

Primary education degrees in Spain: do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers? _____

Marian Amengual Pizarro
Universitat de les Illes Balears, Spain
marian.amengual@uib.es

Abstract

Over the past decade, the political will to introduce foreign languages in primary schools has gradually increased. According to the recommendations of the Common European Framework for modern languages (CEFR), the learning of foreign languages should be encouraged and promoted at a very early age. The implementation of this Framework requires language teachers to be equipped with the necessary language skills and abilities to be able to cope with classroom communication. This study aims at investigating the extent to which the English language needs of prospective primary school teachers are being addressed in the restructuring of the current primary education degrees in Spanish Universities, in accordance with the new European Space for Higher Education. Among other changes and innovations, new primary education degrees favour a generalist orientation as opposed to any specialist training (i.e. Foreign Language Teaching, Physical Education, etc.) in their teacher education programmes.

A questionnaire was designed to capture the opinion of 106 first-year future primary school teachers at the University of the Balearic Islands on the level of satisfaction towards the remodelling of the new degree, the meeting of their English linguistic and pedagogic needs in the current education programme, their perceived command of the English language, and the use of English they would make in their future classes. Results reveal that the majority of students oppose the generalist orientation of the current degree and believe that their English language and pedagogic training does not equip them to cope effectively with the demands of the foreign language classroom. These results cannot be ignored if we want prospective primary school teachers to be able to attend to the linguistic needs of young language learners at primary level in accordance with Europe's current policies.

Keywords: Primary education degrees; Common European Framework for modern languages (CEFR); second language teachers, specialist training, young language learners.

Resumen

En las últimas décadas, la voluntad política de introducir el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras en la educación primaria ha crecido considerablemente. De acuerdo con las recomendaciones del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCERL), el aprendizaje de las lenguas extranjeras debería incentivarse desde edades muy tempranas. La implementación de este Marco requiere que los profesores de segundas lenguas o lenguas extranjeras dispongan de los conocimientos y habilidades lingüísticas necesarias para poder mantener una buena comunicación oral en el aula. El objetivo de este trabajo es investigar hasta qué punto las necesidades lingüísticas del futuro profesorado de inglés en la educación primaria se han tenido en cuenta en la reestructuración de los planes de estudio de los grados de Educación Primaria de las universidades españolas. Entre los distintos cambios e innovaciones, los nuevos grados de Educación Primaria favorecen una formación de carácter generalista que se opone a la formación especialista (Lengua Extranjera-Inglés, Educación Física, Educación Musical, etc.) hasta ahora planteada en los planes de estudio de formación del profesorado.

Se diseñó un cuestionario con la intención de recoger la opinión de 106 futuros profesores de educación primaria, de primer curso de la Universitat de les Illes Balears (UIB), sobre su nivel de satisfacción con la remodelación del actual grado de Educación Primaria, la respuesta a sus necesidades lingüísticas y pedagógicas planteadas en el nuevo plan de estudios, su nivel de conocimiento de la lengua inglesa y el uso de la lengua inglesa en sus futuras clases de inglés. Los resultados de este estudio demuestran que la mayoría de los estudiantes está en desacuerdo con la orientación generalista del nuevo plan de estudios y consideran que su formación lingüística y pedagógica en lengua inglesa no les prepara adecuadamente para poder atender las necesidades comunicativas de la clase de inglés. Estos resultados no pueden ignorarse si lo que se pretende es que el futuro profesorado de educación primaria pueda satisfacer las necesidades lingüísticas de nuestros jóvenes estudiantes de acuerdo con las actuales directrices políticas europeas.

Palabras clave: Grados de Educación Primaria, Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCERL), profesorado de segundas lenguas, formación especialista, jóvenes estudiantes.

