



2

CLIL and Language Education in Spain

Daniel Madrid Fernández, José Luis Ortega-Martín,
and Stephen Pearse Hughes

1 Language Education Policy and CLIL

Before the introduction of formalised legislation which included language training, language learning was essentially reserved for the elite and generally took place among the nobles and people of great social influence and high economic status. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century that Spanish educational laws began to include the teaching of foreign languages as a curricular subject in the public school curricula.

The first regulation that established the obligatory nature of languages in the school curriculum was *the Law of Public Instruction* promoted by Claudio Moyano in 1857, when he was the Minister of Development. This law established that general studies in education were to include the study of living languages from the age of 10 to 11.

In the twentieth century, the 1926 education *Royal Decree* divided secondary education in two periods, *elementary baccalaureate*, with three

D. Madrid Fernández (✉) • J. L. Ortega-Martín • S. P. Hughes
Faculty of Education, University of Granada, Granada, Spain
e-mail: dmadrid@ugr.es; ortegam@ugr.es

grades (age 12–14), and *upper baccalaureate*, including two academic years (age 15–16); the latter was divided into two itineraries: sciences and arts. In the three years of the elementary baccalaureate, French was studied, and in the two years of the upper stage, the students could choose between English, German or Italian.

Thanks to the reforms of 1926, important innovations in the development of language teaching in Spain were incorporated and some schools and institutes of languages were created (Morales, 2009). A few years later, the 1938 *Reform Act of Secondary Education* continued to include the teaching of foreign languages for three hours per week, throughout the seven years of the baccalaureate.

With the arrival of *the Spanish Second Republic* (1931–1936), education in Spain improved considerably, and so did the teaching of foreign languages, due to the fact that two languages were studied: French during the first four years of secondary education and a second language (English or German) in the last two (out of a total of seven grades). Regarding the teaching methodology, there were also notable advances: more practical objectives were established, cultural aspects were included, the direct method was given a certain emphasis and audio devices, such as the use of the gramophone, were recommended for the learning of oral language (Fernández Fraile, 1996; Morales, 2009). Nevertheless, the study of literary texts, translation, written expression and the grammar were still predominant.

Later, the law of 1945 for primary education did not include the study of foreign languages in the compulsory education school curriculum. Legislation did, however, provide training for foreign learners as well as for Spanish migrant students in Spanish schools abroad. With the legislative reforms carried out in 1965, schooling was divided into eight grades, from ages five to six up to 13–14 years old. In the eighth grade (ages 13–14), the introduction of the foreign language was established to provide students with the knowledge and habits that allowed them to speak, understand, read and write the language. Yet it was in the secondary education stage (from ages 11 to 16) where the foreign language was studied in a systematic way and where specialised language teachers became the norm (Madrid, 2017).

1.1 The Consolidation of Modern Languages in the Spanish Education System

During the 1960s, modern languages experienced an extraordinary boom in Spain, which was associated with rapid economic growth, especially with tourism, and new scientific and technological advances. Europe was moving towards its unification and expansion, and in this process, it was considered that the study and promotion of European languages was fundamental. In 1954, the member states of the Council of Europe signed the *European Cultural Convention* by which the signatory countries committed themselves to the promotion of foreign languages in order to enhance better understanding among Europeans and to consolidate European unity.

The national curriculum in the 1960s established that the objective of teaching a foreign language was to develop the student's oral and written communication, although this legislation recommended that the teaching method should be active and that oral expression was to be developed in conversations and dialogues and with the help of recordings; in practice, however, the didactic techniques of the grammar-translation method prevailed (Fernández Fraile, 1996). In fact, in external examinations, students were asked to translate a text from a second language (L2) to their first language (L1) without the use of the dictionary.

In order to reinforce the training of language teachers, the Ministry of Education and Science created the English departments at the Spanish universities in the 1960s, and the 1967 study plan was designed at primary school teacher training colleges (Madrid, 2000). At that time, school pre-service teachers could study French or English throughout their training period, but the vast majority would normally choose English, given that at the end of the 1960s, the interest and demand for the English language had far surpassed that of French, which had predominated in the previous years.

1.2 From the Audiolingual Method to the Communicative Approach

With the *General Education Law*, passed in 1970, the teaching of foreign languages was strongly influenced by audiolingual methodology (Brooks, 1966; Rivers, 1964) and behaviourism (Skinner, 1957). This influence was clearly reflected in the pedagogical orientations offered by the Spanish Ministry of Education (*New Orientations for the Basic and General Education*) published in 1970. According to these official guidelines, the learning of the foreign language was to reinforce the general objectives of education and those specific to the language area. The introduction of the L2 started during the second stage of basic education, in grade six (age 12). This legislation recommended the acquisition of a foreign language as a communication tool, which could also favour familiarity with other cultures and help encourage future commercial, technical and cultural exchanges with other countries.

