



UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA

Facultad de Filosofía, Letras y Ciencias de la Educación

Carrera de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa

“Effects of Using Content and Language Integrated Learning
Instruction in English as a Foreign Language classes”

Trabajo de titulación previo a la
obtención del título de
Licenciado en Ciencias de la
Educación en Lengua y
Literatura Inglesa.

Autora:

Martha Maribel Matute Mendoza

CI: 0104733340

maribel_17@live.com.ar

Tutor:

Rodas Pacheco Fabián Darío

CI: 0101867703

Cuenca, Ecuador

22-junio-2021



Resumen:

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), o AICLE en español, es un método aplicado en varios países alrededor del mundo y consiste en integrar cualquier asignatura a un lenguaje extranjero con el propósito de adquirir los dos al mismo tiempo. Estudios demuestran muchos beneficios de AICLE en los estudiantes, por lo cual, el objetivo principal de este proyecto es descubrir el potencial de la instrucción AICLE, analizando los resultados de 17 estudios que comparan esta metodología con la metodología tradicional de enseñanza del inglés en escuelas primarias y secundarias. Este análisis se centró en los efectos de AICLE en la competencia lingüística de las 4 destrezas del idioma, vocabulario y motivación. Los resultados revelaron que la producción oral, el vocabulario receptivo y la motivación son significativamente más altas en estudiantes AICLE que en estudiantes bajo modalidad tradicional. De igual manera, AICLE también ofrece beneficios importantes en cuanto a escritura, pero muy pocos estudios analizan esta destreza. Además, las destrezas receptivas también se benefician de esta metodología, pero solo en estudiantes de secundaria. Finalmente, se recomienda llevar a cabo más investigaciones en lo que respecta a escritura y vocabulario productivo en Europa, pero en lugares como Latinoamérica se necesita estudios sobre las 4 destrezas. Por otra parte, existen muchas variables que podrían jugar un papel importante el momento de aplicar la metodología AICLE, por lo que también se recomienda que futuros estudios deberían controlarlas para que no interfieran con los resultados.

Palabras claves: Aplicación Integrada de Contenido y Lengua Extranjera. AICLE. Escuela primaria. Escuela secundaria. Resultados. Aprendizaje de materias por contenido.



Abstract:

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an approach that is applied in many countries around the world, and it consists of integrating any subject with a foreign language in order to learn both at the same time. Research claims many positive effects of CLIL on students; therefore, the aim of this research synthesis is to explore the potential of CLIL instruction by analyzing the results of 17 studies that compared this methodology with traditional EFL programs in both primary and secondary schools. This analysis focused on the effects of CLIL on linguistic competence regarding the four skills, vocabulary and motivation. Findings showed that oral production, receptive vocabulary, and motivation are significantly higher on CLIL students. In addition, writing is also significantly higher on CLIL students, but few studies focused on this area of the language. Furthermore, CLIL also offers important benefits for receptive skills but only on secondary students. Finally, further research is suggested on this topic regarding productive vocabulary and writing around Europe, but around Latin America regarding the 4 skills. Moreover, there are many variables that might play an important role when applying CLIL and should be controlled.

Keywords: Content and Language Integrated Learning. CLIL instruction. EFL classes. Primary school. Secondary school. Outcomes. Content subject learning.



Índice del Trabajo

Resumen	2
Abstract.....	3
Introduction	9
CHAPTER I	10
1. Description of the research	10
1.1 Background	10
1.2 Statement of the problem	12
1.3 Rational	13
1.4 Research Questions	14
CHAPTER II.....	16
2. Theoretical Framework	16
2.1 Introduction.....	16
2.2 History and Definitions.....	16
2.3 Vocabulary in CLIL	19
2.4 Speaking in CLIL.....	20
2.5 Writing in CLIL	20
2.6 Receptive Skills in CLIL.....	20
2.7 Motivation in CLIL.....	21



CHAPTER III	23
3. Literature Review	23
3.1 Introduction.....	23
3.2 Results in Vocabulary	23
3.3 Results regarding Productive Skills	25
3.4 Results regarding Receptive Skills	26
3.5 Results regarding Motivation.....	27
CHAPTER IV	30
4. Methodology	30
CHAPTER V	32
5. Data Analysis	32
5.1 Introduction.....	32
5.2 Level of Education.....	32
5.3 Type of Study.....	33
5.4 Skills of the Language affected positively by CLIL instruction	35
5.4.1 Vocabulary.....	36
5.4.2 Reading.....	37
5.4.3 Listening	39
5.4.4 Oral Production.....	40



5.4.5 Writing..... 41

5.5 Affective factors in CLIL instruction..... 42

5.6 Other aspects of the language affected by CLIL instruction..... 44

5.7 Motivational factors influenced by CLIL instruction 45

5.8 Confounding variables in teaching with CLIL instruction 47

CHAPTER VI..... 52

6.1 Conclusions 52

6.2 Recommendations 53

References 55

Appendix: Studies Analyzed 64



Cláusula de licencia y autorización para publicación en el Repositorio Institucional

Martha Maribel Matute Mendoza en calidad de autora y titular de los derechos morales y patrimoniales del trabajo de titulación "Effects of Using Content and Language Integrated Learning Instruction in English as a Foreign Language classes", de conformidad con el Art. 114 del CÓDIGO ORGÁNICO DE LA ECONOMÍA SOCIAL DE LOS CONOCIMIENTOS, CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACIÓN reconozco a favor de la Universidad de Cuenca una licencia gratuita, intransferible y no exclusiva para el uso no comercial de la obra, con fines estrictamente académicos.

Asimismo, autorizo a la Universidad de Cuenca para que realice la publicación de este trabajo de titulación en el repositorio institucional, de conformidad a lo dispuesto en el Art. 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Cuenca, 22 de junio del 2021

Martha Maribel Matute Mendoza

C.I: 0104733340



Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual

Martha Maribel Matute Mendoza, autora del trabajo de titulación "Effects of Using Content and Language Integrated Learning Instruction in English as a Foreign Language classes", certifico que todas las ideas, opiniones y contenidos expuestos en la presente investigación son de exclusiva responsabilidad de su autora.

Cuenca, 22 de junio del 2021

Martha Maribel Matute Mendoza

C.I: 0104733340



Introduction

Nowadays, learning a foreign language, especially English, is an academic necessity. That is why many methods had been designed around the world for students to acquire better language competence. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an approach applied in Europe and around the world that integrates both subject content and a foreign language. Several studies have been conducted in order to prove the validity of this methodology. In this paper, an analysis of different studies is presented in order to know the impact that CLIL instruction has on different skills of the language when acquiring English. In order to do so, the studies compared the achievement of CLIL students to EFL students in both primary and secondary levels. Therefore, the first Chapter presents the background, the statement of the problem, the rationale, and the research questions to be answered after the analysis. The second Chapter provides some history and general concepts about this topic as well as information about what is known about CLIL regarding productive and receptive skills and motivation. Chapter III presents the specific information about some of the most relevant studies analyzed in this paper in order to know important results on students after the application of this methodology. Chapter IV presents the description of the methodology used for the writing of this paper. Chapter V offers the analysis itself divided into seven tables: 1) Level of Education, 2) Type of study, 3) Skills of the language affected positively by CLIL, 4) Affective factors in CLIL instruction, 5) Other aspects of the language affected by CLIL, 6) Motivational factors influenced by CLIL instruction, and 7) the confounding variables interacting with CLIL instruction. Finally, Chapter VI concludes with the most relevant findings from the analysis, and the suggestions for future investigations.

CHAPTER I



Background

Throughout the years, many methods have been designed in order to teach English as a foreign language, and each of them has its pros and cons. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is not a new approach, but, since the 1990s, it has had an exponential uptake across Europe (Perez-Cañado, 2012). In 1994, the term CLIL was coined by David Marsh with the following definition: “it is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of content and language with the objective of promoting both” (as cited in Marsh, 2012, p. II). Consequently, CLIL uses the language as the medium to learn a content subject, acquiring both at the same time. According to Xanthou (2011), Content and Language Integrated Learning is an approach that is influenced by the ideas of Vygostky, who claims that language is acquired in social interaction. In addition, the same author argues that Krashen also influenced CLIL with his theory that language acquisition takes place when students develop language skills in an environment similar to native speakers. Furthermore, according to Pladevall-Ballester (2015), for students, the idea to learn a subject in a foreign language is motivating, and this allows them to acquire different skills in a unconscious way.

CLIL can be confused with other approaches like English Medium Instruction (EMI) or Content-Base Instruction (CBI). However, EMI instruction focuses predominately on content learning, dismissing the importance of foreign language learning; and, on the other hand, CBI is used to teach subject-matter while acquiring English as a second language (Brown & Bradford, 2016).



CLIL has become really popular especially in European countries where it has received political support since the mid-1990s because the Commission of the European Communities set the mother tongue + 2 objective (Pérez-Cañado, 2018), which encourages bilingualism and multilingualism by stating that all European citizens should be able to interact in their mother tongue and at least in two any foreign languages (Eurobarometer, 2006; Llinares & Pastrana, 2013). Therefore, most European governments have decided, among other aims, to lower the starting age of learning a foreign language and to implement CLIL programs (Eurydice, 2006). That is the reason why CLIL is used as a key element for students to improve their bilingual and multilingual skills (Nikula, 2017). Moreover, according to Dalton-Puffer (2008), results from different studies have showed that CLIL students have significant gains in different areas of the language learning i.e., receptive skills, vocabulary, morphology, creativity; and authors like Pérez-Cañado (2018) have found improvements in oral production competence as well.

