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ABSTRACT
This study highlights tensions and challenges experienced by language teachers in CLIL contexts. Using an example from the Netherlands, it explores the pedagogical and collaborative practices of Teachers of English in Bilingual streams (TEBs). The study shows how, using formal and practical theories (Borg & Burns, 2008), pedagogical and collaborative practices were formulated and used to investigate the beliefs and practices of language teachers in bilingual settings. The paper presents the operationalisation of 36 practices for TEBs and reports on an online survey investigating TEBs’ stated beliefs and practices. The findings suggest this set of practices has potential, both as a professional development tool for language teachers in bilingual education settings, and for further research. Results of the online survey revealed that the disciplinary identity of most Dutch TEBs leads to a focus on language, communication, literature, and language arts. TEBs are not necessarily aware of, and do not automatically consider, possibilities for expanding their own pedagogical practices in relation to subject-specific language or supporting and collaborating with their subject teacher colleagues. We suggest that policy guidelines, curricula development and teacher education programmes should pay more attention to the unique position of language teachers in these settings.

Introduction

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is implemented in a range of curricular models (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). This study reports on research in Dutch secondary schools offering CLIL to academic learners in the first three years. Most of these schools have both a mainstream offering English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and a bilingual stream in which at least 50% of subjects are taught in English (cf. Verspoor, de Bot, & Xu, 2015). Mainstream EFL teachers usually focus on developing communicative language skills in the first three years and teaching literature and language arts in the final three years. The position of Teachers of English in Bilingual Streams (TEBs) is different to that of both their subject teacher (ST) colleagues in bilingual streams and their English teacher colleagues teaching EFL to mainstream learners. In the bilingual stream, TEBs differ from their ST colleagues as the ‘content’ of TEBs’ curriculum is at best ill-defined and at worst, non-existent (Creese, 2000; Dale, Oostdam, & Verspoor, 2018a). They differ from mainstream EFL teacher colleagues as TEBs’ learners use English meaningfully in subject lessons taught parallel to the language curriculum. Also, unlike EFL teachers, TEBs in the Netherlands are expected to collaborate with and support their ST colleagues and to help learners develop subject-specific language. The Dutch quality assurance standard (European Platform, 2012) includes a competency profile for teachers in bilingual schools. This specifies TEBs co-operate with other language teachers and STs on projects, initiate cross-curricular projects, receive information from STs on pupils’ language problems and address these in English lessons. Schools with bilingual streams sometimes appoint language and/or pedagogical ‘CLIL’ coaches. In a previous study, participants in a focus group advocated using TEBs’ expertise in this way (Dale, Oostdam, & Verspoor, 2018b). In the larger EFL teaching community, this puts English teachers in CLIL contexts in a unique position and presents opportunities for TEBs to develop context-specific pedagogical and collaborative practices. TEBs could, for example, adapt their teaching to take into account learners’ use and development of subject-specific language in other lessons. They could develop ways of doing this themselves, or of supporting and collaborating
with their ST colleagues. Alternatively, they may minimally adapt to this context, and continue implementing more familiar non CLIL-specific pedagogical practices.

This article explores opportunities and tensions when TEBs consider and implement context-specific practices. We were interested in ways in which we could characterise opportunities for TEBs by identifying possible pedagogical and collaborative practices based on both literature and the experiences of teachers in the field. To explore TEBs’ stated beliefs and practices with respect to these specific practices, we carried out an online survey. The survey builds on a literature review (Dale, Oostdam, & Verspoor, 2018a) and a focus group study (Dale, Oostdam, & Verspoor, 2018b).

**Theoretical framework**

**Formal and practical theories of teaching**

Borg and Burns (2008) distinguish formal theories of teaching, based on research literature, and practical theories of teaching, based on teacher beliefs. We report first on formal theories about pedagogical and collaborative practices for language teachers in bilingual streams based on a literature review and then present practical theories on TEBs’ pedagogical and collaborative practices in the Netherlands, based on a focus group study.

In a review of 69 articles, we explored how research into foreign language, second language and first language teaching provides insights into pedagogical and collaborative practices for language teachers in CLIL contexts. Five topics were identified. These included three potential foci for language teachers; types of language, aspects of language, and types of content. Two further topics included theories informing pedagogical practices for CLIL language teachers, and issues with collaborative practices. For a comprehensive overview of the findings, see Dale, Oostdam, and Verspoor (2018a). Here, we briefly identify these topics to demonstrate the range of views on pedagogical and collaborative practices for language teachers in bilingual streams presented in the literature.
In the wake of Snow, Met, and Genesee’s (1989) seminal paper on integrating language and content in foreign language teaching, literature referred to five types of language TEBs could focus on:

- **Subject-specific language** – language needed to gain and demonstrate understanding of school subjects.
- **Academic language** – more generic non-subject-specific language found across subject areas.
- **Everyday language** – language used for social interaction on a daily basis.
- **Classroom language** – language needed to follow classroom instructions and carry out learning tasks.
- **Culture-specific language** – language needed for effective communication with native speakers of the target language.

A range of aspects of language TEBs could focus on was also apparent. Some researchers focused on several aspects, for example, grammar, vocabulary, functions, skills, strategies and discourse (e.g. Coyle, 2011; Crandall, 1998; Cummins, 2014; Kong, 2014; Larsen-Freeman & Freeman, 2008). Others focused on one aspect only, e.g. vocabulary (Met, 2008; Nation & Webb, 2011). Others showed how language teachers may address content or meaning only, in order to facilitate the learning of subject content (Creese, 2000; Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012).