1.3 The Early Teaching and Learning of Foreign Languages

One of the most important innovations in foreign language teaching in Spain during the 1970s was the early introduction of L2 training in the first years of schooling (Madrid, 1980). At the time, legislation took into account the extraordinary plasticity of children's brains (Lenneberg, 1967); their excellent imitation capacity and adaptability; their ease to distinguish, imitate and articulate sounds and to acquire a good level of phonological control (Oyama, 1976); as well as their spontaneity and lack of inhibitions. For all these reasons, the *General Law of Education*, for the first time in the Spanish education history, recommended the need to start the study of foreign languages at an earlier age and provided several methodological considerations to be taken into account in those cases where schools decided to start from grade three, at the age of eight. Since then, the early teaching of foreign languages has been developed in almost all schools, and at present, most early learning educational

institutions begin with the teaching of English from infant education (ages three to five) (Cortina-Pérez & Andújar, 2018).

1.4 The Integration of Contents and the Foreign Language

In the 1980s, the Spanish Ministry of Education published the reformed programmes of basic education in which the influence of the notional and functional curriculum (Wilkins, 1976) and communicative language teaching methodology was decisive (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Johnson & Morrow, 1981; Widdowson, 1972, 1978). The structural paradigm employed previously was highly criticised and replaced by the principles of speech act theory (Searle, 1969) and the pragmatics paradigm (Leech, 1983) in foreign language teaching (van Ek & Alexander, 1975). It is in this decade when the integration of curricular contents and the foreign language emerged, denominated in origin *content-based instruction* (CBI) (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Snow & Brinton, 1997). This approach introduced the use of an L2 as a medium of instruction for imparting certain school curricular subjects, although it was not until the early twenty-first century that mass adoption of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) would take place (see Ortega-Martín & Trujillo, 2018). In those schools where CLIL has been adopted, generally two or three curricular subjects are taught in an L2 (normally English) at all educational levels, from early childhood education to university.

1.5 Examples of the Integration of Contents and the L2 in Spanish Textbooks

In the 1980s, a number of English textbooks published in Spain included activities that integrated the study of content and the L2. For example, McLaren and Madrid, in their English textbook *Let's Write*, published by Miñón (Valladolid) in 1983 for grade seven students of primary education (age 13), introduced a teaching unit on *Our Nature* and the different types of lands: farms, the wood, mountainous areas and the desert.

Another lesson dealt with the *Water Cycle*, where children studied the formation of clouds from sea water and how rain and snow are produced. In *Use Your English*, for grade eight (age 14), they studied *Oil-Petroleum*: its formation from the decomposition of animals and plants buried below ground, its extraction in oil wells, refineries, distribution and use as fuel. Another example included a teaching unit on *Pollution*: contamination caused by factories, aerosols and motorised transport vehicles. The presentation of these contents was accompanied by linguistic activities whereby students studied and revised certain grammatical, lexical, phonetic and pragmatic aspects of the English language. At university level, Madrid, Muros, Pérez and Cordovilla also published *Education Through English*, *Physical Education Through English* and *Music Through English* for the Spanish Faculties of Education students (Cordovilla, Madrid, Muros, & Pérez, 1999; Madrid, Pérez, Muros, & Cordovilla, 1998; Muros, Pérez, Madrid, & Cordovilla, 1998).

1.6 Implementation and Development of CLIL in Spain

Despite the advances of bilingual instruction in other international contexts, the *General Organic Law of the Educational System (LOGSE)* passed in 1990 did not mention this modality of learning. Thanks to the focus on the communicative approach, however, teachers frequently introduced topics and contents in class which favoured authentic communication, and an important emphasis was placed not only on grammatical aspects of texts but also on content. In this sense, classes were message oriented and activities often included authentic language, relevant topics and problem-solving tasks, all of which are aspects which were to later form an integral part of CLIL training.

In addition to the influence of *communicative language teaching* in the development of CLIL, other approaches that shared several characteristics also contributed to its consolidation (Madrid & García-Sánchez, 2001). These approaches included language for specific purposes (Stevens, 1977), cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA) (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994) and the task-based approach

(Estaire & Zanón, 1994; Willis, 1996). In spite of the impetus of all these developments, it was necessary to wait until the first years of the twenty-first century for CLIL programmes to be regulated and implemented in the Spanish autonomous communities (Ortega-Martín & Trujillo, 2018).

In the case of Andalusia, one of the pioneering regions in the creation of bilingual schools, the implementation of CLIL programmes started with the *Plan for the Promotion of Multilingualism*, approved in March 2005 by the Office of Education of the Andalusian Local Authorities (CEJA, 2005). Subsequent publications have provided useful information for the functioning and management of bilingual schools in the Spanish autonomous communities. These publications include the informative guide for bilingual schools (CEJA, 2011), where valuable information is provided on bilingual schools, bilingual coordination, the roles of language and non-language teachers, language assistants, students and families, materials and resources, and certain European projects of interest for the stakeholders professional development.

