UNIVERSIDAD PÚBLICA DE NAVARRA

The salience of language in social sciences lessons

Máster Universitario en Formación del Profesorado de Educación Secundaria
Trabajo de Fin de Máster
Minor: English

Verónica Bengoechea Irañeta

Mentor: Izaskun Villarreal Olaizola

INDEX

0. ABSTRACT 2
1. INTRODUCTION 2
2. LITERATURE REVIEW 4
2.1. CLIL teachers 5
2.2. CLIL students 7
2.3. CLIL materials 7
3. METHOD 8
3.1. Participants 8
3.2. Instruments 10
3.2.1. Lesson observation checklist 10
3.2.2. Materials checklist 10
3.2.3. Interview to a social sciences teacher 11
3.2.4. Questionnaire to CLIL students 12
3.3. Procedures 12
3.4. Data analysis 13
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 14
4.1. Lessons observation 14
4.2. Materials analysis 18
4.3. Teacher's perceptions *vs*. actual practices 21
4.4. Students' perceptions 25
6. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS 27
7. CONCLUSION 28
8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 30
APPENDIX 1. INTERVIEW TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCES TEACHER 31
APPENDIX 2. QUESTIONNAIRE TO CLIL STUDENTS 34
9. REFERENCES 38

0. ABSTRACT

Even though there is not a unified definition of CLIL and it is therefore approached from different perspectives, what is known is that CLIL is not only about teaching conceptual content through a FL; it also entails linguistic content. However, it is not yet clear what role language plays in CLIL courses. This research study seeks to find out about the extent to which language is made salient in social sciences lessons taught through English by considering the teacher's methodology and the materials used. Likewise, the perceptions towards language of the aforementioned teacher and a group of students involved are also considered and analyzed.

Data were collected by means of lesson observation, textbook analysis, an interview, and the administration of a questionnaire. The findings revealed that lessons developed in a basic language-aware way, which was aligned with the teacher's perception towards language, who considered it to be important but not decisive. The materials used considered language to a great extent, and the students' perceptions towards language were predominantly positive. Finally, it was discussed how certain changes in the teaching procedures can make lessons develop in a more language-salient way for best exploiting a CLIL environment.

Keywords: CLIL, Salience of language, Language awareness, Perceptions, Teaching practices.

1. INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) lacks unified standards and the methodologies employed vary significantly from context to context. However, the most common scenario in practice is that where CLIL teaching regards content learning as a priority whereas language plays a secondary role. Considering that CLIL also entails language in its full name, it is worth analyzing the actual role that language plays in a specific CLIL environment. In order to approach this, this research study takes the three-dimensional approach (Ball, Kelly & Clegg, 2015) as a conceptual framework since it considers language as a dimension itself, along with the conceptual and procedural ones. Therefore the aforementioned approach fits the object of analysis this study sets to assess, which is the salience of language.

Language is paramount since, as found in the neurolinguistics field, it is inherently linked to the processing of information. In brief, if learners do not understand conceptual content because of the language, they are more than likely not to fully learn. Considering this, it seems reasonable to argue that language should be enhanced.

According to the three-dimensional approach (Ball et al., 2015), content comprises concepts, procedures and language. Language is therefore not merely a means through which concepts are taught to and processed by learners but also an object of study. However, most content teachers consider the foreign language (FL) to be a vehicle only (Gierlinger & Wagner, 2016, as cited by Llinares & Whittaker, 2009), a statement that underscores the need to raise awareness towards language.

In order for language awareness to be developed in a CLIL context the teacher's role is essential since "a key component of quality CLIL education lies in teachers' classroom pedagogies" (Van Kampen, Admiraal, & Berry, 2018, p. 223), and therefore teachers are expected to carry out the extra role of teaching language (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010; as cited in Van Kampen et al., 2018).

Students are active agents in CLIL and therefore their views and performance should be taken into account too. By doing so, teachers will be able to adapt the procedures they resort to so that their methodology allows them for best learning both the conceptual and linguistic content through their FL. In fact, CLIL programs are burgeoning and in spite of the lack of cohesion around CLIL pedagogies (Coyle, 2008, as cited by Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter, 2014) most research studies coincide in the fact that a student-centered approach "is necessary for effective subject and foreign language learning to occur" (Van Kampen et al., 2018, p. 224). However, previous studies have underscored that the existing theoretical conceptualizations and the actual implementation of CLIL do not seem to be aligned (Nikula, Dalton-Puffer & Llinares, 2013; Van Kampen et al., 2018).

In order to achieve successful CLIL, where language salience is implied, the agents taking part, the context and the tools used should complement each other in case they fail to contribute to making language salient by themselves; for instance, if the textbook

does not provide meaningful procedures, the teacher's practices should make up for that scarcity. In addition, striking a balance among the three dimensions of content by resorting to the mixing desk metaphor (Ball et al., 2015), that is to say, by turning up or down the volume of the dimensions as teaching develops, would be key for learners to benefit from such learning programs.

In order to analyze the role that language plays in a CLIL environment where social sciences are taught through English as FL, the researcher deems essential to consider the agents involved, the context where CLIL develops and the materials used. As a consequence, a teacher and a group of students took part in the current study and their perceptions and attitudes towards language were analyzed. Likewise, the materials used were scrutinized and three lessons were observed in order to assess to what extent language was made salient. By interlocking these four angles it could be better determined what role language played while social sciences were taught to a group of students of Secondary Education, if such role was balanced if compared to the conceptual and procedural dimensions, and if the social sciences teacher's perceptions and practices contributed to the language enhancement.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Even though CLIL is also about language, it is not clear-cut how learners' linguistic skills actually develop (Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2012), which could be at least partly due to the lack of standards around CLIL. Even though conceptual content is what drives the teaching, it cannot be disentangled from the other two types of content, these being the procedural and linguistic ones (Ball et al., 2015; Coyle et al., 2010). As regards linguistic knowledge, language has been ascribed "an enabling role in constructing content knowledge" (Llinares et al., 2012, p. 309) and it has been considered paramount in achieving the set content-related objectives (Ball & Lindsay, 2010). Considering these findings, it seems that when learners struggle with language conceptual understanding and learning get compromised.

Most CLIL teachers consider the FL to be a tool only (Llinares & Whittaker, 2009, as cited by Gierlinger & Wagner, 2016), and the fact that normally formal language learning objectives are not stated (Järvinen, 2015) in the curricula may contribute to that conception of language. Some teachers polled also assumed that students learn the

language in a natural and incidental way and therefore it is not necessary to explicitly teach it (Llinares & Whittaker, 2009; as cited by Gierlinger & Wagner, 2016). These perceptions were corroborated later on; it was found out that, in practice, CLIL is based on language acquisition rather than on language learning (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019). Nonetheless, research addressing FL attainment reported that some formal features of language cannot be expected to be acquired incidentally (Llinares et al., 2012). After all, language is not systematic and it is necessary to explicitly focus on form (Lyster, 2007).

There has been great debate amongst CLIL experts and practitioners about how much teachers should focus on form. Relevant studies strongly suggest that before something can be learnt it needs to be noticed (Schmidt, 1990; as cited by Spratt, 2017). This may be the case of students whose first language (L1) is Spanish and learn English as FL. In order to learn how to accurately pose questions in English they must be aware of the fact that it requires an inversion. In Spanish a change in intonation would make the difference between an affirmative and an interrogative sentence, whereas in English each kind of sentence requires a different structure. In brief, certain aspects of language need to be explicitly addressed and made salient if students are to be aware of how language works, which consequently will have an impact on their their learning.