The Ecuadorian Ministry of Education, acknowledging the importance of English around the world, has tried to align the latest 2016 curriculum to standards of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) by setting different objectives (Loaiza, et al., 2019). Among the objectives to be mentioned, students, at the end of (Baccalaureate) twelfth grade, must achieve a B1.2 level and they have to build up their communicative language competence. Therefore, they need to develop the different language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), and, for that, longer exposure to the language is required (Ministerio de Educación, 2014). In order to achieve these aims, one of the core principles from the English curriculum is the CLIL approach



because it supports the development of cognitive, social, and thinking skills (Ministerio de Educación, 2016). These skills are useful to integrate the four principles involving CLIL that Coyle (2007) named as the 4Cs: Content, Cognition, Culture, and Communication.

CLIL seems to be an effective approach to involve students in the English culture and language since the content of other subjects is taught in this foreign language (Loaiza, et al, 2019).

Statement of the Problem

English is the most widespread language in the world and acquiring it is almost a necessity nowadays (Kitao, 1996). According to the EF English Proficiency Index (2019), Ecuador is among the countries with very low proficiency of English, occupying the 81st place in a list of 100 countries. It is even worse when analyzing the results inside Latin America: Ecuador's grade is 46.57, making it the country with the lowest English proficiency in the region. According to Calle, et al. (2012), the poor English performance of students is negatively affected by different aspects; for example, the use of traditional teaching strategies, the teacher-centered approach, and that lack of interaction with and among students in the target language. The CLIL approach, implemented in Ecuador, is based on the ideas of a student-centered environment, scaffolding and plenty of interaction among students and teachers (Ministerio de Educación, 2016). On the other hand, in Ecuador, students receive some hours of English subject in school and high school with the purpose of learning the language; however, at the end of this period, their communicative skills are really low (Calle, et al., 2012). In order to overcome this problem, CLIL approach



has been seen as the possible solution since, according to Loaiza, et al. (2019), students will receive more English hours without overloading their schedule.

Since CLIL is already a part of the Ecuadorian curriculum, authorities and teachers need deeper information about this approach in order to use, to improve, or to combine it with other methodologies in order to enhance the teaching of the English language in the students.

Rationale

Many methodologies used around the world have the goal that, at the end of the course, students will be able to acquire English language competence. According to Samaranayake (2015), these methods go from the mechanic ones like Grammar Translation Method to other approaches that are just suitable for beginners (Total Physical Response), for private schools because they are expensive (Communicative Language Teaching), or for small group of students. A different approach such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), on the contrary, as Muñoz (2007) argues, “may be viewed as an alternative that could overcome the deficiencies in previous languages models because learning the language lies in its integration of both language and content with no preference of one over the other” (as cited in Bret, 2011, p. 1). Similarly, CLIL provides the adequate exposure to vocabulary in meaningful situations and the opportunities of using it in context (Xanthou, 2011). Besides, students have stated that working on a CLIL project involves an environment where they have the opportunity to interact in based game activities (Korosidou & Griva, 2014). This makes this approach different; students learn new knowledge and they are able to present it in another language. In addition, some



stakeholders' perceptions studies show that the great majority of students, parents, and teachers show interest on this approach since pupils feel motivated on learning English and new concepts at the same time, and it is challenging for them (Pladevall-Ballester, 2015). CLIL is suitable for small and big classes, it is useful for all different stages of instruction, and is a bilingual education for the pupil because teaching content is done through a foreign language, so the attention is not exclusively on language neither on the content (Pladevall-Ballester, 2015; Serra, 2007).

As CLIL is implemented in the Ecuadorian curriculum, it is of great significance to obtain and analyze information about the benefits of this approach in students' performance. The results from different studies show positive results on the application of CLIL; as Xanthou (2011) points "CLIL provides opportunities for learning content and language in meaningful settings, allows linguistic interaction with teacher and peers, and promotes both the academic and social aspects of the target language" (p. 123). Korosidou and Griva (2014) state that CLIL instruction affects positively on EFL learners' performance because it provides "rich, meaningful input, efficient in developing both their linguistic skills and content knowledge" (p. 252). Consequently, based on all this information, this research will help to identify the different benefits of this approach since it is a compilation of many studies applying CLIL and comparing the results from CLIL and EFL students. This kind of synthesis will be useful for Ecuadorian teachers in primary and secondary schools because this method is already being applied in the curriculum expecting to improve foreign language competence and motivation in learners.



Research Questions

Which skills of the language acquisition are most positively affected by CLIL instruction according to the reported literature?

How is vocabulary reportedly affected by CLIL instruction?

What is the reported impact of CLIL instruction in motivation?

Objectives

General Objective

1. To analyze the skills of language acquisition on which CLIL instruction has reported a stronger impact.

Specific Objectives

1. To describe how vocabulary is reportedly affected by CLIC instruction.
2. To determine if motivation is positively or negatively reportedly affected by CLIL instruction.



CHAPTER II

Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

This research synthesis provides useful information about the application of CLIL approach for teaching English as a Foreign language. It will present a definition of this approach, its history, principles, classification, and the areas of language where CLIL has been proved to have a positive or negative impact. It is important to know the benefits of this approach and why some authors support its application when teaching English.

2.2 History and Definitions

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has its background in the bilingual/immersion programs from the US and Canada where many positive results were found on second language learning (Perez-Cañado, 2012). This type of instruction now consists of integrating a target language and any subject content in the learning of any foreign language and “in which both language and subject have a joint curricular role” (Marsh, 2012, p. 132). In addition, CLIL offers extra exposure to the target language without overburdening the school curriculum and quality of language input that impact positively on learner’s competence (Mattheoudakis, Alexiou, & Laskaridou, 2014).

The term was coined by Marsh in 1994 (Pérez-Cañado, 2012), who provided the following definition:

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a generic term that refers to the teaching of subjects in a different language from the mainstream language of instruction. It is an educational approach in which diverse methodologies are used which lead to dual-focused education where attention is given to both topic and language of instruction. (Marsh, 2008, p. 233)



Consequently, CLIL is a form of bilingual education or immersion teaching with a twofold aim: language and subject (Eurydice, 2006).

CLIL has become popular around East Asian countries in recent years (Yamano, 2013), and around European countries since mid-1990s being used in all the educational levels (Czura, 2009). The Commission of the European Communities has set the mother tongue + 2 objective (Pérez-Cañado, 2018), which promotes bilingualism and multilingualism by stating that all European citizens should be competent in their mother tongue and any other two foreign languages (Eurobarometer, 2006; LLinares & Pastrana, 2013). Therefore, most European governments have decided, among other aims, to lower the starting age of learning a foreign language and to implement CLIL programs (Eurydice, 2006). When implementing CLIL programs, European schools are free to decide many aspects of this instruction like the time and scale of their CLIL activities, the subject to be taught through this method, but it will depend on the school, the environment, and the educational level (Eurydice, 2006). In addition, CLIL is supported because the time of exposure to the language is increased without assisting to extracurricular classes (Mattheoudakis et al., 2014).

According to Coyle (2007), there are four principles involving CLIL (a.k.a. the 4Cs): Content, Communication, Cognition, and Culture. Content refers to the knowledge imparted through the subject taught in the foreign language; Communication involves the foreign language used; Cognition refers to cognitive skills that students employ during the lesson; and Culture comprises the developing of intercultural understanding. The integration of Content and Cognition and Culture and Communication raise linguistic competence (Coyle, 2010), and motivation (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016).



Grin (2005) points out that CLIL programs can be classified according to many variables such as age of onset, status, intensity (as cited in Coyle, 2010), and regarding different situations surrounding the language teaching on each school /country (Pérez-Cañado, 2012). Taking into account the variable intensity, there are two types of CLIL programs: strong/ hard CLIL and weak/soft CLIL, but the distinction between them has not been discussed in academic literature (Ikeda, 2013). However, Ball (2009) identified five types of CLIL programs in a continuum going from hard CLIL to soft CLIL: “immersion, partial immersion, subject courses, language classes based on thematic units and language classes with greater use of content” (as cited in Ikeda, 2013, p. 32). In other words, as Bentley (2010) pointed, hard CLIL is considered a partial immersion because almost half of the curriculum is taught through a foreign language and weak CLIL when language teachers do cross-curricular work by teaching topics from the curriculum as part of a language course (as cited in García, 2015).

A different perspective for strong and weak CLIL is given by Dale and Tanner (2012). They proposed that the difference lies on the teacher who must be trained in CLIL principles, but when subjects like math or history are taught by a non-native teacher, the type of CLIL is known as strong or hard CLIL because the focus is on teaching and learning content (as cited in García, 2015). The other version of CLIL, so-called weak or soft CLIL, is either taught by native or non-native teachers but with a focus on the language (as cited in Ikeda, 2013). According to Ikeda (2013), “all the research outcomes summarized in recent review articles are produced in prototypical settings of ‘strong’ or ‘hard’ CLIL” (p. 31).

