Integración de los principios metodológicos Clil en la enseñanza de materias de contenido en inglés

Clil methodological principles integration into the teaching of content subjects in English

[1]   Paola Belén Torres Lazo   https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0589-5128

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Ambato, Ecuador

belent.lazo@gmail.com

[2]   Michael John McCandless   https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6904-1973

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Ambato, Ecuador,

mmccandlessec@yahoo.com

Palabras claves:
integración,
materia,
contenido, Clil,
conceptualización,
bilingüismo.

Resumen

Introducción. Con la creciente promoción de la educación bilingüe, la enseñanza de materias de contenido en inglés ha ganado considerable importancia alrededor del mundo. Esto ha ocasionado desafíos para los docentes que enseñan materias de contenido debido a diferentes factores los cuales han influenciado la integración de los principios del CLIL en la enseñanza de materias de contenido. **Objetivo.** Por lo tanto, este estudio pretende analizar la presencia de los principios metodológicos del CLIL en clases de materias de contenido existentes. **Metodología.** Con este fin, este proyecto de investigación fue basado en un diseño cualitativo. La información fue recolectada a través de una entrevista vía zoom con siete profesores de inglés de una escuela privada en Ecuador quiénes fueron seleccionados intencionalmente y han enseñado materias de contenido en inglés. Para el análisis de la información, se utilizó las transcripciones de las entrevistas y se realizó un análisis temático usando códigos. La información fue organizada usando el programa Taguette. **Resultados.** Los resultados del presente estudio revelan que los principios metodológicos del AICLE no son notablemente integrados actualmente debido a diferentes factores como la falta de preparación, bajo nivel de conocimiento sobre el enfoque CLIL y asuntos de tiempo y recursos. **Conclusiones**. Manejar estos desafíos ayudarán a los docentes a ampliar su conocimiento y mejorar su práctica docente. Por lo tanto, se puede mejorar el proceso de implementación de la enseñanza de materias de contenido en inglés.

Keywords:

integration,
content, subject,
Clil,
conceptualization,
bilingualism.

Abstract

Introduction. With the increasing importance of bilingual education, the teaching of content subjects in English has gained considerable significance worldwide. This has brought challenges for teachers in charge of teaching these subjects due to distinct factors which have influenced the integration of CLIL principles in the teaching of content subjects. **Objective.** In this regard, this study aims to analyze the presence of CLIL methodological principles in existing content subject classrooms. **Methodology.** For this purpose, this research project was based on a qualitative design. Data was collected through interviews via zoom with seven English teachers from a private school in

Ecuador purposefully selected, because they have taught content subjects in English. For the analysis of the data, the interview transcripts were used, and a thematic analysis using codes was conducted. All the datasets were organized using the software; Taguette. **Results.** The outcomes of the study revealed that CLIL methodological principles are not noticeably integrated currently due to several factors such as the lack of teacher training, low awareness of the CLIL approach, and matters of time and resources. **Conclusions.** Addressing these challenges will help teachers broaden their knowledge and enhance their teaching practice. Hence, there is room for improvement in the process of implementing the teaching of content subjects in English.

Introduction

The integration of the methodological principles of Content and Language Integrated Learning (henceforth; CLIL) approach in the teaching of content subjects in English is the core of this study. In a vast variety of places around the world and in South America, CLIL has gained widespread praise during the 21st century due to its relevance for fostering bilingualism and multilingualism that in fact entails English learning (Banegas, 2015; Karabassova, 2018). Scholars have even highlighted the benefits of such an approach along with its principles in education since it allows students to learn content subjects such as history, science, literature, among others, in a language different from their first language (Coyle, 2010; Marsh, 2006).

However, the implementation of CLIL strategies has created challenges for English teachers not only in the international context but also in Latin America, and among these challenges are matters of identity and culture, the existence of proper materials, and teachers' preparation (McDougal, 2015; Meyer, 2010; Savic, 2010). In the same vein, such difficulties have been noticed in Ecuador with the inclusion of CLIL as a principal language-driven approach in the English Curriculum, the promotion of English learning, and the new teaching resources (Ministerio de Educación [MINEDUC], 2016).