According to the literature, types of content TEBs could use included:

- **School subjects from the non-language, non-culture (e.g. literature) mainstream curriculum.**
- **Language arts and culturally-specific perspectives.**
- **Thematic content in the form of theme-based projects derived from school subjects or contemporary social or cultural issues.**
- **Language itself as content, as the subject matter of TEBs’ lessons.**
These foci for TEBs were informed in the literature reviewed by second language acquisition, systemic functional linguistics, socio-cultural and cultural theories. Issues identified in language and subject teacher collaborative practices included lack of expertise, knowledge or skills (e.g. Kong, 2014; Méndez García & Pavón Vázquez, 2012), how to balance language and content (e.g. Creese, 2000; Tedick & Cammarata, 2012), varied understandings linked to teachers’ respective disciplinary or cultural identity (e.g. Kong, 2014; Tedick & Cammarata, 2012), potential inequalities of power and status (e.g. Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2000) and organisational factors (e.g. Kong, 2014; Newman, Samimy, & Romstedt, 2010).

The review thus revealed a plethora of possible practices, informed by a range of theories, and several issues for TEBs’ collaborative practices. It concluded that we cannot assume all TEBs share the same disciplinary and cultural identity or that they will choose a similar language or content focus. It suggested that the literature does not provide clear guidelines for practising TEBs or teacher educators seeking to prepare TEBs for this field or support TEBs in ongoing professional development. We therefore formulated a dynamic framework, based on the literature, to represent TEBs’ choices regarding pedagogical and collaborative practices. This consists of four quadrants (Figure 1). The horizontal continuum represents a content/language continuum with a focus shifting from left to right, from content/meaning to language/form. The vertical continuum represents target language discourse, ranging from bottom to top from subject-specific to culture-specific discourse. Each quadrant has a different language teacher focus.
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Figure 1. A framework for language teaching in bilingual education (Dale et al., 2018a)

Whilst the framework provides a theoretical representation of a dynamic field, we agree with Tedick and Cammarata (2012) that teachers’ lived experiences are central to our understandings of key issues in content and language integration. We therefore sought to enrich the theoretical framework with views of practitioners and other stakeholders in bilingual streams in a focus group study. For a detailed explanation of this study and the rich qualitative data it generated, see Dale, Oostdam, and Verspoor (2018b). Here, we outline background information on the context of the study, the approach taken and how we used stakeholder ideals identified in the study to populate the quadrants with views from the field.
Stakeholder participants in five focus groups included audit chairs, audit secretaries, TEBs and STs (n = 23). Audit chairs and secretaries are members of small audit teams in the Netherlands which certify bilingual schools using an agreed quality standard (European Platform, 2012). Participants were asked to consider what an ideal TEB would do in English lessons and in cooperation with ST colleagues. Transcripts of the focus groups were inductively analysed to identify themes. Each theme was then positioned by deductive analysis in one of the four quadrants in the framework.

The study demonstrated how the framework accommodated stakeholder ideals for TEBs in the Netherlands. Participants argued teaching in a bilingual school involves more than just language; culture and literature should also play a role. These content/meaning-oriented themes focusing on culturally specific discourse were placed in Q1 Literature and language arts. Participants also maintained TEBs should focus on general and academic English skills and strategies, and on language systems integrated in real-life language production. They suggested TEBs should make use of a variety of course materials on general topics such as current affairs and English media, and assess and give feedback on learner language. These more language/form-oriented themes focusing on culturally-specific discourse were placed in Q2 Language and communication. Some stakeholders felt TEBs should coach their ST colleagues in CLIL pedagogical skills, support and monitor non-native speaker STs’ language skills and formulate language policies for bilingual streams. These themes related to supporting ST colleagues in helping learners to understand the content of their subject. These content/meaning-oriented themes focusing on subject-specific discourse, were placed in Q3 Content support. Stakeholders also felt that TEBs should focus on transferrable skills and strategies, and language systems in subject contexts. They suggested TEBs use topics and materials in English lessons from other subjects, prepare, assess and give feedback on language for subject tasks and team teach. These language/form-oriented themes focusing on subject-specific discourse were placed in Q4 Subject-specific language.
The focus group themes echoed findings in the literature review regarding language and content foci for TEBs in several ways. We recognised types of language e.g. subject-specific, general everyday, academic and culture-specific. We also saw various aspects of language: content/meaning (e.g. culture or literature), language systems (e.g. vocabulary, grammar), skills (e.g. academic language skills) and strategies (e.g. transferrable skills). In addition, we recognised content foci: language as content, cultural or thematic content and other school subjects. The study showed that practitioners and stakeholders’ ideals reflected the variety found in the literature.

The range of views from the literature review and focus groups could generate a multitude of TEB pedagogical and collaborative practices. To further our understandings of these practices (cf. Tedick & Cammarata, 2012) and inform policy, curricula development and teacher education (cf. Borg, 2018), we argue there is a need to further delineate TEBs’ practices. Firstly, to clarify the practices not just theoretically but in terms of observable or measurable behaviour. Secondly, to develop a shared language to discuss, compare and critically evaluate these practices. To that end, we have developed a set of pedagogical and collaborative practices associated with the four quadrants.

A set of practices for TEBs

Table 1 presents the practices we associated with the four quadrants. The first column indicates nine pedagogical aspects of TEBs’ practices. The nine aspects reflect curricular choices which could feature in TEBs’ practice, individually or in cooperation with ST colleagues. We define curricular as relating to ‘the learning experiences and goals the teacher develops for particular classes – both in her planning and while teaching – in light of the characteristics of students and the teaching context’ (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005, 170). An overarching organising principle for these nine aspects was the principle of constructive alignment of aims, learning activities and assessment (Biggs & Tang, 2011), reflected in the order. We were also concerned that aspects chosen reflect current views on effective general and second language teaching practices. Dale, Oostdam, and Verspoor (2018a)
highlighted a lack of studies measuring the effect of TEBs’ pedagogical practices on learner outcomes. However, there is evidence that clearly communicating the intentions of lessons has a positive effect on learner achievement (Hattie, 2009) supporting the inclusion of aim. Second language acquisition theories also provide guidelines for learning activities which promote language learning. They suggest that comprehensible input is needed (Krashen, 1985), along with a focus on meaning (Ellis, 2000), form (Ellis, 2002; Leow, 2007) and output (Swain, 2005). Based on this, we included teaching materials (cf. comprehensible input), focus of understanding (cf. focus on meaning), focus on language (cf. focus on form) and speaking and writing activities (cf. output).

