collaboration between ESP and content teachers goes through three main progressive stages, namely cooperation, collaboration, and team teaching. In their regard, cooperation is the simplest initiative that is usually taken by ESP teachers to know the students’ subjects, inasmuch as the skills and knowledge they have to acquire, and tasks they have to perform. However, collaboration entails the interest of the two teachers, digging into the aspects that should be covered from the two disciplines, in particular, the linguistic and content areas. In other words, dissimilar to cooperation, collaboration comes from both sides. Each teacher builds upon the other teacher’s experience in his/her discipline, either language or content, for a common purpose that is serving students’ learning. According to them, collaboration between teachers can take different formats, entailing a set of points:

1. The content specialist provides the topics that can be covered, which they call “carrier content”.
2. The ESP teacher builds students’ linguistic competences academically and professionally to prepare them to interact and communicate in real-life situations.
3. The content teacher provides the ESP teacher with the topics that should be covered for the consolidation of the teaching program.
4. The last phase is team teaching, which involves each teacher focusing on his/her own field, the language teacher on the linguistic skills, and the content specialist on professional competences.

As there is no specific CLIL teacher collaboration paradigm to follow, the data analysis of the research at hand will be based on these four stages of collaborative practices, suggested by Dudley-Evans and St John (1998), as a theoretical rationale.

2.5 Collaboration between Educators in CLIL Contexts in the Algerian Research Landscape

Due to the scarcity of research papers on CLIL in the Algerian academic research, there are limited empirical investigations on the interdisciplinary collaboration between content and language educators, as it is conceived to be a secondary element leading to the efficient application of CLIL. The theoretical research undertaken by Makhlouf (2023) elucidated the essence of teacher collaboration in having a quality CLIL teaching-learning practice. Additionally,

the study conducted by Ghezali (2021) investigated the extent of collaboration between ESP and content teachers in the Commercial Sciences department.

The research findings of the aforementioned research indicated that ESP teachers are open to collaborating with fellow ESP and content teachers. It has also emphasized that they should know how to implement it practically, to improve the quality of their teaching practice in preparing lectures and teaching materials, and to promote their instructional practices, opening the door for their continuous professional development. So far, the interdisciplinary partnership between soft and hard CLIL practitioners in Algeria is not an active area of research. The existing literature on it is almost restricted to the soft CLIL practice (ESP), and not on both types, soft and hard CLIL instructions, in English-medium institutions. Considering that EMI is a new pedagogical model in the Algerian HE, scholars have called to address and pay more attention to the topic, focusing on the process of partnership, co-teaching, and co-planning in the Algerian CLIL contexts, highlighting the possible challenges thereof.

2. Methodology

This section elicits the employed methodology to address the predefined research objectives in this study. It gives clear details on the adopted approach, which was carefully designed to provide a comprehensive and in-depth overview of the collaboration between content and language professors in an Algerian university.

2.1 Research Design

This research was a case study adopting the qualitative approach. To attain credible, reliable, and valid data, the researchers relied on the interview as a data collection instrument. According to Creswell & Creswell (2018), the interview can be defined as a face-to-face, one-to-one, or in-person meeting that is useful when participants cannot be directly observed, allowing them to provide historical information. They also report: “These interviews involve unstructured and generally open-ended questions that are few in number and intended to elicit views and opinions from the participants”. In the current research, the interview was designed to examine the status of collaboration between subject specialists and language educators, as well as to delve into their attitudes regarding this cooperation.

2.1.1 Research Setting

This study was undertaken in the National Higher School of Management Sciences, Annaba, in the academic year 2023-2024, where EMI was introduced for the first time. The study involved two representative samples to ensure

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

representation from the two academic disciplines, including nine subject specialists and six language professors.

2.1.2 Research Procedures

The researchers interviewed hard and soft CLIL teachers to investigate their cooperative approaches and strategies in relation to joint lesson planning, curriculum coordination, team teaching, pedagogical professional training in CLIL settings, and the organization of regular meetings. Additionally, it focused on exploring their attitudes towards these collaborative and joint efforts. The interview included ten open-ended questions; with some interviewees, the researchers had to translate the questions into Arabic.