1. Introduction

In today's Europe, the relevance of language learning and the introduction of foreign languages in primary schools has been given a significant boost from the Common European Framework (CEFR) for modern languages (Council of Europe,

2001; North 2000), which emphasises the role of individuals' communicative competence, and encourages the learning of foreign languages at a very early age. The implementation of this Framework has placed new demands on second language (L2) primary school teachers regarding their linguistic competence in English. Thus, current L2 teachers must demonstrate a high level of English oral proficiency to be able to deal with any linguistic emergency and cope with classroom communication (Marton, 1988; Nicholas, 1993; Grant, 1997; Árvá and Medgyes, 2000; Lee, 2002; Edelenbos and Kubanek-German, 2004; Shin, 2008). These recent developments in foreign language teaching and learning across the European Union should have been an incentive for governments to improve future primary school teachers' language competence in English. However, explicit attention to the linguistic needs of teachers is lacking in most teacher training programmes for prospective L2 primary school teachers, in spite of the fact that most teachers have expressed a clear need for improving their formal competence in the foreign language (Berry, 1990; Grant, 1997; Amengual, 2007; Shin, 2008). Furthermore, numerous researchers argue that a high command of the target language is indeed the most valued aspect of non-native teachers' competence (Murdoch, 1994; Goto Butler, 2004; Lee, 2004; de Jong and Harper, 2005; Shin, 2008; Liu, 2009). Nevertheless, most L2 primary school teachers responsible for implementing the CEFR for modern languages have not yet received adequate training to teach English effectively. According to Hasselgreen (2005: 353), "...primary school teachers tend to be the 'poor relation' when it comes to any specialist training in language teaching". As Berry (1990) points out, the proficiency level of L2 teachers is often assumed or taken for granted, even though it is not clear whether the majority of such teachers have the necessary language skills and abilities to use English adequately and teach it in a communicative way.

This study aims at investigating the extent to which the English language needs of prospective primary school teachers are being addressed in the restructuring of the current primary education degrees in Spanish Universities, in accordance with the new European Space for Higher Education (the Bologna Declaration, 1999). Among other changes and innovations, new primary education degrees favour a generalist orientation as opposed to any specialist training (i.e. Foreign Language Teaching, Physical Education Teaching, etc.) in their teacher education programmes. Indeed, the formative itineraries or specialized subjects that have been maintained or integrated into these new teaching training programmes have drastically reduced the number of ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) credits allocated to these subjects. Thus, English language requirements have been relaxed at university level since teaching English is considered an integral part of mainstream teacher preparation. The failure to include more English-specific courses and fewer general education-related ones arises, at least in part, from the assumption that teaching English can be easily fulfilled by

adapting and incorporating pedagogical strategies into mainstream teachers' current instructional practice for teaching any course or subject. Under this perspective, teaching English is understood as a matter of applying good teaching practices such as activating students' background language knowledge, promoting cooperative learning, etc. While we acknowledge the importance and relevance of general education-related courses, we believe that this generic approach will contribute to the problem of inadequate teacher preparation with regard to English language proficiency at primary level. Thus, this holistic orientation overlooks the linguistic needs of L2 primary school teachers, assuming that such teachers possess a sufficient linguistic base in English to do their jobs (Grant, 1997), and deal effectively with the demands of the foreign language classroom.

This research analyses data obtained from first-year future primary school teachers at the University of the Balearic Island (UIB). In order to prepare primary school teachers for teaching English, the new primary education degree (UIB, 2009) requires students to take two compulsory courses in English, awarded 6 ECTS credits each, distributed into the first two years of the current four-year degree (it was a three-year degree for primary education teachers until 2009). No further additional training is required to teach English at primary school level. After the initial first two years of mainstream preparation, students can choose a reduced number of specialized subjects included in the following seven formative itineraries: *Tutorial Action*, *Educational Support*, *Language and Audition*, *Educational Technology*, *Foreign Language (English)*, *Physical Education*, and *Arts and Musical Education*. The total number of ECTS credits allocated to each of these formative itineraries at the University of the Balearic Islands is 32 out of the total 240, which correspond to the current four-year primary education degree. In view of this new generic orientation, the main purpose of this paper is to investigate whether this new training programme can successfully equip students with both the necessary English language proficiency and the English teaching skills to carry out their duties effectively.

