

Master's Dissertation/
Trabajo Fin de Máster

A COMPARATIVE RESEARCH STUDY ABOUT CLIL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE REGION OF MURCIA

Student: Llamas García, Beatriz

Supervisor: Dr. Piotr Romanowski
Department: English Philology

July, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	4
1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1. Theoretical contextualisation of CLIL. Definition and characteristics.....	6
2.2. CLIL evolution in Europe and Spain.	7
2.3. Regulations for the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia.	9
2.4. Factors affecting CLIL.....	11
2.5. Educational agents involved in CLIL	12
2.6. Practical implementation of CLIL	14
2.6.1. Student-centered methodologies.....	14
2.6.2. Materials and resources	15
2.6.3. Evaluation.....	17
2.7. Previous research on CLIL	18
2.7.1. The effects of CLIL on L1, L2, and content learning.....	18
2.7.2. Outcomes from previous studies and the need for further knowledge through new lines of investigation.....	19
3. JUSTIFICATION AND AIM	21
4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	22
4.1. Type of research study	22
4.2. Population	23
4.3. Data collection instrument	25
4.4. Data collection procedure	26
4.5. Techniques for data analysis	27
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	28
6. CONCLUSIONS	32
7. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND IMPROVEMENT PROPOSALS.....	34

8. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS 35

9. REFERENCES 36

10. ANNEXES 42

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a research study that seeks to collect the perceptions of students, teachers and parents regarding CLIL implementation in the Region of Murcia. To achieve this objective, information was gathered through the distribution of Likert-scale questionnaires to 97 participants who belonged to one of the three stakeholder groups. The questionnaires focused on 7 key aspects of CLIL implementation: theoretical characteristics of CLIL, factors affecting the teaching-learning process, educational agents, student-centered methodologies, materials and resources, evaluation and effects on L1, L2 and content learning. The main findings were that the overall perceived impressions concerning the way CILL is being practically implemented are generally favourable, however, notable variations exist within the students' cohort and across this cohort and the ones corresponding to teachers and parents.

Key words: CLIL, Region of Murcia, perceptions, students, teachers, parents.

RESUMEN

Este trabajo presenta un estudio de investigación que pretende recoger las opiniones de estudiantes, profesores y padres sobre la implantación del AICLE en la Región de Murcia. Para ello, se recogieron datos mediante cuestionarios en escala Likert distribuidos a 97 participantes pertenecientes a alguno de estos tres grupos de interés. Los cuestionarios se centraban en 7 aspectos clave de la implantación del AICLE: características teóricas del AICLE, factores que afectan al proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje, agentes educativos, metodologías centradas en el alumno, materiales y recursos, evaluación y efectos sobre el aprendizaje de L1, L2 y contenidos. Las principales conclusiones fueron que las impresiones percibidas respecto a la implementación práctica del AICLE son en general favorables; sin embargo, se pueden encontrar diferencias estadísticamente significativas dentro de la cohorte de estudiantes y entre esta cohorte y las correspondientes a profesores y padres.

Key words: AICLE, Región de Murcia, percepciones, estudiantes, profesores, padres.

1. INTRODUCTION

The globalised world in which we live is forcing us as a society to adapt to new ways of carrying out various aspects of our lives. Of course, this affects education and, for granted, languages. Foreign languages must be promoted in order to achieve the internationalisation of citizens and enable their interaction by breaking down the barriers between one country and another. That said, there is a need to create an approach that links both aspects, an education that makes it possible to improve the second language proficiency to which we aspire.

One of the measures taken to this end has been the implementation of a new teaching system called CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), a concept coined by David Marsh in 1994, which has brought about a revolution in foreign language teaching in European countries. Thus, being recognised as the European approach to bilingual education, significant attention is being focused on this methodology, which is becoming more and more widespread in our classrooms. However, this is not without controversy, as there is still a notable knowledge gap regarding what CLIL actually is and its proper implementation. That is why, with this study, I intend to dispel some of these doubts, going into the classrooms to see how it is really developed. The specific context of the Region of Murcia, which is where I am located, will be the one considered, seeking to know the perspectives of the three main agents involved: students, teachers and families.

Thus, the main topic of the study will be CLIL implementation, from a comparative point of view among the three stakeholders involved mentioned above. In order to investigate this topic, several sections will be developed, starting with the theoretical framework in which the previous studies on this topic will be approached. It is relevant to understand the theoretical contextualisation of CLIL, with its definition and characteristics, as well as its evolution in Europe and Spain. More concretely, regulations for the application of CLIL in the Region of Murcia will be approached, continuing with a review of other factors affecting CLIL and the educational agents involved in it. Concerning its practical implementation, student-centered methodologies, materials and resources and evaluation will be analysed. Finally, with reference to previous research on CLIL, the effects it has on L1, L2, and content learning will be reviewed, to conclude with other more general outcomes from previous studies, opening the way to further knowledge through new lines of investigation.

Building on the premises mentioned above, the empirical evidence will be gathered administering a questionnaire that will be completed by the students, teachers and parents related to different bilingual schools of the Region of Murcia. Their perceptions about relevant issues on this matter will be collected, such as the practical application of the theoretical characteristics of CLIL, ways in which CLIL deals with factors affecting the teaching-learning process, the educational agents involved, the implementation of student-centered methodologies, the materials and resources used, the way assessment is carried out and its impacts on first and second language, as well as academic subject learning. Once this information is collected, it will be crucial to discuss the conclusions, pedagogical implications and further investigations that may derive from them.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Theoretical contextualisation of CLIL. Definition and characteristics.

After introducing the aspects under study, we need to explore the subject further. First of all, it is necessary to know what this approach consists of. In the words of Marsh & Langé (2000, p. 2), CLIL is "a dual-focused education approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language". However, CLIL not only involves the mere integration of content and language as the acronym itself indicates, but also it requires the consideration of numerous additional aspects to highlight its undisputed value as a force for change in the way we learn languages.

To begin with, we can consider the 4Cs Framework, contemplated by Coyle et al. (2010). The authors indicate that there are four fundamental aspects which must be most relevant in order to carry out CLIL effectively. These are content, communication, cognition and culture, and all of them have a considerable role to play in developing CLIL to its fullest potential.

On the other hand, rescuing the need for communication that we have named as primordial in order to be part of this interconnected world, we must also pay attention to language skills, so that reading, writing, listening and speaking are worked on (San Isidro & Coyle, 2020). Related to this, we cannot lose sight of two other concepts introduced by Cummins (1999), also related to language skills, such as BICS (Basic Interpersonal

Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency). These allude to the communicative skills that would be necessary in day-to-day social interaction, and to the more academic and abstract language necessary to work on certain concepts in class, respectively. Thanks to CLIL, by working both together, we achieve unique results due to its integration, creating a meaningful environment in which children acquire language skills in a contextual manner that mirrors the situations that would take place in their daily lives, with all the advantages that this entails.

Finally, to conclude, as in any aspect related to education, we cannot leave cognition aside, and CLIL was not going to be less. It is common knowledge that we must start with our students' prior knowledge, linking it to their interests and experiences, as Pérez Cañado and Marsh (2018, p. 10) indicate, and adjust it to their level. Different levels of cognition recognised by Bloom et al. (1956), and later restructured by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) must be considered. The latter categorisation divides them into six levels, ranging from least to most cognitively challenging: remember, understand, apply, analyse, evaluate and create. CLIL indicates the need to progress from the Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS) to the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) (San Isidro & Coyle, 2020).

2.2. CLIL evolution in Europe and Spain.

As we have already seen, CLIL has gained importance in the present era and has generated a real revolution in teaching. In the words of Pérez Cañado and Ráez Padilla (2015), it has come to be seen as "a lever for change and success in language learning" (p. 1). However, like everything else, it also has its more negative aspects and these are the ones that have gained prominence recently in the most recent research. With regard to implementation, which is what we are concerned with, a certain variety of perceptions can be acknowledged. On the one hand, According to Cenoz et al. (2013), it is challenging to identify the properties of CLIL as there is such a wide range of models depending on the context. On the other hand, other authors such as Coyle and Baetens-Beardsmore (2007) point to this as a positive aspect that makes it possible to adapt it to the requirements of each specific situation and circumstances.

Regarding these circumstances, Pavón et al. (2014) provides an X-ray of some of the factors to consider when adapting its implementation. These include the selection of subjects, the inclusion in the programme of language assistants who will collaborate with the rest of the

teachers involved, the ability to assess both content and language appropriately, as well as the proposal of activities outside class hours that allow children to continue practising the foreign language in a more relaxed environment, since linguistic proficiency is an aspect to be taken into account by both students and teachers.

Knowing these general characteristics and aspects to take into account, we are now going to see how CLIL is actually being implemented in Europe, to see how it has evolved and then move on to the next step, which is its implementation in Spain. As we already know, much importance has now been given to acquiring a second language, although this has not been the case at all times. In Spain this was introduced in 1990, some other European countries having achieved it earlier. However, when we move on to CLIL, we can say that nowadays it has been implemented almost everywhere in Europe (Wolff, 2002). Taking up the variety mentioned above, there is no doubt that this diverse scenario will be repeated in Europe, as each country has different backgrounds (Wolff, 2002). Even so, certain common features such as the enhanced incorporation of the second language in the curriculum have evolved favourably, leading to a more bilingual panorama. Turning to Spain, certain aspects can be extrapolated. The motivation for the need of a change has mainly been the low level of proficiency in this foreign language reported by students (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009, p. 7). This has led to attempts to alleviate this situation by means of CLIL, since, as Cenoz et al. (2013, p. 16) indicate, it is considered a "well-recognized and useful construct for promoting L2/foreign language teaching". However, the heterogeneity in the ways it is carried out is still present (Dueñas, 2009). This heterogeneity depends on multiple factors that need to be analysed, including what Coyle et al. (2010) call operating factors, such as the English proficiency level of students and teachers, opportunities for relations with other countries or the utilization of the non-native language in instruction. Wolff (2005) also refers to environmental parameters, which include, for example, the choice of subjects. Or Smit's (2007) criteria such as the type of teachers involved.

With all this, it is clear that there are many aspects to take into account that can make CLIL vary from one model to another. Furthermore, we should be aware that the decentralisation of our education system will also affect CLIL. It is necessary to delve deeper into the educational regulations of the community in question, in this case the Region of Murcia, in order to be able to discern specifically what possibilities are offered in this region.

2.3. Regulations for the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia.

As we have seen, the variety of ways in which CLIL is implemented will depend largely on the regulations stipulated by each autonomous community. In our case, based on the Region of Murcia and on the Primary Education stage, two regulations that will be explained below take on special importance.