2.1. CLIL teachers

Teachers at the secondary level are content specialists who must prove a good command of English in order to join a CLIL project (Llinares & Whittaker, 2006). However, teachers yet face pedagogical challenges associated with language and content integration (Ó Ceallaigh, Ní Mhurchú & Ní Chróinín, 2017). Social sciences are one of the subjects most frequently taught through English (López Medina, 2016). Nonetheless, pre-service science teachers still demand specific training in how to teach Sciences in English (Aamat, Vallbona & Martí, 2017), which shows that teaching sciences in English requires specific methodological knowledge rather than science didactics and English didactics as separate methodologies.

CLIL teachers usually have little training, if any, in how to teach a FL. As a result, they fail to explicitly teach linguistic issues (Fortanet, 2010) since they are often unaware of the type of linguistic knowledge required by learners to perform well (Llinares &

Whittaker, 2006). This lack of awareness was confirmed by observation, which revealed that explicit focus on linguistic features was not considered in any of the lessons observed, and little evidence was found for facilitating noticing and explaining problematic and relevant language forms (Van Kampen et al., 2018; Morton, 2010, as cited by Van Kampen et al., 2018; De Graaff, Koopman, Anikina & Westhoff, 2007)

Although CLIL classrooms are considered as language-rich environments, CLIL seems to fail if teachers do not actively develop specific awareness towards language (Cenoz & Hornberger, 2007; Villarreal, 2011). Recent findings revealed that most content teachers stated that they plan lessons with language in mind but they failed to address it as linguists would (Martín del Pozo, 2016), which led to the conclusion that the language awareness shown was basic according to the interviewees' reflections. Being language-aware means explicitly knowing about language and having conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, teaching and use (as defined by the Association for Language Awareness, as cited by Martín del Pozo, 2016). Teachers showing language awareness know how their subjects are constructed in terms of language and therefore are able to help their students use it so as to learn the content of the subject (Llinares et al., 2012). For this reason, it is essential that teachers, no matter if they use the L1 or FL, "be highly skilled in the use, understanding, and ability to actively use language for teaching and learning" (Cenoz & Hornberger, 2007). In brief, teachers do not need to be experts on language (Ball, 2018) but do need to be able to anticipate to the students' linguistic needs.

"Teachers' conceptions of learning and teaching influence their instructional practices" (Martín, Pozo, Mateos, Martín & Pérez Echeverría, 2014, p. 211), and they therefore have a strong impact when it comes to planning lessons (Pajares, 1992, as cited by Rahimi & Sahragard, 2019). However, it has been recently found that teachers may not always apply their beliefs to their actual teaching practices (Rahimi & Sahragard, 2019). Considering this, further evidence from classroom observation is needed to check to what extent perceptions of CLIL teachers match the procedures they actually implement (Oattes, Oostdam, De Graaff, & Wilschut, 2017).

2.2. CLIL students

Students are necessary agents in CLIL programs but more frequently than not their needs have been overlooked. Existing investigations targeting students' opinions and attitudes concluded that students show positive attitudes in participating in CLIL programs (Cenoz 2001, cited in Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009; Rubio Mostacero, 2009, as cited in Oxbrow, 2018; Cabezas Cabello, 2010, as cited in Oxbrow, 2018). Students are willing to learn in a FL but they do not expect to be focusing on grammar or stylistic features, a view which was found to be shared by teachers (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2016).

Although CLIL practice varies from classroom to classroom (Spratt, 2017), the most suitable approach to CLIL should be that were learners are the main characters, even though this happens in the minority of cases (Wolf, 2003). In order for learners to foster their language skills and content learning communicative teaching procedures should be provided, which prove to be the most effective. After all, if students are expected to process and produce output in their FL, they need to be given the opportunity for doing so (Kelly, 2014).

2.3. CLIL materials

Current research and teaching practice show that there is a need for specific CLIL resources (Czura 2017; López Medina, 2016). Quality CLIL materials must consider linguistic salience (Ball, 2018) and help learners acquire both subject-specific and linguistic content (Czura, 2017) by means of meaningful procedures.

CLIL materials should include features portraying the 7 principles suggested by Ball et al. (2015) for CLIL material design. The first principle establishes the primacy of task, which defines tasks as being goal-oriented, requiring a sequenced interaction among learners and including work plans. The second principle focuses on the three dimensions of content (conceptual, procedural and linguistic). The third establishes that materials should guide input and support output. The fourth applies to language scaffolding and embedding. The fifth suggests making key language salient; the sixth considers an increase in difficulty in materials as learning progresses; and the seventh regards both teaching and tasks as sequenced plans.

Checklists are useful instruments for teachers to determine the adequacy of, evaluate and adapt their materials (Sheldon, 1988; Mc Grath, 2006). Those instruments can help teachers spot linguistic features and text types, and formulate language aims for lessons (Coonan, 2012; Dale, Van der Es & Tanner, 2011), which would be of help since more often than not students are required to use a language for which they are not offered any scaffolding whatsoever (Morton 2010, cited by Van Kampen et al., 2018).

In order to contribute to the ongoing efforts to identify and assess the salience of language in CLIL lessons by considering all the agents and elements involved, the present study investigates how language is perceived and enhanced in a specific Secondary Education setting by analyzing the materials used in class, gathering students opinion's, observing lessons and by interviewing a CLIL teacher. The following research questions guided this study:

1. Does the social sciences teacher focus on language while teaching CLIL? What strategies does the teacher resort to and when?

2. Do the materials used focus on language?

3. What are the perceptions towards language of the social sciences teacher? Are those aligned with the actual teaching practices implemented?

4. What are the perceptions towards language of a group of CLIL students?

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The participants taking part in this study were a CLIL teacher teaching social sciences and one of her groups of students, which was made up of 18 learners. These students attended the first year of Secondary Education (aged 12-13) in a Spanish state high-school. Even though the proficiency levels in English are varied, all of them attended the PAI program (the Spanish for learning program in English) in Primary Education, which gives them direct access to the bilingual program in Secondary Education. This

program offers two subjects imparted in English (mathematics and social sciences in the first year of Primary Education), which are taught three times a week each.

Table 1 features students' marks in the English and the social sciences subject courses obtained in the preceding term.

Table 1. Marks in the English and social sciences subject courses obtained by the students polled.

Subject	**Marks**						
	4	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
English	1	2	5	5	1	3	1
% of students	5.6%	11.1%	27.8%	27.8%	5.6%	16.7%	5.6%
Social sciences	3	1	3	7	1	3	0
% of students	16.7%	5.6%	16.7%	38.9%	5.6%	16.7%	0%

Marks were overall similar in the two courses. The average grade for English was 6.9 out of 10 points, and a slightly lower of 6.1 for social sciences. Three students failed the social sciences course but only one failed English (16.7% *vs.* 5.6%). Seven students obtained a pass in English (a mark of a 5 or a 6, 38.9%), while four students did so in social sciences (22.2%). An outstanding mark was obtained by six students in the English subject (33.3%) while eight students got it in social sciences (44.5%). Four students got an excellent grade in English (22.2%) whereas three did it in social sciences (16.7%). In brief, 6.8 (SD 43.7) was the mean in English and 6.6 (SD 44.2) that in social sciences, which is aligned. In general terms, one student failed English whereas social sciences were failed by three. Considering their grades, it can be stated that most students are able to manage CLIL and neither concepts nor language seem to pose significant difficulties.

Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymity of the participants was guaranteed.

3.2. Instruments

Four instruments were used to collect data: (1) a class observation checklist; (2) a materials checklist; (3) an interview to the teacher; and (4) a questionnaire administered individually to the 18 CLIL students taking part.

3.2.1. Lesson observation checklist

The first instrument used by the researcher to collect data was the lesson observation checklist. The researcher joined a class of students to gather information regarding the development of three social sciences sessions in terms of linguistic salience. The checklist used to tick the items witnessed was used three times, one for each session observed.