A questionnaire was developed to examine students' views on these two main issues.

2. Research questions

This study attempted to explore future primary school teachers' opinions through a questionnaire by addressing the following research questions:

- 1) What is the level of students' satisfaction towards the remodelling of the current primary education degree (UIB, 2009)?

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

- 2) How far are the English linguistic and pedagogic needs of such students being catered for in the current primary education degree?
- 3) What are students' perceptions of their English proficiency?
- 4) How much English do they intend to use in their future English classes?

3. Method

3.1. Subjects

The participants in this study were 116 first-year future primary school teachers from three different courses in the Faculty of Education at the University of the Balearic Islands (UIB). There were no native English students and, therefore, none of them had English as their first language. As seems to be representative of the current teaching situation in most Spanish universities, the majority of primary education students were female (80.6%) in contrast to 19.1% who were male. Ages ranged from 18 to more than 36 years old. 72.4% of the participants were under 21 and 25.9% were between 21 and 35 years old. Two subjects did not provide information regarding their age.

3.2. Instruments

The questionnaire was administered to all the students who attended the compulsory English subject at the end of the academic year (i.e. March 2009) with the intention of gathering prospective primary school teachers' feedback on the above-mentioned issues (see section 2). The questionnaire contained two main types of questions: five-point Likert scales and closed sets of categories, although participants were given the possibility of providing additional information in their first or second language (L1/L2) to support their chosen answers in some cases (see Appendix).

4. Results

The first question included in the questionnaire attempted to obtain students' opinion on the remodelling of the new primary education degree at the UIB in a general fashion. Participants were asked to choose among 4 different options to answer this question, as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Future primary school teachers' opinion on the current primary education degree

	Frequency	Percentage
I think it is all right	42	36.2%
It is indifferent to me	11	9.5%
I don't think it is all right	56	48.3%
I don't know it	1	0.9%
Total	110	94.8%
*No answer/no comment	6	5.2%
TOTAL	116	100.0%

As can be observed in Table 1, although a considerable number of respondents (36.2%) have a favourable opinion on the new primary education degree, the majority of them seem to have a negative perception (48.3%) of this new teaching training programme in the first year of its implementation.

These results find support in the second question of the questionnaire, which enquired of the participants whether they were in favour of the new holistic or generic approach, and consequently, approved the eventual disappearance of specialist education programmes (i.e. Foreign Language Education, Physical Education, Musical Education, etc.) in the remodelling of the current degree. Unexpectedly, results below (Table 2) indicate that an overwhelming majority of respondents (80.2%) seem to be against the generic orientation of the degree. Only 19.8% of the respondents viewed the restructuring of this degree in a positive light.

Table 2. Students' opinion on the new Primary education Degree

	Frequency	Percentage
In favour	23	19.8%
Against	93	80.2%
TOTAL	116	100%

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

In order to determine the most popular formative itineraries or specialized subjects included in the current primary education degree, participants were asked to choose the formative itinerary they intended to follow among the seven ones offered at the UIB, namely: *Tutorial Action*, *Educational Support*, *Language and Audition*, *Educational Technology*, *Foreign Language (English)*, *Physical Education*, and *Arts and Musical Education*. Results to this question are presented in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Formative itinerary

	Frequency	Percentage
Tutorial Action	36	31.0%
Educational Support	20	17.2%
Language and Audition	6	5.2%
Educational Technology	4	3.4%
Foreign Language (English)	14	12.1%
Physical Education	26	22.4%
Arts and Musical Education	5	4.3%
Total	111	95.7%
* No answer/no comment	5	4.3%
TOTAL	116	100.0%

As regards formative itineraries, results reported in Table 3 indicate that the majority of respondents show a preference for *Tutorial Action* (31.0%). This formative itinerary is, in fact, the most generic of all formative itineraries and clearly reflects the holistic orientation of the current degree. Following this, *Physical Education* (22.4%), *Educational Support* (17.2%), and *Foreign Language (English)* (12.1%) were ranked in order of preference. *Language and Audition* (5.2%), *Arts and Musical Education* (4.3%) and *Educational Technology* (3.4%) were the less popular options, being placed last in order of preference.