Several researchers suggest a genre-based approach to teaching speaking and writing is appropriate in academic bilingual school settings (Llinares, Morton, & Whittaker, 2012; Lorenzo, 2013). This approach emphasises joint deconstruction and reconstruction of texts, involving a process of preparing speaking and writing tasks, carrying them out and peer reviewing them. We therefore sub-divided speaking and writing activities into three aspects: prepare, carry out and peer review. The value of peer review is underlined by Hattie (2009) and Black and Wiliam (1998).

Finally, we included grading and feedback. Assessment and teacher feedback play a crucial role in learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie, 2009), the importance of corrective feedback on learners’ interlanguage has also been documented (Lyster, 2007).
Table 1. Overview of practices associated with the four quadrants of the framework for TEBs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical aspect</th>
<th>Quadrant 1 literature and language arts</th>
<th>Quadrant 2 language and communication</th>
<th>Quadrant 3 content support</th>
<th>Quadrant 4 subject-specific language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Learners can interpret and analyse literary and non-literary texts</td>
<td>Learners can understand, speak and write effectively in English in everyday situations</td>
<td>Support ST colleagues in understanding and using CLIL skills</td>
<td>Learners can understand, speak and write effectively in other subjects taught in English (e.g. presentations for history, lab reports for biology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Use literary and non-literary texts (e.g. short stories, novels, poetry, drama, advertising texts etc.)</td>
<td>Use general English teaching materials (e.g. a standard EFL course book with supplementary materials on current events/English speaking media)</td>
<td>Support STs in choosing and adapting course materials</td>
<td>Use course materials from other subjects taught in English (e.g. videos and/or course texts from a biology lesson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of understanding</td>
<td>A variety of mainly literary texts</td>
<td>General everyday English</td>
<td>Support STs to help learners understand the content of course materials</td>
<td>Language of materials used in other subjects taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language</td>
<td>Analyse language use in literary texts</td>
<td>Teach grammatical structures and general, everyday vocabulary following a fixed order from simple to more complex</td>
<td>Support STs in noticing and teaching grammatical structures and subject-specific vocabulary in course materials in other subjects taught in English</td>
<td>Teach grammatical structures and vocabulary as they appear in course materials in other subjects taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare writing and speaking assignments</td>
<td>Have learners prepare for analysing texts in English lessons</td>
<td>Have learners prepare writing and speaking assignments for everyday communication skills in English lessons</td>
<td>Support ST colleagues in designing writing and speaking assignments for their subjects</td>
<td>Have learners prepare writing and speaking assignments for other subjects taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out writing and speaking assignments</td>
<td>Have learners carry out writing and speaking assignments for analysing texts in English lessons</td>
<td>Have learners carry out writing and speaking assignments for everyday communication skills in English lessons</td>
<td>Design language support for learners when carrying out writing and speaking assignments for other subjects taught in English (e.g. writing or speaking frames/scaffolds)</td>
<td>Have learners carry out writing and speaking assignments for other subjects taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review writing and speaking assignments</td>
<td>Have learners peer review writing and speaking assignments for analysing texts in English lessons</td>
<td>Have learners peer review writing and speaking assignments for everyday communication skills in English lessons</td>
<td>Support ST colleagues in designing peer review activities for writing and speaking assignments in their lessons</td>
<td>Have learners peer review writing and speaking assignments for other subjects taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Give grades for English based on essays and open questions on text interpretation</td>
<td>Give grades on vocabulary and grammar tests and/or reading and listening comprehension tests, speaking and writing assignments linked to the CEFR</td>
<td>Give grades based on tests for other subjects taught in English (e.g. language use in open test questions for biology or history)</td>
<td>Give grades for speaking and writing assignments from subjects taught in English, linked to the CEFR (e.g. a presentation for biology, a history essay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Give feedback on language use in writing and speaking assignments analysing texts</td>
<td>Give feedback on writing and speaking assignments for general, everyday English</td>
<td>Give feedback on ST colleagues’ use of English in lessons, materials and tests</td>
<td>Give feedback on writing and speaking assignments for other subjects taught in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the aspects, we then formulated one practice per quadrant, informed by the themes from the focus groups. The upper half of the framework represents practices at the culture-specific end of the target language discourse continuum. In Q1, practices focus on interpretation and analysis of literary (e.g. short stories, novels, poetry and drama) and non-literary texts (e.g. advertisements), based on examples participants discussed. In Q2, practices focus on communicative language use in everyday contexts, using examples such as current events, English speaking media and a fixed order grammatical syllabus as is common in standard EFL course books. Participants advocated focusing on a variety of material on general topics, general and academic language skills, strategies and language systems integrated in real-life production, and assessing and giving feedback on learner language. The lower half of the framework represents practices at the subject-specific end of the target language discourse continuum. In Q3, practices focus on supporting ST colleagues’ pedagogical and language skills for CLIL. This is based on participants’ ideals for TEBs coaching ST colleagues in CLIL pedagogical skills, supporting and monitoring their language skills and formulating language policies for bilingual streams. In Q4, practices focus on supporting learners’ language development in other subjects using assignments such as presentations for history or course materials such as a video from a biology lesson. These practices reflect the themes transferrable skills and strategies, language systems in subject contexts, using topics and materials in English lessons from other subjects, preparing, assessing and giving feedback on language for subject tasks, and team teaching.