This study seeks to analyze the presence of CLIL methodological principles in existing content subject classrooms, since knowing how to properly integrate CLIL principles in content subject classrooms has been identified as a fundamental necessity. First, this investigation intends to highlight the importance of understanding CLIL methodological principles for content subjects. Second, it will analyze how these principles are currently being integrated in the teaching of content subject. Finally, it will provide teachers with

insights about the current situation at a particular educational community based on the outcomes encountered after the data analysis.

The nature of this paper is an exploratory, qualitative study that focuses on teachers working at a private institution that is implementing the teaching of content subjects in English as a means of promoting bilingualism, entailing learning English as a foreign language. The data was collected by means of a semi-structured interview that made it possible to examine how CLIL principles are currently being integrated.

Conceptualization of CLIL and bilingualism

Learning languages has great significance worldwide since they are a means of communication and create opportunities for learners. In most countries, bilingualism has been characterized by learning English as a second language (L2) since it is considered a lingua franca and an international language. This has been promoted by the inclusion of curricular subjects taught in the target language at schools, assuring that learners achieve a good command of this language (Pena & Porto, 2008). As a result, bilingualism has been subjected to investigation and content instruction as well. During the 1990s, CLIL became a novel approach in education and institutions started implementing it in their classrooms for content instruction. Nonetheless, in the past other traditional methodologies were used as well. Content-Based Instruction, or CBI, was part of several bilingual programs. McDougald (2015) points out the fact that they present some similarities, however, CBI was used in North America and for language for specific purposes programs.

By virtue of the widespread importance, Content and Language Integrated Learning became a popular term in the 21st century when talking about fostering bilingualism and multilingualism. Research on content instruction through CLIL has been conducted to a great extent for several years since its unveiling in Europe (Banegas, 2015; Coyle, 2018; Custodio-Espinar, 2020; McDougald, 2015; Pena & Porto, 2008). This approach is understood in education as a "dual focus," which integrates the instruction of both content and language through a second or an additional language as the means of instruction (Coyle, 2018). Banegas (2011) mentions that CLIL is considered as an umbrella for bilingual and multilingual education, but also for all methodologies that have a dual focus on content and language instruction. Apart from that, Richards (2013) qualifies CLIL as a forward curriculum since it "starts with the design of a syllabus that contains both content and language components. This then leads to the choice of suitable instructional materials as well as selection of activities for delivering, reviewing, and assessing instruction" (p.12).

Scholars such as Agudo (2020) and Pladevall-Ballester (2015) highlight the benefits of CLIL in education as it allows students to learn content subjects such as history, science,

and literature, among others, in a language different from their first language. In a quantitative study executed to analyze the impact of CLIL on English language competence, Agudo (2020) demonstrates that students who did not have access to CLIL programs had an overall lower English performance in comparison to the CLIL students. The difference was noticeable mainly in Use of English and vocabulary, and there was an even more significant improvement at the end of secondary education. Likewise, Pena and Porto (2008) support the effectiveness of CLIL from a teachers' perspective based on the progress they have seen in their students, showing that they understand the implementation of a CLIL project as a feasible way of providing learners with a higher amount of exposure and time to learn English. But this study also suggests adapting the CLIL approach to students with learning disabilities. Similarly, the qualitative study conducted by Pladevall-Ballester (2015) states that students in primary education are satisfied with the CLIL program because of the skills they have developed to give English more meaningful use, and most parents consider CLIL as a beneficial practice that gets students' attention and generates motivation. Additionally, Marsh (2006) claims that some learners could even get to a point when they focus on learning the content and the use of the language becomes automatic.

