



Universidad Internacional de La Rioja

Facultad de Educación

MASTER'S DISSERTATION

From Bilingualism to Trilingualism

Effects of Introducing CLIL in a Bilingual Community

Presented by: Marta Pedrero Motis

Director professor: Jose Maria Díaz Lage

Type of dissertation: Research

Place: Barcelona

Date: March 3, 2017

Abstract: We are entering a new era in which it is undeniable that foreign language (FL) learning is incredibly important due to globalization. Educational systems are well aware and are committed to improve students' FL proficiency. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) appears in this context as an innovative approach to foster multilingualism around Europe, since it is believed to help improve FL competence. CLIL entails the integration of a foreign language in the school curriculum as language of instruction with the dual-focused educational approach for the learning and teaching of both content and language. Research has mainly focused on CLIL's impact on FL competence, but the number of studies done in multilingual contexts in which more than two languages coexist is insignificant (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015). The coexistence of three languages in the curriculum is something increasingly common: the majority language coexists with a minority language (whether it is the vernacular language, in the case of bilingual communities, or as the L1 of immigrant children), and the foreign language. Throughout this dissertation we will refer to English as the FL since it is the most popular around Europe, due to its global importance. The overall aim of this dissertation is to examine the effect of CLIL on the learning of three languages and the general effect of its implementation in a bilingual school. Research has shown CLIL's benefits in FL competence, but there is little attention paid to students' other languages. The conclusions developed in this dissertation state that neither the minority language (L1) nor the majority (L2) is negatively affected by the implementation of CLIL and a foreign language (L3), even if students were less exposed to L1 and L2 in the school setting. It was also of interest to discover the attitudes of students and teachers in a trilingual school in which CLIL has been implemented. Thus we also analyze the linguistic attitudes that arise from this coexistence of languages.

Key words: CLIL, bilingualism, trilingualism, plurilingual education, minority language, foreign language, vernacular language and linguistic attitudes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1. Justification of the research question and problem | 4 |
| 1.2. Brief analysis of the recent research | 5 |
| 1.3. Aims | 7 |
| 1.4. Methodology | 8 |
| 2. Literature review | 9 |
| 2.1. Bilingualism | 9 |
| 2.1.1. CLIL in bilingual education | 12 |
| 2.2. Trilingualism | 13 |
| 2.2.1. CLIL in trilingual education | 15 |
| 2.3. Spanish Bilingual Communities | 16 |
| 2.3.1. Catalonia | 17 |
| 2.3.2. The Basque Country (BAC) | 22 |
| 2.4. Canada | 26 |
| 2.5. Attitudes toward English and CLIL | 29 |
| 2.5.1. Students' attitudes (Catalonia and the BAC) | 30 |
| 2.5.2. Teachers' attitudes in Spain | 32 |
| 3. Discussion | 34 |
| 3.1. Bilingualism and trilingualism | 34 |
| 3.2. CLIL bilingual education and CLIL trilingual education | 34 |
| 3.3. Bilingual communities in Spain (Catalonia and the BAC) | 36 |
| 3.4. Language competences (minority language, majority language and English) | 38 |
| 3.5. Support and resources for a trilingual program | 40 |
| 3.6. Students and teachers' attitudes | 41 |
| 3.7. CLIL benefits and challenges | 42 |
| 4. Conclusions | 45 |
| 5. Future research lines and limitations | 55 |
| 6. Bibliography | 57 |

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past few centuries, the definition of a cultured and educated person has become someone who dominates various languages. The value of language mastery is extending all over the world (Pérez Esteve et al., 2008).

In addition, Graddol (2006, p.72) said that the world now views English not so much as a language but as a core skill. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), with its dual-focused aim and its goal of promoting plurilingualism, perfectly encapsulates this post-modern approach. Therefore, schools are increasingly adopting CLIL programs that implement the teaching of an additional language at an early age (Graddol, 2006; Lasagabaster, 2003).

More and more, having mastered a second language leads to more opportunities in the labor market; knowing a third one opens even more doors. Being trilingual enhances not only the speaker's professional life but it also has been shown to have many social, psychological and lifestyle advantages. For example, promoting social relationships, opening people's minds and increasing their interests toward different cultures (Cummins, 1976; Berry & Kalin, 1995).