This instrument based on the 7 principles for language practice in CLIL put forward by Ball et al. (2015), and on the CLIL stages (Dale et al., 2011). The checklist consisted of 23 items measured on a five-point scale of “always (A), “usually (U)”, “barely (B)”, “never (N)” and “inconclusive (I)”. Each item was also followed by a blank space to include examples and comments.

The items (Bal et al., 2015) addressed the mediation of language between the learner and new knowledge by the teacher, the explicitness of general academic language, the creation of initial talk time, and the sequencing of activities. Further items regarded linguistic issues such as grammar, language functions and the four language skills (listening, speaking, writing and reading). Additional items had to do with the stages in CLIL (Dale et al., 2011), which range from activating to guiding and supporting input up to supporting and producing output, and assessment.

The checklist compiling the items witnessed and their frequency of occurrence are detailed in the Results and Discussion section of this study.

3.2.2. Materials checklist

The second instrument used to collect data was a materials checklist to analyze the textbook used in the social sciences lessons, which is entitled *Geography and History*.

1.2. History. Secondary Education. 3D class (Albet, Bosch, García, González-Monfort, García, & Gatell, 2016). The three sessions observed dealt with unit 9, *The prehistory of mankind*, which is 22 pages long.

The materials were scrutinized basing on the 7 principles suggested by Ball et al. (2015) and on suggestions for CLIL materials design (Dale et al., 2011). In addition, Mehisto's (2012) criteria for producing CLIL learning material (as cited on López Medina's 2016 checklist for the quality of textbooks) were considered too. This instrument sought to find out if the materials used contributed to enhancing language in CLIL lessons.

The checklist considered 18 items concerning the primacy of task, the three dimensions of content, input guidance and output support, the salience of key language and the sequencing of activities. Further items referred to how materials present the information and if it is sequenced in terms of difficulty, if tasks foster communication among peers, and if the four language skills are worked on.

3.2.3. Interview to a social sciences teacher

The interview was the third instrument used to collect data and it sought to both analyze the teacher's perceptions towards language and contrast her views with her actual practices. Similarly to the observation and materials checklist, the interview based on the 7 principles for language practice in CLIL (Ball et al., 2015), on the stages of CLIL (Dale et al., 2011), and on a questionnaire by Kelly (2014) focusing on CLIL management, teachers, resources and learners.

45 questions were posed to the teacher, which were sorted out into 8 different themes: teacher's academic and linguistic background, perceptions towards language, lesson planning, teaching practices, lesson stages, materials used, assessment and difficulties encountered while teaching CLIL. As for the teacher's background, questions related to CLIL training and experience were posed. Likewise, she was asked about her perceptions towards English, and how she planned and carried out lessons in terms of language. Further questions on assessment were raised too since it is key to determine the importance attributed to language. Issues concerning the materials used and lesson preparation were also commented upon, and finally the teacher was asked about the

difficulties encountered when teaching social sciences through English. The complete interview is enclosed as Appendix 1 at the end of this study.

3.2.4. Questionnaire to CLIL students

The fourth and last instrument used for this study was an individual questionnaire administered to 18 CLIL students. This instrument sought to find out about their perception towards language in terms of the importance they attributed to English, as well as their views on the linguistic support provided by the teacher.

The questionnaire considered competence, attitudes, and perceptions, and 21 questions were posed, among which close-, open-ended and likert-scale were to be found. Students were asked about their grades in English and in the social sciences subjects, about their ability in and how they feel when using English, and if they avoided using English in class. Likewise, questions concerning explicit language explanations in social sciences lessons and what challenges they faced in terms of language were considered too. Additional questions sought to find out about learners' opinion on language and if they considered it to be important when being taught social sciences in a FL. Finally, they were asked what aspects of language were the most difficult and the easiest ones for them. The complete questionnaire is enclosed as Appendix 2 at the end of this study.

3.3. Procedures

This study was carried out in six sessions over four weeks, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Description of the procedure of the study.

Week	Session number	Tasks
1	1	Lesson observation; materials analysis
2	2	Lesson observation; materials analysis
3	3	Lesson observation; materials analysis
4	5	Interview to the teacher; materials analysis
4	6	Questionnaire to students; materials analysis

Three lessons were observed by the researcher over a period of three weeks. The observations took place once on a weekly basis. Students took 3 social sciences lessons a week, which means that the researcher did not observe two lessons developing in between due to schedule constraints. Each lesson lasted 55 minutes and Prehistory was taught in all the lessons observed. The same procedure was repeated in each lesson observed. The researcher ticked in the checklist the items fulfilled and took additional notes on the lessons development. Afterwards, the notes were typed into an electronic checklist and arranged for better recalling since the observation was not recorded or filmed.

The textbook analysis was carried out in four weeks. In Weeks 1, 2 and 3, the researcher was provided with a copy of the book while observing lessons to better follow the teaching. In week 4, the teacher was lent a copy of the book in order to scrutinize the complete teaching unit. The researcher analyzed the textbook and contrasted the content and layout against the items appearing in the checklist.

The interview to the teacher was carried out in week 4 on a face-to-face basis. The interviewee and the researcher gathered at the high-school for roughly an hour. The interview was not recorded and the researcher wrote down the answers provided and later typed them. Finally, a questionnaire was administered individually to 18 students in week 4 too. They filled it in hard-paper format in class, which took them about 20 minutes. The questionnaire was written in Spanish in order for students to feel more comfortable when expressing their views, and also for the researcher to make sure that they fully understood the questions.

3.4. Data analysis

The lesson observation checklist was conceived to answer the first research question. Each of the three checklists was typed after the observation, and then the compiled outcome was transcribed into another checklist showing the findings of the three lessons as well as the frequency of occurrence. This allowed the researcher to draw conclusions on the extent to which those lessons developed in terms of language salience.

Since the checklist included 23 items, the researcher established a threshold of 12 items as needed to be complied with in order for each lesson to be considered to develop in a basic language-salient way.

The materials analysis checklist was conceived to answer the second research question. In weeks 1, 2 and 3 (while observing lessons) notes concerning the book use were taken. In week 4 the researcher conducted detailed analysis of the teaching unit imparted in the lessons observed. Once the items were checked and exemplified, they were transcribed into an electronic table for better arrangement. Since the checklist included 18 items, the researcher established a threshold of half of the items (9) as needed to appear in the textbook for this to be considered language-salient to a basic extent.

The interview instrument was conceived to answer the third research question, which addressed the teacher's perceptions towards language and their alignment with her teaching practices. The researcher took notes and then typed the manuscripts into a Word sheet right after the interview for better recalling and note extension. The researcher highlighted the most relevant findings and crossed data manually so as to contrast the teacher's perceptions and her actual teaching practices.

The attitudinal questionnaire administered to students was the instrument conceived to answer the fourth research question. The answers were typed in an Excel spreadsheet, and afterwards findings were counted and grouped.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section the results gathered by means of the four instruments used are presented and discussed.

4.1. Lessons observation

23 items were considered in the checklist (see Table 3), among which 14 (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 23) were noticed happening in the three lessons observed even though they differed in frequency of occurrence. On the other end, there were five items (8, 13, 14, 17 and 20) which were never witnessed. Additionally, three items (3,

11 and 22) were not observed in all the lessons, and finally one item (10) was ticked as inconclusive since the researcher was not able to judge.

Table 3. Frequency of occurrence of the items observed in the three sessions.