We thus operationalised 36 practices for TEBs using the framework and the focus group study findings. Although these practices are derived from formal theory (literature) and practical theory (stakeholder views), we do not know to what extent they reflect the beliefs and practices of a larger sample of TEBs. We now explore the nature of teacher beliefs and the relationship between teacher beliefs and practices to lead to the formulation of our research questions.
Teacher beliefs and practices

An array of concepts and terminology is used in research on teacher cognition (Borg, 2006). This study follows Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis’ (2004) definition of the term beliefs. Beliefs are statements about ‘ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what “should be done”, “should be the case” and “is preferable”’ (Basturkmen et al., 2004, 244). We see beliefs as preferred practices, underscoring the affective dimension. There is general agreement that teachers’ practice is informed by ‘complex, practically-oriented, personalised, and context-sensitive networks’ of beliefs’ (Borg, 2003). Teachers’ sets of beliefs are complex as is the relationship between their beliefs and practices.

Sets of beliefs may be organised hierarchically in terms of priorities. Some core beliefs may be more resilient and resistant to change, whereas other, peripheral beliefs may be more context-adaptable (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001; Pajares, 1992). For example, Phipps and Borg (2009) demonstrated how language teachers’ beliefs about teaching grammar were not reflected in their teaching practice. Using the distinction between core and peripheral beliefs, they showed how teachers’ specific beliefs about language learning were at odds with their practice, but at the same time, their general beliefs about learning were consistent with their practice. For example, a specific teacher belief was that learners learn better if they discover grammatical rules. This contradicted the same teacher’s practice of sentence-level presentation of a rule. The teacher justified this practice based on learners’ level, responsiveness or motivation. A general belief that teaching should engage and motivate learners (based on both formal and practical theory), over-rode a specific belief (based on formal theory).

The relationship between teacher beliefs and practices is complex in several ways. Firstly, the relationship is not linear or unidirectional, but dynamic and interactive (Borg, 2006). This is linked to the issue of congruency; teachers do not consistently implement practices which reflect their beliefs (e.g. Karavas-Doukas, 1996). Borg’s (ibid) framework for conceptualising the complex field of language teacher cognition shows how the degree of congruence may be affected by contextual factors. These
may lead to changes in beliefs or tensions between the two. Practice in the form of classroom experiences, itself a product of interaction between contextual factors and teacher beliefs, also affects teachers’ beliefs. Furthermore teachers’ individual background, in the form of personal learning experiences, shapes beliefs and professional development may affect or be affected by beliefs.

Secondly, the relationship between practices and beliefs is not always one to one. Teachers may be inconsistent in the way they associate specific practices with specific beliefs; here also congruency is an issue. Breen et al. (2001) showed how in teachers working in similar contexts, similar teacher practices may be based on different teacher beliefs and similar teacher beliefs may lead to a variety of practices. They suggested teachers’ experience played a role in this divergence.

Thirdly, despite this divergence in ways teachers associate practices and beliefs, ‘as a collective, there is an underlying and consistent pattern between the ways [teachers] think about their work and the ways in which they act in the language class’ (Breen et al., 2001, 496). A group of experienced language teachers working in similar situations may implement a ‘collective pedagogy’ based on a specific and largely distinctive set of beliefs. The idea that beliefs may be not only individually held, but communally, is reiterated by Shulman and Shulman (2004), who show how teaching is a communal activity, whereby individual teacher practices and beliefs may interact not only with teacher communities, but also with policies (including allocation of resources).

To summarise, teacher belief systems may be organised hierarchically, and differences between core and peripheral teacher beliefs may explain incongruences in their implementation of beliefs in practice. The relationship between beliefs and practices can be characterised as dynamic with context, classroom experiences, individual background and professional development all playing an interactive role. Different teachers may associate different practices with different beliefs but at the same time, may hold certain beliefs collectively when working in similar situations. Their beliefs and practices may interact with their teaching community and with policy decisions.
Research questions

The issue of congruence between teacher beliefs and practices has been presented as problematic, but following Phipps and Borg (2007, 2009), we take a positive approach to exploring this issue, whereby investigating the tensions teachers experience between their beliefs and practices may further our understandings of the process of teaching. We are interested in the collective views of a specific subset of language teachers, TEBs, on a set of practices derived from formal and practical teaching theories. Our study focuses firstly on the organisation of TEBs’ belief systems and their implementation of a set of practices. To explore the role of context in TEBs’ beliefs and practices, we selected four background variables: level of experience (Borg, 2006; Breen et al., 2001), department size (cf. teaching community, Shulman & Shulman, 2004), workload (cf. allocation of resources, Shulman & Shulman, 2004), status as department head or coordinator (and therefore aware of policy guidelines [cf. Shulman & Shulman, 2004], which advocate practices associated with quadrants 3 or 4 [Dale, Oostdam, & Verspoor, 2018b]).

Our focus group study (ibid) showed some native speaker English teachers were critical of the use of course books and more supportive of practices associated with quadrants 3 and 4 than non-native speakers. To explore the role of individual background in their beliefs and practices, we therefore selected a further variable: status as native or non-native speaker. Our research questions were as follows:

- What is the relative importance to TEBs of practices associated with the four quadrants?

- How often do TEBs report using practices associated with the four quadrants?

- Is there a relationship between TEBs’ preferred and reported practices and background variables (level of experience, size of department, teaching load, TEBs’ status as head of department, coordinator or native speaker)?
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Method
This was an exploratory study using a self-report online survey with forced choice ranking questions and a sliding frequency scale. It investigated the relative importance to TEBs and their reported use of practices associated with four quadrants in a dynamic framework for teaching English in bilingual streams. It also explored the relationship between TEBs’ preferred and reported practices and selected background characteristics.