A substantial number of European countries began implementing the CLIL approach in schools, aiming to help people acquire a second or third language, and giving birth to a growing recognition worldwide that made it an international approach. CLIL has been implemented in educational systems in diverse ways, establishing a wide set of models. In fact, Villabona and Cenoz (2021), in an exploratory study, discovered that CLIL scope and implementation varies from classroom to classroom, depending on teachers' insights about this approach even though it is applied within the same institution. As can be seen, several countries have included CLIL subjects, focusing on English as the target language, and other languages (Dafouz et al., 2016; Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2016). However, the implementation of CLIL has created challenges for English language teachers. Among these challenges are matters of identity and culture, the existence of adequate materials, and teacher preparation (Pimentel & Albuquerque, 2018).

CLIL implementation

It is worth mentioning that although CLIL has been referred to as a core pedagogical approach of bilingualism, a few studies have pointed out the factors involved in the implementation of CLIL programs in schools (McDougal, 2015, Savic, 2010). Meyer (2010) suggested that scholars should also give more attention to the existence of educational resources, materials, books, etc., to provide teachers with insights to plan and teach in CLIL programs. However, Alcaraz-Mármol (2018) notes that not even the 50% of teachers who participated in her study had received specific methodological training on CLIL, and they struggled to develop and create materials for CLIL programs. Ball

(2018) concluded that design, provision, and access to materials for CLIL programs are some of the greatest challenges and have been noted and investigated in Europe. Consequently, most of the time materials used in CLIL programs are merely adaptations of existing materials, and they are seldom created based on the learners' needs.

Controversies regarding the amount of time teachers have for planning and teaching were also evident since teachers argued that they have numerous activities to perform during their day (McDougal, 2015; Pena & Porto, 2008). These factors have been sometimes overlooked, even though planning and resources are an essential to reach an effective integration of content and language.

It is common knowledge that teachers play a significant role in the learning process. Therefore, their preparation, conceptualization does this mean 'current CLIL of CLIL and bilingualism, their perceptions, and insights are of vital importance as shown by Pena and Porto (2008). In this study, CLIL teachers mention that there is room for improvement regarding their classroom practice. Some of them pointed out the necessity of observing other colleagues working with CLIL programs, and another group considered it important to get more theoretical knowledge to better understand its underlying principles. Using questionnaires and interviews, McDougal (2015) demonstrates that teachers see the implementation of CLIL as beneficial for learners. However, these authors have also stated that there is a lack of preparedness and familiarity with CLIL which can reduce its effectiveness.

Equivalent results were echoed by Karabassova (2018) who insists that the vague awareness of CLIL principles is reflected in teacher's practice which in fact influences the student learning process. Alcaraz-Mármol (2018) and Villabona and Cenoz (2021) fully coincide with previous studies since teacher preparation has been found as a necessity. Teachers possess diverse ways of understanding CLIL that have an impact on their practice. Some of them focus on content and others on language as they find it difficult to achieve a balance between these two, highlighting the relevance of having training not only in the target language but also in methodologies and strategies for teaching content subjects in English. In turn, once receiving training, teachers will have a clearer idea about the CLIL approach and implementing it will become easier as deepen their knowledge. Custodio-Espinar (2020) state that the quality of CLIL depends on practitioners' competencies, meaning that, teachers should receive continuous training on the core principles of CLIL.

Meyer (2010) declares that teacher preparation for planning and the creation of materials is fundamental because in the past not many researchers drew their attention to these factors which in fact are a core element of CLIL implementation. He suggested that teachers had to learn and understand this new paradigm of teaching along with its principles, following the parameters from the CLIL pyramid and the 4Cs-framework

(communication, culture, content, and cognition) (Coyle, 2010), to be adept at teaching in CLIL classrooms. In line with previous studies, Banegas (2015) mentions that it is imperative to provide teachers with training opportunities to enhance their teaching practices, the creation of materials, and the elaboration of plans, seeking to reach an effective integration of content and language.