Thanks to studies conducted at all educational levels, it is possible to know the effects of CLIL implementation on foreign language competence and support CLIL programs (Pérez-Cañado, 2012). Thus, Dalton-Puffer (2008) reported some areas that are benefited



by the application of CLIL instruction such as receptive skills, vocabulary, morphology, and creativity; and among the unaffected areas are writing, informal language, pronunciation, and pragmatics. In addition, other areas beyond linguistic competence might seem to be affected as well: problem solving, risk taking, confidence, improvement of L1 literacy, develop study skills, among others (Dalton-Puffer, 2008; Lasagabaster, 2008; Coyle, 2010) However, many authors agree that CLIL is an approach that needs further investigation and definitive conclusions cannot be reached yet (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2014; Xanthou, 2010; Agustín-Llach, & Canga Alonso, 2016).

2.3 Vocabulary in CLIL

Vocabulary size is an important factor in order to acquire a language (Tragant, Marsol, Serrano & Llanes, 2016) and favors communication in the classroom (Canga, 2013); that is the reason why it has been considered in several studies. The results of many investigations have come to the conclusion that CLIL methodology offers repeated exposure to new words as well as meaningful and rich context activating background knowledge, and a more naturalistic learning of vocabulary (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016). In addition, it provides real and meaningful input and different opportunities for interaction and discussion among peers and with the teacher (Canga, 2015). Furthermore, higher number of FL exposure is important to grow vocabulary, so an approach like CLIL is effective since it provides students with more hours of input of the language (Agustín-Llach, 2016). Therefore, as Sylvén (2010) mentioned, CLIL is the most appropriate method for vocabulary development (as cited in Agustín-Llach, 2016)

2.4 Speaking in CLIL



CLIL is often attributed with a better production on communicative competence than other EFL types of instruction because CLIL students are exposed to learning opportunities for showing lexical gaps and for filling them (Dalton-Puffer, 2008). Actually, according to Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (2016), oral production is the most benefited language competence by CLIL and this must be because of the active participation of the teachers and the students (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). In addition, CLIL environment offers more input and exposure to the target language as well as opportunities for interaction which creates the conditions for language acquisition (Eurydice, 2006; Lasagabaster & López, 2015); being the most noticeable benefited area (Lasagabaster 2008; Ruiz de Zarobe 2008).

2.5 Writing in CLIL

Regarding writing abilities, CLIL students show advantages since they have at their disposal lexical and morphosyntactic resources, which help to elaborate more complex structures and a higher degree of accuracy in inflectional affixation and spelling (Dalton-Puffer, 2011). In addition, Whittaker, Llinares, and McCabe (2011) propose that CLIL environments provide learning of content that creates a suitable context to develop written discourse. Furthermore, in order to develop this skill in CLIL environments, it is necessary to use some techniques such as prompts from the teacher, models of structures and provide students with scaffolding (Ball, Kelly & Clegg, 2016).

2.6 Receptive skills

Prieto-Arranz, Fabra, Calafat-Ripoll and Catrain-Gonzalez (2015) point out that growing vocabulary affect students' receptive skills in the language (listening and reading), and CLIL instruction results show clear gains in vocabulary. Regarding listening skills, according to Liubinienė (2009), the success of CLIL methodology is evident because the authentic material used and the input from the teacher which play an important role at



developing language knowledge and skills. In addition, under CLIL methodology, the learner uses metacognitive, cognitive, and socio affective strategies which facilitate comprehension and acquisition of the language (ibid). On the other hand, vis-à-vis reading, Diab, Abdel-Haq, and Aly (2018) indicate that the strategies used by CLIL teachers in order to help pupils to acquire this skill are: “check if their students understand key vocabulary before a reading, provide pre-reading questions, or reading support tasks, such as filling in a chart, labeling a diagram or taking notes on specific information dates or figures” (p. 7). While it is true that the CLIL impact on the reading ability seems evident as a consequence of continued exposure to written input, positive CLIL-effects on listening are in contrast less clear-cut (Martínez Agudo, 2019).

2.7 Motivation in CLIL

According to Fernández Fontecha and Canga (2014), motivation has also been a factor positively affected by CLIL instruction because students feel more attracted towards a content subject rather than learning a foreign language. Hence, students are willing to learn the target language without noticing it. In addition, “the focus on content provides an aim for language use, and reduces anxiety, thus creating safer learning and participation environments” (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016, p. 83).

Finally, in order to get good results in CLIL implementation, collaboration and social interaction are essential components for successful learning in all CLIL contexts (Mattheodakis, et al., 2014). Furthermore, CLIL, as any other approach, needs adaptation; consequently, the results will require time and experience (Pladevall-Ballester & Vallbona 2016), and this approach also presents some limitations that should be taken into account in order to be introduced when “the conditions to make it successful are met” (Lasagabaster, 2008, p. 35), and only if “programs are carefully designed and developed in each school



context” (Pérez-Vidal & Roquet, 2015, p. 20). Additionally, some concerns about the implementation of CLIL programs in different countries have emerged because, most of the time, the samples are formed with the most motivated students (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016), the groups are not homogeneous, or studies do not control for confounding variables (Pérez-Cañado, 2017).

2. 8 Conclusions

In this section of the research review, the author has provided key information regarding the history of CLIL and its application around the world. In addition, it was possible to appreciate the way this approach influence on each of the skills of the language, vocabulary and motivation. With all the data presented above, the author tried to explain what makes this approach special and different from other traditional methodologies. The following section will be useful for acknowledging the results that the application of this approach has had on each of the skills above mentioned.



CHAPTER III

Literature Review

3.1 Introduction

The application of CLIL instruction is burgeoning rapidly in Europe and around the world, and many investigations have been carried out in order to know the real impact that this type of instruction has on primary and secondary students. Therefore, for this research synthesis, 17 studies have been compiled, and classified according to the different areas of the language reported affected by CLIL such as vocabulary, productive skills, receptive skills, and motivation. Consequently, it will be possible to know in more detail if CLIL instruction is really fostering student's performance of the English language.

3.2 Results regarding Vocabulary

Vocabulary is one of the most important factors when it comes to learn and use a FL because it facilitates students' interaction (Canga, 2013). For this reason, teachers have it among the main objectives to achieve inside the process of learning English (Manzo, Manzo, & Thomas, 2006). A considerable number of investigations mainly carried out in Europe have been conducted in order to compare vocabulary size of CLIL and EFL students by cross-sectional studies or longitudinal studies, though the latter are less common (Pérez-Cañado, 2018).

According to Xanthou (2010, 2011), positive results were shown in favor of CLIL learners in vocabulary knowledge in her cross-sectional studies conducted in primary schools. CLIL participants from 6th grade, receiving Geography and Science, were tested in order to compare their vocabulary size with non-CLIL learners. Under quantitative and



qualitative methodology, the author concluded that the outcomes favored CLIL pupils because the vocabulary is acquired due to different factors such as meaningful setting, activation of prior knowledge, more opportunities of interaction with the teacher, and repeated exposure to the target vocabulary. One important limitation from these studies is the small size of the samples which were composed of 16 and 25 CLIL students.

Results from Canga's (2013) study also support the application of CLIL instruction in primary education. In his investigation the main aim was to compare the vocabulary size of 79 CLIL students with 331 EFL pupils in 6th grade of primary school. He assessed students with the 2000-word frequency-band (2k) and, even though, the results showed that CLIL students' receptive vocabulary knowledge is lower than 1000 words, they outperformed their non-bilingual counterparts. However, the author suggested using a bigger sample on future studies in order to have more reliable results.

With the same instrument, similar results were obtained by Agustín and Canga (2016). The authors compared the receptive vocabulary size of 58 learners in a CLIL program and of 49 EFL students in a three-year longitudinal study. The results informed that the difference in favor of the bilingual group is not significant at the beginning; however, they became noteworthy as time passes by concluding that CLIL learners benefit from this instruction as they get experience with the methodology. Authors speculate that CLIL students would perform even better if they were tested on vocabulary related to the subject learned under CLIL instruction and not on general topics.

Opposite results were informed by Fernández Fontecha (2014) who carried out a cross-sectional study where vocabulary size of 5th primary school learners under CLIL methodology was compared with students from 2nd grade of secondary education EFL instruction. His purpose was to maintain the homogeneity of the groups regarding the hours



of instruction. Outcomes showed that non-CLIL students outperformed CLIL students in the tests. However, two important limitations have to be pointed out: the first one, the difference in ages, and the second one, the amount of time. Regarding the second limitation, the key point of CLIL instruction is that it comes hand in hand with more exposure to the language, that is, the number of hours of L2 exposure affects the number of words that learners know receptively (Fernández Fontecha, 2014).

3.3 Results regarding Productive Skills

Speaking and writing belong to the category of productive skills (a.k.a active skills) and they are in a reciprocal relationship (Golkova & Hubackova, 2014). Dalton-Puffer (2011) has concluded that one of the most positively affected dimensions of language due to CLIL is oral production. This affirmation is supported by the results from Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (2016) who worked with 2110 CLIL learners and 19187 EFL students from 4th grade of primary education. After evaluating the four skills of the language informed that speaking is the only competence where students show significant differences.