The study is based on the view that teachers’ beliefs influence their classroom practice. It is motivated by recognition that unacknowledged teacher beliefs may limit the impact of implementation of changes in educational policies and curricula and teacher education programmes (Borg, 2006; Shulman & Shulman, 2004). It maintains that both formal theory based on research literature and practical theory based on teacher beliefs and practices (Borg & Burns, 2008) should inform educational policies, curricula and teacher development programmes. In the larger, overall study, a mixed-methods approach is used, starting with a literature review, followed by a focus group study, then an online survey, culminating in interviews. This range of methods allows us to gain insight into teacher beliefs and practices from both theoretical and practical perspectives. Furthermore, book ending quantitative data from an online survey with qualitative data from the prior focus group study and subsequent in-depth interviews allows us to mitigate some of the limitations of survey data (see below) for exploring teacher beliefs and practice, whilst also gaining insights from the more fine-grained point of view made possible using qualitative data.

Although self-report instruments in the form of surveys have been widely used to investigate teacher beliefs and practices, several criticisms have been noted (Borg, 2018). One criticism (Basturkmen et al., 2004) is that using surveys containing standardised statements to elicit teacher beliefs may reflect researchers’ ideas rather than teachers or ‘mask or misrepresent a particular teacher’s highly personalised perceptions and definitions’ (Kagan, 1990, 426). Whilst our survey does make use of standardised statements, these were developed based not only on the literature,
but also on the views of a range of stakeholders, including teachers. The beliefs informing the list of practices on which the statements are based were derived from focus groups rather than an online survey.

Another criticism (Graham, Santos, & Francis-Brophy, 2014) is that beliefs emerging from studies of language teacher cognition may be influenced by the ways in which beliefs are elicited: ‘beliefs elicited through questionnaires may reflect teachers’ theoretical or idealistic beliefs – beliefs about what should be.’ (Phipps & Borg, 2009, 382). Our survey directly asks TEBs for their beliefs about ‘what should be’ and so in this sense could be seen as fit for purpose. Our main focus, however, was not on eliciting beliefs, as beliefs elicited through focus groups were already integrated into the formulated practices. Our focus was rather on the extent to which a set of practices based on beliefs elicited from a small group of stakeholders are supported and implemented by a larger number of practising TEBs. A similar criticism may be applied to practices which teachers report using in this survey. Asking only about pre-formulated practices restricts by definition the practices TEBs report using. Again, our focus at this stage of the research is not on all the practices TEBs implement, but the extent to which they report using a set of practices based on both formal and practical theory.

A further criticism is that surveys ‘cannot measure action but only respondents’ reports of their actions’ (Borg & Burns, 2008, 459). Following Graham et al. (2014), we use the terms ‘stated beliefs’ and ‘stated practices’ to acknowledge this but reiterate their point that the anonymity of surveys may lead to participants representing their practices more accurately than observations for which they may adapt their practices knowing they are being observed. Furthermore, an online survey may allow us to investigate a wider range of beliefs and practices than observations (ibid).
Table 2.

Background characteristics: percentage or mean (SD) (n = 143).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage or mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching experience (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstream</td>
<td>12 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual stream</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching load (hours)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstream</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual stream</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head of department</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEBs in department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–9</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

In December 2017, 119 Dutch schools offered a bilingual academic stream (Nuffic, 2018). Bilingual stream coordinators at all these schools were asked to distribute the survey among all TEBs working in the first three years at their school. The invitation to participate explained the aim of the research, what would happen with the data, assured participant anonymity in reporting and the right to withdraw. A total of 146 teachers responded to this invitation. Three of these were removed as they were STs, not TEBs’, resulting in a sample of 143 TEBs from 89 different bilingual academic schools who participated in the survey (a school response rate of 75%). The reported results are based on the data of these 143 respondents. However, not all participants fully completed the survey. This resulted in a different number of respondents per section, ranging from 143 to 86. Based on responses to a question how many TEB
colleagues work at their school, a rough estimate could be made of the total TEBs working at Dutch bilingual schools. Survey participants of the 89 schools reported that about 250 TEBs were teaching in the first three years. Extrapolating this number to the total of 119 schools with a bilingual stream, we estimate approximately 340 TEBs work in the lower grades, indicating a response rate at teacher level of approximately 42 percent of the total population of TEBs (143/340).

Participants’ gender, age, teaching experience, teaching load, status and department size are presented in Table 2.

The survey
The survey asked first for background information, and then asked about ‘beliefs about what should be’ (Phipps & Borg, 2009, 382). We asked teachers to rank practices in order of importance before we asked them to indicate their use of these practices. If our aim was to elicit participants’ individual beliefs and test whether their beliefs and practices were consistent, asking first about beliefs could distort the way they reported on their practices. However, our aim in this study is not to elicit participants’ individual beliefs but to gauge their response to a set of practices based on formal and practical theory. Neither is our main focus on testing the consistency of their stated beliefs and practices. As beliefs may be different to practices (Borg, 2006), we are interested in and therefore asked about both. Having explored participants’ beliefs through ranking questions, we then asked teachers to rate how often they implemented these practices. The order in which the survey asked about beliefs and practices could highlight tensions participants experience between their stated beliefs and practices. To allow teachers to express tensions or mention beliefs or practices they felt had been omitted from the survey, a final question asked for open comments.

A ranking scale was used to measure the relative importance to TEBs of the sets of practices. In this ‘forced choice’ ranking exercise, TEBs were given four practices per aspect, based on Table 1 and asked to rank these in order of importance. Figure 2 shows an example for preferred teaching materials. The numbers in brackets [1–4] indicate the importance TEBs give to the practice, e.g. [1] indicates focusing mainly
on literary and non-literary texts is most important, [4] indicates supporting subject teachers in choosing and adapting course materials is least important. TEBs were able to adjust the order of practices by dragging and dropping. Each question on the nine aspects was constructed in this way.