This dissertation aims at discovering what the effects are of implementing CLIL in a bilingual school. In other words: what relevant changes occur when a bilingual education becomes a trilingual one? Are the three languages in the curriculum developing in harmony? We will focus mainly on Spain, since there are many bilingual communities (although we will focus on Catalonia and the Basque Country), and language is a topic that has always caused debate. In addition, we will explore Canada, since the country has had a significant influence on multilingual education policies around the world.

Language has a huge importance in any society and particularly its educational system.

1.1. Justification of the research and problem

According to one report from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) published in 1953, “we take it as axiomatic [...] that the best medium for teaching is the mother tongue of the pupil” (p.6) (UNESCO, 1953).

A potential problem of monolingual schools teaching another language is that many students are afraid to lose their mother tongue. Therefore this loss could lead to social and academic negative consequences (Fillmore, 1991; Cummins, 1996).

Catalonia has a long history of fighting to have an educational system in which Catalan (the vernacular language) is the primary language of instruction. However, Catalan authorities and schools agree that a third language must be introduced as soon as possible. Lasagabaster (2003) explains in his study on the Basque Country that together with the desire to keep and foster the minority language (Basque), there is also a widely accepted need to know at least one additional international language. As a result, hundreds of schools throughout Spain and Europe have implemented CLIL projects and their number is increasing every year (Lasagabaster, 2003).

This situation is concerning because the implementation of a third language of instruction means a loss of hours invested in the vernacular language (Lasagabaster, 2001). Could CLIL-English projects (the third most implemented language) weaken the mastery of the minority languages? Will the vernacular languages of any given country be undermined over the years and provoke negative attitudes toward English? In an increasingly plurilingual community, will the three languages (the vernacular, national and foreign language) be learned with the same competence? It seems that the introduction of a third language into an already bilingual society brings new questions to the table.

On the one hand, there's a growing concern about how multilingualism will affect the minority language; but on the other hand, who could stand against having our children master English, especially when “foreign language learning

has traditionally been a weak point in Spanish education” (Fernández Fontecha, 2009, p.3)?

Another worry is whether the bilingual students’ English competence acquired through CLIL will end up lower than that of their monolingual peers because they already have extra work learning two languages.

We would like to explore how the bilingual schools implementing CLIL are tackling this situation and also how teachers and students feel about this process of becoming a trilingual school.

1.2. Brief analysis of the recent studies

When we first began the research we wanted to start with investigating bilingualism and trilingualism as concepts and then examine their educational models. Later on, we looked for studies that analyzed the effects of CLIL’s implementation in both monolingual and bilingual contexts.

Rothman (2007) points out how linguists, psychologists and other social scientists became interested in studying bilingualism in the beginning of the 20th century, following the work of pioneering research such as Ronjat and Leopold. The research on bilingualism has evolved from a social perspective through the early 1980s to a linguistic approach in the mid-1980s; and today, many scholars are studying the cognitive aspects of language acquisition (Rothman, 2007).

Cenoz (2003) states that the investigation on cognitive outcomes of bilingualism has ultimately provided useful explanations about the key role of bilingualism on third language acquisition. However, more research must be conducted in order to better understand that multicompetence is not the sum of monolingual competences (Cook, 1993).

Third language acquisition has been treated as the study of bilingual people who tried to master an additional language in adulthood or of adults that master two languages and want to master a third one. Most studies concerning trilingualism have been carried out within the framework of bilingualism research. In fact,

trilingualism has often been considered an extension of bilingualism. However, children raised in a trilingual context is especially interesting because of the new questions that it brings and the scarcity of studies carried out (Hoffman, 2001).

When looking for information about plurilingual education, we came across the UNESCO's report about the risks of a foreign language of instruction (1953). It says the risk exists of having negative effects over their linguistic competence in their mother tongue, and therefore being unable to connect with their cultural heritage (UNESCO, 1953).

Research on language acquisition so far has focused on bilingual contexts and on FL learning. There are a significant number of studies that address this topic, but trilingual communities are still an uncharted territory (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015).

In regard of CLIL, studies have been carried out in bilingual communities where CLIL's implementation has consisted of a plurilingual curriculum with the presence of three languages. However, these are much less numerous compared to the research that can be found in monolingual communities implementing CLIL (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009).

Moreover, we wanted to collect some evidence about two bilingual communities in Spain: Catalonia and the Basque Country. Despite the unfortunately little attention paid to the comparison of CLIL bilingual schools to CLIL trilingual schools, we have found different studies in the Catalanian and Basque context about the evolution and development of CLIL that will help us develop a deeper understanding of the approach.