In short, the teachers' role is crucial in the implementation of the teaching of content subjects using the CLIL approach since they guide the learning process. Nonetheless, it has been shown that some teachers are not aware of the CLIL approach and the role they have in helping students develop language skills and learning content even though they are teachers of CLIL programs (Karabassova, 2018).

Methodology

The research reported in this study was based on a qualitative and exploratory design with socio-educational underpinnings. It was executed in a private educational institution in Ecuador that provided the researcher with the permission to collaborate with some teachers of the English area as participants in this research project. Data was collected from seven English teachers purposefully selected, working in this school where CLIL is a fundamental approach for the teaching of content subjects in English as a means of promoting and enhancing English learning. It is worth mentioning that this school is aiming to become a bilingual institution; meaning promoting the learning of English and Spanish, and that is why they are giving more importance to English learning.

The participants' years of experience teaching English as a foreign language range from one to fifteen, and their ages from twenty-four to fifty. All of them had at least one year of experience teaching content subjects in English and have formally attended a two-hour CLIL training session conducted by experts from a books' publisher as part of their professional development and preparation for teaching subjects such as social studies, computer science, finance and commerce, science, and language through arts. Some participants said they also attended other training sessions on their own.

The instrument applied for data collection was a semi-structured interview which included ten open-ended questions that were developed based on the main principles of CLIL proposed by David Marsh to analyze teachers' conceptualization and teachers' practices based on this approach. Furthermore, sometimes additional questions were asked to clarify the participants' responses. This instrument was an adaptation of the interview utilized by Karabassova (2018). Due to Covid pandemic circumstances, the interviews were conducted virtually via zoom, and they were recorded. The interviews lasted from 25 to 50 minutes, and the participants were able to see the questions in English and Spanish while answering them.

To deeply analyze the data collected through the semi-structured interview, the audio-recorded information was transcribed in a Word document using the voice recognition tool and listening to the interviews several times. For the analysis of the information obtained, the interview transcripts were used, and a thematic analysis using codes and tags was executed. Such an analysis being "a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006), was done aiming to analyze the presence of CLIL methodological principles in existing content subject classrooms. These transcriptions allowed the researcher to do a preliminary analysis when various categories and themes from the datasets emerged. This process was executed in the following phases: data organization and data coding. During the data organization step, the researcher organized all the datasets using Taguette, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software. In the coding phase, data was categorized using "tags" or codes into themes to describe and interpret this social phenomenon considering the frequency of repetition of each statement. The major themes below emerged in this study, and they will be elaborated and discussed in the following sections:

a) Awareness of CLIL methodological principles
b) CLIL focus and teaching practice
c) Teachers' perceptions towards the implementation of content subjects

Results and discussion

The next sections describe information related to the most meaningful themes identified in the data collected through the interviews.

Theme a: Awareness of CLIL methodological principles

It has been noted that some teachers that are familiar with CLIL have defined this approach using terms such as "integrating," "subject area," "content," and "language," among others. These terms relate to the definition of CLIL that says that it "refers to situations where subjects, or part of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with a dual-focused aim, namely the learning of content and the simultaneously learning of a foreign language." Nonetheless, there were a couple of teachers that were clearly not familiar with these terms. This was reflected in the responses made when talking about familiarity with this approach and its definition:

P1 said "and my answer, I am not familiar with CLIL".

P6 mentioned "I don't sure that CLIL is learned for me because I think it's a new term, right, because I am graduated so many years ago, but I consider, I considered that we can use this integrated learning nowadays in order to improve the learning of the students…".

Meanwhile, teachers who said they were familiar with CLIL tended to describe some activities they do in class and give more details of their content subject classes. Participant two expanded on this topic which can be attributed to the expertise she had previously acquired and her knowledge. She showed a deep understanding of the topic and the highest level of awareness and conceptualization of CLIL. Likewise, Participant 7 also gave a clear idea about this topic.