![Figure 2.](image)

**Sample ranking question.**

We used a ranking scale here for two reasons. Firstly, we wanted to avoid participants effectively making no choice between the practices by agreeing in equal measure to all of them when answering an abstract question about how important they feel a practice is. Secondly, some researchers claim hierarchical systems such as belief systems can best be inferred from ranking rather than rating (e.g. Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989).

A rating scale was used to measure how often TEBs reported using practices. We asked them to indicate how often they implemented each of the 36 practices on a sliding frequency scale of 0–100 (0 = never, 25 = sometimes, 50 = half the time, 75 = most of the time, 100 = all the time). We used a rating rather than ranking scale here as we were less concerned that TEBs would report using all practices in equal measure and to reduce the risk of respondent fatigue (Lavrakas, 2008) when asking about the same set of practices in a similar way.
The survey was piloted with two trainee teachers with two years’ teaching placement experience teaching English in bilingual streams. They were asked for feedback on survey length and item clarity. This resulted in some minor adjustments to wording in the final version.

**Data analysis**

Preferred practices were analysed by calculating the mean ranking score (4 = most important, 1 = least important). Reported use of practices was analysed by calculating the mean amount of time TEBs indicated using practices associated with each quadrant.

An independent-samples t-test was performed to compare mean scores for TEBs’ preferred and reported practices based on six background variables: experience level, department size, teaching load, status as department head, coordinator or native speaker. TEBs with 0–3 years’ experience teaching in bilingual streams were categorised as novices. Departments with 1–3 TEBs were defined as small, teaching loads of 19 or more hours per week were defined as high workloads. As the total number of comparisons was 36 (nine practices in four quadrants), we applied a Bonferroni adjustment, setting the alpha level for comparison at 0.001 (0.05/36 = 0.0014) for preferred and reported practices. Open comments were not analysed separately, but are referred to in the discussion.

**Results**

**Relative importance of practices**

In a forced choice ranking exercise, TEBs were asked to rank nine sets of four practices (Table 1) in order of importance. Each ranking was given a score to express its importance (most important = 4, least important = 1). Table 3 shows the mean score of the nine distinct practices ($n = 104$) related to the quadrants. For example, the Q2 aim (Learners can understand, speak and write effectively in English in everyday situations) is considered most important by all TEBs ($M = 3.7$) while the Q3 aim (Support ST colleagues in understanding and using CLIL skills) is seen as least important ($M = 1.4$).
Table 3.
Mean scores for preferred practices of TEBs (n = 104).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Q1 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Q2 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Q3 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Q4 Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>2.5 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.7 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.7)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>3.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.9)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.8)</td>
<td>1.9 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of understanding</td>
<td>2.6 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language</td>
<td>2.4 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare assignments</td>
<td>2.9 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.7)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out assignments</td>
<td>2.8 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review assignments</td>
<td>3.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>3.1 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.6 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.2 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2.9 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.7)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that TEBs ranked practices associated with each quadrant consistently in the same order. They ranked Q2 practices as the most important (M is between 3.2 and 3.7). These focused on communicative language use in everyday contexts, using examples such as current events, English speaking media and a fixed order grammatical syllabus as is common in a standard EFL course book. TEBs ranked Q1 practices second in importance (M is between 2.4 and 3.1). These focused on interpretation and analysis of literary and non-literary texts, giving as examples short stories, novels, poetry, drama, advertising texts etc. Q3 practices were ranked as the least important (M is between 1.4 and 1.7). These focused on supporting ST colleagues’ pedagogical and language skills. TEBs ranked Q4 practices in third place (M is between 1.9 and 2.4). These focused on supporting learners’ language development in other subjects using assignments such as history presentations or course materials such as a biology video.

**Reported use of practices**

TEBs were asked to indicate how often they used a practice, on a sliding frequency scale of 0–100 (0 = never, 25 = sometimes, 50 = half the time, 75 = most of the time, 100 = all the time). Table 4 shows the mean frequency score for reported use of practices associated with each quadrant.
Table 4.

Mean amount of time TEBs reported using practices per quadrant (n = 86).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Q1 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Q2 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Q3 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Q4 Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>52.44 (24.14)</td>
<td>81.50 (18.10)</td>
<td>26.64 (26.17)</td>
<td>40.29 (28.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>56.27 (25.79)</td>
<td>74.92 (19.25)</td>
<td>22.65 (21.97)</td>
<td>25.44 (24.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of understanding</td>
<td>50.59 (28.30)</td>
<td>80.66 (20.61)</td>
<td>19.41 (22.07)</td>
<td>25.57 (26.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on language</td>
<td>46.57 (25.34)</td>
<td>70.58 (25.30)</td>
<td>19.67 (23.05)</td>
<td>30.70 (28.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare assignments</td>
<td>52.90 (27.24)</td>
<td>69.51 (25.36)</td>
<td>17.66 (21.50)</td>
<td>19.97 (22.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out assignments</td>
<td>56.57 (25.70)</td>
<td>72.28 (22.48)</td>
<td>16.58 (22.16)</td>
<td>18.90 (23.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review assignments</td>
<td>49.59 (25.25)</td>
<td>57.20 (24.02)</td>
<td>13.29 (20.75)</td>
<td>13.31 (21.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>49.41 (25.54)</td>
<td>67.76 (24.08)</td>
<td>10.93 (18.49)</td>
<td>14.86 (22.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>67.01 (26.71)</td>
<td>79.12 (21.52)</td>
<td>23.19 (25.06)</td>
<td>24.19 (25.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the distribution pattern in TEBs’ reported use of practices is also consistent. The most frequently used practices are those associated with Q2 (M ranges from 57.20–81.50), whereby the least reported practice is having learners peer review their speaking and writing assignments for everyday communication skills (M = 57.20).