In the last two decades, Spain has made efforts to address its historic deficit in the teaching and learning of foreign languages by assuming a leading position in the European context in relation to the implementation of CLIL programmes (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010), as acknowledged by Coyle (2010, p. viii):

Spain is rapidly becoming one of the European leaders in CLIL practice and research. The richness of its cultural and linguistic diversity has led to a wide variety of CLIL policies and practices which provide us with many examples of CLIL in different stages of development that are applicable to contexts both within and beyond Spain. (Coyle, 2010, p. viii)

In this sense, Pérez-Cañado (2011, 2012) has recognised the value of Spain as a language education laboratory and as a country where the many possibilities offered by CLIL can be appreciated: “Spain could well serve as a model for the multiple possibilities offered by the broader CLIL spectrum and thus for other countries seeking to implement it” (2011, p. 327).

Subsequent laws, such as *the Organic Law for Quality Improvement of Education* (LOMCE), published in 2013, also support plurilingualism and, indeed, contemplate the establishment of CLIL programmes in autonomous communities. As Pérez-Cañado (2012) has pointed out, then, bolstered by the previous political and social factors, CLIL has had an exponential uptake in Spain and across Europe over the past two decades, and it seems to be for the foreseeable future the most popular approach for the teaching and learning of foreign languages.

2 CLIL in School Curricula

In Spain, early childhood education starts at the age of zero and finishes by age five and is divided into two stages. At age six, children attend primary education for six years. This stage is divided into three “cycles” of two years each; this is followed by compulsory secondary education (CSE) for another four years, and after that, there are two years of pre-university preparation (*Bachillerato*). Alternatively, students can opt for further education (vocational training) or enter the job market at 16 years of age. Nevertheless, it is not an easy task to consider the implementation of CLIL across all of Spain, since there is no single unifying legislative document for the whole country, but instead, different laws, orders and instructions that should be followed in each of the 17 different autonomous governments. Additionally, the design of the current regulations is, in some cases, far removed from the everyday realities present in certain of schools.

Thus, we can speak of resources that are, on occasion, not available or are insufficient, or we may theorise in excess, and we often lack recommendations of a practical, organisational or methodological nature. In this section, then, we will consider the four essential pillars in the implementation of bilingual education in schools: the management of the schools, the coordination of the programmes, the teaching staff and the students involved.

2.1 Importance of School Management

Ortega-Martín, Hughes, and Madrid (2018) carried out an exhaustive study reviewing the schools' operations in Spain in terms of quality, scrutinising the factors that can more decisively influence the implementation of bilingual teaching in this country: management, coordination, teachers and students. In the first case, the school management is considered to be the essential element for the proper development of bilingual plans because it is the knowledge that the leadership team has of the said programme, the elements included, the difficulties entailed and the additional efforts involved for the teaching staff, students and families that will determine the success of the development of the bilingual education curriculum.

Indeed, the leadership exercised by the management team (first pillar) often translates into a constant and positive supervision of the teaching and learning processes; this is reflected in the systematic support for the task carried out by the team members, who ensure the correct use and availability of the materials and maintain a fluid and constant relationship with the educational administration. Leadership involvement also ensures compliance with published regulations and instructions, as well as the correct provision of material and human resources. The educational administrations, in turn, oversee adequate training of the management teams and facilitate information in terms of managerial and methodological practices.

The role of the bilingual coordinator (second pillar) involves having not only the necessary theoretical and legislative knowledge but also methodological experience that enables them to provide solutions for those diverse and potentially problematic situations which may arise at the school. It is expected that those with the responsibility for the coordination of bilingual programmes will be able to solve doubts, propose possible methodological adjustments, offer teaching resources and address issues such as diversity and differentiation in the classrooms. Yet the figure of the bilingual coordinator does not have the same role nationwide. Ortega-Martín and Trujillo (2018), for example, indicate significant differences between the different autonomous communities when establishing criteria for the selection of

coordinators, the benefits they can have by assuming such tasks or their expected roles in the school.

The task of developing the curriculum in the bilingual classroom rests primarily with the teaching staff, which often requires levels of training that may not have been accessed. With regard to the requisites for providing bilingual teaching, the tendency is for all autonomous communities to demand a C1 level established by the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR, 2001).

The state and regional education administrations, however, do provide teachers with different resources for continuing education, as well as stays abroad and courses for methodological renewal. Additionally, there are a growing number of networks for bilingual education across the country. This cooperative work between schools may be seen at the Community of Castilla and León with the *Observation-Action Innovation Project* for the 2017–2018 academic year (<http://www.educa.jcyl.es/educacyl/cm>), which gives greater visibility to the good practice of the schools and serves as a training tool for others. The objective of this particular project is to promote, through observation and exchange, teacher training and professional development in scientific, didactic and communicative competence in foreign languages, as well as ICT skills, competence in innovation and improvement and competence in teamwork. It also aims to provide the necessary support for the development of innovation projects and methodological changes in the classroom.