In a similar context and with similar results, the pilot study conducted by Czura and Kołodziejka (2015) had as its aim the implementation of CLIL instruction in a Mathematics classroom in Wrocław- Poland. After 5 months the results showed that 18 CLIL students experienced at advantage in speaking competence especially vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation comparing to their EFL counterparts. Even though, results in favor of CLIL students are significant, the small sample of this study is an important limitation.

From the longitudinal study carried out by Pérez-Cañado (2018) is concluded that significant differences are found in favor of CLIL students in all the linguistic dimensions but especially for productive skills. For measuring speaking, she used a rubric designed to



evaluate grammatical accuracy, lexical range, fluency and interaction, pronunciation, and task fulfillment on 1033 CLIL students and 991 EFL pupils from primary and secondary education. Results showed that speaking competence is developed significantly in CLIL students enrolled in both levels of education.

Regarding the development of writing competence, the study conducted by Corral Robles (2019) supports the application of CLIL instruction. She analyzed the results from 112 fourth-year CLIL and non-CLIL secondary education students under a qualitative methodology. Although the results favored CLIL students on written accuracy, it revealed that both CLIL and EFL groups present problems concerning cohesion and coherence.

Lasagabaster (2011) conducted a cross-sectional investigation with 191 secondary students measuring language competence between CLIL and EFL students. Even though, both groups of students were exposed to a similar amount of hours, results showed that CLIL students outperformed EFL students on all the skills of the language but especially on writing.

3.4 Results regarding Receptive Skills

Receptive skills are also known as passive skills and include reading and listening (Golkova & Hubackova, 2014). These skills along with vocabulary, creativity, and motivation form part of a list provided by Dalton-Puffer (2008) which showed the components positively affected by CLIL.

The results from Pérez-Cañado (2018) revealed significant differences in all the linguistic components but receptive skills are least affected in primary and secondary education. This is supported by Pladevall-Ballester and Vallbona (2015) who led a two-year longitudinal study with 138 CLIL students and 149 EFL students in primary education. They applied Cambridge Young Learners' Tests (YLE) and the results showed better results for



students under traditional EFL instruction. However, CLIL students did make some progress during the two years, but they could not catch up with their counterparts. This leads to the conclusion that Receptive language competence is not immediate and CLIL necessarily requires long-term and intense exposure (Pladevall-Ballester & Vallbona, 2015). It is worth mentioning that both groups were exposed to a similar number of hours and teachers did not have experience with CLIL methodology which might explain the results.

This is partially supported by Mattheoudakis et al. (2014) who compared 25 CLIL students' and 26 non-CLIL students' performance by applying reading and listening tests. Students were enrolled in 6th grade in primary education and they did not have any experience with CLIL methodology. Results favored non-CLIL students on reading, but CLIL students on listening. However, it is important to mention that at the onset of the study the control group slightly outscored the CLIL group but the latter were able to catch up.

Opposite results were obtained from a cross-sectional study carried out by Navarro Pablo and García (2018). With a sample of 194 primary students and 158 secondary students, he measured and compared the development of language competence at both levels of education CLIL and EFL students. Results showed that even though CLIL students outscored EFL students, reading and listening are the less developed competences in both levels of education, but especially in primary school.

3.5 Results regarding Motivation

Motivation is an important factor in the achievement of a foreign language and one of the main objectives for a teacher; therefore, it has been the focus of literature (Lasagabaster, 2011). According to Fernandez Fontecha (2014) it is more common that students feel attracted to content rather than language, but because CLIL mixed them both it



is considered a good approach to improve motivation in students towards a foreign language without even noticing it.

Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2014) conducted a study where the motivation was measured on 393 secondary students enrolled in CLIL and EFL courses. The data was gathered by using a quantitative questionnaire used in previous studies. The results showed that CLIL students were more motivated and less anxious; but the authors considered that other variables might play an important role when it comes to motivating students such as age and socio-cultural environment.

Trying to identify if CLIL instruction fosters students' motivation, another study was conducted by Lasagabaster and López (2015) in three primary schools with 87 CLIL and EFL students. After applying a motivational questionnaire, outcomes indicated that, in fact, CLIL is beneficial for intrinsic and instrumental motivation but they are not all the clusters measure in the study. The possible explanation for the results could be the age of students, but also the short-term effect of the CLIL approach.

Opposite results are showed by Fernández Fontecha and Canga (2014) on a study carried out with 62 fourth graders' primary students. They were divided into 31 CLIL students and 31 EFL students with similar sociocultural and economic backgrounds. The investigation concluded that non-CLIL learners are more motivated than CLIL learners. However, the authors named as a limitation the small sample of students and their age.



3.6 Conclusions

Considering the aforementioned published literature, significant numbers of studies have reported benefits of CLIL instruction. These successful results in the acquisition of the foreign language stem may be derived from the fact that not only do CLIL programmers provide more exposure to the foreign language but also higher quality of exposure as CLIL promotes more naturalistic learning than traditional EFL lessons (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016). The authors affirm that differences detected in linguistic competence between both groups are due to the CLIL program, especially in the long term (Pérez-Cañado, 2018). However, some other studies are not in harmony with these results because they have detected no gains or differences against the experimental CLIL groups, especially regarding, reading and listening skills. More details on each competence of the language will be possible to distinguish in the analysis section.



CHAPTER IV

4. Methodology

Based on the fact that a research synthesis is accumulated evidence about a specific problem gotten from several research studies in order to create generalizations (Norris & Ortega, 2006), for this explorative descriptive synthesis, empirical studies will be used to obtain information about the results in the application of CLIL instruction in different countries. In order to carry out this documentary research synthesis, the information will be searched in the following online databases: Scholar Google, Scopus and Universidad de Cuenca online Library. However, based on preliminary research, information from the following journals will be searched: *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *Complutense Journal of English Studies*, *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching*, *Advances in Research on Language Acquisition*, *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *Major Trends in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, *Porta Linguarum*, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *Reidocrea*, *The Language Learning Journal*, *International CLIL Research Journal*, *Anglica Wratislaviensia*, and *International Journal of English Studies*.

In addition, for the selection of the studies, the following criteria will be considered. First, the articles have to be published since 2000 because current information about the results of this approach is needed. The articles must correspond just to studies in primary and secondary schools because CLIL instruction is more common in these levels of education, and it seems to be an area where research is needed in our context. Another important aspect worth mentioning is that the empirical studies must be published in peer-reviewed scholarly



journals because reliable information is needed for this literature review. Finally, qualitative, quantitative, or mixed method studies will be collected in order to have varied type of results (Annex 1). The coding process of the analysis in order to classify the articles will be vocabulary, productive skills, receptive skills, and motivation; but other criteria that might emerge through the analysis will be considered. The key terms for searching will be: Content and Language Integrated Learning or CLIL instruction, EFL classes, primary school, secondary school, outcomes.



CHAPTER V

Data Analysis

5.1 Introduction

For this research synthesis, 17 studies were collected according to the criteria mentioned in the methodology section. Each study compares the competence of CLIL students (experimental group) to their EFL peers (control group) on the different skills of the language such as reading, listening, speaking, and writing, vocabulary and motivation. These studies, which provide results favoring bilingual or non-bilingual pupils, were classified and analyzed under the following categories: 1) Level of education, 2) Type of the studies, 3) Skills of the language affected by CLIL instruction, 4) Affective factors in CLIL instruction, 5) Other aspects of the language affected by CLIL instruction, 6) Motivational factors influenced by CLIL, and 7) Confounding variables interacting with CLIL instruction. In addition, methodology, limitations, and other aspects of the investigations will be considered because they might affect the interpretation of the results.

5.2 Level of Education

Table 1

Level of Education

Level of Education	N	Author / year
Primary school	11	Xanthou (2010, 2011); Canga (2015); Mattheoudakis et al (2014); Fernández Fontecha (2014); Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (2016); Agustín-Llach and Canga (2014); Pladevall-Ballester and Vallbona (2016); Lasagabaster and López (2014); Czura (2015); Fernández Fontecha and Canga (2013)
Secondary school	4	Lasagabaster (2010); Corral (2019); Doiz et all (2014); Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009)
Primary and Secondary schools	2	Pérez-Cañado (2018); Navarro Pablo and García (2018)

Note: N=17



Table 1 presents the studies classified according to the level of education where CLIL instruction was implemented. Although research shows that there is a tendency to conduct studies in secondary schools (Czura & Kołodyńska, 2015; Bret, 2011), in this synthesis, the majority of studies were carried out in primary schools; however, the results of all of them will be compared and analyzed. According to Xanthou (2010) and Serra (2007), evidence from many studies suggests that CLIL can have positive effects on language competence at all the stages of instruction. Nevertheless, from the outcomes of two studies conducted at both levels of education at the same time, it can be concluded that CLIL instruction has a stronger impact on secondary students regarding receptive skills (Pérez-Cañado, 2018; Navarro Pablo & García, 2018). Consequently, with a deeper analysis, the different effects that CLIL instruction have will be found out, depending on the level of education of the students on each skill of the language.