3. Results and Discussions

The current descriptive research aimed at illustrating the scope of CLIL teachers' collaborative endeavors, delineating the extent of teacher collaboration alongside the adopted collaborative methodologies and challenges encountered in a CLIL framework. The rendered data was analyzed qualitatively under the categories of teachers' attitudes, the collaborative practices among teachers, and teacher training and professional development opportunities.

3.1 Teachers' Attitudes towards Teacher Collaboration in CLIL Contexts

When asking the participating professors about their understanding of the CLIL approach, its objectives, and the role of collaboration between teachers in CLIL contexts, similar perceptions were presented. Most of the teachers seemed unfamiliar with this approach. While conducting the interview, most of the participants asked for the translation of the didactic terms into Arabic, words like CLIL, curriculum, joint lesson planning, etc. When translating the expression "content and language integrated learning" into Arabic, to facilitate its definition, most of them defined it as a teaching paradigm that uses a foreign language to teach a certain content, in a specific field of study, either humanistic or scientific. One of the teachers defined it as "the teaching of a certain content using a foreign language, which is English in our case". This suggests that they are uninformed about the clear meaning of the CLIL approach.

In a similar vein, when asking them about the objectives of the CLIL approach, most of them linked it to acquiring content knowledge using a foreign language or vice versa. None of the participants has shown understanding of its real dimensions, which are the 4Cs of the pedagogical framework, cited by Coyle et al. (2007), including content, communication, culture, and cognition. This implies that the interviewed teachers are oblivious of their exact roles as CLIL practitioners and of the common objectives they have to attain.

Although they share a lack of comprehension regarding the understanding of CLIL and its objectives, most of them share similar attitudes about the necessity of teacher collaboration in CLIL settings. The majority of the interviewees, either soft or hard CLIL specialists, deem it indispensable. Regardless of their understanding of the objectives of the CLIL approach, they admit that the interdisciplinary collaboration nurtures their students' learning progress, their instructional practice, and their professional growth. The obtained results hint at similarity to the findings obtained by Ghezali (2020) that is mentioned in the literature review. However, when it comes to practice, most of them are open to some cooperative procedures and reluctant to others, either implicitly or explicitly. Most of them are satisfied by participating in the language proficiency training initiated by the university, and open to the curriculum alignment and formal joint lesson planning, but seem unwilling to participate in team teaching and reflective praxis.

3.2The Collaborative Practices among CLIL Teachers

In the interview, the participants revealed that they have similar in sights regarding their vision for the collaborative practices in the context of practice. When asking them about their interpretations of the concept of “teacher collaboration”, they responded that it means “Working together”, “Helping each other”, or “learning from one another”. All the responses signified that they perceive it as an interdependent initiative for seeking help to acquire the required knowledge and skills from their peers in the counterpart discipline. Having collaborative initiatives at the higher educational level between teachers in formal contexts is hardly a reality in Algeria, which makes it applicable to CLIL contexts inherently.

It was found that there is limited collaboration between soft and hard CLIL teachers, which exclusively occurs in informal settings. The teachers are the ones who broach the initiative for collaboration, without any intervention from the university, except for the language training, which is similar to that of most Algerian universities. The ESP teachers find themselves struggling to understand the content knowledge of students' fields. Hence, they ask content specialists to provide them with some specific knowledge. In this light, an ESP professor stated: “As an ESP teacher, I encounter difficulties when dealing with certain specific terms and concepts. In such situations, I informally seek the help of my colleagues. It would be beneficial for ESP teachers to design their courses in alignment with the content provided in the modules of specialties. This approach can enhance the effectiveness of ESP courses for students”. Even though soft CLIL teachers are not expected to focus on content areas, they need a certain

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

minimum of knowledge on the content to be provided, as it is a part of CLIL practice.

Correspondingly, hard CLIL teachers solicit support from language teachers as linguistic advisors outside the CLIL classroom regarding the content terminology and some definitions in preparing their lectures. Similarly, content teachers pursue assistance from language instructors when preparing their assessment documents to check the correctness of their instructions and language used. It was noticed that this was mostly between colleagues with more than six to ten years of teaching experience in the same institution. It is crucial to point out that newly recruited or novice professors felt uncomfortable doing the same. Even though they were in favour of collaboration, they were not able to take the initiative in practice. This may refer to the fear of being judged by fellow professors, as they do not have a strong professional relationship and collegiality with their workmates.