On the one hand, we have the Order of 3 June 2016, of the Regional Ministry of Education and Universities, which regulates the Foreign Language Teaching System (SELE henceforth, by its acronym in Spanish) in the Autonomous Community of the Region of Murcia, with the modifications introduced by the Order of 22 June 2017. Thanks to this Order, we know that SELE guarantees the incorporation of at least two languages, including Spanish, in the teaching and learning process of the respective curriculum; and Plurilingual Education System ensures the use of a minimum of three languages. Likewise, it is established that the main aim of SELE is to foster the improvement of communicative competences in foreign languages among students, allowing all of them to study in bilingual or multilingual modalities. At the same time, increased independence is granted to schools, allowing them to determine the subjects and number of hours instructed in the second language.

Within this system, some fundamental principles are also mentioned, such as the teaching through CLIL, using at least one foreign language in at least one of the areas or subjects of each year of the stage. The teaching system will encourage the exploration of the culture of countries where the target foreign languages are spoken officially, and it will facilitate interaction with individuals from those countries. Teachers instructing in a foreign language will use that language as the primary means of communication with their pupils in all school contexts, using only Spanish as a support when necessary. Finally, the acquisition of terminology and vocabulary specific to non-language subjects in basic education will be encouraged, both in the foreign language and in Spanish.

With regard to the methodology to be followed, SELE teaching practice will be based on CLIL methodological principles. In addition, teachers of subjects taught in foreign languages will establish the necessary methodological and organisational strategies in order to cater for the diversity of pupils, mitigate potential challenges arising from using a foreign language as the medium of instruction, and proactively address these difficulties once identified. We will

also try to implement task-based learning and meaningful projects that enable students to enhance their proficiency in all four linguistic skills. Cooperative work will be encouraged through flexible groupings, seeking maximum interaction. To promote oral expression, students will engage in expositions and oral presentations in the second language. Finally, the implementation of complementary activities that expose students to the target language in various contexts shall be sought, including storytelling, theatre in a foreign language, cultural weeks, book fairs, etc.

Article 11 of this order explains the different modalities through which SELE can be carried out in Primary Education. They indicate how many hours, apart from the allocated timetable for the First Foreign Language subject, will be taught in that language. With this, we can distinguish between basic, with between 1 and 2 hours per week in each grade; intermediate, with between 2.5 and 4.5 hours; and advanced, with 5 hours or more. It is recommended to choose as a non-linguistic subject the area of Natural Sciences, Applied Sciences, or an area of the specific subjects block; and, in the later stage of the educational cycle, the advanced modality recommends focusing on First Foreign Language Deepening. Starting from the school year 2018/2019, each educational centre in the Region of Murcia has the authorization to put into effect the basic or intermediate bilingual education option. However, the application of advanced and intermediate bilingual teaching approaches requires a formal request.

Having said this, it is time to contextualize the transitional period in which we are included, dominated by the Resolution of the Directorate General for Vocational Training and Innovation which establishes the transition between the Foreign Language Teaching System and the Improvement and Proficiency Programmes in Foreign Languages in the publicly funded centres of the Autonomous Community of the Region of Murcia which provide Infant Education, Primary Education, Compulsory Secondary Education and Baccalaureate for the academic year 2022-2023. An order will be created which will establish that the Improvement Programme in Foreign Languages will be executed in the Primary Education period in the academic year 2022-2023 in years 1, 3 and 5, while during the academic year 2023-2024 it will be implemented in the remaining years of the stage. In addition, in order to access the Foreign Language Proficiency Programme, it indicates that at least 25% of the pupils' timetable must be devoted to linguistic immersion.

The foreign language which is the object of the Improvement Programme will be English and will be utilized as a means for learning in the subject areas covered by the program, with Spanish being relegated back to being used only as a support language. The objectives of this Programme are to reinforce the language subject in Primary Education that focuses on a non-native language, favouring the acquisition and learning of English and the development of plurilingual competence. Schools that are incorporated into this programme will teach in English during the 2022-2023 academic year in the area of Educational Proficiency in the 1st, 3rd and 5th levels. In 2nd, 4th and 6th grade, they must choose a subject other than language to be instructed in English.

2.4. Factors affecting CLIL

Once these regulations have been examined, we cannot forget to bear in mind that, apart from the official ways of carrying out bilingual teaching, there are many other factors that affect any educational practice. Therefore, these should be considered to achieve a correct implementation of CLIL, as they will have a great influence on it.

To begin with, one of them is discipline. We know that this refers to maintaining order and control in class, limiting disruptive behaviour so that the teaching-learning process is not disrupted. Thus, although CLIL is an approach that may involve some excitement in class, we must be able to keep this at bay and ensure that it does not interfere with our programme. On the other hand, we also know that affective factors greatly influence the effectiveness of learning (Arnold, 1999/2000). Therefore, we cannot leave them isolated in an educational practice such as CLIL. As Sostres Larrosa (2021, p. 27) points out, attitude towards bilingual education is a very important affective variable that must be considered. Arnold (1999/2000) indicates that motivation has a lot to do with the outcomes of the language learning process, so that if our learners aspire to acquire communicative competence in that language, they will work towards achieving it. Undoubtedly, the atmosphere in which the pupils are immersed will also influence this. Therefore, we must make it one in which they feel safe and confident in order to promote the desired participation and reinforce their self-esteem.

Tomlinson (2010) also sets out a number of principles that materials must meet in order to be suitable for CLIL for students. The author includes that the input they are exposed to should be rich, comprehensible and meaningful, that they should be involved affectively (in a

positive way) but also cognitively. Having opportunities to communicate, manipulating the content in the foreign language, but focusing on the meaning (through scaffolding) will also be sought.

Some studies have also been carried out in order to find out which more specific variables would influence the excellence of bilingual programs. This is the case of the one carried out by Madrid and Roa (2018). In this study, the respondents set out some factors that will determine the effectiveness of the programme, such as the level of English of the teachers, along with the inclusion of individuals who are native English speakers, the interest and motivation of students, and the training of the teachers involved.

Finally, diversity will also be a very important factor affecting our CLIL practices. The implementation of bilingualism means that all students will be exposed to it, so we must know how to deal with it in mixed-ability classes. In order to cater for diversity, this scaffolding mentioned above will also be of paramount importance. Similarly, the variety in the ways in which it is carried out can also be positive in order to adapt it to different types of pupils. This will be taken into account both in assessment and in the way it is carried out with the different subjects or the groupings of the groups themselves when carrying out cooperative learning, making allusion to the different types of intelligence and learning styles.

2.5. Educational agents involved in CLIL

As we have seen, there are many factors that can modify CLIL implementation. However, although the teacher has already been mentioned on some occasions, it is time to take a closer look at its figure. An analysis that clarifies all the aspects that surround them will be carried out, contextualising this key element that has so much to do with the success or failure of the programme.

To begin with, it is necessary to know who the teachers involved in the programme will be. We should know that the bilingual team is made up of the bilingual coordinator, the instructors responsible for language and subject instruction and, finally, the language assistants. The bilingual coordinator will be responsible for the correct implementation of the programme, through meetings, activity proposals and ensuring effective coordination between all of its components.

Regarding the responsibilities of language and subject teachers, article 21 of the Order of 3 June 2016 mentioned above indicates the aspects related to the teaching staff that have to be taken into account to carry out this system. Here we are told that teachers participating in the system for the Primary Education stage must hold a language accreditation at B2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Additionally, the Regional Ministry of Education and Universities will support initiatives and implement measures to assist teachers in obtaining or enhancing their pedagogical training in CLIL, as well as their proficiency in foreign languages, both of which are crucial for the successful execution of CLIL. As Pavón and Ellison (2013) have already indicated, there are three skills that the teachers involved must display: knowledge of the discipline and of the language, being able to use it competently, and a correct use of the methodologies. As long as these characteristics are met, multiple possibilities of implementing the programme arise. In fact, it will depend on the context and the human resources available. Thus, we can find programmes in which language teachers are responsible for delivering the content of the other disciplines to the students. Alternatively, it is also possible that subject teachers, who possess expertise in their respective fields, bring the content to the learners through the foreign language, having an extensive control over it. However, sometimes teachers may not feel confident in their foreign language proficiency. Therefore, ways of compensating for this deficiency become more relevant, such as collaboration with the language teachers and implementation of strategies that facilitate the understanding of the content by the learners. More than having a high level of the language, they must make it work efficiently through the methodologies and materials used.

Finally, language assistants also have an important role to play. They will be an ideal role model for the students in the foreign language, making them develop their speaking skills in a more fluent and uninhibited way. It will also bring them closer to the culture of their country. Multitude of benefits for both students and teachers are brought through collaboration with them.

Ultimately, speaking of collaboration, we must recognize its impact in the programme, having to be developed in three levels. According to Pavón (2014), collaboration between subject and language teachers is absolutely essential, as it encourages the integration of linguistic skills to manipulate the subject matter, as well as to give meaning to that language and to have the capability to assess it in a consensual way. Furthermore, the advantages do

not end there, because the assimilation of content is also facilitated among content teachers through thematic, methodological and assessment cohesion. Lastly, the cooperation among language teachers also holds advantages. By establishing shared linguistic goals and content, creating activities that demand similar language usage, and employing general linguistic elements and communication strategies, it can enhance the comprehension and articulation of subject matter. Furthermore, it can bolster the processing and reinforcement of educational materials within the specific subject areas, all of this in pursuit of the improvement of students' language competences.

2.6. Practical implementation of CLIL

Now that we have theoretically analysed the characteristics of CLIL and the aspects to be taken into account for its implementation, it is time to see how it should be put into practice. The methodologies to be carried out, together with the materials and resources through which they would be developed, and their subsequent evaluation will be the aspects to be analysed in this section.

2.6.1. Student-centered methodologies

In recent years, a shift in focus has taken place in education, leaving behind the traditional model and giving way to a switch in the centre of attention, making the students the protagonist of their own learning. These changes of perspective are in line with the requirements of CLIL. Therefore, student-centered methodologies (henceforth SCM), in which the learner is at the centre of the process, will be desired for this educational approach, being the teacher relegated to the role of a guide and facilitator.

One of the consequences of this paradigm shift is the increased interaction that takes place in class by the students, both among themselves and with the teachers. This will attract many advantages, as expressed by Short et al. (2011). These authors indicate that students will benefit from being able to create meaningful discussions, develop oral language, academic language and cognitive skills. Teachers will also be able to take advantage of the opportunity to assess students and gather information. In line with this, Coyle et al. (2010) have indicated that CLIL requires students to cooperate with each other for mutual enrichment, so, as further ways of promoting this enriching interaction, we will find cooperative learning. Fathman and

Kessler (1992, p. 128) define it as group work in which students interact by exchanging information while being assessed individually on their work. In doing so, some modifications to classroom arrangement may take place, while respecting the visibility and mobility of the learners. Another aspect to consider is how these groups will be formed, in relation to the level of the members. Finally, the assignment of roles, as indicated by Johnson et al. (1994) will help us to know what to expect from each member of the group, as well as helping them to know what their own and their peers' missions are.