5.3 Type of Study

Table 2

Type of study

Type of study	N	%	Author / year
Cross-sectional	11	65	Xanthou (2010, 2011); Canga (2015); Fernández Fontecha(2014); Lasagabaster (2010); Corral (2019); Lasagabaster and López (2014); Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009); Fernández Fontecha and Canga (2013); Navarro Pablo and García (2018); Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (2016)



Pilot	2	12	Mattheoudakis et all (2014); Czura (2015)
Longitudinal	4	23	Pérez-Cañado (2018); Agustín-Llach and Canga (2014); Pladevall-Ballester and Vallbona (2016); Doiz et all (2014);

Note: N=17

This table presents a classification of the studies according to their type. Cross-sectional studies evaluate participants at one point in time (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2015); pilot studies are small-scale projects that measure the feasibility of applying a method in a large-scale experiment (In, 2017); and, finally, longitudinal studies measure how a variable change over time by following the same participants (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2015); this means that they are long-term studies. As it can be seen in table 2, cross-sectional studies (65%) are more common than longitudinal ones (23%). These results agree with the affirmation made by Pérez-Cañado (2018): “The majority of studies conducted about CLIL are cross-sectional lacking a longitudinal perspective” (p.52). Therefore, more longitudinal studies should be carried out in order to support the idea that the longer the students beneficiate from bilingual education and acquire experience with the method, the greater the differences with their non-bilingual counterparts will be (Pérez-Cañado, 2018; Agustín-Llach & Canga, 2014; Fernández Fontecha, 2014). Furthermore, many authors point out the importance of conducting longitudinal studies in order to measure motivation and attitudes towards English over time (Doiz et al., 2014; Lasagabaster & López, 2015; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009; Fernández Fontecha, 2014)



It is important to mention that the majority of cross-sectional studies were conducted in schools where CLIL was already implemented; therefore, they had experience with the approach. On the other hand, the four longitudinal studies cannot be contrasted or compared because they focus on different areas of the language. However, it can be concluded that more than two years are needed to see better results for CLIL students over their counterparts. In this context, Mattheoudakis et al. (2014) suggested that for productive skills “it will be necessary to study learners’ language gains after at least four years of CLIL implementation” (p. 228).

5.4 Skills of the Language affected positively by CLIL instruction

Table 3

Skills of the language affected positively by CLIL instruction or EFL instruction

Author/year	Skills of the language	Results favoring CLIL students	Results favoring EFL students
Xanthou (2010, 2011); Canga (2015); Fernández Fontecha (2014); Pérez-Cañado (2018), Agustín-Llach and Canga (2014); Navarro Pablo and García (2018)	Vocabulary	6 ^a	1 ^a
Mattheoudakis et all (2014); Pérez-Cañado (2018); Moreno (2016); Pladevall-Ballester and Vallbona (2016); Navarro Pablo and García (2018)	Reading	3 ^a	2 ^a
Mattheoudakis et all (2014); Moreno (2016); Pérez-Cañado (2018); Pladevall-Ballester and Vallbona (2016);	Listening	4 ^a	2 ^a



Lasagabaster (2010); Navarro Pablo and García (2018)		
Pérez-Cañado (2018); Moreno (2016); Lasagabaster (2010); Navarro Pablo and García (2018); Czura (2015)	Oral Production	5 ^a
Moreno (2016); Lasagabaster (2010); Corral (2019)	Writing	3 ^a

Note: N=13

^a Studies are counted on more than one category

In this table, it can be observed the number of studies whose results favored CLIL or EFL students on the different skills of language. Since this research synthesis is about the impact of CLIL instruction, in the comparison between CLIL and non-CLIL students, results will be considered “positive” when CLIL students have outperformed the EFL pupils with higher scores on the tests, and “negative results” will be the opposite. Finally, 13 studies were used for this category; the rest of them focused on motivation which will be analyzed later.

5.4.1 Vocabulary

Six out of seven studies that focused on receptive vocabulary agreed that CLIL students outperformed their counterparts significantly; in other words, at the end of the experiment, CLIL students know many more words (Xanthou, 2010, 2011; Canga, 2015; Pérez-Cañado, 2018; Agustín-Llach & Canga, 2016; Navarro Pablo & García, 2018).

It is important to analyze the study that showed contradictory results for CLIL students in order to explain the reason why the outcomes differ. In 2014, Fernández Fontecha conducted a study whose aim was to measure and compare the receptive vocabulary size of 5th graders CLIL students (Primary school) and 2nd graders non-CLIL pupils (Secondary



school). The receptive version 2 of the 2000-word frequency band was applied and the outcomes compared. Results indicated that non-CLIL students knew 985 words and CLIL students knew 705 words. In other words, the mean vocabulary size of non-bilingual learners was higher, showing better results for this group. However, two important limitations need to be considered: 1) the cognitive level of primary and secondary students is different because of their age, and 2) students in both approaches received the same number of hours of instruction. Cummins (1999, p.27) points that “studies must compare students in bilingual programs to a control group of similar students” in order to be methodologically acceptable. Therefore, with the limitations mentioned above, it is clear that the groups are not homogenous, making the results unreliable. In other words, if students would be the same age, the results would probably vary. Furthermore, the effect of time of exposure favors the CLIL approach and it has been canceled out. Consequently, it is difficult to know which variable, age, type of instruction or both, influenced on the results.

The majority of the studies were carried out in primary setting, which means that in the specific case of vocabulary acquisition, age of students is not a limitation. Thanks to the three-year longitudinal study conducted by Agustín-Llach and Canga (2016), it is possible to know that CLIL students incorporate more words every year and the difference becomes significant as time passes by under CLIL instruction.

5.4.2. Reading

As can be seen, two studies present negative results for CLIL students on reading, but they are not significant (Mattheoudakis, 2014; Pladevall-Ballester & Vallbona, 2016). These studies were conducted in primary schools. Additionally, within the studies with positive



results favoring CLIL in primary school, the difference is not significant either (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016; Navarro Pablo & García, 2018).

Among the studies with negative results, the longitudinal investigation conducted by Pladevall-Balleste and Vallbona (2016) was applied to 138 CLIL students and 149 non-CLIL students from 5th grade of primary school. Students of CLIL education received one hour per week of this type of instruction and three hours per week of EFL instruction; and, on the other hand, non-bilingual students received 3 EFL hours per week. However, at the moment of applying the tests, both groups received equal amount of exposure to the foreign language. This study collected information from four tests during two academic years. On the onset of the study, CLIL students slightly outperformed non-CLIL students. During the second data collection, the differences favored non-CLIL students significantly. Finally, on the third and fourth tests, those differences became less significant, concluding that CLIL students might have had problems at the beginning understanding academic concepts in the foreign language, but with experience, they could almost catch up to their peers. Then it would be necessary to develop longer studies to see if CLIL students are able to outperformed their peers in following years. This is precisely a limitation noted by the authors, “a two-year longitudinal study might not have been long enough to yield more significant results” (Pladevall-Balleste & Vallbona, 2016, p. 47). In conclusion, this study demonstrates two things: the first is that CLIL students need experience to develop and beneficiate from this approach, and the second is that the methodology of this approach works even when CLIL and EFL students were exposed to the same number of hours of instruction.

Results from the study conducted by Mattheodakis et al. (2014) showed that bilingual and non-bilingual presented improvement in reading, though no significant differences



avored non-CLIL group. In their pilot study, after applying pre-test, non-CLIL students started with better results than CLIL students and even though both groups showed progress on the post-test, CLIL students could not catch up their counterparts.

5.4.3 Listening skill

Two studies that measured the listening skill show disadvantage for the CLIL group and they were carried out in primary schools (Pladevall-Balleste & Vallbona, 2016; Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016). From the ones with positive results, three were conducted in this level of education, and they show non-significant differences between CLIL and EFL students (Pérez-Cañado, 2018; Mattheoudakis, et al., 2014; Navarro Pablo & García, 2018). In short, impact of CLIL instruction on the listening skills is low.

Pladevall-Balleste and Vallbona's (2016) two-year longitudinal study, already described in the section above, explained that the possible reason for the negative outcomes for the experimental group could have been the limited number of hours of exposure to CLIL instruction. The results for the listening skill show as well that during the first year, no significant differences between the experimental and control group were observed; however, differences became significant in the second year and at the end of the study favoring non-CLIL students. One important fact is worth mentioning, inside the CLIL group, some students took Science and others Arts and Crafts and each of them was compared to EFL peers. The author explained that: 1) CLIL students taking Arts and Crafts were at greater disadvantage comparing to the students taking Science, which means that the subject involved in CLIL instruction affects the results, 2) students were tested on general English test and not on the topics related to the subject learned under CLIL methodology, and 3)



teachers did not have experience applying CLIL methodology, then they probably have problems applying some strategies like listening scaffolding techniques to make the subject comprehensible.

Another important study with negative results for CLIL students is the one conducted by Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (2016). This project examined the differences between 2840 CLIL students and 17143 EFL students of 4th year of primary education. She assessed the listening competence of students by subskills: *global comprehension, details, situation of communication, paralinguistic elements, oral vocabulary, space-time relations*. CLIL students only outscored EFL pupils on the first two indicators, making this category as the author mentioned “the least developed by CLIL” (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016, p.97). However, the results of this study could be due to the following limitations: 1) the age of the students and 2) the minimal exposure to CLIL instruction.