With this in mind, it can be inferred that collaboration between teachers is at a very low level regarding Dudley & Evan's (1998) suggested model of collaboration. The team-based effort was limited to make up for teachers' deficiencies and areas of improvement in their knowledge areas in the counterpart discipline. Despite this, there was no coordination between them in terms of curricular integration, formal joint lesson planning, or team and reflective teaching exercises. For instance, neither soft CLIL teachers were integrating topics that are suggested by content experts, to be in a similar line, nor content teachers were teaching the content in a communicative environment that evokes discussion and interaction in the foreign language. From this perspective, a content instructor declared: "I do not have the linguistic ability that enables me to create a communicative environment in the target language". Along similar lines, many teachers showed resistance towards reflective teaching as most of them feel disenfranchised to be observed, evaluated, and reflected on their instructional practices by other colleagues; though, their mutual observation is a must due to the interdisciplinary nature of the CLIL teaching paradigm.

These partnership undertakings, including the joint lesson planning in informal settings, were supposed to be initiated and encouraged by the institution. This initiative was taken by CLIL professors due to the challenges they have been facing during their CLIL instructional practice. The obtained results on the cooperative practices are also similar to the results obtained by Ghezali (2020), which linked the collaboration between ESP and content teachers to acquiring knowledge related to the specialized area. Teachers have a limited scope on the ways of applying interdisciplinary symbiosis.

3.4 Teacher Training and Professional Development Opportunities for CLIL Instructors

Similar to any other Algerian university, there is a language proficiency training that was organized by the university, depending on the Minister of Higher Education's, Prof. Kamel BEDDARI, ministerial decree to help content teachers improve their English language proficiency level. This language development training was initiated by the academic year (2023-2024). Since the majority of hard CLIL instructors ceased learning or practicing English in high school, they claimed that the endeavor to train them in the language was a notable action. One teacher affirmed that this training reminds them of the syntax and allows them to practice the language. Nonetheless, they stressed that they need more training and professional development opportunities in EMI to ensure attaining satisfying results in the *English-mediated* CLIL contexts. One of the teachers asserted, "We appreciate all the efforts made by our colleague in the language proficiency training, and it is very useful to us, but we all feel that it is not enough to make us able to teach using EMI." Another professor confirmed:

"We need to learn how to say classroom instructions in English, assessment and feedback terminology, and all the required vocabulary in teaching. We also need development related to academic writing and oral presentations, ESP courses related to the subjects we teach, and pedagogical and assessment instruction". (Participant 3)

That is why some teachers have started using English in their classrooms and lesson plans, relying on translanguaging and code switching using three languages, namely English, Arabic, and French, while others found themselves unable even to take this step. The former teachers took the initiative to present a summary of the presented lesson in English, explaining it using their mother tongue or French for some others, as they studied in that language as a medium of instruction. In this context, an ESP trainer announced: "As an ESP teacher teaching management students in this school for almost ten years, I took too long learning the content of the specialty on my own, without being provided any help or guidance except the one asked from my content colleagues." Although this ESP teacher was trained to teach EGP and not ESP, as a soft CLIL practitioner, he was not provided with any training or materials that guided his soft CLIL instruction. Chiefly, both teachers face many challenges in their pedagogical settings that urgently call for appropriate teacher educational and professional growth programs.

4. Recommendations and Suggestions

Based on the research findings, the researchers suggest an array of directives for fostering effective collaboration between content and language teachers, encouraging them to pool their skills and knowledge altogether, insofar as possible, for the betterment of CLIL practice in Algeria. The recommendations provided suggest providing CLIL teacher education training and professional development opportunities for CLIL teachers, establishing curriculum alignment and formal lecture planning, in addition to promoting team teaching and reflective praxis.