Knowing this, it is time to discuss some methodologies that would be in line with the cited approach, being task-based learning one of them. Ellis (2009) points out that tasks provide unique opportunities to motivate learners, focusing on meaning rather than form, as well as on fluency at the same time that there is no loss of accuracy. A similar methodology but taken to a more ambitious level would be project-based learning, involving more than one subject and across an extended timeframe. In this case, it is Gallacher (2023) who makes us aware of its advantages, such as the increase in impetus, the inclusion of the four linguistic abilities through authentic tasks, the creation of a final product and the development of interpersonal relationships, among others. Flipped classroom techniques are also relevant in this context. Brame (2013) indicates here that to carry them out teachers should provide exposure to the content before class, incentives to prepare for class, ways of assessing the understanding of the students and higher-order activities to take place in class. Finally, another methodology worth mentioning is the Text-driven approach. Tomlinson (2013) indicates that in order to perform it, a series of activities will be prepared around the text. The learner will experience the text, engaging in a process in which they will extract meaningful language and culminate paying attention to the linguistic elements contained in it.

2.6.2. Materials and resources

Once we have seen the methodologies, we are going to focus on how and which materials have to be used to carry them out. Thus, referring exclusively to materials, we know from Tomlinson (2002) that they must be able to provide linguistic and content situations that sustain learners' engagement, foster motivation, and evoke interaction and creativity. Mehisto (2012, p. 17) also sets out a number of criteria for quality CLIL materials, including: making learning intentions visible to learners, regarding language, subject matter, and learning abilities, as well as the learning process itself; consistently enhancing academic language competence,

as well as the advancement of learning abilities and learner independence; incorporating self-assessment, peer assessment, and other forms of formative evaluation; cultivating a secure learning environment; promoting collaborative learning; integrating genuine language and real-world language usage; nurturing critical thinking; facilitating cognitive fluency by providing support for the development of content, language, and learning abilities, enabling learners to surpass their individual capacities; and ultimately, ensuring that learning is meaningful.

Within the materials, they should also contribute to clarifying the content and making the input received in the foreign language comprehensible. To this end, we have scaffolding, a technique for providing support and helping learners to progress. There are various ways of doing this, including bridging, as Llull and Fernández (2016, p. 33) call it, in which new content is linked to what learners previously knew. It is important to be cautious and ascertain that the input provided orally by the teacher has the correct intonation, speed and articulation, so that it does not hinder learners. L1 could also be used for clarification if necessary. Also, when explaining tasks, instructions need to be given clearly, including demonstrations and examples of the final product (Echevarria et al., 2007, p. 81). Additional resources also have a significant impact in this scaffolding in the words of Echevarria et al. (2007, p. 33). Some examples of these would be realia, images, graphic organisers or adapted texts. Regarding the textbook, Fleta and Forster (2014, p. 58) state that sometimes these may not meet the needs of learners as they may restrict the information they show, so it would be better to use them as complementary material rather than the only one. Changing the perspective, audio-visual aids will always provide an indisputable help, through flashcards or picturebooks for example. Slattery and Willis (2001, p. 44) also indicate that songs and rhymes can help to disinhibit pupils by improving their self-esteem. Similarly, when it comes to materials that encourage students' leisure and enjoyment, games occupy high positions. The Internet can also be an asset for this, being motivating and offering the ability to adapt to multiple contexts, but we must be critical when using it (Cortina-Pérez & Andúgar Soto, 2018). For the creation of materials, Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), may be quite relevant, since they can provide a wide variety of them, with the possibility of including gamification, visual aids or cultural activities. Some examples of the use of ICTs in the classroom would be through blogs or social media, which also favour communication between users, a pillar for CLIL.

2.6.3. Evaluation

Once we have seen all these aspects, we are going to complete the process of implementation by means of evaluation. This aspect is of great importance in the process, as it is considered essential in order to be able to check its effectiveness, as well as to detect any possible shortcomings and implement the necessary changes. In CLIL, given its integrated nature, both content and language have to be evaluated, carrying out a contextualised and authentic assessment, but with a greater focus on content. When we talk about testing, anxiety levels have to be taken into account. To minimize this, it is crucial that pupils know what to expect when facing a test, being similar to what they have worked on in class. On the other hand, feedback is also essential to foster positive attitudes towards achievement, as well as to know what aspects need to be improved.

With this small contextualisation of how assessment should be, it is time to see the different moments to carry it out, by means of the indications given by Pérez Paredes and Rubio (2005, p. 609). At first, before starting the process of instruction and acquisition of knowledge, a diagnostics evaluation is implemented, as a way of gathering attitudes and profiles that will determine whether the students are capable of developing a certain subject. Later, once the process has started, the initial evaluation is executed, to find out the level from which our students start. Then, the formative evaluation will be performed throughout the process, gathering information about the students' work and motivating them. Finally, the concluding assessment will take place to close the period, obtaining the results and the level of achievement of the objectives.

Having a clear idea of the moments, we will now see kind of instruments will be used to carry them out, both for content and language. Here we distinguish mainly two types, discrete-item evaluation tools, isolated and unrelated to the rest of the parts taken into account; and global tests, seeking to integrate everything that can be assessed in a single task. That said, the two types are not mutually exclusive but complement each other, as both cover possible gaps in the opposite one.

Finally, we need to know in what ways assessment is developed, as it is not always the teacher who must effectuate it out by means of a test. Every day more and more new practices in which students also take on a more prominent role in it are fostered. An example of this

would be the portfolio, where Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlou (2003) indicate its prevalence as a more comprehensive instrument that can show in more detail the extent of a learner's achievements. Equally, it can also be the students themselves who carry out this activity, assessing themselves as well as their peers, promoting reflection and awareness of their own progress, awakening their more critical side.

2.7. Previous research on CLIL

After the extensive recapitulation of the characteristics of CLIL, ways of implementing it and factors to be taken into account for its implementation, the time has come to also analyse the possible effects it may have. In the following sections we will analyse how this approach affects L1, L2 and content learning. In addition, we will also explore other outcomes relevant to society, leaving the door open for further research.

2.7.1. The effects of CLIL on L1, L2, and content learning

We will begin by commenting on why specifically these effects need to be analysed. As we have already discussed in previous sections, CLIL is an integrated approach with a dual purpose (Marsh & Langé, 2000, p. 2), that is, content and foreign language learning. Thus, we need to know whether it really fulfils its purposes with respect to these two aspects. Also, the fact that it replaces the mother tongue in the delivery of knowledge for these content subjects may raise some concern regarding if it adversely affects the mother tongue, which we will now investigate.

With regard to the L1, Spanish in our context, we find several studies. Ramos García et al. (2011, p. 156) carried out a study in Andalusia in which they concluded that "the time spent teaching subjects in L2 (English) is not detrimental to the global linguistic competence developed by students in L1 (Spanish)". Similar results are found in those presented by Madrid and Barrios (2018), also with respect to Andalusia, where they again conclude that reducing the hours in which they are exposed to Spanish in class does not have a negative impact on them. Similarly, Pérez Cañado (2018a) also carried out a study in which she concluded that those who received bilingual education were not detrimentally impacted in their level of Spanish, but even surpassed their non-bilingual counterparts at the culmination of the stage.

Shifting the perspective to another language, English, which constitutes the L2 in this case, we will see how it is affected. Villoria et al. (2011) conducted a large research in which they studied the performance of this L2 in both bilingual and monolingual schools in the various communicative skills. The findings indicated that students in bilingual schools outperformed students in monolingual schools in all skills, especially showing a much higher level in writing. In addition, there are many studies that highlight the fact that there is a higher proficiency in writing for those students immersed in a bilingual programme (Sotoca Sienes, 2014; Hughes & Madrid Fernández, 2015; Jiménez Catalán & Fernández Fontecha, 2015). Turning now to oral comprehension and production, Pérez Cañado and Lancaster (2017) show that this is also positively affected by CLIL.

Finally, with regard to content learning, for the subject of Social Sciences, San Isidro & Lasagabaster (2018) confirm that CLIL does not affect it negatively either. Sotoca Sienes (2014) in her study also analyses this for the subjects of Mathematics and Environmental Science, leaving us with statistically significant results for the former but with non-bilingual students outperforming CLIL ones for the latter. In this regard, Pérez Cañado (2018d) now offers the contradictory view that CLIL students outperform their peers in Natural Sciences, although this is mostly in the long term, as there are no differences in the short term.

2.7.2. Outcomes from previous studies and the need for further knowledge through new lines of investigation

Now that we have seen the effects that CLIL may have, it can be assumed that they are predominantly positive. However, there are still prominent aspects to be investigated. The time has come to analyse some studies to find out whether these theoretical traits of CLIL, already explained in the previous sections, are being put into practice in other contexts.

Pérez Cañado (2018b) carried out a very ambitious study where she collected the perceptions of the three stakeholders involved. Her results indicated that, regarding methodology, both teachers and students recognise a change in teachers' roles towards being more facilitators due to the incorporation of student-centered methodologies, such as task-based language teaching, cooperative learning, or project-based learning. Parents would be the most critical ones with this aspect, because they do not view the approach as being as groundbreaking or student-focused as the other two stakeholders. As for the materials, it could be said that they

are more critical here, since, although the teachers and students consider them to be interactive, captivating, and pioneering, new technologies are still not being utilized to any great extent. Shortcomings appear regarding the lack of diversity materials and the absence of guides for parents in Spanish, which would be the biggest complain for them. Concerning assessment, all three actors have very positive experiences of it. They claim that it is diversified, formative, continuous and holistic. These same results were obtained for Milla Lara and Casas Pedrosa (2018), in a study in which they only analysed teachers' perceptions.

Other similar studies have also been carried out in relation to these aspects. In this case, analysing only the perceptions of parents, Ráez-Padilla (2018) brings us a study from which we can extract in this case that student-centered methodologies are consolidated on their part. Regarding materials and resources, parents express a positive but not excessively enthusiastic stance, also highlighting the need for attention to certain technological aspects. As for evaluation, elements of student-centered assessment are indeed being integrated into CLIL classroom practice, with regular exams being conducted to facilitate ongoing evaluation. Parents also give their opinion on the teachers' level of English, considering it quite high. They also consider that their children's level of English has improved, as well as motivation.

Going back to Milla Lara and Casas Pedrosa (2018), these authors also analysed certain needs regarding teacher training. For example, they found that all teachers are motivating for students and that language assistants collaborate with them. Also, speaking about collaboration, they consider that communication with their coordinators is smooth. Continuing with teacher training, Pérez Cañado (2016) compiled in her study certain responses indicating that teachers considered themselves to exhibit a proficient command of English. In another article by the same author, Pérez Cañado (2017) also indicates that, although there has been a remarkable development, it is undeniable the fact that there is a need for more training in linguistic and intercultural competence for CLIL teachers. Around this issue, another aspect to consider would be that CLIL teachers need more time to meet and coordinate and collaborate for the development of CLIL programmes and projects (Pérez Cañado, 2018c).