P2 said "my perspective of CLIL is integrating content language in a way that should be creative allowing the students to develop their language skills through different forms, different just means like writing through speech, through writing, using online tools, through reading, comprehensible input, and output. I mean it is a combination of all of that for the students to learn a specific area of subject area."

P7 affirmed that "it could be an opportunity to gain experience a new subject and also the second language, and that's, the that's the definition for me, we can learn both at the same time".

Some participants seemed to relate CLIL with other ideas which did not give a clear sense of their actual conceptualization.

P3 remarked that "giving the students new opportunities of having a meaningful learning and try to combine, to integrate like the word say, with other subjects during the process of learning".

P5 said "I think that specially if we work with projects like, I think that is also integrated here, why, because content and language are very connected in order to achieve a goal".

P4 stated "specifically CLIL, I think that, is like very popular, you know, it's a very popular like topic around us as teachers".

Based on the responses, it can be concluded that participants have various levels of awareness about the CLIL approach and its principles, as only a couple of them seemed to have a clear idea about it. The integration of content and language does not seem to be clear, which, in turn, could be understood as a lack of knowledge. These findings couple with Savic (2010)'s study who found out that EFL teachers at a Serbian school where CLIL was being implemented only had a vague idea of the approach. So, she concluded that teachers needed more training. It is worth highlighting that Cenoz et al. (2014) declare that there is a plethora of interpretations of CLIL and define it as an "ambiguous" term which makes it even harder to differentiate it from other approaches that address content and language teaching for second language learning.

Theme b: CLIL focus and teaching practice

Regarding the dual focus CLIL aims to achieve, it was evident that some teachers give the same importance to both content and language which is the ideal of CLIL. This was determined based on the details they gave with respect to the input and output activities they do in class with their students, and teachers' pedagogical practices in the classroom. However, some participants showed a preference for focusing on one of these two components.

Dual focus

For P2, for instance, it was fundamental to provide students with input about the content in diverse ways, so students could process content to be able to produce the language later.

P2 also said "I had to cover the four skills while them learning the, the information of the subject so that's why I couldn't proceed that well, actually I could proceed, like I said the information that I gave to them, it was, it was nice because they understood we covered it during class during games, at homework in the we also did like individual tasks and, and also the, the tests everything was related to that so they were able to understand that."

In the same vein, two other teachers considered that giving equal importance to both content and language is necessary in a content-based class because students can develop and enhance their language skills at the same time.

P1 said "I think both because if they didn't know the contents is impossible that they can share your ideas I think that we have to mix half and a half."

P5 also declared that "the main thing here is that they learn, they can learn this language but also focus on content".

Language Focus

In one of the interview sections, teachers were asked about what they do to promote language development in the class, and it was easy to conclude that they focus on developing oral communication skills along with vocabulary. Participants 1 and 2 strongly emphasized the significance of including activities for oral communication in the class since they consider developing speaking skills as the goal. This could be justified by the fact that the administration of this school implemented content subjects in the curriculum as a way to enhance students' proficiency in oral communication since the development of speaking skills has been an area for improvement for several years at this institution.

P1 added that "to develop skills with oral communication. This is, this is my focus language because I tried to with the subject try to develop oral communication skills in other words many classes or I do not know I can say that all classes they practice speaking they practice speaking and sharing your opinions about the subject."

P2 declared "to include activities that would involve developing the language skills".

Teachers 6 and 7 gave more importance to vocabulary related to computer science and social studies because of time constraints and the necessity to understand new terms. They help learners with pronunciation of isolated words yet other language skills are addressed less frequently.

P6 said "I think in a computer science, I consider basically they learn about vocabulary basic because we don't have time to learn the present simple or the grammar, or we need to, one thing it's important because they start to pronounce different words, so we work with listen, we work with speaking but it's no more fluency, it's like word by word".

P7 added "my social studies classes are based on vocabulary especially, in all the topics will learn new vocabulary, innovative words, we have to practice this vocabulary, practice the reading, the writing, speaking activities using these innovative words".