To investigate the extent to which the preference for a particular formative itinerary could influence the results concerning the second question of the questionnaire, that is participants' opinion on the remodelling of the new degree, the following Table (Table 4) was created. As can be observed, results show the total number of responses which either favoured or opposed the generic approach of the current teaching education programme.

Table 4. Contingency Table. Generalist orientation * Formative itinerary

	Tutorial Action	Educational Support	Language & Audition	Educational Technology	English	Physical Education	Arts & Music Education	TOTAL
In favour	11	5	2	2	1	1	1	23
Against	25	15	4	2	13	25	4	88
TOTAL*	36	20	6	4	14	26	5	111

* 5 No answer/no comment

The fact that almost all participants were against the new holistic approach contemplated in the restructuring of the current primary education degree, and subsequently favoured some specialist teaching training (i.e. Foreign Language Education, Physical Education, etc.) came as a surprise. As can be seen from Table 4, even respondents who intended to follow *Tutorial Action* as a formative itinerary opposed the generalist orientation of the current degree. Only respondents who chose *Educational Technology* as their formative itinerary had divided opinions on this issue. We believe it appropriate to consider these results since if the current degree poses challenges that future primary school teachers feel they cannot meet, benefits are unlikely to accrue.

Question 4 of the questionnaire enquired of the respondents whether they thought the new primary education degree would provide them with the appropriate English teaching training in the event they decided not to follow the *Foreign Language (English)* formative itinerary. As can be seen from the data (Table 5), only 31.0% of the participants responded positively to this question. On the contrary, the majority of respondents (66.4%) felt that their mainstream repertoire of instructional strategies for teaching any course was not enough to enable them to teach English effectively.

Table 5. English teaching training

	Frequency	Percentage	
Valid	Yes	36	31.0%
	No	77	66.4%
	Total	113	97.4%
*No answer/No comment	3	2.6%	
Total	116	100.0%	

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

Furthermore, the results of Table 6 below indicate a strong agreement in the range of responses given by participants—and with independence of their chosen formative itinerary—with regard to their English teaching skills. Thus, the data show that, on the whole, students believe that their general teaching training does not prepare them sufficiently to teach English adequately at primary level. Only those respondents who chose *Educational Support* as a formative itinerary seem to have divided opinions on this issue, with half of the respondents (n=10) having a favourable opinion and half of them (n =10) holding the opposite view. As might be expected, respondents who chose *Foreign language (English)* as their future formative itinerary were the ones who had stronger views on this issue, and practically all of them (T = 13 vs. 1) reported that the general teaching training they received was not enough to prepare them effectively to carry out their duties. On the basis of these results, it seems evident that most future primary school teachers feel that additional specialist training in English language teaching is required to instruct their students to learn and speak English (see Ball & Lindsay, 2010; Martín Ortega et al., 2010).

Table 6. Contingency Table. English teaching training * Formative itinerary

	Tutorial Action	Educational Support	Language and Audition	Educat. Technology	English	Physical Educ.	Arts & Music Educ.	Total
Yes	13	10	2	0	1	8	2	36
No	23	10	4	3	13	18	3	74
Total*	36	20	6	3	14	26	5	110

* 6 No answer/no comment

Question 5 of the questionnaire asked participants whether they thought the current primary education degree would equip them with the necessary English language proficiency to teach English adequately. As can be observed in Table 7, the majority of respondents (69.0%) believed that their level of English proficiency was lower than the levels they see as necessary to cope successfully with classroom communication. These results, therefore, reveal an existing gap between students' perceptions of their specific English pedagogic and linguistic needs, on the one hand, and the kind of preparation they feel is needed to teach English adequately at primary level, on the other hand.