	LESSON 1					LESSON 2					LESSON 3				
ITEMS	**A**	**U**	**B**	**N**	**I**	**A**	**U**	**B**	**N**	**I**	**A**	**U**	**B**	**N**	**I**
1. Activation	V					V					V				
2. Initial talk time	V					V					V				
3. Multimodal input				V		V					V				
4. Language mediated	V					V					V				
5. Input scaffolded	V					V					V				
6. Explanations understood checked		V					V					V			
7. New vocabulary introduced	V					V					V				
8. Grammar use explained				V					V					V	
9. English corrected			V					V					V		
10. Specific language needs supported					V					V					V
11. When explaining activities: language focused				V					V			V			
12. When correcting activities: language focused		V					V						V		
13. More student talk time				V					V					V	
14. Peer- interaction promoted				V					V					V	
15. Teacher L1 use			V					V					V		
16. Students questions		V					V					V			
17. Word formation promoted				V					V					V	
18. Fat questions			V					V					V		
19. Rich-vocabulary tasks	V							V						V	
20. Full sentences				V					V					V	
21. Output supported			V					V					V		
22. From 'private' to 'public'				V				V						V	
23. 4 skills	V					V					V				

Notes: A: Always; U: Usually; B: Barely; N: Never; I: Inconclusive.

Six items (items 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 23) were observed happening in the three sessions at the highest frequency. The teacher always created initial talk time teacher-students and activated previous knowledge by asking learners in plenary what they had done in the previous lesson as a way of focusing the topic. Likewise, the teacher mediated language between learner and new knowledge by simultaneously showing text and pictures in some power point presentations displayed during lessons 2 and 3, by providing detailed explanations, rephrasing content from the textbook, and giving examples. Related to this, the teacher also guided input. For instance, when explaining what a chopping tool is, the teacher presented that concept by means of pictures and text displayed as well as by oral explanations. The teacher tried to bring the tool closer to students by explaining that they can find one in a park but they would not know that it is a prehistoric tool because a park is not the context where a chopping tool may be expected to be found. The teacher introduced new subject-specific vocabulary by emphasizing certain words and providing the equivalent in Spanish "walking upright, *estirado*, spine straight, spine (teacher pointed at her spine)". Finally, the four skills of language were targeted in all the sessions. Listening, reading and writing were the skills that students practiced most, followed at a distance by the speaking skill, since only few students contributed in plenary and uttered brief oral messages in the form of question-answer.

On the other end of the distribution, 5 items (items 8, 13, 14, 17, 20) were not considered in any of the sessions observed. The teacher did not explain specific grammar structures or gave instructions with regard to using specific language when asking students to carry out tasks, which collides with the need for explicit focus on form (Lyster, 2007). Students' talking time never outweighed teacher's. In fact, not many students contributed in plenary. On average, students uttered brief answers but failed to make full sentences, and content explanations were teacher-centred and talking among peers did not happen. Talking happened between teacher and students, not among peers, which is aligned to the teacher's perceptions, who said that peer interaction is not promoted on a daily basis. However, she said that she tends to make students produce output basing on the new input that she delivers, but no peer-to-peer talking was observed by the researcher. It is fair to acknowledge that lesson observation was limited in time and perhaps the teacher allows time for interaction among peers. However, the sample collected cannot be ignored and talk among learners should be enhanced more frequently since the researcher did not observe any situation of this kind.

Learners were not required to change forms of words either, which would be a meaningful way of broadening vocabulary and raising awareness towards word types and construction. An advisable teaching practice here would be highlighting cognates since in many cases similar words both in English and Spanish are likely to be misunderstood, and therefore explicit comments upon by the teacher are needed. Otherwise, students risk for bad understanding.

In between there were three items (3, 6, 12 and 16) which were observed in all or most sessions to an acceptable frequency. Multimodal input was frequently provided by means of power point presentations displayed in plenary showing text and pictures to convey meaning in a visual way. When delivering conceptual explanations, the teacher tended to ask students if these were understood by saying “Yes? Clear?". When correcting activities, language was usually highlighted at the lexical level, and the teacher would write on the blackboard the words posing problems in terms of spelling. The researcher perceived students followed the explanations and they posed few questions when they did not understand in each lesson. However, the researcher cannot evaluate whether students asked for clarifications anytime when needed.

Seven items (9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22) were barely or never noticeable in the sessions observed. Although the teacher corrected students’ production in English in each lesson, it mainly happened when students read a text or their answer in a written activity but not when they spoke spontaneously. Language was highlighted only once when the activities were explained. As for the use of L1, the teacher used Spanish in the three lessons observed, but only for translation purposes (twice on average), such as in the example:

Example X:

Teacher: “These tools are buried, *enterradas*”.

This example shows a time-saving way of making sure that all students grasp the idea.

The questions posed by the teacher used to be skinny (Dale et al., 2015) rather than fat, and rich-vocabulary activities were carried out only once in one of the lessons observed. Skinny questions do not allow students for Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTs) but for Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTs) instead (derived from Bloom, 1956), which means that students do not make great effort either cognitively or linguistically speaking, they

do not perceive the tasks challenging and therefore learning is not likely to happen or progress.

Output production was weakly supported, only once in one of the lessons observed. The teacher asked students to draw a time line and place events in order within, for which she drew one on the board as an example and named a few events so that students could follow suit. Few activities were sequenced from private through to public, only in one of the sessions. A new topic was introduced by initial talk on what had been done in the previous lesson. The teacher carried out some exploratory talk and delivered explanations while she asked students to contribute. Then she asked learners to do in writing some tasks where they had to apply that knowledge.

One item was checked as inconclusive (10). Linguistic needs in terms of new vocabulary were supported by the teacher only when students explicitly demanded it and not, for example, when they inserted words in Spanish while speaking English. However, the researcher could not determine whether there were further needs which might have gone unnoticed in the other lessons.

Even though most items were observed happening during the sessions' development, some of them did not happen in all the occasions that they could have happened, which means that there were missed opportunities for the teacher to promote language. The number of items noticed in each lesson observed were 15, 16 and 14 respectively which, according to the threshold established by the researcher, lessons developed in a basic language-salient way according to the teacher's reflections and practices, which were aligned, and also due to the fact that there were missing opportunities which, if addressed differently, would have allowed for explicit language explanations.

4.2. Materials analysis

The textbook used in class was scrutinized for indicators of language enhancement as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Items analyzed in the textbook used in the social sciences lessons.

ITEM	YES	NO
1. Proficiency level of L2 is considered	V	
2. The language is authentic	V	
3. Presentation of subject-specific vocabulary/content is guided	V	
4. Aids for pronunciation are suggested		V
5. Language learning goals are visible to students		V
6. Tasks require interaction among peers	V	
7. Tasks are sequenced/have identifiable stages	V	
8. Materials foster cognitive fluency through scaffolding of language	V	
9. Materials foster cooperative learning	V	
10. Materials include self, peer and other types of formative assessment	V	
11. Tasks include scaffolding to support output	V	
12. Key language is made salient	V	
13. Extensive vocabulary practice	V	
14. Enhanced visualization of meaning (timelines, illustrations, diagrams)	V	
15. Conceptual dimension is considered (i.e. list of keywords)	V	
16. Linguistic dimension is considered	V	
17. Procedural dimension is considered (i.e. chart filling to categorize information provided in a text)	V	
18. Materials help develop the 4 skills of language	V	

The textbook considers 16 of the 18 items included, although the intensity and typology of the strategies used vary. In general terms, visualization is enhanced throughout the unit, there are timelines, illustrations and charts displaying content in different ways.

The proficiency level of the FL is considered since content is explained by using level-appropriate grammatical structures. Paragraphs are brief and are made of short

sentences. The language is authentic since vocabulary appears in appropriate contexts. Key language is made salient in the teaching unit analyzed by highlighting key words in different colours, in bolds and by compiling them in vocabulary boxes that come up every two pages. However, there are few activities promoting vocabulary development, these being fill-in-the-gaps-like, which imply mechanic rather than creative performance.