Interviewees' answers also showed that other linguistic aspects; namely phonetics and grammar structures, are also included as the language part of CLIL since they are necessary; however, they do not explicitly teach English.

P3 affirmed that "the language focus is all the time immersed, it's being part of what we're doing there, and I think that for example in phonetics in the grammar structures at itself was really important for the students not to see them as like a formal structure but when it was right, or when it was the right moment to say I just explained it in a soft way that this is related to the linguist content of the subject,…".

P4 said that "the students started applying all the grammatical structure into my classes, into my, the, the content, you know, the content that they were learning from social studies".

Content Focus

Furthermore, teachers described what they do to promote content learning of the subject. The techniques most frequently mentioned to safeguard content are using videos, asking for students' opinions, putting content in a real-life situation, using diagrams, games, presentations, and visual aids. There is only one teacher who explicitly mentioned that content is the focus in her class because of the importance of understanding vocabulary.

P5 reasoned "because when we need to understand a topic then we just need the vocabulary that is key to understand the content, so I focus on content mainly".

It was also noted that some the content activities are connected to the linguistic aspects of language because of the follow-up tasks they include. That is to say, a dual focus is also evident in the activities described by the participants.

P1 said to include "Wh-questions about the previous knowledge and as I told you at the beginning, I start many times with time to climb like a game when they practice or remember the knowledge learned and I continue with, with the short story for example like conversation".

P7 said to "use different strategies, and we use different resources like videos, and also we use different info, infographics, and presentations and using different tools to, to increase the students' knowledge".

After analyzing what teachers do to promote both parts of CLIL in the class, participants were also questioned about the stages they include in a class period, and all of them agreed that these activities are included three stages: anticipation, construction, and consolidation. This gives us an idea of the pedagogical practices and the level of inclusion of CLIL principles.

Theme c: Teachers' perceptions towards the implementation of the teaching of content subjects in English

To analyze teachers' perspectives on the implementation of the teaching of content subjects in English in this school, they were asked about how they felt, the needs they found, and potential changes that need to be made to have even more successful outcomes.

One of the aspects emphasized by the participants when asked about their perceptions of teaching a content-subject class was how they felt. Most teachers pointed out that they felt good because teaching in English would not be an issue for them. However, some of them also said that it was challenging because they had little formal training. Hence, they had to learn about CLIL methodologies and become knowledgeable in the content and specific terms the subject required.

One of the social studies' teachers said that it was a wonderful experience because the class was active, and students enjoyed it. Similarly, participant three also considered it a pleasant experience.

P1 said "I like to teach Social Studies because I learn, and to be honest with you, I learn so much about World War One, origin of the earth, different, different topics, I learn I prepared and I develop my, my skills, reading, speaking".

P3 said "I felt excited I felt good with this new opportunity to experience something new".

Despite having to teach a content subject in English, teachers had a positive attitude and are willing to do it. Teachers also highlighted that there is room for improvement and there are some needs that should be addressed, with the aim to be better able to teach a CLIL class and to get greater outcomes and benefits for students.

Another aspect was related to what they need to improve within their teaching practice. All teachers reported they did not have enough preparation before starting to teach a content subject in English because their expertise was mainly in teaching English as a foreign language, not a content subject. They said they had attended a workshop, but it lasted just a couple of hours which was not enough. Yet, they managed to constantly prepare by themselves throughout the school year and to keep themselves informed and adept at teaching a CLIL class. Additionally, time constraints and school's support were also mentioned.

P2 evidenced lack of preparation by saying "No, I don't believe I had enough training, but my advantage was, is that I grew up in Canada so, for me I had that training there the experience that I went through with my teachers".

P2 also said "We definitely need time to, to teach a subject class just like they do in their native language, as a matter of fact, I would think a little more because it's in a second language."