Table 7. Trainees' perceived English proficiency

		Frequency	Percentage
Valid	Yes	30	25.9%
	No	80	69.0%
	Total	110	94.8%
*No answer/No comment		6	5.2%
Total		116	100.0%

A Chi-square test (Table 8) also showed a significant association ($X^2 = 34.248$; $df = 1$; $p < 0.05$) between these two variables, that is, English teaching training (question 5 of the questionnaire) and English language proficiency (question 6 of the questionnaire). In other words, English teaching training is clearly related to English language proficiency. From these results, it is obvious that the majority of students believe that they have neither the necessary English pedagogical skills nor the sufficient English language proficiency to fulfil their roles (see Llurda & Huguet, 2003; Llurda, 2005).

Table 8. Chi-square results for English teaching training and English language proficiency

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	34.248	1	.000
Likelihood Ratio	33.197	1	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33,934	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	109		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.36.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of students' English proficiency, participants were asked (question 6 in the questionnaire) to rate their perceived language proficiency in the four main skills (i.e. *listening*, *speaking*, *reading*, and *writing*). They evaluated each skill on a five-point Likert scale (1 = poor; 2 = marginal; 3 = sufficient; 4 = good, and 5 = excellent). Results are reported in the following Table (Table 9) below. As can be seen, the mean level for oral proficiency in English (i.e.

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

speaking) is below 3 (i.e. “sufficient”), which indicates that the majority of respondents believe that their English oral skills are on average insufficient or not good enough. In fact, *speaking* ($\bar{x} = 2.85$) registers the lowest score on the scale and is marked as the most critical area. Since L2 learners (especially young learners) acquire much oral language naturally and without explicit instruction, these perceived shortfalls in prospective primary school teachers’ oral proficiency should be of great concern to us. In this regard, numerous researchers point out that teachers’ low proficiency in English hinders them from teaching communicative skills and serve as good language models (Berry, 1990; Lee, 2002).

Following *speaking*, participants rated *listening* ($\bar{x} = 3.06$) lower than the other two remaining skills: *writing* ($\bar{x} = 3.31$), and finally *reading* ($\bar{x} = 3.58$), which was rated the highest on the scale. It is worth noting that none of the mean levels for the different skills exceeded 3, which indicates that students’ perception of their English proficiency is on average less than “good” in all four skills. From these results, it seems evident that prospective primary school teachers are rather self-conscious of their faulty command of the language.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics: English proficiency in the four skills

	Nº of subjects	Minimum value	Maximum value	Mean	Std. Dv.
Speaking proficiency	113	1	5	2.85	0.804
Listening proficiency	113	1	5	3.06	0.869
Writing proficiency	114	1	5	3.31	0.800
Reading proficiency	111	2	5	3.58	0.745

A further troubling outcome (Table 10) was that a considerable number of respondents (29.3%) felt that their *speaking* was “poor”. Indeed, although the majority of responses gathered around “sufficient” (48.3%), only 14.7% of the respondents felt that their English oral proficiency was “good”. In light of these results, it is evident that improving future primary school teachers’ oral proficiency seems to be a serious and particular urgent matter.

Table 10. Self-assessment of teachers' oral English proficiency

	Frequency	Percentage
Very poor	3	2.6%
Poor	34	29.3%
Sufficient	56	48.3%
Good	17	14.7%
Very good	3	2.6%
Total	113	97.4
* No answer/no comment	3	2.6%
TOTAL	116	100.0%

Finally, the last issue explored in the questionnaire (question 7) asked participants to indicate the amount of English they intended to use in their future English classes. Here again, a five-point Likert scale was used to rate this matter, ranging from 1 (“very little”) to 5 (“Almost all the time”). Results are found in Table 11 below.