Finally, we will consider two other important aspects. On the one hand, the cultural knowledge expressed by bilingual students compared to non-bilingual ones was analysed by Ramos García (2011). Her findings indicated that bilinguals surpass the knowledge in this area. Also, to conclude, we will check a recurrent thought regarding CLIL, which is that it would be

better to teach language and content separately, increasing the allocated time for the instruction of the First Foreign Language. This will be addressed by Lancaster's (2018) study, thanks to which we found that CLIL students outperformed non-CLIL ones (with additional formal English instruction) concerning the overall use of English. Thus, we can conclude language outcomes are definitely better by subconscious CLIL acquisition in the long term, as it entails greater significant exposure.

After analysing all these studies, it can be appreciated that there have been some studies focusing on this topic. Some of them have focused on monolingual communities, however, Murcia was not among them, therefore, it would be interesting to promote an analysis in this context. In addition, there are several studies that have analysed the perceptions of teachers and parents independently, but there are none in which students are the main agents analysed, so it is necessary to provide one in which they are given the importance they deserve as the main agents involved in their own learning.

3. JUSTIFICATION AND AIM

Thus, in view of the above, it is necessary to create a comparative study in which the adoption of CLIL in the Murcia Region is analysed in relation to multiple variables. To this end, the perceptions of students, teachers and parents as the main stakeholders involved in the teaching and learning experience will be considered. With this, the aim of the study is to gather these perspectives and carry out the analysis of the implementation through them.

This leads to the creation of the subsequent research question and sub-questions that will serve as the study's guiding framework:

1. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to...
 - a) practical application of the theoretical characteristics of CLIL?
 - b) ways in which CLIL deals with factors affecting the teaching-learning process?
 - c) educational agents involved?
 - d) the implementation of student-centered methodologies?
 - e) the materials and resources used?
 - f) the way assessment is carried out?

g) its effects on L1, L2 and content learning?

In addition, performing a within-cohort comparison between students, it will be examined whether there are statistically significant disparities between those belonging to the first and second tranches of primary education. It will also be determined whether notable variations exist among them and the teachers, as well as between them and the parents, by carrying out an across-cohort comparison.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Type of research study

With the aim of obtaining this data, it is time to characterise the research to be carried out, based on the classification extracted from Nunan (1991, 1992) and Seliger and Shohamy (1989). Regarding its general framework, it includes some basis of theoretical research, carrying out a literature review exploring the prior research about the topic. However, the main part will be focused on the practical implementation of CLIL, observing the way it is carried out by the teachers, so it will be practical research in the end. In respect of the source of information, it would be primary research because it extracts information from the teachers, families and students that belong to the schools involved, which are primary sources of information. In relation with the method for data collection, we are faced to a non-experimental study since the phenomena will be explored in a natural manner, studying CLIL implementation in class just as it usually is, finding out their perspectives in order to assess the current practice. The approach is holistic, focusing on CLIL implementation in general, in an all-embracing way which includes multiple variables analysed as part of a coherent whole. Its purpose is inductive, as single instances will be explored searching for a general truth, without starting from an already created hypothesis. Concerning the data, most of them will be quantitative, as questionnaires and surveys will be carried out for all stakeholders, however, qualitative data will be approached as well, since open questions will be developed to explore in deep the thoughts of teachers and parents, with more freedom to express them. Nevertheless, as these questions were not compulsory most of them were not completed so the data collected is almost exclusively quantitative. Linked to this, the method of data analysis will be statistical, analysing central tendency and variability of the data. Finally, it will be cross-sectional, since the data

will be gathered during a specific time period, with a particular subset of students, educators and parents.

4.2. Population

The participants in the study comprised a total cohort of 97 people, all of them stakeholders immersed in the schooling system of the Region of Murcia and experiencing the ways in which it deals with bilingual education. Of the 97 people, 69 were students, 18 were teachers and 10 were parents closely linked to schools belonging to the Bilingual Schools of the Region of Murcia. Most of these schools were located in Lorca, with 70% of the data obtained in this city, followed by Águilas with 21%, Murcia with 7% and, finally, Cartagena and Puerto Lumbreras with 1% of the responses each. Regarding the centres, the vast majority of those surveyed were linked to public centres, with only 3% of responses belonging to charter schools. The predominant economic, social and cultural level in these centres is medium. With regard to the choice of the sample, I have to say that it is a convenience sample, since the schools selected to take part, as well as certain individual agents, were contacted by the researcher to take part in the study due to their proximity and links with them. Likewise, each individual student, teacher and family member had the option to participate or not in the study.

More specifically, focusing now on the students, males slightly outnumbered females, with 54% compared to 46%. In terms of age, around 29% of the students fall within the age range of 7 to 8 years old, 25% are between 9-10 years old and, finally, the predominant age is 11-12 years old, with 46% of the results. In terms of nationality, although the majority were Spanish (83% of the results), there were also immigrants from Latin America, who accounted for 13% of the results, coming from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras and Nicaragua. Finally, we also have minority nationalities, Moroccans, English and French, accounting for around 1.3% each. With regard to the level of English, in speaking and listening, most of the participants consider themselves to have an intermediate level, something which is rectified when referring to the written skills, since for both reading and writing, the majority of responses are at a high level, slightly surpassing the intermediate level. Finally, when talking about the grades they are in, we have 14 students (20%) in 2nd year, 16 in 3rd year (23%), 21 in 5th year (31%), and 18 in 6th year (26%). These students surveyed are part of their school's bilingual programme and, as such, the hours of English per week are increased in various ways. In this case, the modality concerning pupils in the first tranche (years two and three) is to have

2 hours per week of Natural Sciences in English, in addition to one hour of Art and, finally, the two hours per week of First Foreign Language. However, for students in the second tranche (5th and 6th grade) there is more diversity, for example, 56% have one hour per week of Art, 1 hour of Music, and, in addition, one hour of English Deepening and a weekly allocation of 3 hours of English. However, the option of two hours of Applied Sciences and 3 hours of English is also supported by 41% of pupils. Finally, 3% of respondents receive one hour of Music, 2 hours of English Deepening and 3 hours of English as First Foreign Language per week.

Turning now to teachers, women overtook men, with 72.2% of respondents, compared with 27.8% of men. Of those surveyed, 44.4% were aged 30-39, followed by 33.3% aged 40-49. Subsequently, the 20-29 and 50-59 age brackets account for 11.1% each. All are of Spanish nationality, and 77.8% consider themselves to be foreign language teachers, while 27.8% are content teachers. With regard to the level of English, C1 predominates with 50% of the responses, followed by B2 with 38.9%, 5.6% with B1, and another 5.6% with A1. Most of them (33.%) possess a teaching background of 16 to 20 years in Primary Education, followed by 22.2% of the respondents with 6-10 years and 16.7% with 1-5 years and 11-15 years each. Finally, also tied in percentages with 5.6% we have someone with 21-25 years of experience and another person with more than 25 years. When we transfer this teaching experience to that related to the bilingual programme, we see that it is drastically reduced, with the maximum being 11-15 years with 11.1% of the responses, followed by 27.8% for 6-10 years, 50% of the majority with 1-5 years, and, finally, 11.1% with less than one year. With regard to the grades in which they teach, 38.9% teach in the 3rd grade of primary school. The first, second and fourth grades account for 33.3% of the responses. Finally, 22.2% of teachers teach in 5th grade, and 16.7% in 6th grade.

Finally, as far as parents are concerned, here females outnumber males by a wide margin, with 90% compared to 10% for men. In terms of age, we also have a very large 90% of respondents between 40 and 49 years old, with only 10% for 50-59 years old. All are also of Spanish nationality, with 80% holding a university degree, followed by 20% with a vocational training certificate, and 10% with a baccalaureate certificate. In this case, the majority of parents surveyed have their children in 6th grade of primary school, with 50% of the data, followed by 20% in 4th grade and 10% for both 1st, 2nd and 5th grades.

4.3. Data collection instrument

Three questionnaires were employed as instruments for data collection, one for each stakeholder (students, teachers and parents), all of them extremely related to each other. The surveys were created by me, including in them the aspects I considered important regarding CLIL, after all the formation received during this master's on the subject, and adapting them to each stakeholder who was to fill them in, in terms of the specific terms used. Likewise, as a way of facilitating understanding by all stakeholders (especially students and parents), they have been implemented in Spanish. As for those created for students, these were presented in paper format to facilitate their completion at the educational centres, while those provided to teachers and parents were provided through Google forms so that they could complete them online (see Annex 1 to find the surveys provided to each stakeholder).

As for the questionnaires, all of them had 33 items that constituted the opinion or value questions in the words of Patton (1987), which were intended to collect stakeholders' perceptions of CLIL implementation. These were encapsulated in seven major blocks, each related to a corresponding research question. These are as follows: (i) Theoretical characteristics of CLIL (Qs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12), (ii) Factors affecting the teaching-learning process (Qs 19 and 20), (iii) Educational agents (Qs 14, 15, 21 and 28), (iv) Student-centered methodologies (Q 13, 22, 23 and 27), (v) Materials and resources (Qs 24, 25, 26 and 29), (vi) Evaluation (Qs 30, 31, 32 and 33) and (vii) Effects on L1, L2 and content learning (Qs 16, 17 and 18). For collecting the measures of these items of the questionnaire a Likert scale was used, so that respondents could rate their agreement or disagreement with the statements presented. The values of the Likert scale ranged from 1 expressing complete disagreement to 5 indicating complete agreement.

In addition to these items, the survey also included, returning to Patton's (1987) terminology, demographic questions, which were intended to elicit the personal circumstances of the participants. These will correspond in this case to the identification variables. For the three stakeholders, these identification variables correspond to gender, age, nationality, city in which they are located, the school to which they are related, the grade in which they are involved, as well as the subjects in which they are receiving, teaching or their child is taught in English and the hours per week. In addition to these general identification variables, we also found some more specific variables, such as, in the case of students, their level of English for

each of the language skills. For teachers, also the teacher's profile, their English proficiency level, and their instructional expertise in primary education and in a bilingual programme. Finally, for parents, their level of education was also included.

Finally, the teachers' and parents' forms also included two free-response questions at the conclusion in which they were requested to elaborate on any aspect related to CLIL that they considered relevant, as well as to make suggestions. The possibility of including a proposal for future research related to the topic was also raised.