P4 described his preparation for teaching content subjects in English as "zero, so that's why I've learned from like such a lot of mistakes that I've make but finally I got it like, it is the most important to join, you know, to be very I would say honest with yourself first about the mistakes that you are committing with their students, and then trying to find some solutions, so not, I've never received anything because they are most part of the seminars or webinars that you find is like for, you know, English teachers, writing and grammatical structures that's it, but not for, for social studies is like very hard to find".

P2 indicated that "there is lack of support of the institution, I think that when the institution does not support their teachers or not back them up and not give them the amount of time and training that they need, I mean the teacher could, could train on their own that's fine, I mean I love researching for me it's OK but what about onsite training, I want to see someone who's had experience how to show me how, how would be to teach a class like that".

Regarding the benefits of the implementation of CLIL subjects and students' perception towards it, teachers claimed that it is beneficial for learners as they can learn content and acquire the English language at the same time. They even get more confident using the language, however some students struggle because of the vocabulary used in the subject.

They noted that the implementation of new subjects should be better analyzed and done in a continuous and systematic form, because if they are not, favorable results will not be observed.

P3 said "I think is improving the level of the student and getting an exceptionally good profile in the student. That is a main idea in general to offer the community a better level of English."

Conclusions

- The research reported here aimed to appraise the presence of CLIL methodological principles in existing content subject classrooms which have been implemented in this school as a means of enhancing students' English proficiency. This study revealed that most participants' responses did not fully show a deep and clear understanding of CLIL. This could be due in part to the fact that these teachers claimed to have attended only a short workshop before starting to teach content subjects in English. Hence, getting practical and theoretical knowledge will enable teachers to be better at planning, creating, and selecting appropriate resources, and integrating the underlying principles of CLIL into their lessons.

- Even though teachers possess different conceptualizations of CLIL, most teachers put forth the effort to give equal importance to both content and language through the techniques they use in class for addressing each component of CLIL. It was found that most teachers focus on both components since they consider that students can obtain content knowledge and develop their English language skills at the same time, giving them the chance to enhance their level of proficiency in English which was previously proved by Agudo (2020)'s study. Similarly, data shows that teachers in this study aim to help students produce the language, to communicate, and learn about different topics. Therefore, students can speak about different subject contents while utilizing appropriate grammar and other features of language.

- The results regarding the teachers' perceptions towards the implementation of the teaching of content subjects in English confirm the results of other studies, showing that teachers must manage challenging situations (Ball, 2018; Karabassova, 2018; Meyer, 2010; Pena & Porto, 2008; Savic, 2010). Teachers' professional development and training is once again found as a necessity. Participants consider that observing CLIL experts would be feasible for learning how to teach content subjects in English. In this study there was only one teacher who has been teaching a content subject, social studies, for more than five years. This participant stated that there is an evident lack of training opportunities for learning to teach content subjects in English as most training sessions or seminars

focus on teaching English as a foreign language only, and that she has learned from her own experience.

- Another challenging aspect that needs to be addressed is about time. Some teachers claimed that the number of class periods and total time for teaching content subjects in English is not appropriate for the curriculum they must follow. School's administrative support and appropriate resources were less frequent topics. Nevertheless, participants believe that it is indispensable to provide teachers with materials such as books as a guide for teaching. Some of them also addressed the fact that the ongoing support of the institution is essential.

- Despite all these situations, teachers showed themselves eager to face this challenge because it has allowed them not only to expand their knowledge but also to see this as a professional growth opportunity. Likewise, they see the implementation of the teaching of content subjects in English as favorable not only for them, but more importantly for students because of the greater exposure to the target language, the skills they can develop, and the self-confidence students get through coping with the fear of speaking in a foreign language.