This teaching unit offers four tasks which require interaction among peers and one fosters cooperative learning. In some cases speaking frames are provided to scaffold the conversation. Tasks are sequenced and they range from the least cognitively and linguistically demanding to the most challenging ones, that is to say, they progress from LOTs to HOTs (derived from Bloom, 1956). For instance, the first questions included in an activity require brief answers whereas the second part requires a description of a process. The third task demands analyzing, and the last part implies establishing a relationship. Language is scaffolded and the keywords are depicted by pictures or definitions in English, which helps to better understand the meaning. Tasks also include scaffolding to support output, and input activities involving filling charts headlines are provided to help categorize the information.

The conceptual dimension is considered in that there are lists of key concepts, diagrams retrieving the key concepts, and green charts every two pages called “Quick Revision” summarizing the main ideas. As for the linguistic dimension, keywords are defined in English, and there is also an activity which suggests using the language appendix provided, but this happens only once throughout the unit and therefore language salience is scarce. This is to be seen once throughout the book. The procedural dimension of content is also considered in that some activities present a chart to be filled in which the information appearing in a text needs to be categorized. Nonetheless, the book does not offer a wide range of procedures.

As for assessment, there is an “Online challenge” box with a link to the Internet where students can do activities and self-correct them, which helps know how they are doing and what they need to improve. However, in order to determine if this kind of assessment is formative the teacher would need to use it to steer teaching. Otherwise it would be summative.

This textbook also helps develop the 4 skills of language, being reading and writing promoted to a greater extent since there are texts to be read through all the teaching unit, and most activities are to be carried out in writing, even though it is not explicitly specified and the teacher could also choose to do them orally instead by tailoring procedures to suit students' demands for further practice. Listening is to practice in roughly 10 links to the Internet to further learning, whereas communicative activities appear only four times throughout the unit.

On the contrary, the unit analyzed does not offer aids for pronunciation. Neither language learning nor procedural goals are considered, only conceptual ones are stated.

Unlike previous research conducted in the field, the textbook analyzed considers language according to the researcher's criteria. However, it is fair to acknowledge that activities which promote interaction among peers do not come up very frequently. Considering this, the teacher's role would be essential in order to complement the book by resorting to procedures which help enhance communication among peers, language explanations and guidelines in terms of the language to be used.

4.3. Teacher's perceptions *vs.* actual practices

To gauge the importance the teacher attached to language in her CLIL course, she was asked about her teaching practices and perceptions about language.

Firstly the teacher was asked how long she had been teaching CLIL for:

> "I have been teaching Social sciences in English for six years now; I do not know if my methodology is considered to be CLIL though".

Her response was surprising since it can be inferred that the lack of knowledge about CLIL is due to the absence of training, which should be provided to guide teacher in this kind of programs regardless of the lack of unified criteria around CLIL methodologies.

In addition, further revealing findings were that the interviewee perceives language as important, but not as decisive.

> "I think that language is important but not decisive, and I would score it with a 6 or 7 out of 10 points. Apart from that, language is not decisive because I use lots of visuals and I do not punish grammar mistakes in exams".

The teacher stated that linguistic mistakes are ignored when assessing assignments and exams. Her responses are aligned with her practices, as observed by the researcher. These attitudes are also in the line of Llinares et al's (2012) findings, which revealed that "no matter if language is assessed or not, it will play an invisible role in CLIL evaluation". However, assessing language is essential because "if students cease to attach importance to the language component, the full potential of the CLIL classes may not be realized" (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2016. p. 13). Therefore, in order to prevent this from happening, the teacher would need to convey the idea that language is so important that it does have an impact on students' grades, and then students would acknowledge that importance and therefore their learning attitudes could be steered. Because if teachers are not the first to challenge the idea of them not expecting to be focusing on grammar or other linguistic issues (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2016) students will hardly be expected to attach importance to language.

The interviewee also stated that she collaborated with the English teacher when needed. The teacher told the researcher that such collaboration takes place when projects are carried out, for instance, they cooperated in an assignment on weather and climate. The Sciences teacher worked on concepts whereas the English teacher focused on subject-matter vocabulary. Students had to do a "Round-the-world trip" consisting of going through all the climate zones they had learnt about in class before. First of all, they had to do a climatogram, then analyze the landscape and prepare a power point presentation that was later presented orally in front of their classmates. The oral presentation was also witnessed by the English teacher and she assessed it as a project for the English subject too. Shared expertise by a content and a language specialist collaborating in instruction (San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019) seems an optimal solution to implementing good language and content teaching, and therefore it can be stated that the interviewee is on the right way concerning this. However, in order to acknowledge the

role of language it would also need to be assessed in the CLIL subject. Otherwise it will be conveyed the idea that linguistic issues are only related to the teaching of a language. Nonetheless, the researcher deems fair to praise this collaboration because in spite of the lack of training in CLIL both teachers show initiative to cooperate, and therefore they are on the right track, since this cooperation acknowledges that the CLIL subject (social sciences) and the English subject need to go, at least to a certain extent, hand in hand.

The teacher considers CLIL as positive because it offers a good opportunity for students to improve their language learning, and although she reports that her lessons are content-driven, as shown in previous research conducted, she admits to anticipate the subject-specific vocabulary needed.

The teacher said she cares about the use of English but gives more importance to conveying concepts than to linguistic accuracy. When asked about language awareness, she replied:

> "I correct grammar mistakes and spelling mistakes, but I do not like explaining grammar because I am not a specialist".

Even though this answer has to do with personal tastes, it is somehow linked to the beliefs of those teachers assuming that students can learn a language in a natural and incidental way (Llinares & Whittaker, 2009; as cited by Gierlinger & Wagner, 2016). Nonetheless, some features of language need to be explicitly addressed (Lyster, 2007), and if those common and limiting beliefs are rethought CLIL can be made a more exploitable learning environment.

Accordingly, when telling students to carry out writing tasks, she does not provide instructions with regard to grammar structures or specific phrases which would be relevant. As for the frequency in correcting students' English, the teacher admits that she does not always do it, as stated below:

> "I try to correct students once they have finished talking. If I do it while they talk, they usually get nervous and stop talking. When they are writing I correct

> them while they are working or at the end. I explain them their mistakes or tell them the appropriate word".

Something on which teacher's perceptions and practices differ to a certain extent is the frequency with which students are required to switch to English when their start contributing in Spanish in plenary. The researcher noticed this happened only once in one of the three lessons observed. Most of the students who took part in plenary, which were not many, contributed in Spanish and were not required to switch languages.

When asked about the materials used, she said she adapts them to achieve the content objectives. She says she looks for and designs herself additional materials to support content. When canvassed about her teaching practices, she introduces new content in different ways, mainly through videos, readings, brainstorming activities and visuals. As for interaction among students she stated she does not promote it on a daily basis but when she does it she approaches it in a way that student are expected to produce output based on the input she gives. Nonetheless, the researcher did not witness this in any of the lessons observed.

After having analyzed the results gathered by means of the interview the researcher concludes that the perceptions of the teacher taking part in the study considers language to a certain extent, which can be determined to be basic in terms of language awareness. This connotation is inferred from the teacher's reflections and also deducted through lesson observation considering the missing opportunities that the teacher could have benefited from to explicitly teach English while, for instance, correcting students' mistakes.

In addition, that awareness fails to be conveyed to students since language is not assessed. In other words, the importance attached to English is acknowledged by the teacher but if students do not perceive it as decisive the language dimension risks not to be fully considered in CLIL lessons (Coyle, Hood, & Mars, 2010). In general terms, the teacher's perceptions and her practices are aligned and no significant mismatches were noticed.