2.2 Teachers and Students

One of the great challenges for teachers (third pillar) is the use of information and communication technologies. This is particularly true for bilingual education, which often relies heavily on online resources. According to the *General Activity Plan 2013–2014, Detection of good ICT practices* (2014) of the Regional Government of Andalucía, good use of ICT increases motivation, improves the classroom environment, favours autonomous production, reinforces communication with families and serves as support for attention to diversity. This same report detects weaknesses, including the lack of well-maintained equipment, the incorrect

application of these resources in schools, a lack of attention to diversity when using ICTs or insufficient use of the resources provided by the administration.

The fourth pillar mentioned would be the students themselves since they are the ones who stand to benefit from the result of the appropriate implementation of the curriculum in the classroom, from a methodology that adapts to their current level of foreign language competence and from the learning of contents in an effective and accessible way. The concern of educational administrations in Spain is that bilingual education should not be elitist or classist, and this requires that schools must strive to have web pages, blogs and free platforms (e.g., Edmodo, SeeSaw) that offer adequate resources and make bilingual education an element of social balance that offers the same possibilities to all students.

The fifth factor to consider in bilingual schools is the conversation assistant. By virtue of bilateral agreements with countries from (mostly) European and some non-EU countries, the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training annually hires a relatively large number of teaching assistants, who spend a maximum of 12 hours per week in the school in a non-supervisory, auxiliary role. In the Autonomous Community of Madrid, for example, the maximum number of assistants for 2018 was 2618, with a total expenditure of 22 million euros.

2.3 Hours of Instruction in the Second Language

Madrid has a longer tradition than the rest of the other autonomous communities in the implementation of bilingual education. After Madrid, the second most long-running programme is that of the regional government of Andalusia which introduced CLIL training on a large scale under the *Plan for the Promotion of Multilingualism* (CEJA, 2005; Jáimez & López Morillas, 2011). In this plan, the bases of bilingual education in Andalusia were established and subsequently updated by the educational administration. This plan also meant that students in the second cycle of early childhood education (three to six years) should receive one and a half hours of foreign language instruction per week each year (spread over three sessions a week). Students in the first cycle of primary education

(ages seven and eight) were to receive two hours a week divided into three days, if deemed appropriate by the school. For students in the second and third cycles (ages nine to ten and 11–12), the subjects to be taught in a foreign language were specified and included social sciences, education for citizenship, natural sciences, physical education and arts and crafts. Legislation also stipulated that the subjects taught under the bilingual modality should employ the L2 for at least 50% of the total teaching time. In the case of Andalusia, for example, a second foreign language was also included in the bilingual schools.

For secondary education, it was originally stipulated (CEJA, 2005) that the students in the first three years (ages 13, 14 and 15) were to have four hours per week of teaching in a foreign language. In the fourth and final year of CSE, the hours would be increased to five per week. At present, and according to the *Instructions of the Junta de Andalucía* for the 2018–2019 academic year, the distribution of hours per week is as follows in Table 2.1.

The curriculum to be taught in a foreign language is left to the choice of the school, taking into consideration the training and preparation of the teaching staff involved.

Table 2.1 Example of distribution of hours per week in the Andalusian bilingual schools (CEJA, 2018)

	1st CSE	2nd CSE	3rd CSE	4th CSE
Geography and History	3	3	3	3
Biology and Geology	3		2	
Physics and Chemistry		3	2	
Mathematics	4	3		
Academic Mathematics or Applied Mathematics			4	4
Physical Education	2	2	2	2
Visual, Audiovisual and Manual Arts	2	2		
Music	2	2		

2.4 Methodology

With respect to methodology, administrations suggest certain actions but do not impose a concrete style of teaching. Thus, the Andalusian government published the *Informative Guide for Schools with Bilingual Teaching* (CEJA, 2011) in which there is no mention of specific methodological recommendations; details are provided, however, of the characteristics of the CLIL approach, which includes the following:

- Flexible work by tasks or projects
- Meaningful learning, focused on the students and integration of L2 as a vehicle for other areas or professional training courses
- Classes contextualised around a theme that creates synergies between different departments
- Collaborative and cooperative work of teacher groups
- Use of multiple resources, especially ICT
- Promotion of teamwork among teachers, contributing to sharing and creating common methods and activities

It is also noted that the teaching of a subject in a foreign language does not imply the same effort on the part of the learner as the same process in the mother tongue. Hence, there is a need to use different tools when considering the learning situation and to include multiple situations in which the contents are repeated to consolidate learning.

Of all the recommendations made by the Andalusian government, the need for teamwork is emphasised, as it combines criteria, defines common goals and distributes tasks among teachers. Guidelines also recommend the use of tasks or projects rather than more passive approaches, and promote the presentation of final projects as a culmination of the work that is done in a didactic unit.

At the classroom level, one of the most widely used tools is the Integrated Unit of Work. With this type of planning strategy, the concept of classroom as four walls that separate teachers from the rest of the staff or from the reality external to the school disappears, and work is encouraged among the teaching professionals from different areas or subjects with a series of common objectives.