The second most frequently used practices, used around half the time (M ranges from 46.57– 67.01), are those associated with Q1. Within this quadrant, the most reported practice (M = 67.01) is giving feedback on language use in writing and speaking assignments analysing texts.

TEBs report using the aim associated with Q4 just under half the time (M = 40.29). They report sometimes using Q4 materials, focus on understanding, focus on language and giving feedback on speaking and writing assignments for other subjects taught in English (M ranges from 24.19–30.70). They report having learners peer review speaking and writing assignments from subjects taught in English and grading these themselves less frequently (peer review, M = 13.31; grading, M = 14.86).
The least frequently used practices are those associated with Q3. TEBs report using the aim we associated with Q3 (to teach ST colleagues CLIL skills) sometimes ($M = 26.64$). They also report sometimes supporting ST colleagues in choosing and adapting course materials ($M = 22.65$) and giving feedback on ST colleagues use of English in lessons, materials and tests ($M = 23.19$). TEBs reported a little less often focusing on how ST colleagues can help learners understand the content of course materials ($M = 19.41$), supporting STs in noticing and teaching grammatical structures and subject-specific vocabulary ($M = 19.67$), and helping them prepare ($M = 17.66$) and design ($M = 16.58$) writing and speaking assignments for their subject. They report least often helping STs design peer review activities ($M = 13.29$), and giving grades based on tests for other subjects taught in English ($M = 10.93$).

**Relationship between preferred and reported practices and background variables**

Independent-samples t-tests only showed a significant difference with a large effect size in the ranking scores of native and non-native speakers with regard to preferred teaching materials. Native speakers ranked using Q2 materials (e.g. a standard EFL course book) lower ($M = 3.1, SD = 0.6$) than non-native speakers ($M = 3.8, SD = 1.1$); $t(102) = 3.92, p = 0.001, d = 1.22$. They ranked using Q4 materials (e.g. course materials from other subjects) higher ($M = 2.2, SD = 0.8$) than non-native speakers ($M = 1.7, SD = 0.7$); $t(102) = −3.60, p = 0.001, d = 4.73$.

**Discussion**

This paper presented a set of 36 pedagogical and collaborative practices for TEBs and reported on a survey exploring their relative importance to TEBs, how often they reported using them, and the relationship between TEBs’ preferred and reported practices and background variables. Preferred practices were seen as beliefs. The 36 practices were derived from formal (based on a literature review) and practical (based on a focus group study) teaching theories. They were developed using a framework for language teachers in bilingual streams consisting of four quadrants (Dale, Oostdam, & Verspoor, 2018a). For each quadrant, nine practices were formulated to reflect curricular choices which could feature in TEBs’ teaching practice, individually or in cooperation with ST colleagues. Each practise within a
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quadrant was based on the same nine aspects; aim, teaching materials, focus of understanding, focus on language, preparation of assignments, carrying out of assignments, peer reviewing, grading and feedback.

In the Netherlands, EFL teachers (non-TEBs) usually focus on everyday language and communication (Q2) in the lower school and literature and language arts (Q1) in the upper school. The Dutch CLIL quality assurance standard encourages TEBs to support and collaborate with STs (Q3) and help learners develop subject-specific language (Q4). The findings show that TEBs’ preferred practices – their stated beliefs – and reported use of practices (research questions 1 and 2) favour Q1 and Q2, reflecting current practices by EFL teachers in mainstream Dutch schools. However, among reported use of practices, there was some variety. For example, few teachers indicated using peer review in speaking and learning activities or grading learners’ English in tests and assignments for other subjects.

The question is why most TEBs favoured more generic EFL teaching practices, whilst working in the bilingual stream, which is a CLIL context. TEBs’ stated beliefs and practices are at the culture-specific end of the target language discourse continuum in our framework, rather than the subject-specific end. Previous research suggests disciplinary and cultural identity plays a role in the choices TEBs make about their practice (Kong, 2014; Tedick & Cammarata, 2012). Tapping into the distinction between core and peripheral beliefs (e.g. Phipps & Borg, 2009), we suggest core TEB beliefs may rest quite heavily on disciplinary and cultural identity; the link between language and culture may be part of their core beliefs.

It is noteworthy that TEBs’ stated beliefs and practices show consistency, whereas previous research (e.g. Karavas-Doukas, 1996) has highlighted inconsistencies. In this study, participants were required to rank practices in order of preference. Participants therefore express a hierarchy. The hierarchical structure of beliefs has been explored in previous studies (Breen et al., 2001; Pajares, 1992; Phipps & Borg, 2009). This study does not confirm that beliefs are hierarchical; the order is a function of the type of question asked. It does show, however, that when the
hierarchical structure of beliefs is made explicit, we can find consistency between teachers’ stated beliefs and their practices. Borg (2018) recommends that when comparing beliefs and practices, research should explore and acknowledge the hierarchical structure of beliefs. This approach appears, in this case, to be justified.

TEBs favoured two pedagogical aspects less than others: peer reviewing learner work in all four quadrants and grading learners’ English for tasks or tests in other subjects in quadrants 3 and 4. These findings could be explained by a lack of expertise or knowledge in these areas; open comments confirmed that some TEBs were unaware of some of the practices the survey asked about. Dale, Oostdam, and Verspoor (2018b) point out that while Schleppegrell (2018) argues that Systemic Functional Linguistics and joint deconstruction and construction of texts should be included in English language teacher education, these do not feature explicitly in the Dutch knowledge base for English teacher education (HBO-raad, 2011–2012). Previous research on the collaborative practices of language and subject teachers suggests that lack of expertise, knowledge or skills may limit teachers’ implementation of practices (Arkoudis, 2006; Kong, 2014). Finally, regarding grading language in tasks and tests from other subjects, it is perhaps understandable that TEBs are wary of taking on extra marking involved in grading learners’ tasks or tests in other subjects given time issues mentioned in open comments.