4.4. Students' perceptions

When canvassed about the most difficult aspects of English, grammar was the most mentioned category (33.3%), whereas pronunciation and assignments were mentioned by only one student each (5.6%).

Table 5: Aspect mentioned by students as the most difficult.

MOST DIFFICULT ASPECTS MENTIONED	MENTIONS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS
Grammar	33.3%	6
Writing	16.6%	3
Vocabulary	16.6%	3
Speaking	11.1%	2
Unanswered	11.1%	2
Pronunciation	5.6%	1
Assignments	5.6%	1

These findings would need to be taken into account since students may need further grammar practice and therefore it would be advisable for the teacher to challenge her statement "I do not teach grammar because I am not an expert" and take a step forward since, according to the researcher, she masters English and efforts towards this would undoubtedly make a difference.

Students were also asked about how difficult they perceived English to be. 50% of students perceived it as easy, 44.4% as attainable, and 5.6% as difficult. The easiness perception was parallel to their opinions about learning social sciences in English. Almost 90% of students found it not difficult regardless of the mark obtained in the English subject.

When asked if they found positive to learn social sciences in English, 100% of students answered that it was so, and they also added reasons supporting that opinion, among which "because we learn more" and "we practice English more" were the most cited arguments by 80% and 20% of learners respectively.

When asked how often the teacher provides corrections (table 7), all students said that they are corrected with a difference in frequency. All students admitted to participating in class, although only 11.1% said they always did it. Most of them stated that they only did it sometimes. In fact, when asked to rank out of 10 their contribution by using the English language, a mean of 6.94 was obtained (SD: 32.94), whereas the mean dropped sharply for Spanish (mean 3.05; SD: 32.94). According to the researcher's observations, most contributions were made by students in Spanish, but for two or three students who would always use English only.

Table 6: Students' perceptions concerning language corrections, participation in plenary and the requirement of using English.

	Always	Most times	Sometimes	Barely	Never
Students get language corrections	0%	55.5%	44.5%	0%	0%
Participation in plenary	11.1%	33.3%	55.5%	0%	0%
English required in plenary	11.1%	44.4%	27.7%	0%	16.6%

Over 80% of students said that the teacher required them to use English in class to a greater or lesser extent, while 16.6% said this never happened to them. However, the researcher observed this situation happening only once during the three lessons observed. The researcher witnessed that about 7 students tended to take part, from which two were the ones who participated the most in all the lessons observed, which differs from the students' perceptions towards their degree of participation.

As for instructions with regard to language use, about 60% of students stated that the teacher provides linguistic guidelines when they have to fulfill tasks, while a fairly high proportion said she did not. Those who said that they do not perceive those guidelines as explicit argued that they would be useful "to better know what to do and how". However, the researcher did not listen to any instructions regarding language use when the teacher asked students to carry out tasks. In addition, the teacher admitted not giving that kind of instructions, so it seems reasonable to conclude that perhaps students do not fully make the difference between procedural and linguistic guidelines.

Table 7: Language guidelines provided by the teacher and language awareness conveyed.

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Guidelines language use	61.1%	38.9%
Vocabulary awareness	83.4%	16.6%

Finally, over 80% of students (15 out of 18 students) stated that the teacher highlights vocabulary, whereas three students said that it does not happen. The researcher corroborates that the teacher tends to highlight subject-specific vocabulary in her course.

The predominant perception of most of the students polled was positive with regard to learning a subject-matter in FL, which is aligned with findings from previous research, regardless of the mark they get and how difficult or easy they find the language to be. To be more specific, there were three students who failed the social sciences subject the previous term but passed the English subject, from which it can be inferred that English is not the reason of them failing. Likewise, they think that getting feedback is positive in order to improve, and some students said that more instructions in tasks would be useful. Considering this, it could be argued that more frequent corrections and a change in some procedures would be needed, as students require.

6. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

By having been offered the possibility to observe lessons the researcher reached several conclusions and thought of possible ways of making social sciences more salient in terms of language by considering proposals put forward by prior relevant studies .

As for the development of the lessons observed, it would be advisable to devote time to interaction and cooperation among learners (Aamat et al., 2017). Classroom methodology needs to be communicative, because if learners are expected to process and produce in their FL, the opportunity for them to practice has to be created (Kelly, 2014). By exposing them to interactive processes they are “gently pushed to try out, correct and improve what they say” (Dale et al., 2011, p.121).

An appropriate way of fitting that talk would be by asking learners to carry out writing tasks involving comparing or describing, which come up frequently in social sciences. Before writing down the answers students can have a small talk, argue, and then decide how to answer the question in writing. Likewise, a brief review by the teacher where of clues such as “while/whereas; unlike” would help students focus their talk and produce output typical of that specific field. In fact, almost 50% of students stated that they missed guidelines regarding language use and argued that these would be useful “to better know what to do and how”, and once they have expressed their views their demands should not be overlooked.

If language is to be made more salient than it looks it is, assessment should consider language too. Assessment influences the way learners learn (Dale et al., 2015), and if teachers assess language use, they will be more likely to pay more careful attention to the way they use it. However, if teachers fail to convey the importance of language, it is more than likely to be neglected by students. A first step to address this could be by including the linguistic aspect in the rubrics assessing assignments.

To conclude, as the researcher sees it, the teacher masters English and she is also confident to teach 100% of time (but for specific translation purposes) in English, at which she succeeds. Considering her command of English, it could be suggested the teacher make an effort to explicitly teach specific language-related issues and carry out the extra role of teaching language (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010; as cited in Van Kampen et al., 2018).

7. CONCLUSION

This research study constitutes a further case-study supporting that language remains secondary in CLIL. In general terms, the findings hereby provided are in the line of those revealed by previous research except for those concerning CLIL materials.

This is a comprehensive study overarching the classroom context, the materials being used as well as students’ and their teacher’s perspectives. As for the context where three social sciences lessons taught through English were observed, the researcher considers that those lessons developed with basic language awareness. The practices used by the

teacher in order to impart those lessons were aligned with her own perceptions on language, considered as important but not decisive.

As witnessed by the researcher, training remains a pending issue and it is needed in order to make teachers aware of the importance of language and the impact that it has on the learner's learning process. After all, "encouraging learners to focus on the language they use to express their ideas helps them understand subjects better" (Dale et al., 2011, p. 181). Furthermore, this will also provide teachers with information on the language difficulties that students experience and it will therefore allow them to tailor their teaching to the students' needs (Dale et al., 2011). That training should also approach communication as a key matter and include procedural proposals on how to teach language while a specific subject-matter is imparted.

As for the materials used in those lessons, considering the items that make books to be good quality, the analysis revealed that the materials used in the group of participants taking part are appropriate and consider language to a great extent. Concerning the few features which are not considered, practices contributing to language awareness to be implemented by the teacher would easily fill those minor gaps. Finally, students' perceptions towards the FL were positive in most cases, regardless of the students' proficiency level in their FL.

In brief, even though the four angles hereby analyzed, these being the teacher's perceptions and practices, students' perceptions and the materials being used, do not promote language to its greatest extent by themselves, the researcher has found out that the gaps to be filled are minor and they could be easily made up for if those angles complement each other. The textbook used is good quality, and the lack of varied procedures could be made up by meaningful teaching practices which should be taught to CLIL teachers by means of CLIL training, which is needed. In addition, considering that the students taking part show positive and receptive attitudes, it can be stated that there is a propitious scenario for implementing small but significant changes which undoubtedly make a difference.