As a way of obtaining validity and reliability, two types of triangulation expressed in Denzin (1970) were taken into account. These were data triangulation, by obtaining the perspectives of three different sources of information, namely students, teachers and parents. On the other hand, location triangulation was also obtained by collecting data from several cities in the Region of Murcia, these being Lorca, Águilas, Murcia and, much lower down, Cartagena and Puerto Lumbreras.

4.4. Data collection procedure

Data collection was done in three different ways depending on the stakeholder involved. For the students, the questionnaires were distributed on paper by going to the schools myself and being in class during the completion of the questionnaire. For teachers and parents, on the other hand, the questionnaires were distributed via a link to the Google form that included the questions. As it has already been stated, convenience sampling was employed, so in most cases I was able to distribute them personally via instant messaging applications by contacting several teachers and parents. Similarly, once the questionnaire was in their possession, I also urged them to try to distribute it to their contacts who fit the necessary conditions for answering it, such as being a teacher involved in bilingual education in a school in the region of Murcia, or having a child enrolled in one of these schools carrying out bilingual education.

I will now return to the students' data collection procedure, which was the most demanding to conduct, as it involved the greatest expenditure of time and mobility. To carry it out, as I have already indicated, I travelled to each school involved, introducing myself to the classes in which I was going to implement it. Once immersed in each class, I handed out the questionnaire to the students present and we began to complete it, taking about 45 minutes,

although this depended on the level and characteristics of the students in each case. As there was a great deal of variability between years, including students from 2nd and 6th grade in the same sample, it was necessary to adapt the way it was carried out for each year. Scaffolding strategies were executed on my part for that purpose. Some of them consisted of reading the questions aloud, trying to explain what information was requested in each case, using a vocabulary closer to their daily lives, especially for the students in the lower years, and trying to complete them all together at the same time, although there were always differences in the pace of each individual student. In the last years, it was easier for them to complete the questions as they understood better what each of them referred to. Even though there were of course exceptions, in most cases they answered them individually and only required my attention if there was a specific case of a question that they did not understand clearly.

4.5. Techniques for data analysis

The programme used for the statistical analyses is called *Jasp* in its 0.17.2.1 version. Using this programme descriptive statistics were obtained for each of the items of the survey, calculating the mean and the standard deviation. These descriptive statistics were obtained for each of the four groups that would be taken into account for further analysis. These were the students in the first and second tranches, who would then be compared with each other to see whether there were notable disparities of statistical significance in this within-cohort comparison. In addition to the statistics for these two groups of students, the same statistics were also obtained for the teachers and for the parents involved in the study. These data were then taken into account for the across-cohort comparison, comparing the responses of the teachers on the one hand, and, subsequently, the responses of the parents, with those of the students as a whole, highlighting once again the importance of them in our study. This is due not only to their unquestionable role in the process of instruction and learning, but also to the reality that they are the most representative group and the one from which the largest number of responses has been obtained. Moreover, there are two clearly distinguished sub-groups included in it, with a very similar number of participants from each. These sub-groups also involve differences in the way CLIL is carried out, which will allow us to glimpse which modality is the one with which the best results are obtained. The results were also later merged into tables by blocks, grouping the answers to those questions that corresponded to the same research question.

Once this descriptive information was gathered, inferential statistics were processed. For the comparisons between groups the statistical assessment relied on the Mann-Whitney U test. This test was used for both types of groups comparisons, within and across cohorts. With this test the p value and the effect size were attained, to see whether the results differ significantly. The decision to include within and across cohort comparisons helps to triangulate the information collected, enriching the analysis of results and the conclusions obtained from them, and providing more validity and reliability. Even though this makes the whole procedure of gathering and analysing data more complex, it is worthwhile.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1.a. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to practical application of the theoretical characteristics of CLIL?

As for the responses in this first block (cf. Annex 2), we can say that they are mostly positive, as the means tend to be above 3, which indicates that there is a prevalence of agreement with the statement. Within this, it can be observed that the best rated questions are those corresponding to questions 5 and 6, which would be those relating to listening and speaking practice in class, with means well above 4. This is consistent with the findings obtained by Pérez Cañado (2018b), where we know that students make the most of speaking opportunities in class.

Also, in addition to highlighting these general trends, it is important to note the between-groups comparisons. In this respect, for example, the first question, regarding working through English on other subject content, shows a statistically significant difference between students and parents ($U = 178.000$, $p = .010$), the latter having a much less optimistic view of this taking place. On the other hand, with respect to question 8, which refers to the use of academic language, it is the within-cohort comparison that shows statistical differences by means of the Mann-Whitney Test ($U = 783.500$, $p = .012$). Finally, to complete the only comparison that remained with some stability until now, teachers also show statistically significant differences in terms of whether learning is based on their previous ideas or interests. In this, we can see that both students and parents do not perceive it in the same way as teachers, who do value it very highly.

1.b. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to ways in which CLIL deals with factors affecting the teaching-learning process?

Turning to this block's results (cf. Annex 3), here we can see that students rate positively how CLIL affects motivation and attention to diversity, especially those in the first stage. However, parents and teachers are more critical of these aspects. This is shown especially in question 20 concerning attention to diversity. We can clearly see how teachers do not believe that CLIL allows attention to diversity, thus creating a statistically significant difference with students ($U = 289.000$, $p = < .001$). Also in the study by Pérez Cañado (2018b) it is already mentioned that attention to diversity is the pending subject of CLIL, so we see that this is still the case and we must remedy it. As for motivation, teachers with an average of 3.111 are not too sure about agreeing with the statement, something that would not coincide entirely with the results obtained by Milla Lara and Casas Pedrosa (2018).

1.c. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to educational agents involved?

This block can be seen to be one of the most positively rated in the survey (cf. Annex 4), thus demonstrating that the overall perspectives on educational agents involved in CLIL are quite positive and there is a high degree of agreement as to their good level, collaboration and contribution to motivation. However, this does not mean that no notable disparities exist among the groups. For example, in the case of question 14, concerning language level, both when comparing students with teachers ($U = 418,000$, $p = .006$) and with parents ($U = 240,500$, $p = .036$) statistically significant differences are found in which students' ratings overlap with those of the other stakeholders. This positivity in the responses is consistent with the studies of Pérez Cañado (2016) although in this case it was the teachers who positively valued their level with the language. However, Pérez Cañado (2017) indicated that there was still a need for more training, something that could be correlated with the capacity for improvement to reach 5 in the perceptions.

On the other hand, in the within-cohort comparison there are also such differences, with those in the second tranche being more critical ($U = 76.500$, $p = .018$). Among this same cohort, we also find statistically significant differences ($U = 792.500$, $p = .008$), in this case with respect

to the figure of the language assistants, with respect to which students in higher grades do not have such positive views. On the other hand, with respect to this issue we can see that, in contrast to what is expressed by these second-tranche students, the teachers do value very positively their ability to motivate and encourage the utilization of the non-native language, which is in line with what is also expressed in Milla Lara and Casas Pedrosa (2018). This study also refers to the collaboration between them and with the language assistants themselves, giving a very satisfactory view of it, which again coincides with the outcomes of this research. However, simultaneously, this would be in disagreement with the results obtained by Pérez Cañado (2018c), where more time was required to be able to coordinate and collaborate.

1.d. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to the implementation of student-centered methodologies?

In terms of student-centered methodologies, the results (cf. Annex 5) tend to oscillate around 3, which indicates that, although there is an upward trend towards 4, these results are not fully consolidated and there are still areas for improvement in this respect. Pérez Cañado (2018b) obtained more positive results in this regard. Question 27, as to whether cooperative learning is carried out, is the only one in which all groups of respondents exceed 4, showing their degree of agreement that in this case does take place, something that coincides with Pérez Cañado (2018b), and therefore with Milla Lara and Casas Pedrosa (2018), as their results are in line with this study as well. Not too many statistically significant differences stand out either, except in question 22, regarding task-based learning, where parents and students differ in their views ($U = 198.000$, $p = .024$).

1.e. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to the materials and resources used?

In materials and resources, the ratings rise again slightly, with several answers above 4 (cf. Annex 6). One of these cases can be seen in the between groups comparisons. Question 24 (audio-visual resources used in class), shows substantial disparities between students and teachers ($U = 792.000$, $p = .045$), with teachers valuing their use more highly. Teachers tend to rate all materials very positively. Regarding ICTs, students in the first stage do not give very high data regarding their implementation, although the other groups tend to surpass them. In the case of Pérez Cañado (2018b), the use of ICTs is also taken into account as aspects to be

improved, which would agree with the perspectives of students in the first stage. On the other hand, Pérez Cañado (2018b) indicated a considerable reduction in the use of the textbook, something that has not been confirmed in this study, as we have obtained high means regarding its use. For adaptation of materials and the use of technologies, Ráez-Padilla (2018) also provides lukewarm responses, in line with those of this study, or perhaps with the parents' present responses regarding scaffolding being even more positive than then, with a mean of 4.5.

1.f. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to the way assessment is carried out?

In the evaluation, we can see that the data does vary quite a lot between questions (cf. Annex 7). For example, in the initial evaluation question, all stakeholders rate it above 3.7 but below 4, which indicates a tendency to agree with the statement, but which is not consolidated, meaning it is an area that requires improvement. In the formative evaluation, these values are widely surpassed, with the lowest value obtained by the teachers, which also shows significant differences with the students, who are much more optimistic ($U = 445.000$, $p = .024$). In terms of statistically significant differences, the question that takes the lead is question 33, relating to the use of the test, since in all comparisons between groups these differences were obtained. Starting with the within-cohort comparison ($U = 712.000$, $p = .038$), it is the students in the first group who agree most with this statement. With regard to the comparison with between students and teachers ($U = 177,500$, $p = < .001$), it is the latter who disagree the most with the statement, there being an abysmal difference between them and the students. Finally, parents would be the most balanced, with a mean that slightly exceeds 4, however, when considering their comparison with respect to students, the latter far exceed their perceptions ($U = 216.500$, $p = .017$). In the study by Ráez-Padilla (2018), he indicates that examinations are carried out regularly, something that in this case would coincide with parents and students above all. In addition, he mentions that formative evaluation is carried out, which is broadly in line with the stakeholders' perspectives in this regard. The fact that the perspectives of all three stakeholders on evaluation are very favourable is something that also occurred in Pérez Cañado (2018b), so this trend has been corroborated.

1.g. How do students, teachers, and parents perceive the implementation of CLIL in the Region of Murcia in relation to its effects on L1, L2 and content learning?