- The implementation of CLIL methodological principles into the teaching of content subjects in English at this school may be enhanced by effectively managing the challenges that have been noticed so far to unlock the potential of CLIL and obtain better outcomes of such an initiative. Implementing CLIL demands greater effort and commitment from all the people who intervene in this process. It is imperative for administrators and teachers to act, make changes, and enhance this process of implementation; considering all members' opinions since it is a huge step towards giving students the chance to be more prepared for the 21st century challenges by reaching a prominent level of proficiency in an international language, English. Foremost, it is fundamental to prepare students linguistically to communicate with people from other countries, to have a broad world view and seek opportunities for studying abroad, thereby improving their educational experiences.

- Factors such as unit and lesson planning, formats used, skills incorporated, and the existing educational materials being used still need to be further analyzed, considering that the overall aim of this study is to analyze the integration of CLIL principles in existing content subjects that are taught in English. Nevertheless, this data is useful to understand the current situation of this process and to determine a method to handle the challenges described and fill the existing gaps to increase the effectiveness of CLIL as a viable solution to help students develop speaking skills and become bilingual.

Bibliographical References

Agudo, J. (2020). The impact of CLIL on English language competence in monolingual context: a longitudinal perspective. *The Language Learning Journal, 48*(1), 36-47.

Alcaraz-Mármol, G. (2018). Trained and Non-Trained Language Teachers on CLIL Methodology: Teachers' Facts and Opinions about the CLIL Approach in the Primary Education Context in Spain. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 11,* 39-64.

Ball, P. (2018). Innovations and Challenges in CLIL Materials Design. *Theory Into Practice, 57*(3), 222-231.

Banegas, D. (2011). A Review of "CLIL: content and language integrated learning," *Language and Education*, *25*(2), 182-185.

Banegas, D. (2015). Sharing views of CLIL lesson planning in language teacher education. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 8*(2), 104-130.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

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

Coyle D. (2018). CLIL: Planning Tools for Teachers. Nottingham: *University of Nottingham*. https://clilrb.ucoz.ru/_ld/0/29_CLILPlanningToo.pdf

Coyle, D. (2010). CLIL - a pedagogical approach from the European perspective. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education,* 97–111.

Custodio-Espinar, M. (2020). Influencing Factors on In-Service Teachers' Competence in Planning CLIL. *Latin American Journal of Content &Amp; Language Integrated Learning, 12*(2), 207-241.

Dafouz, E., Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2016). University teachers' beliefs of language and content integration in English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Conceptualizing integration in CLIL and multilingual education*, 123-143.

Karabassova, L. (2018). Teachers' conceptualization of content and language integrated learning (CLIL): evidence from a trilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(3), 787-799.

Lasagabaster, D. & A. Doiz. (2016). "CLIL Students' Perceptions of Their Language Learning Process: Delving into Self-Perceived Improvement and Instructional Preferences." *Language Awareness, 25* (1-2),110–126.

Marsh, D. (2006). Using languages to learn and learning to use languages. http://archive.ecml. at/mtp2/clilmatrix/pdf/1UK.pdf

McDougald, J. (2015). Teachers' attitudes, perceptions, and experiences in CLIL: A look at content and language. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 17*(1), 25–41.

Meyer, O. (2010). Introducing the CLIL-pyramid: Key strategies and principles for quality CLIL planning and teaching. *Basic issues in EFL-Teaching and Learning,* 11-29.

Ministerio de Educación [MINEDUC]. (2016). *Currículo de lengua extranjera*. https://educacion.gob.ec/curriculo-lengua-extranjera/.

Pena, C. & Porto, M. (2008). Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project. *Porta Linguarum, 10,* 151-161.

Pimentel, J. & Albuquerque, R. (2018). Innovations and Challenges in CLIL Implementation in South America. *Theory Into Practice, 57*(3), 196-203.

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.

Richards, J. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal, 44*(1), 5–33.

Savic, V. (2010). Are we ready for implementing CLIL in primary language classrooms? *MELT - Magazine for English Language Teachers, 13*, 16-19.

Villabona, N. & Cenoz, J. (2021). The integration of content and language in CLIL: a challenge for content-driven and language-driven teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 35*(1), 36-50.

Indexaciones