TEBs’ background variables did not affect preferred or reported practices to a great degree (research question 3). The analysis showed that out of the six background variables – experience level, department size, teaching load, status as department head, coordinator or native speaker – only native speaker status was significant, but only concerning preferences, not concerning the frequency of their reported practices. Native speakers find using Q2 materials (e.g. a course book) less important than non-native speakers. To them, using Q4 materials (e.g. course texts from a biology book) is more important.
No relationship between TEBs’ experience level, teaching load and status as department head or coordinator and their stated beliefs and practices is not in line with previous research, which suggests contextual factors including experience, teaching community, allocation of resources, and policy guidelines play a role. However, some open comments suggested that some individual TEBs do feel experience level, department size and teaching load play a role in the extent to which they implement the practices in quadrants 3 and 4. If, as our data suggests, TEBs’ beliefs and practices with regard to quadrants 3 and 4 are peripheral rather than core, this seemingly contradictory finding may be an illustration of the context-adaptable nature of peripheral beliefs (Breen et al., 2001; Pajares, 1992).

The fact that native speaker status affects TEBs’ preferences, but not the frequency of their reported practices provides an example of and confirms the complexity of the relationship between beliefs and practices expressed in Borg’s (2006) model of language teacher cognition. Individual characteristics such as native speaker familiarity with a wider range of language than non-native speakers may lead to native speakers being more willing to consider dealing with subject-specific language. Native English speakers’ own education experience and initial teacher education may also differ to that of non-native speakers in terms of the approach to selecting teaching materials, e.g. Dutch language teachers generally take a course-book led approach (Educational Inspectorate, 2004) and will have experienced this approach themselves as learners, whereas native English speakers may have experienced and been trained in less course-book led approaches. A discrepancy between the stated beliefs and practices of native English speaker TEBs may be explained by the contrast between their personal and educational background (less course-book led approaches) and the context in which they operate (course-book led approaches in Dutch schools). This illustrates how tensions arise when there is a mismatch between beliefs and the contexts in which teachers operate, as Borg’s (2006) framework acknowledges.
Some open comments offered support for Shulman and Shulman’s (2004) suggestion that allocation of resources and policy guidelines (along with individual characteristics and the teaching community) play a role in teachers’ implementation of innovative practices, e.g. lack of time to support colleagues, lack of guidelines, size of department. They also offered support for the suggestion that lack of knowledge, expertise and skills may play a role in TEBs’ willingness and ability to implement the practices associated with the subject-specific end of the discourse continuum in quadrants 3 and 4 (Arkoudis, 2006; Kong, 2014), e.g. completing the survey prompted some TEBs to write that they had become aware of missed opportunities. This implies that when TEBs become aware of pedagogical and collaborative practices in these quadrants, they are willing to consider ways of implementing them. Current teacher education and professional development programmes for TEBs in the Netherlands may not have raised their awareness of more CLIL-specific Q3 and Q4 practices. Existing policy guidelines in the Netherlands may not steer TEBs and schools in the direction of Q3 and Q4 practices. Comments also suggested participating in the survey could change TEBs’ perceptions about their position in bilingual streams. We therefore suggest that the set of practices itself could have potential as a professional development tool for TEBs.

As discussed above, the online survey has some design limitations. Care should be taken when interpreting the results for TEBs’ preferred practices. The use of forced ranking means the responses express relative importance. Our discussion highlights that this does not necessarily mean that TEBs do not feel Q3 and Q4 are important, just that they feel these are less important than Q2 and Q1. Similar care should be taken when comparing the results for stated beliefs and reported practices. As with any self-report, we cannot be certain that TEBs reported their actual use of the practices; observations would be needed to confirm their answers. We mitigated this shortcoming by referring to ‘stated’ or reported practices.

Placed in the context of a larger study on TEBs’ pedagogical and collaborative practices, we suggest this online survey has several implications and provides promising avenues for further exploration. Firstly, current policy guidelines for
the pedagogical and collaborative practices of TEBs in the Netherlands may not adequately support schools and teachers with examples of context-specific approaches informed by formal and practical theories. Some open comments suggested that TEBs feel organisational issues such as allocation of resources, based on policy guidelines play a role in their implementation of collaborative practices. Secondly, there is potential for using the set of practices developed for this study to inform such guidelines and in curricula development for English programmes in bilingual streams and teacher education, in the Netherlands or elsewhere. The study has shown patterns in TEBs’ beliefs and practices which offer a road map for teacher development, by highlighting the hierarchy in their beliefs and the nature of disciplinary and cultural identity as a core belief for TEBs and tensions TEBs experience between continuity and change. This insight could allow teacher educators to plan professional development progressively, beginning in the areas which lie within teachers’ ‘zone of proximal development’ (Vygotsky, 1978), and filling gaps in expertise, knowledge and skills in other areas.

**Conclusion**

We set out to demonstrate how teaching practices can be formed and informed through an interactive process of interrogation of theories, beliefs and practices, leading to the formulation of practices which are both underpinned by research and recognisable and accessible for practitioners. We have shown how this approach has both furthered our understanding of TEBs’ practices and demonstrated the explanatory power of characterising teacher beliefs as hierarchical. We suggest that both the set of practices and the survey developed and carried out in this study have potential for further research and as a tool for the professional development of language teachers in CLIL contexts. It is plausible that, although this survey was limited to the Dutch context, the results may well be representative of teachers of other languages and in bilingual education elsewhere. It would be interesting to carry out the survey with language teachers working in a variety of CLIL contexts, to investigate the relevance of the practices in other CLIL contexts and to collect the views of a larger sample of TEBs. We hope disseminating our experiences in
this article will encourage researchers and teacher educators to also explore the relevance of this set of practices as a professional development tool for language teachers in other CLIL contexts.