4.1 Institutional Support for CLIL Teacher Education Associated with Ongoing Professional Development Opportunities

The researchers propose that Algerian universities should provide teacher training and professional development programs for both hard and soft CLIL specialists to deepen their understanding of CLIL and EMI endeavors, targeting both in-service and pre-service CLIL professors. The training should not be limited to English language proficiency training for content teachers. But rather, both hard and soft CLIL instructors should be engaged in teaching practicum, internships, seminars, workshops, and webinars that introduce CLIL and its endeavors, along with its pedagogical practices. In this context, we suggest that the Ministry of HE in Algeria organizes online training for all teachers and lecturers teaching the same subjects. For instance, they can specify a unified teacher training program for all hard CLIL and soft CLIL teachers' teaching in the Management departments. This would scaffold their team teaching to keep on the same pedagogical track of CLIL implementation, incorporating the same teaching principles under CLIL specialists' supervision. In this way, they may call for CLIL specialists from other countries with expertise in the sphere to exchange insights and save time and energy for the novice CLIL practitioners in Algeria.

4.2 Establishing Curriculum Alignment and Joint Lesson Planning

CLIL professors have to be aware that the end of the CLIL approach goes beyond the acquisition of subject knowledge and the mastery of a foreign language. They should realize that they should not compartmentalize content and language as two different disciplines, but rather address them in an interwoven convergence due to the interdisciplinary nature of CLIL. CLIL is a spectrum of four main dimensions, namely content knowledge, communication, cognition, and culture. To this end, all the educational institutions should rigidly call for establishing a unified curriculum that works towards common pedagogical

objectives to avoid any implementation dips or lack of compliance with CLIL principles.

4.3 Encouraging Team Teaching and Reflective Praxis

The interdisciplinary dimensions of the CLIL framework impel team teaching and reflective exercise. Buckley (2000:4) declares that “team teaching involves a group of instructors working purposefully, regularly, and cooperatively to help a group of students learn”. Soft and hard CLIL teachers should be aware that the quality of their CLIL instruction is not limited to their linguistic competences or content knowledge, with an uneven focus. However, it is also determined by their learners’ level and active participation, as CLIL is a student-centred approach in nature. Raising CLIL teachers’ awareness of these areas helps to prevent their implicit and explicit rejection of collaborating with their peers. To achieve team teaching in CLIL, content teachers can help language instructors by providing them with topics they have to cover so that they employ communicative tasks and activities that promote the active usage of the acquired content. In a like manner, language teachers should provide content specialists with the linguistic knowledge they need about content-specific terminology and the functional exponents for instructing in a foreign language. Team teaching in CLIL settings leads to decreasing teachers’ loads and unifies their efforts towards common pedagogical objectives. In a related context, reflective teaching opens teachers’ eyes to the instructional practices of their peers through observing their teaching praxis. This observation permits them to analyse their peers’ instructional techniques to adopt some, avoid others, and get new pedagogical insights for implementation.

5. Conclusion

In a nutshell, achieving quality CLIL practice is inextricably linked to having good teacher collaboration. The findings of the present research demonstrated that collaboration between content and language teachers is limited to language proficiency training and joint lecture planning in informal contexts. It was revealed that they are willing to participate in some collaborative practices, like formal joint lesson planning and curriculum alignment, while refusing others, such as team teaching and reflective practice. Besides, most of them are in favour of teacher partnership due to the challenges faced in their CLIL instructional practice, including language restrictions and content terminology, and understanding. Nevertheless, they do not know how to implement collaboration appropriately.

Bridging Content and Language Instruction through Teacher Collaboration

To improve their instruction's status quo, CLIL teachers need to be equipped with a heightened awareness that recognizes the value of collegiality and mutual support between soft and hard CLIL teachers, in an end to attain CLIL objectives. Working together opens the door for them to learn from and with one another to gain qualifications and skills that all pool towards one common objective, namely, content-language integrated learning. We recommend that the language teachers contribute by providing linguistic support as a guiding practice inside and outside the CLIL classroom. The content teacher can learn from how the language teacher establishes a communicative learning environment using active-interactive tasks, providing the required functional exponents. In the same vein, we suggest that content teachers provide language instructors with the necessary content materials, including topics, terminology, and materials that help them integrate content softly. We also suggest that the educational institutions take the initiative to encourage teacher collaboration through establishing a unified curriculum, supporting joint lesson planning, and incorporating reflective teaching among teachers from similar and different disciplines.