5.4.4 Oral production

Speaking is the only skill of the language that receives complete support of all the studies by affirming that CLIL students developed significantly better oral production in both primary and secondary level of education.

The studies analyzed speaking competence of students under the following subskills: *vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, grammar, interactive communication, task fulfillment*, among others. They agree that all the sub skills are benefited from the CLIL methodology, but from the analysis, it can be seen that vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation showed greater results for primary school and vocabulary, task fulfillment, and fluency for secondary level of education.



Despite the different limitations that the studies present and might influence the other skills of the language such as age (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016), limited CLIL-based instruction (ibid), short-term studies (Lasagabaster, 2010; Czura, 2015), it seems that the development of oral production takes place anyway.

5.4.5 Writing

Even though a minority of studies focused on the written competence, all of them show positive results for this skill. This matches with the asseveration made by Bret (2011) who claims that the writing skill is where less attention has been paid to, especially in Spain; and that is why as Llinares, Morton and Whittaker (2012) claim “the role of writing in CLIL contexts has been largely unrecognized” (as cited in Gené-Gil, Juan-Garau, & Salazar-Noguera, 2015, p. 300).

In this research analysis, the only study in primary school assessing writing competence was conducted by Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (2016). She worked with 1980 CLIL students from 4th grade of primary school and found out that CLIL instruction did not significantly influence acquisition of the writing competence. CLIL students outperformed their EFL counterparts in some specific sub aspects of writing skill such as “preparing an outline”, “use of vocabulary”, “fluency”, and “spelling”.

Two studies were conducted in secondary schools, and they agree that students under CLIL instruction present better results on the writing competence than their counterparts. Lasagabaster (2010), in his cross-sectional study, concluded that the writing skill is one of the most beneficiated area of the language. On the other hand, Corral Robles (2019) carried out a qualitative study analyzing the writing skill from specific areas of the following



competences: Linguistic, strategic, discourse and sociolinguistic competence. CLIL students performed better on these areas: “resort to prior knowledge of L1” (strategic competence), “textual adequacy” (discourse competence), “adequacy to the English-like patter of writing” (sociolinguistic competence), but EFL students did not outperformed CLIL students on any category.

Even though, studies do not use the same methodology to measure writing, they agree that CLIL has positive impact just on specific subskills of writing. This finding is in the line with the conclusion reached by Ruiz de Zarobe (2011) who affirms that “in some areas of writing clear gains were observed, whereas in others no clear improvement was found.” (as cited in Gené-Gil, Juan-Garau, & Salazar-Noguera, 2015, p. 287)

5.5 Affective factors in CLIL instruction

Table 4

Affective factors in CLIL instruction

Author/year	Affective factors	Results favoring CLIL students	Results favoring EFL students
Fernández Fontecha (2014), Lasagabaster (2010), Lasagabaster and López (2014), Doiz et al. (2014), Fernández Fontecha and Canga	Motivation	5 ^a	1



(2013), Navarro Pablo and

García (2018)

Lasagabaster and Sierra

Attitudes towards

2a

(2009), Lasagabaster (2010)

English

N= 7

^a Studies are counted on more than one category

Table 4 indicates the number of studies that support the idea that CLIL instruction enhances motivation and positive attitudes towards English as a foreign language. Even though the majority of studies affirmed that both bilingual and non-bilingual groups were highly motivated, five of them identified statistically significant differences in terms of motivation favoring CLIL students. In addition, according to Navarro Pablo and García (2018), Fernández Fontecha (2014), and Lasagabaster (2010), there is a relationship between motivation and FL competence of students only regarding CLIL group; that is, the higher the motivation on students, the higher their performance of the language.

The study conducted by Fernández Fontecha and Canga (2013) is the only one with contradictory results about motivation in CLIL students. In their cross-sectional study, 31 CLIL students were compared with 31 non-CLIL students from 4th grade of primary school and after applying Gardner's attitude/motivation test, which had been applied in other investigations as well, results favored EFL students. The authors point out that the type of instruction might have affected students' motivation because of the extra load of exposition to foreign language involving CLIL methodology; however, outcomes could also have been affected by the age of students (8-9 years old) or the teachers' level of English (B1).



Regarding attitude towards English, according to Lasagabaster (2010) and Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009), teaching content through English influences positively on students' attitudes towards the foreign language because of relevance and authenticity with which the language is taught.

5.6 Other aspects of the language affected by CLIL instruction

Table 5

Other aspects of the language affected by CLIL instruction

Author/year	Factor of the language	Results favoring CLIL students	Results favoring EFL students
Xanthou (2011), Mattheoudakis et al. (2014)	Content	2	
Pérez-Cañado (2018), Navarro Pablo and García (2018)	Use of English	2	
Lasagabaster (2010)	Grammar	1	
N= 5			

In table 5, other factors affected by CLIL instruction besides the skills of the language and affective factors have been portrayed; and as it can be seen, even though there are not too many studies focusing on these areas, all of them favor CLIL instruction.

One of the biggest concerns from parents and teachers is whether students will be able to acquire knowledge of the subject learned under CLIL instruction since it is imparted



in another language (Mattheoudakis et al., 2014; Dalton-Puffer, 2008). The results from Xanthou (2011) and Mattheoudakis et al. (2014) showed that CLIL does not affect the appropriate learning of the subject; actually, CLIL groups indicated a significant increase in content knowledge in primary students even outperforming their EFL counterparts on the content tests.

In the same way, the use of English is also benefited by CLIL instruction according to the longitudinal study carried out by Pérez-Cañado (2018) and by Navarro Pablo and García (2018), who pointed out that this is one of the most affected areas by CLIL instruction.

Finally, according to Lasagabaster (2010), from the results of his cross-sectional study where he analyzed all the competences of the language, Grammar is the area of the language most benefited by CLIL instruction.

5. 7 Motivational factors influenced by CLIL instruction

Table 6

Motivational factors influenced by CLIL instruction

Author/year	Motivational factors	Positive results for CLIL students	Positive results for EFL students
Fernández Fontecha (2014), Lasabagaster and López (2014), Doiz et al. (2014), Fernández	Intrinsic motivation	3	1



Fontecha and Canga

(2013)

Fernández Fontecha	Extrinsic motivation	1	2
--------------------	----------------------	---	---

(2014), Lasabagaster

and López (2014),

Fernández Fontecha

and Canga (2013)

Lasagabaster (2010),	Instrumental	3	
----------------------	--------------	---	--

Lasabagaster and López	orientation/motivation		
------------------------	------------------------	--	--

(2014), Doiz et al.

(2014)

Doiz et al. (2014),	Anxiety	1	1
---------------------	---------	---	---

Navarro Pablo and

García (2018)

N= 6

^a Studies are counted on more than one category

In spite of the fact that not all the studies analyzed motivation based on the same parameters, this table shows the common factors of motivation affected by CLIL instruction.

Three studies concluded that bilingual students are more intrinsically motivated, which means that students under CLIL instruction feel inherent satisfaction during their class activities (Lasagabaster & López, 2014). Similarly, three studies agree that CLIL students have instrumental orientation, indicating that the reasons students want to command English



are the advantages this language can bring and other external reasons (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Lambert, 1974)

Regarding Extrinsic motivation, it is the factor of motivation less affected by CLIL instruction, but this might not be because of the type of instruction but because of students age since both studies with negative results were applied in primary schools in 4th and 5th graders (Lasagabaster & López, 2014; Fernández Fontecha, 2014). In addition, it worth mentioning that Ryand and Deci (2000) explain that extrinsic motivation seems to be low when intrinsic motivation is high.

Lastly, about anxiety, Doiz et al. (2014) affirms that comparing both groups, the CLIL cohort emerged a little more anxious, and this could be because students find more demanding to learn a subject in a foreign language. On the other hand, Navarro Pablo and García (2018) point out that both groups present similar levels of anxiety.

5.8 Confounding variables interacting with CLIL instruction

Table 7

Confounding variables interacting with CLIL instruction

Author/year	Variables	Subvariables
Xanthou (2010, 2011), Canga (2015), Fernández Fontecha (2014), Pérez-Cañado (2018),	Demographic variables	Age, sex, verbal intelligence, motivation, English level, socioeconomic status, habits, parent's



		level of education, English outside school
Pladeval-Ballester and Vallbona (2016); Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, (2016); Czura, (2019), Canga, (2015); Lasagabaster, (2010); Xanthou, (2010 - 2011); Lasagabaste, (2016); Agustín-Llach & Canga (2014); Fernández Fontecha (2014); Lasagabaster (2010)	Educational context	Type of school, subject taught under CLIL, teacher training, teachers' personality, support from the administration, experience with CLIL, number of CLIL hours, selection of students for CLIL programs, instruments

N= 11

^a Studies are counted on more than one category

Table 7 shows different variables that authors consider might affect the results of the studies and should be controlled in order to know if CLIL is really responsible for the results obtained or the other variables account for a greater intervention. In addition, few studies applied pre-test at the outset of the study and this will be; as Pérez-Cañado (2018) mentions; “potentially serious flaws” in research because it is not warranted the homogeneity of the samples and the intervening variables are not controlled (p. 54). Many authors seem to agree with this idea because some of these variables are considered a limitation in their studies.