Finally, regarding the effects of CLIL with these three factors, we can observe that the results oscillate around 3, which implies neither agreement nor disagreement with the statement (cf. Annex 8). The statement with which the students agree the most, with means of 4.5 in both groups, is that CLIL does not hinder the assimilation of content. In this respect, both teachers and parents have rather more pessimistic views, which results in statistically significant differences with these cohorts and that of the students ($U = 271.500$, $p = < .001$ for teachers and $U = 184.500$, $p = .005$ for parents). On this issue, previous research has also obtained disparate data, for example San Isidro and Lasagabaster (2018) confirm that it does not harm content, as does Pérez Cañado (2018b). However, Sotoca Sienes (2014) indicates better results for non-bilingual students, so this study would be in line with the perspectives of parents and teachers. As for the detriment of L1, all studies (Ramos García, Ortega Marín & Madrid, 2011; Madrid and Barrios, 2018; Pérez Cañado, 2018a) indicate that there is no detriment of L1. The results of this study have similar trends; however, they do not stand out for their positivity, as the means remain around 3. Finally, for L2, a multitude of studies (Villoria et al., 2011; Sotoca Sienes, 2014; Hughes & Madrid Fernández, 2015; Jiménez Catalán & Fernández Fontecha, 2015; Pérez Cañado & Lancaster, 2017) confirm that it benefits from the programme, in line with stakeholders' perspectives, although these do not reach extreme positivity.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This empirical study has allowed the general objective to be achieved, that is, to investigate the perspectives of students, teachers, and parents in the context of the Region of Murcia with regard to CLIL implementation. Giving also response to this research question divided into more specific sub-questions considering different aspects. In general, we have been able to observe that the perceptions are positive since in most of the items the answers exceed the mean of 3, from which the range in which they agree with the proposed statements begins. However, there are also exceptions where the results drop, especially in the case of parents and teachers for certain questions, with students showing the greatest stability and high perceptions regarding the implementation of CLIL.

In terms of the pragmatic application of the theoretical characteristics of CLIL, the majority of stakeholders' perceptions indicate that it is being implemented, especially in terms of classroom communication. However, some negative marks also appear from parents who do not consider that the content is being worked on through this approach.

Talking about the factors affecting the teaching-learning process, we again highlight the positive view on the part of the students. However, an aspect to be highlighted here is also the attention to diversity, which remains one of the weak points of the programme according to parents and teachers.

Shifting the perspective to a much more positive one, the educational agents shine for their suitability. All stakeholders rate the circumstances of the above-mentioned agents favourably. Even though there are some considerable differences from one cohort to another, all of them remain in the range of high perceptions.

Regarding student-centred methodologies, the study shows that they are not as well established in the programmes as we would like them to be. Cooperative learning is the only one in which all agree that it is mostly used. As for the teacher's guiding role, and task and project-based learning, there is still some way to go, although we are moving in the right direction.

The materials and resources score well in general. Audio-visual resources are clearly implemented regularly in class, as well as those necessary to carry out scaffolding, which are also rated positively. ICTs also seem to be used, although this does not diminish the use of the textbook, which continues to be quite present in the classroom.

With regard to evaluation, we can observe that the initial assessment is the one that has the least presence in the classroom, compared to its other formative and summative versions, in which all stakeholders do agree on its implementation. As for the instruments, the test offers contradictory views on the part of the students, who do provide them a high degree of participation in the assessment, and the teachers, who do not agree with this statement.

Finally, we can conclude that the effects of CLIL do not include damage to the L1, although neither do stakeholders strongly deny it, as the overall responses to this research question range between the middle values without much decline on one side or the other. Similar results are found for the improvement of the students' level of foreign language. Concerning content, here we do find quite positive data from the students, who are clear that it

is not damaged by the implementation of CLIL, but these perceptions are not supported by either parents or teachers.

7. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND IMPROVEMENT PROPOSALS

The outcomes and deductions obtained from this research allow us to know which aspects of CLIL implementation need to be paid attention to improve. This will make us aware of which ways of carrying it out do work in order to modify the CLIL programmes that are already in place towards this improvement, as well as know how to approach new ones as they are created. Likewise, the comparison of first and second tranche students can be very useful as we have seen that there are differences in the way of performing the bilingual modality between these academic years. That said, it would be very positive to study in which aspects each year outperforms the other, in order to be able to adopt the way of executing it in those years to the other and increase the favourability of the results in the near future.

As for the aspects to be improved in the application of CLIL, thanks to the findings from this research we can extract that in some contexts the teaching of the content through CLIL should be promoted, as parents expressed the lack of it, in spite of differing from the students' perceptions. Because of this, information exchange and communication between the three stakeholders should be encouraged, as sometimes some incoherences between their opinions arise, which could be due to lack of information regarding how the programme is actually being conducted.

Similarly, as this study has again found, attention to diversity remains a weak aspect in these programmes, so efforts should be devoted to trying to find a way in which CLIL can effectively address diversity. Similarly, the student-centred methodologies should be more widely implemented in schools, giving children the prominence they require. Perhaps this implementation will also lead to the textbook becoming a little more detached, relegating it to the secondary role it does not yet occupy.

This study has also introduced the need to carry out initial assessment, which is not being properly executed, denying the necessity to start from the students' prior knowledge. Similarly, there is a lack of consensus as to whether examinations are the main instrument of assessment. Perhaps this may be because students do not really know how much weight is

attributed to exams, and assign more to them than they should, owing to the amount of anxiety they cause them. This could perhaps be solved by greater clarity in the assessment methods used by teachers so that there is no room for uncertainty, clarifying the process.

Finally, with regard to the effects of CLIL, the knowledge that it does not harm students' learning of content should send a message of relief to parents and teachers. This, together with the non-deterioration of L1 and the improvement of the foreign language, only brings benefits.

8. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS

Once this entire study has been analysed, certain limitations that can be drawn from it should be reported. To begin with, the context in which it has been carried out is not broad enough to be extrapolated to the whole population, since, although the perspectives have been analysed in several cities of the Region of Murcia, many others have been left undiscovered. Moreover, the sample of each may also be somewhat reduced and chosen in a non-probabilistic way. Thus, a bigger pool of participants would have ensured both the internal and external validity of our results.

Regarding professors, some may be reluctant to expose their ways of developing CLIL and their perceptions may not be entirely accurate since they exposed them in a general manner for all their pupils. There was no differentiation according to the year each of their students belonged to, which is something to take into account as the ways of carrying out teaching practice may not be the same. This would be an aspect that could be improved by asking the professors to carry out the survey several times, once for each group of students from different years that they teach, although this would be a bit more time consuming for them. Then, filtering it accordingly, as we have done for students, would allow more meaningful data to be extracted.

Similarly, for both students and parents, another problem that could arise would be a lack of familiarity with the specific terms and variables related to education that are raised in the surveys. To address this, the vocabulary should be as close as possible to their everyday vocabulary, but still be specific enough to so as not to confuse what wants to be discerned. For students this difficulty would also be related to the year in which they are enrolled, as, for example, providing the same survey for 1st and 6th years may not be appropriate. In this study it was the same survey, so these shortcomings have been addressed by scaffolding, but another

possible solution would be to create two separate surveys for 1st and 2nd tranche students, adapted to their corresponding level. This difficulty in completing them for early years students might require the help of parents or teachers, so that perhaps in this help some biased perceptions might be transferred from one stakeholder to the other.

Equally, being a holistic approach does not allow for a great degree of depth in every aspect involved, making it difficult to isolate a specific problem that may be the cause of a certain perception. Finally, being cross sectional, the evolution of each implementation with its long-term effects is difficult to perceive, and the particular moment for the collection of the information may not be the most adequate one. Therefore, the replication of the research in other contexts and with other samples should always be encouraged so that all these possible questions are resolved and the research has even more value, searching for more successful bilingual programs that represent a real evolution in education.

9. REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. W. & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *Taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Boston, USA: Longman.
- Arnold, J. (2000). *La dimensión afectiva en el aprendizaje de idiomas*. (A. Valero, Trans.). Madrid, Spain: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1999)
- Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D. & Furst, E. J. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of Educational Goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York, USA: David McKay Co.
- Brame, C. (2013). *Flipping the Classroom*. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved from <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/flipping-the-classroom/>
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011>
- Cortina-Pérez, B., & Andúgar Soto, A. (2018). *Didáctica de la Lengua Extranjera en Educación Infantil*. Madrid, Spain: Pirámide.
- Coyle, D., & Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2007). Research on content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 541-542.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

- Cummins, J. (1999). *BICS and CALP: Clarifying the distinction* (Report No. ED438551). Washington, D.C., USA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics
- Denzin, N. K. (Ed.) (1970). *Sociological methods: A source book*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Dueñas, M. (2009). The whats, whys, hows and whos of content-based instruction in second/foreign language education. *International Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 73-96. Retrieved from <https://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/48061>
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., and Short, D. (2007). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston, USA: Allyn and Bacon
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>
- Fathman, A. K., & Kessler, C. (1992). Cooperative Language Learning in School Contexts. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 127-140.
- Fleta, T., & Forster, E. (2014). From Flat Stanley to Flat Cat: An Intercultural, Interlinguistic Project. *Children's Literature in English Language Education*, 2(1), 57-71.
- Gallacher, L. (July 2023). *Project work with teenagers*. Teaching English, British Council. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/professional-development/teachers/planning-lessons-and-courses/articles/project-work-teenagers>
- Hughes, S., & Madrid Fernández, D. (2015). The written production of CLIL and EFL students. In D. Marsh, M. L. Pérez Cañado & J. Ráez Padilla (Eds.), *CLIL in action: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 98-111). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ioannou-Georgiou, S., & Pavlou, P. (2003). *Assessing Young Learners*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Jiménez Catalán, R. M., & Fernández Fontecha, A. (2015). Lexical phrases in compositions by CLIL and non-CLIL EFL learners. In D. Marsh, M. L. Pérez Cañado & J. Ráez Padilla (Eds.), *CLIL in action: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 82-97). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1994). *El aprendizaje cooperativo en el aula*. Virginia, USA: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lancaster, N. K. (2018). Extramural Exposure and Language Attainment: The Examination of Input-Related Variables in CLIL Programmes. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 91-114.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4-17.