5. Bibliography List:

- Amina, G. (2021). Collaboration between ESP and Content Teachers: Challenges and Advantages. *Translation Studies*, 09(01).
- Arnold, J. 2011. El dominio afectivo en la enseñanza bilingüe. In S. Casal (Ed.), *Implicaciones de la enseñanza bilingüe en centros educativos*. Sevilla: Aljibe, 37-48.
- Basterrechea, M., & Del Pilar García Mayo, M. (2013). 2. Language-related episodes during Collaborative tasks: A comparison of CLIL and EFL learners. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 25–44. <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/books/9789027272348-lllt.34.05ch2>.
- Buckley 2000. Buckley F. Team-teaching: What, why, and how? Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Carrió-Pastor, M. L., & Bellés-Fortuño, B. (2021). Teaching Language and Content in Multicultural and Multilingual Classrooms. In M. L. Carrió-Pastor & B. Bellés-Fortuño (Eds.), *Teaching Language and Content in Multicultural and Multilingual Classrooms: CLIL and EMI Approaches*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56615-9>.
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and Language Integrated Learning: Towards a Connected Research Agenda for CLIL Pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb459.0>.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). A window on CLIL. In Cambridge University Press eBooks (pp. 1–13). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024549.001>.
- Creese, A. (2002). Is this content-based language teaching?
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Davison. C Williams. A (2011). Integrating language and content: Unresolved issues. In B. Mohan, C. Leung & C. Davison (Eds.).
- Dudley-Evan. T & St. John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EURAB (2005) Research and Technology Organisations (RTOs) and ERA (European Research Advisory Board – Final Report, Brussels: European Commission.
- Makhlouf, K. (2023). *Breaking Down Barriers: Paving the Way for the Implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the Algerian Higher Education Institutions*. *ALTRALANG Journal*, 5(3), 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.52919/altralang.v5i3.371>
- Marsh, D. 2010. Take your brain on a language workout: Learning English, *The Guardian Weekly* (15.01.10), 4.
- Marsh, David. (1994). *Bilingual Education & Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Paris: International Association for Cross-cultural Communication, Language Teaching in the Member States of the European Union (Lingua), University of Sorbonne.
- Mehisto, P. 2009. Managing multilingual education: structuring stakeholder dialogue and collaboration. In V. Pavón; F.J. Ávila (Eds.), *Aplicaciones didácticas para la enseñanza integrada de lengua y contenidos (AICLE/CLICL/ÉMILE)*. Sevilla: Consejería de Educación de la Junta de Andalucía-Universidad de Córdoba, 9-27.
- Papaja, K. (2013). The role of a teacher in a CLIL classroom. *Glottodidactica. An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 40(1), 147. <https://doi.org/10.14746/gl.2013.40.1.11>
- Pappa, S., Moate, J., Ruohotie-Lyhty, M., & Eteläpelto, A. (2017). Teachers' pedagogical and Relational identity negotiation in the Finnish CLIL context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 65, 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.008>.
- Pastor, M. L. C., & Perry, D. (2010). The Collaborative Approach in Content and Language Integrated Learning María Luisa Carrió Pastor and David Perry Polytechnic University of Valencia. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 23(March), 69–81.
- Vázquez, V. P., & Ellison, M. (2013). *EXAMINING TEACHER ROLES AND COMPETENCES IN CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING (CLIL)*. 4.
- Peeter, M., & Ting, Y. (2017). *CLIL Essentials for Secondary School Teachers: The Cambridge Teacher Series*. <https://iris.unical.it/handle/20.500.11770/268511>.
- R. Barwell (2005). Empowerment, EAL and the National Numeracy Strategy International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.
- Stephane B., & Viebrock.B (2012). CLIL in Germany: results from recent research in a Contested field of education.
- Whitty, G., 1996. Creating Quasi-Markets in Education: A review of recent research on Parental Choice and school autonomy in three countries. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, 89–95.