The three steps that are established for the correct development of an integrated didactic unit are the selection of objectives by the teachers involved, the didactic transposition, in other words, the development of a task in the subjects involved and, finally, assessment, for which the use of rubrics that detail the degree of acquisition of the proposed competences is recommended.

In the latest methodological guidelines published by the Andalusian Government, emphasis is placed on the use of the CLIL approach as well as on the use of the European Language Portfolio, both in its paper version and in the electronic format (ePEL). In these recent guidelines published for the academic year 2018–2019, it is detailed that the curriculum to be taught in the foreign language will be between 50% and 100% of the non-language subject areas that make use of English, French or German as the vehicular language. It is also advised that greater use should be made of the foreign language, and, if possible, 100% of class time should be in the L2.

Finally, with regard to assessment, the foreign language teachers are the ones who assess the linguistic competence of the students taking into account the basic receptive, productive and interactive skills and the levels established by CEFR. In the content class, the assessment of linguistic production, if substandard, cannot negatively influence the final assessment of the area (CEJA, 2018). Additionally, the percentage of time assigned to the use of the L2 in the subjects taught in a foreign language is to be made public for the educational community.

3 The Current State of CLIL and Its Challenges

After more than a decade of experiences in CLIL in Spain, we are now in a position to tentatively examine the effects and consequences of this type of instruction. Focusing primarily on this particular national context, in this section, we will examine how CLIL has affected performance, both in terms of L2 development and content acquisition. Additionally, we will provide information obtained from those professionals involved at

school level, including L2 and subject teachers as well as school management and bilingual coordinators.

3.1 Effects on L2 Development and General Satisfaction with CLIL

The positive effects of CLIL or bilingual training on L2 development have been detected in a variety of international contexts (see Dallinger, Jonkmann, Holm, & Fiege, 2016). This trend is also reflected in Spain in several studies at different educational levels.

One example can be seen in Ruiz de Zarobe's (2008) longitudinal study, with a sample of 161 students from Secondary Education in the Basque Country in Northern Spain, which compared performance in oral production based on the related subcategories of: (a) pronunciation, (b) vocabulary, (c) grammar, (d) fluency and (e) content. In this study, CLIL groups significantly outperformed non-CLIL groups in all subcategories, leading the authors to conclude that higher levels of exposure to L2 in content-based subjects led to positive outcomes in oral performance.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009), on the other hand, examined attitudes (e.g. perceived usefulness, importance, necessity and interest) towards the foreign language and mother tongue(s) in a study with a sample of 287 secondary students from four Basque schools. The authors found significant differences between non-CLIL and CLIL students, with the latter holding more favourable attitudes towards English, and they suggest that among the reasons for these differences, CLIL seems to provide higher levels of L2 exposure and affords more meaningful opportunities to employ the target language.

Another study by Lasagabaster (2008) in the Basque country with 198 secondary students found statistically significant differences in speaking, writing, grammar and listening in favour of CLIL groups. Additionally, one of the participating CLIL groups, comprised of students who had received only one year of CLIL instruction, also outperformed the non-CLIL groups in all of the above areas with the exception of listening comprehension.

In Barcelona, Pérez-Vidal and Roquet (2015) examined the performance of 100 lower secondary school students over the course of an academic year in listening, reading and writing. In this study, while significant differences were not found in listening, CLIL learners did significantly outperform non-CLIL students in reading and writing, and within the latter case, students showed better results in grammar and vocabulary. Similarly, Lahuerta's (2017) study, with a sample of 400 secondary school students in Asturias, northern Spain, found significant differences in global writing scores and individual writing components in favour of CLIL.

The study of Villoria, Hughes, and Madrid (2001) in primary and secondary education in public, semi-private and private schools in Granada, southern Spain, also found statistically significant differences in performance between CLIL and non-CLIL students. In this particular study, in which a total of 196 state school students participated, CLIL students in public primary and secondary education outperformed public non-CLIL students in receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills.

To examine satisfaction regarding CLIL programmes, Rodríguez-Sabiote, Madrid, Ortega-Martín, and Hughes (2018) carried out a study involving 1983 participants (headteachers, bilingual coordinators, language and non-language teachers, and students) across different provinces in Spain, and the results indicate relatively high levels of satisfaction among all stakeholders. This study shows some statistically significant differences, however, between certain groups of participants depending on the region researched. Additionally, participating students showed higher levels of satisfaction with language instruction than with bilingual content classes.

3.2 Effects of CLIL on L1 Competence and Content Acquisition

For the most part, studies on CLIL in Spain deal with the effects of this instructional modality on L2 development and relatively little is to be found in terms of how CLIL influences performance in other subject areas. Moreover, as discussed below, the few studies that do exist do not

always use comparable testing instruments, nor do they tend to focus on learners who have had a substantial number of hours of L2 training.