- Llull, J. & Fernández, R. (2016). *Planning for CLIL. Designing Effective Lessons for the Bilingual Classroom*. Madrid, Spain: CCS
- Madrid, D., & Barrios, E. (2018). A comparison of students' educational achievement across programs and school types with and without CLIL provision. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 29-50.
- Madrid, D. & Roa, J. M. (2018). ¿Qué variables ejercen mayor influencia en la calidad de los programas bilingües? / Which variables affect the quality of bilingual programs the most?. *Revista de Educación*, 382, 79-102. DOI: 10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2018-382-393
- Marsh, D., & Langé, G. (eds.). (2000). *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.
- Mehisto, P. (2012). Criteria for Producing CLIL Learning Material. *Encuentro*, 21, 15-33.
- Milla Lara, M. & Casas Pedrosa, A.V. (2018). Teacher perspectives on CLIL implementation: A within-group comparison of key variables. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 159-180.
- Nunan, D. (1991). Methods in second language classroom-oriented research. A critical review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(2), 249-274. doi:10.1017/S0272263100009967
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Orden de 3 de junio de 2016, de la Consejería de Educación y Universidades, por la que se regula el Sistema de Enseñanza en Lenguas Extranjeras en la Comunidad Autónoma de la Región de Murcia. Retrieved from <https://servicios.educarm.es/templates/portal/ficheros/websDinamicas/172/TextoConsolidadoOrdenSELE240617.pdf>
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. London, UK: Sage.
- Pavón, V. (2014). Enhancing the quality of CLIL: making the best of the collaboration between language teachers and content teachers. *Encuentro*, 23, 115-127. Retrieved from https://ebuah.uah.es/dspace/bitstream/handle/10017/21615/Pavon_Enhancing%20Encuentro_2014_N23.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Pavón, V., Ávila, J., Gallego, A., & Espejo, R. (2014). Strategic and organisational considerations in planning CLIL: a study on the coordination between content and language teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(4), 409-425.
- Pavón, V., & Ellison, M. (2013). Examining teachers roles and competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *Linguarum Arena*, 4, 65-78.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2016). Teacher training needs for bilingual education: in-service teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(3), 266- 295.

- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2017). CLIL teacher education: Where do we stand and where do we need to go?. In M. E. Gómez Parra & R. Johnstone (Eds.), *Bilingual Education: Educational Trends and Key Concepts* (pp. 129-144). Spain: Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018a). CLIL and educational level: A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on language outcomes. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 51-70.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018b). CLIL and pedagogical innovation: fact or fiction? *International Journal of Applied Linguistic*, 28, 369-390.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018c). Innovations and Challenges in CLIL Teacher Training. *Theory Into Practice*, 57(3), 212-221. DOI: 10.1080/00405841.2018.1492238
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018d). The effects of CLIL on L1 and content learning: Updated empirical evidence from monolingual contexts. *Learning and Instruction*, 57, 18-33.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L., & Lancaster, N. K. (2017). The effects of CLIL on oral comprehension and production: a longitudinal case study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 30(3), 300-316. DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2017.1338717: 1-17.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L., & Marsh, D. (2018). Topic 1 of “What is CLIL? Origins, definition, and characterization” [Máster Interuniversitario de Educación Bilingüe’s course]. Universities of Jaén & Córdoba.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L., & Ráez Padilla, J. (2015). Introduction and overview. In D. Marsh, M. L. Pérez Cañado & J. Ráez Padilla (Eds.). *CLIL in action: Voices from the classroom* (pp. 1-12). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pérez Paredes, P., & Rubio, F. (2005). Testing and assessment. In N. McLaren, D. Madrid & A. Bueno (Eds.). *TEFL in Secondary Education* (pp. 606-639). Granada, Spain: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- Ráez-Padilla, J. (2018). Parent perspectives on CLIL implementation: Which variables make a difference? *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 181-196.
- Ramos García, A. M. (2011). The cultural knowledge of monolingual and bilingual studies. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 223-235).
- Ramos García, A. M., Ortega Marín, J. L., & Madrid, D. (2011). Bilingualism and competence in the mother tongue. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.). (pp. 135- 156).
- Resolución de la Dirección General de Formación Profesional e Innovación por la que se establece la transición entre el Sistema de Enseñanzas en Lenguas Extranjeras y los Programas de Mejora y Profundización en Lenguas Extranjeras en los centros sostenidos con fondos públicos de la Comunidad Autónoma de la Región de Murcia que imparten Educación Infantil, Educación Primaria, Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato para el curso 2022-2023. Retrieved

from

<https://servicios.educarm.es/templates/portal/ficheros/websDinamicas/45/Res%20establec%20Otransic%20SELE%20y%20progr%20profundiz%20lenguas%20CI%20177993%2016-06-22.pdf>

- San Isidro, X., & Coyle, D. (2020). An approach to CLIL lesson planning in multilingual settings. In X. San Isidro, D. Coyle & S. Kerimkulova (Eds.), *CLIL classroom practices in multilingual education in Kazakhstan: Guidelines and examples* (pp. 11-23). Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education.
- San Isidro, X. & Lasagabaster, D. (2018). The impact of CLIL on pluriliteracy development and content learning in a rural multilingual setting: A longitudinal study. *Language Teaching Research*, 3(5), 1-19. DOI: 10.1177/1362168817754103
- Seliger, H.W. & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Short, D. J., Vogt, M. E., & Echevarría, J. (2011). *The SIOP Model for Teaching Science to English Learners*. Boston, USA: Pearson
- Slattery, M., & Willis, J. (2001). *English for Primary Teachers*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Smit, U. (2007). Introduction. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16(3), 3-5.
- Sostres Larrosa, A. (2021). *La motivación en el bilingüismo: Un estudio comparativo entre asignaturas bilingües y asignaturas no bilingües*. [Trabajo Fin de Grado, Universidad de Zaragoza]. Repositorio Institucional de Documentos ZAGUAN <https://zaguan.unizar.es/record/108787/files/TAZ-TFG-2021-4094.pdf>
- Sotoca Sienes, E. (2014). The impact of bilingual education in academic achievement of students enrolled in public schools in the Autonomous Community of Madrid. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 25(2), 481-500. DOI:10.5209/rev_RCED.2014.v25.n2.41732
- Tomlinson, B. (2002). Materials development. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 66–72). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles for Effective Materials Development. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English Language Teaching Materials: Theory and Practice* (pp. 80-108). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). Developing Materials for Language Teaching. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.). *Developing Principled Frameworks for Materials Development* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Bloomsbury.

- Villoria, J., Hughes, S., & Madrid, D. (2011). Learning English and learning through English. In D. Madrid & S. Hughes (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 157-194). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Wolff, D. (2002). On the importance of CLIL in the context of the debate on plurilingual education in the European Union. In D. Marsh (Ed.). *CLIL/EMILE. The European Dimension. Actions, Trends, and Foresight Potential*, (pp. 47-48). Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.
- Wolff, D. (2005). Approaching CLIL. In D. Marsh (Coord.). *The CLIL quality matrix. Central workshop report*.

10. ANNEXES

Annex 1. Questionnaires provided to each stakeholder.

Students' Questionnaire

¡Hola! Soy Bea, una profe que está haciendo una investigación sobre tu cole y para eso necesito tu ayuda, porque eres una parte súper importante de él. Solo tienes que contestar estas preguntas, he intentado que no sean muy difíciles así que seguro que sabes hacerlo genial. Igualmente, si tienes cualquier duda o no sabes lo que significa algo solo pregúntamelo, estoy aquí para ayudarte en todo. No hay respuestas buenas ni malas, solamente con que pongas lo que tú pienses y seas sincero lo habrás hecho perfecto. Nadie va a saber quién ha contestado cada una porque no hay que poner el nombre ni nada, así que podéis expresaros libremente.

¡Muchas gracias por animaros a hacerla! Me vais a ayudar muchísimo en mi trabajo y os estoy superagradecida 😊

Marca con una X tu respuesta:

Género

- Masculino
- Femenino
- No contesta

Edad

- 5-6 años
- 7-8 años
- 9-10 años
- 11-12 años
- 13 o más

Nacionalidad

- Española
- Otra: _____

Ciudad en la que vas al cole:

- Lorca
- Murcia
- Otra: _____

Nombre de tu colegio: _____

¿Cómo crees que es tu nivel de inglés?

- a) Hablando (speaking): muy bajo, bajo, intermedio, alto, muy alto
- b) Escuchando (listening): muy bajo, bajo, intermedio, alto, muy alto

- c) Leyendo (Reading): muy bajo, bajo, intermedio, alto, muy alto
d) Escribiendo (writing): muy bajo, bajo, intermedio, alto, muy alto

¿En qué curso de primaria estás?

- 1°
 2°
 3°
 4°
 5°
 6°

¿Qué asignaturas das en inglés? (marca todas las que correspondan y luego de esas escribe en la rayita de al lado cuántas horas das en inglés de cada una a la semana, si no te acuerdas puedes mirar el horario)

- Ciencias de la Naturaleza (Natural Sciences) _____
 Ciencias Sociales (Social Sciences) _____
 Educación Física (Physical Education) _____
 Educación Plástica y Visual (Art) _____
 Lengua Castellana y Literatura (Spanish language) _____
 Inglés (English) _____
 Francés (French) _____
 Profundización de Inglés (English Profundization) _____
 Matemáticas (Maths) _____
 Lectura (Reading) _____
 Música (Music) _____
 Religión (Religion) _____
 Valores Cívicos y Éticos (Civic and Ethical Values) _____

Ahora tienes que marcar tu grado de acuerdo o de desacuerdo con las siguientes frases. Cuando hable de asignaturas me refiero a las asignaturas que has marcado aquí arriba que das en inglés. Rodea el número que corresponda (1 es que no estás nada de acuerdo, cuánto más cerquita del 1 menos de acuerdo, 3 sería que ni si ni no, cuánto más cerquita del 5 más de acuerdo, y 5 es que estás súper de acuerdo)

1. Trabajo por medio del inglés los contenidos de las asignaturas

1 2 3 4 5

2. Uso el inglés para comunicarme con mis compañeros y con el profesor en clase de forma fluida, mientras que aprendo vocabulario y gramática

1 2 3 4 5

3. Leo en inglés en clase

1 2 3 4 5

4. Escribo en inglés en clase

1 2 3 4 5

5. Escucho inglés en clase

1 2 3 4 5

6. Hablo en inglés en clase

1 2 3 4 5

7. Uso el inglés para interactuar normalmente en clase, por ejemplo, diciendo "Can I go to the toilet?" o "Can you repeat, please?"

1 2 3 4 5

8. Uso el inglés para hablar del contenido relacionado con las asignaturas, por ejemplo, decir las partes de una flor en inglés, o los nombres de animales, etc.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Hago actividades en las que tengo que clasificar, explicar, identificar, traducir...

1 2 3 4 5

10. Hago actividades en las que tengo que justificar una decisión, defender algo, juzgar, evaluar...

1 2 3 4 5

11. Trabajo la cultura de mi país y también la inglesa.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Cuando aprendo algo nuevo siempre partimos de lo que ya sabía, por ejemplo, de los contenidos relacionados con eso que ya conocíamos, o de nuestros intereses y experiencias.

1 2 3 4 5

13. Siento que tengo un papel importante cuando estoy aprendiendo, que los alumnos destacamos más que el profe y todo está centrado en nosotros.

1 2 3 4 5

14. El profe tiene buen control del idioma (Inglés)

1 2 3 4 5

15. El profe sabe bien los contenidos de la asignatura.

1 2 3 4 5

16. Estando en un cole bilingüe tengo más contacto con el inglés que si diera esas asignaturas en español, sobre todo me ayuda a poder comunicarme mejor en inglés y también sé más términos específicos.