This research study constitutes a limited sample in terms of class observation due to time and schedule constraints. Likewise, these findings cannot be generalized as they

belong to a case study of one teacher in one classroom context. Having had the possibility of observing all the lessons while which the Prehistory unit was taught would have provided a more accurate analysis. More comprehensive studies are needed to help teachers recognize the language in their subjects (Van Kampen et al., 2018) and provide them with clues on how to best exploit it.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher thanks the school and the participants for having made this research study happen, and she likewise thanks her university mentor for her guidance and support throughout this enriching process.

APPENDIX 1. INTERVIEW TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCES TEACHER

Background

1. Are you a content teacher or a language specialist?
2. Are CLIL teachers required a minimum level of English to teach CLIL? If so, which?
3. Do CLIL teachers volunteer themselves to teach CLIL?
4. How long have you been teaching CLIL for?
5. Did you get any training in CLIL? If so, how long was it? Was it useful? Would you improve anything? What did the training focus on?
6. Do you feel comfortable teaching in English?
7. Do you ask for collaboration to the English teacher?
8. Do the representatives from the Education Department give the school guidelines in terms of how to teach CLIL?
9. Does the curriculum specify language aims for CLIL?
10. Do your students have different levels of proficiency in English?
11. Are students selected for CLIL?

Perceptions towards language

12. Do you consider language to be important when teaching Social Sciences through English? If so, how important?
    a. From 0 to 10 (being 0 not important at all and 10 extremely important). Justify your view

13. Do you think bilingual programs are positive for students? Why?

14. What does bilingual education mean to you?

Lesson planning

15. Do you analyze the curriculum in order to get a clear idea of what students are expected to learn in terms of language?

16. Do you plan your content lessons with language in mind? What do you do?

17. When planning a lesson, do you conceive it as a sequence of stages? If so, can you list the steps you take?

Teaching practices

18. Do you teach the whole lesson in English? If not, what percentage?

19. When you switch languages, why is it? What is the purpose? (i.e. explain complex content)

20. Do you care the way you express yourself in English or do you focus more on conveying concepts regardless of your English being 100% correct?

21. How do you introduce new content?

22. Do you introduce the vocabulary of the unit? If so, how?

23. Do your students use L1? Do you mind? When do you allow its use?

24. Do you raise awareness towards accuracy in English? How? (by correcting, by explaining grammar?)

25. Do you tend to highlight general academic language?

Lesson stages

26. Do you start lessons by activating previous knowledge?

27. Do you think of different ways of introducing new content when planning lessons? (i.e. multimodal input: video watching + task to do)

28. Do you use strategies to guide/scaffold input? Which?

29. When you ask students to carry out tasks in writing, do you somehow support output? If so, how?

30. Do you try to promote interaction among students in each lesson?

31. Do you sequence the tasks considering an increase in the difficulty?

32. Do you tell students what is expected of them before they start doing tasks?

33. While you teach content, do you teach also English? If so, when and what kind of linguistic features?

34. When you ask students to carry out specific tasks, do you give also instructions with regard to grammar structures or specific phrases that should be used? i.e. vocabulary to be used, discourse markers, phrases –for comparing-?

35. Do you tend to work on the 4 language skills in each lesson?

Materials

36. Do you adapt CLIL materials? What? How? Why?

37. What do you find easier or more difficult to adapt?

38. Do you look for or design yourself additional materials? If so, when and why? (i.e. is it to support content or language?)

Assessment

39. During the lessons, do you correct students when their English is not proper? If so, when? What kind of feedback do you provide?
40. Assignments/exams: do you assess content or language?
41. If language is assessed, do you write down specific criteria to assess assignments and exams? If so, which criteria?
42. Do linguistic mistakes have an impact on the students' marks? If so, to what extent and what kind of mistakes?

Difficulties

43. Are there any students with specific language needs?
44. Do you support those students with specific language needs? How?
45. How do you deal with complex situations? i.e. when a student asks for the English for specific vocabulary uttered in Spanish you do not know, or when they do not fully understand explanations.

Comments

APPENDIX 2. QUESTIONNAIRE TO CLIL STUDENTS

1. **¿Qué calificación obtuviste en Sociales el pasado trimestre?**

……..…..

2. **¿Qué calificación obtuviste en Inglés el pasado trimestre?**

……...…….

3. **¿Te sientes cómodo hablando o escribiendo en inglés?** SÍ NO

Puntúa del 0 al 10 (0= nada cómodo; 10 = igual de cómodo que en mi lengua materna)

Hablando: del 0 al 10 ……

Escribiendo: del 0 al 10 …….

4. **¿Qué te resulta lo más fácil del inglés?**

.....

5. **¿Y lo más complicado?**

.....

6. **¿La profesora te corrige tu inglés en clase de Sociales?**

SIEMPRE CASI SIEMPRE A VECES NUNCA

7. ¿Te parece positivo recibir correcciones de tu inglés?

SÍ NO INDIFERENTE

¿Por qué? ……

8. ¿Participas oralmente en clase de Ciencias Sociales?

SIEMPRE CASI SIEMPRE A VECES NUNCA

Cuando participas, ¿lo haces en inglés, en castellano, o en ambos idiomas?

……..……..

¿En qué medida en inglés, y en qué medida en castellano?

Valora sobre 10 puntos.

Por ejemplo, 5 puntos en inglés y 5 puntos en castellano (es decir, aproximadamente la mitad de las veces en inglés y la otra mitad en castellano)

……..……

9. Cuando participas en clase oralmente en castellano, ¿la profesora te pide que repitas en inglés lo que has dicho?

SIEMPRE CASI SIEMPRE A VECES NUNCA

10. ¿Evitas participar en clase por miedo a utilizar el inglés? SÍ NO

Si lo evitas, ¿cuál es el motivo?

……

11. ¿El inglés te resulta complicado, asequible o fácil?

……

12. Cuando no entiendes alguna palabra o explicación en inglés, ¿preguntas?

SÍ NO

13. Cuando no entiendes algo debido al inglés, y no preguntas, ¿cuál es el motivo?

……

14. ¿Tienes dificultades para seguir las clases de Sociales en inglés?

SÍ NO

Si has respondido SÍ en la pregunta anterior, ¿qué dificultades sueles tener?

.....……..……....
.....……

¿Qué haces para solventar esas dificultades?

.....……...……

15. ¿Te parece positivo aprender Sociales en inglés?

SÍ NO INDIFERENTE

¿Por qué?

.....

16. ¿Consideras que aprendes más inglés al aprender Sociales en inglés?

SÍ NO

¿Por qué?

.....

17. En clase de Sociales, ¿la profesora hace explicaciones del idioma inglés? Es decir, como haría la profesora de inglés en la clase de Inglés.

SÍ NO

Si has contestado SÍ en la pregunta anterior, ¿puedes explicar qué cosas explica?
Por ejemplo, gramática, vocabulario, si hace hincapié en los tiempos verbales…

……

Si has contestado NO en la pregunta anterior, ¿crees que sería positivo que la profesora diera un repaso a algunos aspectos del inglés? ¿Por qué?

……

18. Cuando tienes que hacer un ejercicio por escrito, ¿la profesora pide que escribáis frases completas?

SIEMPRE CASI SIEMPRE A VECES NUNCA

19. ¿La profesora resalta el vocabulario importante de cada lección?

SÍ NO

20. Durante la clase, ¿la profesora utiliza más el inglés o el castellano?

…….

21. Cuando tienes que redactar algún ejercicio (por ejemplo, hacer una descripción o una comparación), ¿la profesora te indica qué tipo de expresiones tienes que utilizar?

SÍ NO

Si has respondido SÍ en la pregunta anterior, ¿crees que esas indicaciones son suficientes? ¿Por qué?

……..……
……..……

Si has respondido NO en la pregunta anterior, ¿te vendría bien que diera determinadas indicaciones para ayudarte a hacer el ejercicio? ¿Por qué?