When looking at mother tongue (Spanish) and content subjects, the question of comparable testing is more of an issue for bilingual content classes, since unlike the L1 classes, they are conducted in more than one language, and this plurilingual reality makes the use of identical instruments near impossible. While the case of content subjects is discussed below, it would appear useful to at least briefly touch upon the possible effects CLIL may have on mother tongue development. Here, in the subject of L1 (Spanish), a frequently expressed concern is whether or not the increased time spent learning through the L2 in other classes is detrimental to the students' own language. Several studies conducted in Spain, however, indicate that there are no significantly negative effects (see Anghel, Cabrales, & Carro, 2016; González Gándara, 2015; Ramos, Ortega-Martín, & Madrid, 2011).

In terms of the effects of CLIL on content acquisition, it would seem reasonable to envisage that, at best, the use of instruction of non-language subjects through L2 would not have a significant negative effect on learner performance; on the other hand, there could be a real risk of students not fully grasping what is being taught. To a large degree, both of these situations are reflected in several studies in Spain.

Madrid's (2011) study, for example, measures performance in social sciences in primary and secondary education in private, semi-private and public schools. Within the sample, those groups which were directly comparable (i.e., public schools) showed no significant differences in scores in this subject area. Fernández-Sanjurjo, Fernández-Costales, and Arias Blanco (2017) conducted a study in primary education and found that non-CLIL students had slightly better performance than CLIL learners, but these differences, again, were not significant.

In contrast, Anghel et al. (2016) examined student performance in standardised tests on mathematics and general knowledge (taught in English) at the final stages of primary education. In this study, no significant differences were found between CLIL and non-CLIL learners in mathematics (taught in L1); however, significant differences were found in the subject of general knowledge (taught in L2).

Further rigorous and comparable investigation is still required in Spain. Additionally, it should be remembered that learners in primary education have had relatively little time to acquire sufficient language skills in order to be able to function in content subjects in a foreign language at relatively similar levels to peers in their mother tongue. Given time, it is possible that higher levels of L2 competence may allow CLIL learners to perform on a more equal footing to their non-CLIL peers and that possible early levels of underperformance might be tolerated if, by the end of compulsory education stages, CLIL learners obtain similar levels in content results with the added benefit of increased communicative competence in L2. This phenomenon of low performance levels in primary and more equal results in secondary education is certainly a possibility and may be seen in other international contexts (e.g., Jäppinen, 2006; Seikkula-Leino, 2007).

In addition to comparisons of scores from performance tests, we also have certain stakeholder information on the functioning of CLIL schools in Spain. In the previously mentioned study by Rodríguez-Sabiote et al. (2018), we found an overall satisfaction score for the CLIL programmes of approximately four points out of a total of five. Here, the highest scores were provided by school management teams (4.51), followed by the English language teachers and subject teachers (4.22) and bilingual coordinators (4.09). All of these scores would suggest acceptable levels of satisfaction with the programme.

In terms of the learners themselves, the mean score for satisfaction was 3.7, although there was a significant level of variability based on their autonomous region, with student scores ranging from 3.3, in areas such as Galicia or the Canary Islands, to 4.2 in Navarre.

This study also pointed out a series of repeated strong points and areas of improvement which could be seen in several learning contexts. Among the strong points, we find areas such as:

- High levels of teacher motivation and involvement in the programme
- Development of language skills and key competences for life-long learning
- Positive students' perception of the usefulness of English
- Increased participation in international projects and student exchanges

- Degree of participation in teacher training courses
- Diversification in learning materials and teaching methods
- Level of student engagement and participation in class

A number of these strong points are corroborated in other national research projects. Pérez-Cañado's (2018) study with 2633 participants in three monolingual regions in Spain found that advances were being made in the application of CLIL methodology and use of materials.

In terms of areas of improvement, Rodríguez-Sabiote et al. (2018) identify the following areas:

- Lack of L2 competence on the part of some teachers
- Need for provision of teacher training
- Need to increase scope of student participation in exchanges
- Availability of ICTs for the programme
- Overdependence in some cases on the textbook
- Insufficient attention paid to cultural aspects
- High numbers of students per class
- Difficulties in catering to diverse levels in class
- Need for greater levels of coordination
- High levels of turnover among content teachers
- Lack of availability of CLIL-specific materials

Again, several of these points, including aspects such as teacher training and attention to diversity, are also mentioned in Pérez-Cañado (2018).

From these results we can extract a number of tentative conclusions. First, in this particular study, there are relatively homogenous levels of satisfaction between those professional groups involved in the bilingual programme. At this point, it might be worth indicating once more that, while recognising the similarity in results, the highest levels of satisfaction came from the school headteachers. This apparent approval is arguably vital for the proper functioning for the programme. At the same time, the support from all sectors of the professionals involved would tend to show that the additional efforts involved are worthwhile.