Table 11. Use of English in future classes

		Frequency	Percentage
Valid	Very little	1	0.9%
	Little	34	29.3%
	Enough	36	31.0%
	Very much	16	13.8%
	Almost all the time	26	22.4%
	Total	113	97.4%
No answer/ no comment		3	2.6%
Total		116	100.0%

As might be observed, participants expressed different views on this issue. Thus, results were almost equally distributed between negative responses: “little” (29.3%),

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

“very little” (0.9%), neutral responses (“enough” (31.0%), and positive responses (“very much” (13.8%)) or “almost all the time” (22.4%). Although the total number of negative responses (T = 30.2%) is lower than the number of responses registered at the positive end of the scale (T = 36.2%), the fact that more than 30% of students clearly admitted that they would make such scant use of English in their classes should be a matter of concern. Admittedly, English language avoidance by teachers would have an adverse effect on foreign language learning since it would drastically reduce young learners’ exposure to the language and would influence young learners’ success in acquiring it (see Swain, 1985; Mackey, 2007; García Mayo & Alcón Soler, 2012).

Question 7 in the questionnaire included a last sub-section (7.1) to be completed in the event responses to this question were “very little” or “little”. All respondents (30.2%), with no exception, indicated that the main reason for such limited use of English in class was their poor oral English skills. This finds support in Berry’s belief (1990) that teachers’ oral proficiency will determine the extent to which they use English in the classroom. Indeed, the Chi-square test (Table 12) below reveals a significant association ($X^2 = 34.590$; $df = 16$; $p < 0.05$) between these two latter variables and, therefore, confirms that students’ oral English proficiency is clearly related to the amount of English they will use in the classroom. In short, future primary school teachers’ difficulties with the language should be blamed for the insufficient use of English in class.

Table 12. Chi-square results for speaking proficiency and use of English in class

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	34.590	16	.005
Likelihood ratio	35.739	16	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.610	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	112		

a. 17 cells (68.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.03.

On the basis of these results, it is believed that teacher preparation programmes should revise and examine the knowledge and skills that mainstream teachers need to develop more carefully in order to work effectively as teachers of English at primary level.

5. Conclusion

There are several broad implications that can be taken from this study regarding English teaching at primary level. Firstly, the results obtained in this paper show that the majority of students, with independence of their chosen formative itineraries, feel that the current primary education degree will not provide them with adequate English teaching training in order to teach English effectively. This seems to be the case even with participants who chose *Tutorial Action* as their formative itinerary, a fact which indicates that prospective primary school teachers do not believe that the general pedagogical strategies for teaching any course, which may be acquired through their mainstream instructional practice, are enough to work effectively as teachers of English. On the contrary, students believe they require additional support and further specialised English teaching training in order to instruct their students to learn and speak English.

Secondly, the data showed that students, with no exception, feel that the current primary education degree will not equip them with the necessary English language proficiency to enable them to present and teach the language adequately. Indeed, students' oral proficiency in English is thought to be far below the levels they perceive as necessary to provide reliable input for young learners and serve as good models for imitation. Furthermore, results indicated that *speaking* ($\bar{x} = 2.85$) is marked as the most critical area. This finding should really be of concern to us since prospective primary school teachers' poor oral skills will obviously affect the quality of English input young learners receive as well as their success in acquiring the target language. Furthermore, such limited oral proficiency in English is incompatible with the successful implementation of the Council of Europe's recommendations for modern languages, which emphasise oral communicative interaction. Efficient classroom delivery needs orally proficient teachers who can serve as good models of the language. In light of these results, and in spite of the fact that the Council of Europe's recommendations are increasingly referred to, the needs of Spanish young learners at primary level seem not to have been adequately catered for.