Factors like gender have been analyzed in some studies obtaining contradictory results. Canga (2015) and Doiz et al. (2014) affirm that differences between CLIL and non-CLIL students is not attributed to gender. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) argue that women hold more positive attitudes towards the foreign language in CLIL instruction, and Fernández Fontecha (2013) points that CLIL boys are more motivated than CLIL girls. Another variable analyzed was parent's opinion and social status, which according to Lasagaster and López (2015) and Lagabaster and Sierra (2009), do not play an important role in CLIL instruction since families hold a good opinion about learning English under both methodologies. On the other hand, for Pladeval-Ballester and Vallbona (2016) the subject taught under CLIL instruction plays an important role and the level of English of students as well, being mid-achievers the least favored by CLIL implementation. Regarding selections of students for conforming CLIL groups, it is important to analyze because they are usually the most motivated students (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016), but for Doiz et al. (2014) motivation is equal in CLIL students whether they have been selected or not. Perez-Cañado (2018) indicates that type of school and socioeconomic status are not responsible for good results favoring the bilingual group, it is CLIL instruction the variable with much weight in the differences between bilingual and non-bilingual students.

Even though some other variables have not been analyzed in the studies, there are many others suggested by authors because they might be affecting the results and further investigation is needed. For example, age is considered a determining factor in young learners because they have not developed yet cognitive skills (Fernández Fontecha, 2013; Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016; Agustín Llach and Canga, 2014; Doiz et al., 2014). In addition, other factors like type of CLIL or its methodology (Fernández Fotecha, 2013),



hours of exposure of CLIL methodology that could be not enough (Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, 2016; Czura, 2019), teacher's personality and his interaction with students (Canga, 2015; Lasagabaster, 2010) , characteristics of the learner like habits (Xanthou, 2010, 2011; Lasagabaster 2010), exposure to the foreign language outside school (Xanthou, 2010, 2011), CLIL experience (Pladeval-Ballester and Vallbona, Lasagabaste, 2016), instruments used for measuring students competence are based on general English and not on the topic learned under CLIL instruction (Pladeval-Ballester and Vallbona, Xanthou, 2011), and degree of support from the administration (Lasagabaster, 2010; Czura, 2019). Finally, Agustín-Llach and Canga (2014), Fernández Fontecha (2013), and Lasagabaster (2010) claim that it is not clear whether CLIL is the responsible for the good results or the extra time that students are exposed to the language. Consequently, Xanthou (2010) suggested that more rigorous research, regarding controlled of variables needs to be done in order to corroborate and improve the results about CLIL instruction. Finally, according to Sylvén (2013), policy framework, teacher education, age of implementation, extramural exposure to target language are the most decisive factors for implementation of a program like CLIL, although in this analysis many other variables were mentioned.

5.9 Conclusions

Considering all the outcomes analyzed above, it can be said that CLIL methodology has a good impact on language skills, especially oral production, vocabulary, and motivation in both levels of education. In addition, receptive skills are developed under this type of instruction but not with significant results were found in primary schools. Regarding receptive skills, CLIL instruction has a lower effect. Furthermore, CLIL has a bigger impact in the long term but more longitudinal studies are required on each area of the language



affected by this type of Instruction. Finally, it is important to develop research on this topic where more of the co-variables are controlled in order to know the real impact of CLIL instruction.



CHAPTER VI

Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

The aim of this research synthesis was to explore the potential of CLIL instruction by analyzing the results of several studies that compared this methodology with traditional EFL programs in both primary and secondary schools. This analysis focused on the effects of CLIL on linguistic competence essentially on the following aspects: vocabulary, productive skills, receptive skills and motivation, trying to answer the research questions presented at the outset of the study.

Which skills of the language acquisition were most positively affected by CLIL instruction according to the reported literature? The analysis revealed that CLIL instruction provides undeniable positive results on students' oral production. This conclusion concurs with the results of studies whose authors assure that CLIL students were able to achieve better verbal communication and interaction than EFL pupils (Navarro Pablo & García, 2018; Czura & Kołodyńska, 2015). Similar conclusions can be drawn for writing, although few studies focused on this skill. Regarding the receptive skills (reading and listening), there is a dichotomy between primary and secondary school. Apparently, CLIL has positive results on these skills on secondary students, but the opposite happens on primary schools where CLIL students either cannot perform better than EFL students or they insignificantly outscore them.

In terms of receptive vocabulary acquisition, it can be concluded that this is another area where CLIL instruction has a great impact in both primary and secondary school contexts. Based on qualitative data from Xanthou's studies (2010, 2011), it was possible to



know that the good results on receptive vocabulary are due to the fact that CLIL provides continuous opportunities for learning vocabulary in meaningful situations activating prior knowledge and recalling target words. Therefore, as Sylvén (2010) mentioned, CLIL is the most appropriate method for vocabulary development (as cited in Agustín-Llach, 2016, p. 78)

Finally, to answer the research question regarding affective factors and motivation, important aspects when acquiring a language, it can be said that CLIL students were, in general terms, more motivated than EFL students. Specifically, with a deeper analysis, it was possible to conclude that intrinsic motivation and instrumental orientation are the factors more positively affected. Moreover, CLIL students also present positive attitudes towards English significantly higher than EFL students.

6.2 Recommendations

So far, this section has shown that CLIL instruction indeed offers learning opportunities by which students can develop their command of the target language. Nevertheless, the results of the analysis also raised some observations and recommendations. First, among the studies reviewed, the majority of them failed in controlling some variables that might be affecting the results. In other words, it is important to know if the results obtained are due to the application of CLIL or if they are being affected by contextual factors. According to Sylvén (2013), policy framework, teacher education, age of implementation, extramural exposure to target language are the most decisive factors for implementation of a program like CLIL; although in this analysis, many other variables were mentioned. Therefore, acknowledging that “there will always be differences between educational



systems, and it is important that they be put on the table and discussed” (Sylvén, 2013, p. 314), remarks the necessity of integrating them into a coherent research design.

Additionally, from this analysis it was possible to notice that the majority of studies were cross-sectional, applying quantitative research. Therefore, another recommendation could be the implementation of more longitudinal studies in order to prove a higher impact of CLIL in the long term (Canga Alonso, 2013), and also the need of more studies using qualitative data in order to complement results gathered from CLIL. Furthermore, from this analysis and the observations from some authors, it was possible to know that few investigations focused on areas such as writing and productive vocabulary. Consequently, more studies are needed in these areas because it might be possible that the impact of CLIL on productive vocabulary might be different. Finally, all the studies were conducted in European and Asian countries; therefore, further research is recommended in Latin America since CLIL instruction is also applied in this context and it would be important to know those results.



References

- Agustín-Llach, M. P., (2016), Age and type of instruction (CLIL vs. traditional EFL) in lexical development, *International Journal of English Studies (IJES)*, 16 (1), 75 – 96.
- Agustín-Llach, M. P., & Canga Alonso, A. (2016). Vocabulary growth in young CLIL and traditional EFL learners: evidence from research and implications for education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), 211-227.
- Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2016). Putting CLIL into Practice: Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers. Oxford University Press.
- Bret, A. (2011), Implementing CLIL in a primary school in Spain: the effects of CLIL on L2 English learners' oral production skills (MA Acquisition of English and Intercultural Communication). University of Barcelona, Barcelona, España.
- Brown, H. & Bradford, A. (2016). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. *Transformation in Language Education*, 42, 328 – 334.
- Calle, A., Calle, S., Argudo, J., Moscoso, E., Smith, A., & Cabrera, P. (2012). Los profesores de inglés y su práctica docente: Un estudio de caso de los colegios fiscales de la ciudad de Cuenca, Ecuador. *Maskana*, 3(2), 1-17.
- Canga, A. (2013). The receptive vocabulary of Spanish 6th-grade primary-school students in CLIL instruction: A preliminary study. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 6(2), 22-41.
- Canga, A. (2015), Receptive vocabulary of CLIL and non-CLIL primary and secondary



- school learners, *Complutense Journal of English studies*, 53, 59 – 70.
- Corral Robles, S. (2019). New insights into written competence in CLIL and non-CLIL programmes: pedagogical implications. *ReiDoCrea – Monográfico sobre Perspectivas transnacionales en la enseñanza de lenguas*, 8(3), 289 – 304.
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 543-562.
- Coyle, D. (2010). CLIL-A pedagogical approach from the European perspective. In *Second and Foreign Language Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 4, 97-111. Springer Science+ Business Media.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1999). Alternative paradigms in bilingual education research: Does theory have a place?. *Educational Researcher*, 28(7), 26 – 32.
- Czura, A. (2009). CLIL–the European and the Polish Perspective. *Anglica Wratislaviensia*, 47, 105-14.
- Czura, A. N. N. A., & Kołodyńska, A. (2015). CLIL instruction and oral communicative competence in a primary school setting. *Cross-cultural perspectives on bilingualism and bilingual education*, 88-117.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008), Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): current research from Europe. In Webner D. and Laurenz V. (eds).



Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching (pp. 139 – 157), Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of applied linguistics*, 31, 182.