On the other hand, there is a high degree of variability in student satisfaction scores depending on the region where the programme is

implemented. This situation would seem to suggest that CLIL benefits are not equally distributed and that the reality of the difficulties involved are experienced in the content class. However, the fact that some schools have high levels of learner satisfaction points to the possibility that certain approaches, as well as variables related to the availability of qualified personnel and other contextual factors, might provide better learning outcomes.

4 CLIL to Come

Since the introduction of language learning in official school curricula in the mid-1800s, efforts have been made to continuously improve learners' L2 competence. These efforts have not always led to the implementation of recommendations at ground level and it has often been the case that communicative approaches have been resisted by practising teachers. Despite these limitations, with the advent of widespread CLIL implementation and the legislation which encourages language teachers to adopt task-based learning and project work and to employ CEFR type indicators of performance, it would seem that language classroom practices are changing for the better.

While this may seem like good news in terms of the provision of language instruction and the development of learner communicative competence, there is still the question of the usefulness of the CLIL training in relation to content acquisition. It is true that CLIL has, to a large extent, brought a series of important positive methodological changes into the content class; but these changes are also accompanied by a series of limitations, such as the lack of teaching resources or lower levels of L2 competence among teaching professionals, particularly in certain regions.

In Spain, at least, ongoing research is required to ensure that the path taken in adopting CLIL is the most appropriate for students. At the same time, actions are needed to guarantee that high quality CLIL training is in place, not only through the measurement of perceived levels of satisfaction, but also through large-scale objective and reliable performance testing.

In discussing the future of CLIL, Pérez-Cañado (2012) highlights the need for the following avenues of research:

- Empirical research into major recurrent questions, including effects on L1 and L2 development as well as content-related results
- Longitudinal studies which go beyond snapshot testing
- Closer investigation into root causes behind results
- Identification of stakeholder needs
- Study of the methodology employed
- Examination of teacher support and training

These areas of research are still pertinent today, yet there is an emerging trend, stemming, among other areas, from the Council of Europe and the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) towards the creation of support instruments for teacher competence. Indeed, one current ECML project at its final stages aims to develop a Common European Framework for Teacher Competence, and related forthcoming publications from this organisation are likely to touch upon the role of the CLIL teacher. It is also expected that an international focus on CLIL systems will, in turn, lead to further improvement and support actions for content teachers across Europe, and this will be of particular interest in Spain, where there has been such an important adoption of this type of instruction. While these initiatives are ongoing, large-scale research into the continued supervision of CLIL results is still needed, particularly in the area of performance in content subjects.

References

- Anghel, B., Cabrales, A., & Carro, J. M. (2016). Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: The impact beyond foreign language learning. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(2), 1202–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12305>
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based Second Language Instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Brooks, N. (1966). *Language and Language Learning*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Brumfit, C. J., & Johnson, K. (Eds.). (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). (2001). *A Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Learning, Teaching Assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- CEJA (Consejería de Educación de la Junta de Andalucía). (2005). *Plan de Fomento de Plurilingüismo: Una Política Lingüística para la Sociedad Andaluza*. Retrieved November 28, 2018, from <http://cms.ual.es/idc/groups/public/@vic/@vinternacional/documents/documento/jc80302.pdf>
- CEJA. (2011). *Guía Informativa para Centros de Enseñanza Bilingüe*. Retrieved December 20, 2018, from https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/export/drupaljda/Guia_informativa_centros_ense%C3%B1anza_bilingue_.pdf
- CEJA. (2018). Instrucciones sobre la Organización y Funcionamiento de la Enseñanza Bilingüe para el curso 2018–19. Retrieved December 22, 2018, from <https://bit.ly/2Sp1jwA>
- Chamot, A. V., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Cordovilla, A., Madrid, D., Muros, J., & Pérez, C. (1999). *Physical Education through English*. Granada: Grupo Editorial Universitario.
- Cortina-Pérez, B., & Andújar, A. (2018). *Didáctica de la Lengua Extranjera en Educación Infantil*. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Coyle, D. (2010). Preface. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. R. de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation Results and Teacher Training* (pp. vii–viii). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dallinger, S., Jonkmann, K., Holm, J., & Fiege, C. (2016). The effect of content and language integrated learning on students' English and history competences—Killing two birds with one stone? *Learning and Instruction*, 41, 23–31.
- Estaire, S., & Zanón, J. (1994). *Planning Classwork: A Task-based Approach*. Oxford: Heineman.
- Fernández Fraile, M. E. (1996). *La enseñanza-aprendizaje del francés como lengua extranjera en España: 1767–1936*. Tesis doctoral. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Fernández-Costales, A., & Arias Blanco, J. M. (2017). Analysing students' content-learning in science in CLIL vs. Non-CLIL programmes: Empirical evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1294142>