It is worth noting that students seem to be self-conscious of their insufficient command of spoken English and to point out that this factor as the main reason for its scant use in their future English classes. In addition, participants reported that their command of the remaining skills (i.e. *listening*, *writing* and *reading*) is on average less than "good". On the basis of these results, it seems evident that prospective primary school teachers urgently need to improve their overall English proficiency to be able to teach under Europe's current educational policies.

Thirdly, the generic approach of the current primary education degree fails to account for the specific knowledge and skills of primary school teachers related to the teaching of English. In fact, an overwhelming majority of students (80.2%) seem to be against the generic orientation of the current degree and the eventual disappearance of specialist education programmes (i.e. Foreign Language Education, Physical Education, Musical Education, etc.). Of course, English is only one aspect of teachers' qualifications. By acknowledging teachers' English linguistic difficulties we are not neglecting other equally relevant factors related to general pedagogic skills. However, this study reveals a substantial gap between the current English proficiency level of prospective primary school teachers and the levels they see as necessary for teaching English adequately. On the basis of these findings, and given that the demands placed on teachers are not being matched by their teaching training, we believe it is crucial to set explicit pedagogic and linguistic goals that enable future primary teachers to meet a certain minimum standard of English language ability and specialist language teaching training. Although some efforts have been made in this direction, and on-going professional development programmes have been developed (i.e. study abroad programmes, summer courses, etc.), results generally indicate that the efficiency of these programmes remains unclear (see Ball & Lindsay, 2010). As Goto Butler (2004: 271) states: "It is important that these programs be targeted to meet teachers' specific needs and be evaluated systematically to confirm that they are meeting those needs".

Finally, although this study has been based exclusively on self-assessment of teachers' competencies, it is believed that their opinions should be considered in order to understand their current needs. Only through understanding their learning needs and concerns will teacher educators be able to establish concrete and realistic plans to increase English language proficiency and develop new and competent profiles for teachers of English for the twenty-first century.

References

Amengual Pizarro, M. 2007. "How to Respond to the Demands Set by the Communicative Approach? New Challenges L2 Teachers Face in the Classroom". *The European Journal of Teacher education* 30 (1): 63-73.

Árva, V. and Medgyes, P. 2000. "Native and non-native teachers in the classroom". *System* 28: 355-372.

Ball, P. and Lindsay, D. 2010. "Teacher Training for CLIL in the Basque Country: The Case of the Ikastolas – An experience model". In D. Lasagabaster and Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (eds) *CLIL in Spain*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. 162-182.

Berry, R. 1990. "The role of language improvement in in-service teacher training: Killing two birds with one stone". *System* 18 (1): 97-105

Council of Europe 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Jong, E.J., and C.A. Harper. 2005. "Preparing Mainstream Teachers for English-Language Learners: Is being a Good Teacher Good Enough?" *Teacher Education Quarterly* 1: 101-124

Edelenbos, P., and A. Kubanek-German. 2004. "Teacher assessment: the concept of 'diagnostic competence'" *Language Testing* 21 (3): 259-283

Bologna 1999. *The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999*. Bologna, Italy: European Ministers of Education.

García Mayo, M.P. and E. Alcón Soler. 2012. "Input, Output. The Interactionist Framework". In J. Herschensohn and M. Young-Scholten (eds) 2012 *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goto Butler, Y. 2004: "What level of English Proficiency do Elementary School Teachers Need to Attain to Teach EFL? Case Studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan". *TESOL Quarterly* 38 (2): 245-278

Grant, L. 1997. "Testing the language proficiency of bilingual teachers: Arizona's Spanish proficiency test". *Language Testing* 14 (1): 23-46

Hasselgreen, A. 2005. "Assessing the Language of Young Learners". *Language Testing* 22 (3): 337-354

Lee, I. 2002. "An Investigation into Teacher Proficiency for Communicative English Teaching in Elementary Schools". *Primary English Education* 8 (1): 235-264

_____. 2004. "Preparing Nonnative English-Speakers for EFL Teaching in Hong Kong". In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (ed.) 2004 *Learning and Teaching from Experience: Perspectives on Nonnative English-Speaking Professionals* (pp. 230-249). Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Liu, J. 2009. "Complexities and Challenges in Training Nonnative English-speaking Teachers: State of the Art": *TESOL Conference on English Language Teaching: Selected Papers* 5: 1-8

Llurda, E. (ed). 2005. *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession*. New York: Springer.