1 2 3 4 5

17. Sigo teniendo un buen nivel de español aunque dé algunas asignaturas en inglés.

1 2 3 4 5

18. No aprendo menos de las asignaturas por darlas en inglés, sino que así además los aprendo en otro idioma.

1 2 3 4 5

19. Me siento más motivado dando esas asignaturas en inglés

1 2 3 4 5

20. Dar esas asignaturas en inglés favorece que se incluyan a todos los alumnos en clase, porque se les dan oportunidades para que aprendan la lengua que antes no tenían

1 2 3 4 5

21. Existe colaboración entre los distintos profes que me dan clase y los auxiliares de conversación

1 2 3 4 5

22. Llevo a cabo aprendizaje basado en tareas (se me pone una tarea y tengo que hacerla hablando con mis compañeros y comunicándome)

1 2 3 4 5

23. Trabajamos para resolver un proyecto en varias asignaturas a la vez y luego presentar el producto final, por ejemplo, hacer una redacción, construir algo, hacer algún vídeo, una obra de teatro...

1 2 3 4 5

24. Usamos recursos audiovisuales en clase:

1 2 3 4 5

25. Usamos las tecnologías e internet

1 2 3 4 5

26. Usamos el libro de texto

1 2 3 4 5

27. Trabajamos en grupo para juntos conseguir una meta

1 2 3 4 5

28. Los auxiliares de conversación me motivan y me ayudan a hablar con ellos en inglés

1 2 3 4 5

29. Uso recursos que hacen más fácil que entienda lo que estamos dando, por ejemplo, con imágenes, objetos de verdad, vídeos, esquemas...

1 2 3 4 5

30. Al principio de empezar la unidad hacemos actividades para saber lo que ya sabemos sobre el tema

1 2 3 4 5

31. Durante la unidad el profe también va evaluando nuestro trabajo, nuestra actitud, cómo nos portamos, etc.

1 2 3 4 5

32. Al final de la unidad el profe nos evalúa para ver lo que hemos aprendido

1 2 3 4 5

33. Se me evalúa con un examen

1 2 3 4 5

¡¡¡MUCHÍSIMAS GRACIAS POR AYUDARME!!!



Link to teachers' questionnaire

<https://forms.gle/oKckbAaNVKMTfdgB9>

Link to parents' questionnaire

<https://forms.gle/pZa8pBkQRw5RJ4gV9>

Annex 2

Block 1: Theoretical characteristics of CLIL							
		Mean	SD			p	Effect size
Q1	First tranche students	3,90	1,398	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.995	0.002
	Second tranche students	4,026	1,088				
	Teachers	3,722	1,127	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.281	-0.158
	Parents	2,60	1,578		Students / parents	0.010	-0.484
Q2	First tranche students	3,167	1,367	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.568	-0.079
	Second tranche students	3,359	1,328				
	Teachers	3,278	0,895	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.893	-0.021
	Parents	3,500	1,354		Students / parents	0.638	0.091
Q3	First tranche students	4,133	1,106	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.317	-0.128
	Second tranche students	4,308	1,104				
	Teachers	3,944	1,211	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.302	-0.146

	Parents	4,400	0,699		Students / parents	0.980	0.006
Q4	First tranche students	4,400	1,133	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.602	0.062
	Second tranche students	4,385	0,990				
	Teachers	3,833	1,295	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.033	-0.285
	Parents	4,300	0,823		Students / parents	0.416	-0.136
Q5	First tranche students	4,767	0,568	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.180	0.144
	Second tranche students	4,538	0,790				
	Teachers	4,444	0,856	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.267	-0.134
	Parents	4,500	0,707		Students / parents	0.376	-0.136
Q6	First tranche students	4,233	1,073	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.668	-0.055
	Second tranche students	4,359	0,986				
	Teachers	4,500	0,618	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.809	0.034
	Parents	4,600	0,516		Students / parents	0.611	0.090

Q7	First tranche students	4,067	1,311	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.674	-0.054
	Second tranche students	4,206	1,117				
	Teachers	3,944	0,938	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.151	-0.203
	Parents	4,200	0,919		Students / parents	0.761	-0.055
Q8	First tranche students	4,133	1,332	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.012	0.339
	Second tranche students	3,615	1,115				
	Teachers	3,667	1,138	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.415	-0.121
	Parents	3,700	1,767		Students / parents	0.763	0.058
Q9	First tranche students	3,833	1,117	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.152	-0.191
	Second tranche students	4,205	0,923				
	Teachers	3,778	1,060	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.287	-0.155
	Parents	4,100	0,994		Students / parents	0.907	0.023
	First tranche students	3,200	1,375	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st			

Q10	Second tranche students	3,359	1,203	tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.680	0.000
	Teachers	3,556	1,149	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.482	0.105
	Parents	3,700	0,949		Students / parents	0.410	0.158
Q11	First tranche students	3,667	1,493	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		1.000	8.547×10 ⁻⁴
	Second tranche students	3,744	1,229				
	Teachers	4,111	0,832	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.457	0.110
	Parents	3,000	0,816		Students / parents	0.056	-0.364
Q12	First tranche students	3,733	1,202	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.853	0.026
	Second tranche students	3,718	1,025				
	Teachers	4,333	0,767	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.030	0.316
	Parents	3,200	1,135		Students / parents	0.115	-0.299

Annex 3

Block 2: Factors affecting the teaching-learning process							
		Mean	SD		p	Effect size	
Q19	First tranche students	4,000	1,232	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.146	0.196
	Second tranche students	3,462	1,502				
	Teachers	3,111	1,079	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.054	-0.285
	Parents	3,000	1,054		Students / parents	0.071	-0.343
Q20	First tranche students	3,800	1,157	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.752	0.044
	Second tranche students	3,795	0,951				
	Teachers	2,611	1,290	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	< .001	-0.535
	Parents	3,200	1,135		Students / parents	0.115	-0.299

Annex 4

Block 3: Educational agents							
		Mean	SD			p	Effect size
Q14	First tranche students	4,667	0,844	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.901	-0.013
	Second tranche students	4,641	0,903				
	Teachers	4,389	0,608	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.006	-0.327
	Parents	4,200	1,033		Students / parents	0.036	-0.303
Q15	First tranche students	4,667	0,758	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.096	0.194
	Second tranche students	4,410	0,880				
	Teachers	4,556	0,616	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.753	-0.041
	Parents	4,500	0,850		Students / parents	0.986	-0.004
Q21	First tranche students	4,367	1,098	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.018	0.310
	Second tranche students	4,000	0,889				
	Teachers	4,167	0,924	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.919	-0.015

	Parents	4,500	0,527		Students / parents	0.430	0.145
Q28	First tranche students	4,300	1,179	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.008	0.355
	Second tranche students	3,590	1,251				
	Teachers	4,444	0,856	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.094	0.240
	Parents	4,400	0,843		Students / parents		

Annex 5

Block 4: Student-centered methodologies							
		Mean	SD			p	Effect size
Q13	First tranche students	3,800	1,186	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.081	0.239
	Second tranche students	3,231	1,366				
	Teachers	3,556	0,922	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.845	-0.030
	Parents	3,900	0,876		Students / parents	0.488	0.133
Q22	First tranche students	3,900	1,213	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.969	-0.006
	Second tranche students	3,897	1,252				
	Teachers	3,722	1,074	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.371	-0.132
	Parents	3,100	0,876		Students / parents	0.024	-0.426
Q23	First tranche students	3,233	1,612	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.476	-0.098
	Second tranche students	3,590	1,208				
	Teachers	3,278	1,487	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.682	-0.062

	Parents	2,800	1,033		Students / parents	0.117	-0.301
Q27	First tranche students	4,200	1,095	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.878	0.021
	Second tranche students	4,154	1,159				
	Teachers	4,056	0,998	Across- cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.411	-0.117
	Parents	4,100	0,568		Students / parents	0.276	-0.199

Annex 6

Block 5: Materials and resources							
		Mean	SD			p	Effect size
Q24	First tranche students	4,067	1,285	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		1.000	0.000
	Second tranche students	4,179	1,121				
	Teachers	4,667	0,767	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.045	0.275
	Parents	4,200	0,632		Students / parents	0.559	-0.107
Q25	First tranche students	3,600	1,354	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.121	-0.209
	Second tranche students	4,077	1,156				
	Teachers	4,389	0,850	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.128	0.221
	Parents	4,000	0,943		Students / parents	1.000	-0.001
Q26	First tranche students	4,067	1,363	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.379	0.115
	Second tranche students	3,718	1,538				
	Teachers	3,556	1,338	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.139	-0.215

	Parents	4,600	0,699		Students / parents	0.177	0.243
Q29	First tranche students	4,000	1,259	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.635	0.064
	Second tranche students	3,974	1,038				
	Teachers	4,222	0,732	Across- cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.689	0.059
	Parents	4,500	0,707		Students / parents		

Annex 7

Block 6: Evaluation							
		Mean	SD			p	Effect size
Q30	First tranche students	3,833	1,315	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.663	0.060
	Second tranche students	3,744	1,251				
	Teachers	3,722	1,179	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.690	-0.060
	Parents	3,900	1,197		Students / parents	0.823	0.043
Q31	First tranche students	4,533	0,819	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.343	-0.102
	Second tranche students	4,692	0,731				
	Teachers	4,333	0,686	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.024	-0.283
	Parents	4,500	0,707		Students / parents	0.365	-0.139
Q32	First tranche students	4,600	0,855	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.534	0.072
	Second tranche students	4,462	0,969				
	Teachers	4,500	0,786	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.596	-0.068

	Parents	4,500	0,527		Students / parents	0.353	-0.152
Q33	First tranche students	4,733	0,907	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.038	0.217
	Second tranche students	4,513	0,854				
	Teachers	2,667	1,372	Across- cohort comparison	Students / teachers	< .001	-0.714
	Parents	4,100	0,876				

Annex 8

Block 7: Effects on L1, L2 and content learning							
		Mean	SD			p	Effect size
Q16	First tranche students	3,900	1,155	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.113	0.217
	Second tranche students	3,359	1,405				
	Teachers	3,333	1,534	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.574	-0.085
	Parents	4,100	1,663		Students / parents	0.094	0.319
Q17	First tranche students	4,433	0,971	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.856	-0.021
	Second tranche students	4,462	1,022				
	Teachers	3,056	1,392	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	< .001	-0.563
	Parents	3,300	1,494		Students / parents	0.005	-0.465
Q18	First tranche students	3,900	1,213	Within-cohort comparison: 1 st tranche students / 2 nd tranche students		0.212	0.171
	Second tranche students	3,436	1,447				
	Teachers	3,778	0,808	Across-cohort comparison	Students / teachers	0.892	-0.021

	Parents	3,900	1,370		Students / parents	0.566	0.110
--	---------	-------	-------	--	-----------------------	-------	-------