- González Gándara, D. (2015). CLIL in Galicia: Repercussions on academic performance. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 8(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2014.8.1.2>
- Jáimez, S., & López Morillas, A. M. (2011). The Andalusian Plurilingual Programme in primary and secondary education. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 77–106). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Jäppinen, A. K. (2006). CLIL and future learning. In S. Björklund, S. K. Mård-Miettinen, M. Bergström, & M. Södergard (Eds.), *Exploring Dual-Focused Education: Integrating Language and Content for Individual and Societal Needs* (pp. 22–37). Vaasa: Vaasan Yliopiston Julkaisuja.
- Johnson, K., & Morrow, K. (Eds.). (1981). *Communication in the Classroom*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Lahuerta, A. (2017). Analysis of the effect of CLIL programmes on the written competence of secondary education students. *Revista de Filología*, 35, 169–184.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1, 31–42.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4–17.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Lenneberg, E. (1967). *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.
- Madrid, D. (1980). *Estudio experimental sobre la enseñanza del inglés de 6 a 8 años*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of English Studies, University of Granada, Granada. Retrieved October 20, 2018, from <https://www.ugr.es/~dmadrid/Publicaciones/PublicoGEN.htm>
- Madrid, D. (2000). La didáctica de la lengua extranjera. In L. Rico Romero & D. Madrid (Eds.), *Fundamentos Didácticos de las Áreas Curriculares* (pp. 249–310). Madrid: Síntesis.
- Madrid, D. (2011). Monolingual and bilingual students' competence in social sciences. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 195–222). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Madrid, D. (2017). La formación de los maestros de inglés a lo largo de la historia. *Greta*, 20(1 & 2), 36–53.
- Madrid, D., & García-Sánchez, E. (2001). Content-based second language teaching. In E. G. Sánchez (Ed.), *Present and Future Trends in TEFL* (pp. 101–134). Universidad de Almería: Secretariado de publicaciones.
- Madrid, D., Pérez, C., Muros, J., & Cordovilla, A. (1998). *Education through English*. Granada: Grupo Editorial Universitario.

- Morales, F. J. (2009). La enseñanza de idiomas en España en la frontera de los años 30 : las ilusiones perdidas. *Documents pour l'Histoire du Français Langue Étrangère ou Seconde*, 42, 231–248. Retrieved September 20, 2018, from <https://journals.openedition.org/dhflles/785>
- Muros, J., Pérez, C., Madrid, D., & Cordovilla, A. (1998). *Music through English*. Granada: Grupo Editorial Universitario.
- Ortega-Martín, J. L., Hughes, S. P., & Madrid, D. (2018). *Influencia de la Política Educativa de Centro en la Enseñanza Bilingüe en España*. Madrid: MECED. Retrieved September 10, 2018, from <https://sede.educacion.gob.es/publiventa/influencia-de-la-politica-educativa-de-centro-en-la-ensenanza-bilingue-en-espana/ensenanza-lenguas-espana/22358>
- Ortega-Martín, J. L., & Trujillo, F. (2018). Legislación y normativa para el funcionamiento de los programas AICLE en España. In J. L. Ortega-Martín, S. Hughes, & D. Madrid (Eds.), *Influencia de la Política Educativa en la Enseñanza Bilingüe* (pp. 21–30). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia y Deporte (MECD).
- Oyama, S. (1976). A sensitive period in the acquisition of a non-native phonological system. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 5(3), 261–283.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2011). The effects of CLIL within the APPP: Lessons learned and ways forward. In R. Crespo & M. G. de Sola (Eds.), *Studies in Honour of Ángeles Linde López* (pp. 389–406). Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 315–341.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2018). CLIL and pedagogical innovation: Fact or fiction. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12208>
- Pérez-Vidal, C., & Roquet, H. (2015). CLIL in context: Profiling language abilities. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based Language Learning in Multilingual Educational Environments* (pp. 237–255). Berlin: Springer.
- Ramos, A. M., Ortega-Martín, J. L., & Madrid, D. (2011). Bilingualism and competence in the mother tongue. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 135–156). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Rivers, W. (1964). *The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rodríguez-Sabiote, C., Madrid, D., Ortega-Martín, J. L., & Hughes, S. P. (2018). Resultados y Conclusiones sobre la Calidad de los Programas AICLE

- en España. In J. L. Ortega-Martín, S. Hughes, & D. Madrid (Eds.), *Influencia de la política educativa en la enseñanza bilingüe* (pp. 141–159). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia y Deporte (MECD).
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2008). CLIL and foreign language learning: A longitudinal study in the Basque country. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1, 60–73.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Lasagabaster, D. (Eds.). (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). CLIL learning: Achievement levels and affective factors. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 328–341.
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal Behaviour*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1997). *The Content-based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*. New York: Longman.
- Stevens, P. D. (1977). *New Orientations in the Teaching of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Ek, J. A., & Alexander, L. G. (1975). *Threshold Level English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Villoria, J., Hughes, S., & Madrid, D. (2001). Learning English and learning through English. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 157–194). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1972). The teaching of English as communication. *English Language Teaching*, 27(1), 15–18.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. London: Longman.