Llurda, E. and A. Huguet 2003. "Self-awareness in NNS EFL Primary and Secondary School Teachers". *Language Awareness* 13: 220-235.

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

Martín Ortega, E. Manso Ayuso, J., Pérez García, E.M. and Álvarez Sánchez, N. 2010. "La formación y el desarrollo profesional de los docentes". [pdf document, last accessed 20 February 2012]

Marton, W. 1988. *Methods in English Language Teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Mackey, A. (ed). 2007. *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murdoch, G. 1994. "Language Development Provision in Teacher Training Curricula". *ELT Journal* 48 (3): 253–65

Nicholas, H. 1993. *Languages at the crossroads; the report of the national enquiry into the employment and supply of teachers of languages other than English*. Victoria: National Language and Literacy Institute of Australia.

North, B. 2000. *The Development of a Common Framework Scale of Language Proficiency*. New York: Peter Lang.

Shin, S. J. 2008. "Preparing Non-native English-speaking ESL teachers". *Teacher Development* 12 (1): 57-65.

Swain, M. 1985. Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in its Development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds) 1985 *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIX

NAME (OPTIONAL):
SEX: Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/>
AGE: less than 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25 <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30 <input type="checkbox"/> 31-35 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 36 <input type="checkbox"/>
ACCES TO THE UNIVERSITY (SUEE, etc.):
HOMEINSTITUTION:
City/Town:

PERSONAL OPINION

1. What is your opinion on the remodelling of the Primary Education Degree?

I think it is all right I feel indifferent I don't think it is all right I don't know it

2. Do you agree with the generic orientation, and the subsequent disappearance of any specialist education programmes (i.e. Foreign Language teaching, Musical Education teaching, Physical Education teaching) that has been promoted in the current Primary Education Degree?

Yes No

Explain your answer

3. Which formative itinerary, out of the 7 offered at the current Primary Education Degree, do you intend to follow? Tick ONE option:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Tutorial Action <input type="checkbox"/> | Foreign Language (English) <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Educational Support <input type="checkbox"/> | Physical Education <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Language and Audition <input type="checkbox"/> | Arts and Musical Education <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Educational Technology <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Explain your answer

4. Do you think that the current Primary Education Degree will provide you with appropriate English teaching training, in case you do not follow the *Foreign Language (English)* formative itinerary?

Yes No

Explain your answer

Primary education degress in Spain:
do they fulfil the linguistic and pedagogic needs of future teachers?

5. Do you think that the current Primary Education Degree will provide you with the necessary English language proficiency to teach English adequately, in case you do not follow the *Foreign Language (English)* formative itinerary?

Yes No

Explain your answer

6. Rate your English language proficiency in the following skills: *listening, speaking, reading, and writing*, using the scale below:

Very poor (1) Poor (2) Sufficient (3) Good (4)
Very good (5)

6.1. My ability to understand English is: 1 2 3 4 5
6.2. My ability to speak English is: 1 2 3 4 5
6.3. My ability to comprehend written English is: 1 2 3 4 5
6.4. My ability to write in English is: 1 2 3 4 5

7. As a future teacher of English, how much English would you speak in class? Please, circle your choice.

Very little (1) Little (2) Enough (3) Very much (4) Almost all the time (5)

7.1. If very little or little, why it is so? Please, tick one of the following choices:

- I think I need to improve my speaking
 - It is not possible, even with the use of body language, gestures, etc.
to communicate clearly in English with young learners
 - I do not consider it necessary for a Primary school teacher to be able to speak English.
 - Other
- Specify

MANY THANKS!!