……...……

9. REFERENCES

Albet, A., Bosch, D., García, M., González-Monfort, N., García, M., & Gatell, C. (2016). *Geography and History, 1.2. History. Secondary Education. 3D class*. Vicens Vives. 154-175. ISBN 9788468232393. Spain

Amat, A., Vallbona, A. & Martí, J. (2017). Percepciones de futuros maestros de infantil y primaria sobre la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de las ciencias en inglés. *X Congreso International sobre Investigación en Didáctica de las Ciencias, Sevilla, 5-8 septiembre de 2017*

Association for Language Awareness, retrieved from https://lexically.net/ala/la_defined.htm

Ball, P. (2016). Using language(s) to develop subject competences in CLIL-based practice. Pulso, 39. 15-34

Ball, P. (2018). Innovations and Challenges in CLIL Materials Design, Theory Into Practice, DOI 10.1080/00405841.2018.1484036

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). Putting CLIL into Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ball, P. & Lindsay, D. (2010). Teacher training for CLIL in the Basque Country*:* The case of the Ikastolas - An expediency model. In D. Lasagabaster and Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (*Eds*.). CLIL in Spain*:* Implementation, Results and Teacher Training. 162-187. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *A taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain.* New York, NY: Longmans, Green.

Cabezas Cabello, J.M. (2010). A SWOT analysis of the Andalusian Plurilingualism Promotion Plan (APPP), in M.L. Pérez Cañado (ed.), Proceedings of the 23rd GRETA Convention. Jaén: Joxman, 83-91

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F. & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics, 35* (3). 243-262. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amt011

Cenoz, J. & Hornberger, N. (2007). Chapter 3: Language Awareness & CLIL. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education: Knowledge about Language* (pp.233-246), 2nd edition, Vol 6. New York & Berlin: Springer Science and Business Media

Coonan, C.M. (2012). The foreign language curriculum and CLIL. *Synergies Italie, 8*. 117-128

Coyle, D. (2013). Listening to learners: An investigation into 'successful learning' across CLIL contexts. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16,* 244-266

Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Czura, A. (2017). Translation is not enough – the need for pedagogical adaptation in CLIL textbook development. Porta Linguarum, 27, pp. 35-46 http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero27/3_AnnaCzura.pdf

Dale, L., Van der Es, W., & Tanner, R. (2011). *CLIL Skills*. European Platform - Internationalising Education

De Graaff, E., Koopman, G.J., Anikina, Y. & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10* (5), 603-624. DOI: 10.2167/beb462.0

Fortanet, I. (2010). Training CLIL teachers at university level. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results, and teacher training*. 257-276. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars

Gierlinger E., & Wagner T. (2016). The more the merrier – revisiting CLIL-based vocabulary growth in secondary education. *LACLIL, 9(1),* 37-63, DOI: 10.5294/laclil.2016.9.1.3

Järvinen H-M. (2015). Language in content instruction. Issues in promoting language and learning in CLIL type provision. https://www.researchgate.net/publications/264881264

Kelly, K. (2014). Description of a plenary paper delivered at the Conference "Approaches to teaching content through English: Content and Language Integrated Learnint", in Astana. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/keith-kelly-ingredients-successful-clil-0

Kelly, K. (2014). Questionnaire. How CLIL ready are you and your school? https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/keith_kelly_questionnairre.pdf

Lasagabaster D. & Doiz A. (2016). CLIL students' perceptions of their language learning process: delving into self-perceived improvement and instructional preferences. *Language Awareness, 25* (1), DOI: 10.1080/08658416.2015.1122019

Lasagabaster D. & Doiz A. (2018). Language errors in an English-medium instruction university setting: How do language *versus* content teachers tackle them?

Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J.M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL clases. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1,* (2). 4-17

Llinares A., Morton, T. & Whittaker R. (2012). *The Roles of Language in CLIL.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Llinares, A. & Whittaker, R. (2006). Linguistic analysis of secondary school students' oral and written production in CLIL contexts: studying social science in English. Vienna English Workingpapers, 15 (3- Special Issue December 2006, pp.28-32. Retrieved from: https://www.unifg.it/sites/default/files/allegatiparagrafo/21-01-2014/views_current_research_on_clil_1.pdf#page=28

Llinares, A. & Whittaker, R. (2009). Teaching and learning history in secondary CLIL classrooms: from speaking to writing. In E. Dafouz & M.C. Guerrini (Eds.), *CLIL across educational levels*. Oxford: Richmond Publishing

López-Medina, B. (2016). Developing a CLIL textbook evaluation checklist. *LACLIL, 9 (1)*, 159-173, DOI: 10.5294/la-clil.2016.9.1.7

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins

Martín, E., Pozo, J.I., Mateos, M., Martín, A. & Pérez Echeverría, M.d. P. (2014). Infant, primary and secondary teachers' conceptions of learning and teaching and their relation to educational variables. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología,* 46 (3): 211-221.

Martín del Pozo, M.A. (2016). An approach to CLIL teacher language awareness using the Language Triptych. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308792749

Mc Grath, I. (2006). Materials evaluation and design for language teaching. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mehisto, P. (2012). Criteria for producing CLIL learning material. *Encuentro, 21*, 15-33

Morton, T. (2010). Using a genre-based approach to integrating content and language in CLIL. In *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms*, edited by C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, and U. Smit, 81-104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Nikula T., Dalton-Puffer C., & Llinares A (2013). CLIL classroom discourse. Research from Europe. Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education 1:1 (2013), 70-100

Oattes, H., Oostdam, R., de Graaff, R. & Wilschut, A. (2017). The challenge of balancing content and language: Perceptions of Dutch bilingual education history teachers. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.022

Ó Ceallaigh, T.O.; Ní Mhurchú, S.; and Ní Chróinín, D. (2017). Balancing content and language in CLIL: The experiences of teachers and learners. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315964165

Oxbrow, G.L. (2018). Students' perspectives on CLIL programme development: A quantitative analysis. *Porta Linguarum, 29*, 137-158

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Clearing up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62* (2), 307-332.

Rahimi, S.A & Sahragard R. (2019). The mismatch between EAP teachers' beliefs and classroom practices toward formative assessment in the EFL context of Hormozgan. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research, 3* (1). 40-49

Rubio Mostacero, M.D. (2009). Language teacher training for non-language teachers: Meeting the needs of Andalusian teachers for school plurilingualism projects. Design of a targeted training course. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén

San Isidro, X. & Lasagabaster, D. (2019). Monitoring of teachers' views on both CLIL and the development of pluriliteracies: A longitudinal qualitative study. English Language Teaching, 12 (2). Doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n2p1

Schmidt, R.W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics 11 (2), 129-58

Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. ELT Journal, 42 (4), 237-246.

Spratt, M. (2017). CLIL teachers and their language. *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning, 8* (1), 44-61. http://rpltl.eap.gr

Van de Craen, P., Mondt, K., Allain, L. & Gao, Y. (2007). Why and how CLIL works. An outline for a CLIL theory. *CLIL Special Issue 2, 16* (3), 70-72

Van Kampen, E., Admiraal, W. & Berry, A. (2018). Contend and Language Integrated Learning in the Netherlands: Teachers' self-reported pedagogical practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21* (2), 222-236. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2016.1154004

Villarreal, I. (2011). *Tense and agreement in the non-native English of Basque-Spanish bilinguals: Content and language integrated learners vs. English as a school subject learners*. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Universidad del País Vasco: Spain.

Wolf, D. (2003). Integrating language and content in the language classroom: Are transfer of knowledge and of language ensured? *ASP LA REVUE DU GERAS*, 41-42. Doi: 10.4000/asp.1154