Diab, A. A. M., Abdel-Haq, I. M., & Aly, M. A. S. (2018). Using the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Approach to Develop Student Teachers' EFL Receptive Skills. Online Submission.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2014). CLIL and motivation: the effect of individual and contextual variables. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 209-224. Doi: 10.1080/09571736.2014.889508

EF Educacion First (2019). *English Proficiency Index: A Ranking of 100 Countries and Regions by English Skills* (9th ed.). Retrieve from <https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/>

Eurobarometer (2006). *Europeans and their Languages*. European Commission.

Eurydice (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.

Fernández Fontecha, A. & Canga, A. (2014). A preliminary study on motivation and gender in CLIL and non-CLIL types of instruction. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14(1), 21-36.

García, E. (2015). Soft CLIL in infant education bilingual contexts in Spain. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 1, 30-36.



- Gené-Gil, M., Juan-Garau, M., & Salazar-Noguera, J. (2015). Development of EFL writing over three years in secondary education: CLIL and non-CLIL settings. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(3), 286–303. doi:10.1080/09571736.2015.1053278
- Golkova, D., & Hubackova, S. (2014). Productive skills in second language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 477-481.
- Ikeda, M. (2013). Does CLIL work for Japanese secondary school students. Potential for the ‘Weak. *International CLIL research Journal*, 2(1), 31-43.
- In, J. (2017). Introduction of a pilot study. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, 70(6), 601 - 605. doi:10.4097/kjae.2017.70.6.601
- Kitao, K. (1996). Why do we teach English? *The Internet TESL Journal*, 2. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kitao-WhyTeach.html>
- Korosidou, E., & Griva, E. (2014). CLIL approach in primary education: Learning about Byzantine art and culture through a foreign language. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 216-232.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1(1), 30 – 41. Doi: 10.2174/1874913500801010030
- Lasagabaster, D. (2010). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3-18. Doi:10.1080/17501229.2010.519030



Lasagabaster, D., & López, R. (2015). The impact of type of approach (CLIL versus EFL) and methodology (book-based versus project work) on motivation. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, 23, 41-57.

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

Liubinienė, V. (2009). Developing listening skills in CLI. *Kalby studijos*, 15, 89-93.

Llinares, A., & Pastrana, A. (2013). CLIL students' communicative functions across activities and educational levels. *Journal of pragmatics*, 59, 81-92.

Loaiza, E., Salazar, P., Salazar, M., Montece, S., Veliz, J., and Acosta, M. (2019). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): An Educational and Communicative Approach for Ecuadorians*. Ecuador: Mawil Publicaciones Impresas y Digitales.

Manzo, A. V., Manzo, U. C., & Thomas, M. M. (2006). Rationale for systematic vocabulary development: Antidote for state mandates. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(7), 610-619.

Marsh, D. (2008). Language awareness and CLIL. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 6, 233-246.

Marsh, D. (2012), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). A Development Trajectory. Córdoba.

Martínez Agudo, J. de D. (2019). Which instructional programme (EFL or CLIL) results in better oral communicative competence? Updated empirical evidence from a



- monolingual context. *Linguistics and Education*, 51, 69–78. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2019.04.008
- Mattheoudakis, M., Alexiou, T., & Laskaridou, C. (2014). To CLIL or not to CLIL? The case of the 3rd Experimental Primary School in Evosmos *Major Trends in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 215-234.
- Ministerio de Educación. (2014). *National Curriculum Guideless English as a Foreign Language*. Quito, Ecuador: Ecuador Government printing.
- Ministerio de Educación. (2016). *Currículo 2016 Lengua extranjera*. Quito, Ecuador: Ecuador Government printing.
- Navarro Pablo, M & García E. (2018). Are CLIL students more motivated?: an analysis of affective factors and their relation to language attainment. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 71-90.
- Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, E. (2016). The impact of CLIL on the acquisition of L2 competences and skills in primary education. *International Journal of English Studies*, 16(2), 81-101.
- Nikula, T. (2017). CLIL: A European approach to bilingual education. *Second and foreign language education*, 111-124.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching (13)*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 315-341.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018). CLIL and educational level: A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on language outcomes. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 51-70.



- Pérez-Vidal, C., & Roquet, H. (2015). CLIL in context: Profiling language abilities. In Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments (pp. 237-255). Springer, Cham.
- Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2015). Exploring primary school CLIL perceptions in Catalonia: students', teachers' and parents' opinions and expectations. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 45-59.
- Pladevall-Ballester, E., & Vallbona, A. (2016). CLIL in minimal input contexts: A longitudinal study of primary school learners' receptive skills. *System*, 58, 37-48.
- Ployhart, R., & Vandenberg, R. (2015). Longitudinal Research: The Theory, Design, and Analysis of Change. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 94 – 120. doi: 10.1177/0149206309352110
- Pokrivčáková, S., Babocká, M., Bereczky, K., Bodorík, M., Bozdoğan, D., Dombeva, L., . . . Hurajová, Ľ. (2015). CLIL and Foreign Language Education: e-textbook for foreign language teachers. *Nitra: Constantine the Philosopher University*.
- Prieto-Arranz, J. I., Fabra, L. R., Calafat-Ripoll, C., & Catrain-González, M. (2015). Testing progress on receptive skills in CLIL and non-CLIL contexts. *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments*, 123-137. Springer: Cham.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2008). CLIL and foreign language learning: a longitudinal study in the Basque country. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 60 – 73.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2014). The Effects of Implementing CLIL in Education. *Educational Linguistics*, 51–68. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_4



Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.

Samaranayake, S. W. (2015). The best method in EFL/ESL teaching. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 5(5), 73 - 80.

Serra, C. (2007). Assessing CLIL at Primary School: A Longitudinal Study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 582–602.
Doi:10.2167/beb461.0

Sylvén, L. K. (2013). CLIL in Sweden—why does it not work? A metaperspective on CLIL across contexts in Europe. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 301-320.

Tragant, E., Marsol, A., Serrano, R., & Llanes, À. (2016). Vocabulary learning at primary school: a comparison of EFL and CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(5), 579-591.

Whittaker, R., Llinares, A., & McCabe, A. (2011). Written discourse development in CLIL at secondary school. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 343-362.

Xanthou, M. (2010), Current trends in L2 vocabulary learning and instruction: Is CLIL the right approach?, *Advances in Research on Language Acquisition and teaching*, 460 – 471.

Xanthou, M. (2011). The impact of CLIL on L2 vocabulary development and content knowledge. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10(4), 116-126.



Yamano, Y. (2013). Utilizing the CLIL approach in a Japanese primary school: A comparative study of CLIL and EFL lessons. *Asiane EFL Journal Research Articulos*, 15(4), 160 - 182.



Appendix: Studies Analyzed

Agustín-Llach, M. P., & Canga Alonso, A. (2016). Vocabulary growth in young CLIL and traditional EFL learners: evidence from research and implications for education.

International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26(2), 211-227.

Canga, A. (2015), Receptive vocabulary of CLIL and non-CLIL primary and secondary

school learners, *Complutense Journal of English studies*, 53, 59 – 70.

Corral Robles, S. (2019). New insights into written competence in CLIL and non-CLIL

programmes: pedagogical implications. *ReiDoCrea – Monográfico sobre*

Perspectivas transnacionales en la enseñanza de lenguas, 8(3), 289 – 304.

Czura, A. N. N. A., & Kołodyńska, A. (2015). CLIL instruction and oral communicative

competence in a primary school setting. *Cross-cultural perspectives on bilingualism*

and bilingual education, 88-117.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (2014). CLIL and motivation: the effect of individual

and contextual variables. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 209-224. Doi:

10.1080/09571736.2014.889508

Fernández Fontecha, A. (2014), Receptive vocabulary knowledge and motivation in CLIL

and EFL, *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 9, 23 – 32.

Fernández Fontecha, A. & Canga, A. (2014). A preliminary study on motivation and gender

in CLIL and non-CLIL types of instruction. *International Journal of English*

Studies, 14(1), 21-36.



- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3-18.
Doi:10.1080/17501229.2010.519030
- Lasagabaster, D., & López, R. (2015). The impact of type of approach (CLIL versus EFL) and methodology (book-based versus project work) on motivation. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, 23, 41-57.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4 – 17.
- Mattheoudakis, M., Alexiou, T., & Laskaridou, C. (2014). To CLIL or not to CLIL? The case of the 3rd Experimental Primary School in Evosmos *Major Trends in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 215-234.
- Navarro Pablo, M & García E. (2018). Are CLIL students more motivated?: an analysis of affective factors and their relation to language attainment. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 71-90.
- Nieto Moreno de Diezmas, E. (2016). The impact of CLIL on the acquisition of L2 competences and skills in primary education. *International Journal of English Studies*, 16(2), 81-101.
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018). CLIL and educational level: A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on language outcomes. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 51-70.
- Pladevall-Ballester, E., & Vallbona, A. (2016). CLIL in minimal input contexts: A longitudinal study of primary school learners' receptive skills. *System*, 58, 37-48.



Xanthou, M. (2010), Current trends in L2 vocabulary learning and instruction: Is CLIL the right approach?, *Advances in Research on Language Acquisition and teaching*, 460 – 471.

Xanthou, M. (2011). The impact of CLIL on L2 vocabulary development and content knowledge. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10, 116-126.