We first began with a report that talks about the evaluation and the development of CLIL programs in Catalonia by M^a Neus Lorenzo and Imma Piquer in 2013. It offers a great overview of foreign language teaching plans in the last ten years in Catalonia and it also examines educational results.

In the Basque Country, Lasagabaster in 2003 commenced a huge investigation about the attitudes toward the minority, majority and foreign language in many

different places all over the world. A specific detailed study of the Basque country is also included in his work. In 2015 Merino and Lasagabaster conducted a study in the Basque Country about the effect of CLIL on the learning of the three languages in contact: English, Spanish and Basque. We have greatly appreciated Lasagabaster's work because it takes into account almost all the aspects that we were looking for surrounding the topic.

Another interesting case study in the Basque Country about multilingual education is the evaluation of the MET (*Proceso de experimentación del Marco de Experimentación Trilingüe*), undertaken from 2011 to 2013. Its main aim was the creation of a framework for promoting multilingualism education (ISEI-IVEI, 2014).

To finish the exploration of specific communities, we will briefly explore Canada's experience in this topic by revising the studies carried out by Swain and Lapkin in 1991.

Finally, we will conclude the literature review with a compilation of studies that have analyzed students and teachers' attitudes toward CLIL's implementation. Attention will be paid to our two bilingual communities in question: Catalonia and the Basque Country.

1.3. Aims

The main objective of this work is to discover how the implementation of CLIL affects an already bilingual school, in terms of how the integration of three languages impacts teachers, students and their teaching and learning processes in different areas.

Academically, our aim is to discover the effect of CLIL in regard of both the vernacular language and English competence. We would like to find out if the English competence of Spanish bilingual students (participating in CLIL trilingual projects) is worse than those of Spanish monolingual students (participating in CLIL bilingual schools). Further, we want to compare the vernacular language competence of those students who started their studies

immersed in a CLIL project to those students who did not. The goal is to see if there is any sign that the vernacular language has been negatively affected.

From a teacher's perspective, we want to investigate whether schools are prepared to tackle multilingualism and how are they planning and adapting CLIL in their curriculum. Is having three languages of instruction an obstacle? What new strategies or approaches are they using?

In the social area, we want to know what attitudes do teachers and students from bilingual communities have toward CLIL implementation and to learning and teaching through a third language. Do they have any fear about how this could affect the vernacular language learning? Do they feel positive about plurilingual teaching?

1.4. Methodology

To achieve the main aim of this dissertation we will do a research review of the principal authors and recent studies about bilingual and trilingual education, to determine what is the difference between implementing CLIL in a monolingual school and in a bilingual one. We will first investigate our closest bilingual communities, Catalonia and the Basque Country, and later have a look at Canada, which has a wider experience and numerous investigations.

The goal is to find, if there are any, matching points in trilingual schools and reflect upon them, as well as to compare them with the rest of Spanish monolingual schools. This study will lead to a clear understanding of the different effects that CLIL has in a bilingual society.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Bilingualism

Although it may seem easy to define the concept of bilingualism, it is often difficult to explain accurately, since there are several points of view and it is a multi-faceted term that encompasses a lot of different ideas (Hoffman, 2001).

Experts and scholars do not seem to find a common definition for bilingualism. There are many different ways to define it, and that is why depending on the dictionary you will find a different definition. For example, if we look for it in one of the most important English dictionaries, the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, the definition given is: “ability to speak two languages”.

Richards and Schmidt, in their *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (2002) add into the definition three new concepts: it is necessary for a bilingual person to be able to *read*, speak and *understand* the second language, and to use both languages with a certain level of *proficiency*.

There are different kinds of bilingual individuals, depending mainly on the moment they acquire a second language; the early bilingual is who acquire both languages during the infancy, and the late bilingual is the one that acquire the second language after infancy (Hoffman, 1991).

Research has shown for many years that early bilingualism is not only beneficial solely because the child will know more than one language, but also because they develop types of cognitive capabilities and metalinguistic awareness earlier and superior to those who are monolingual (Bialystok, 2001; Cummins, 2000; King & Mackey, 2007).

It is important to know, as many parents, instructors, and policy makers have made the mistake of thinking that the first language of a child will be negatively affected if a he/she is exposed to a second language or any additional language (Ball, 2011). Smith (1931) adds that the child's support in learning their L1 would have to be extracted completely for this to be a possibility (as cited in Ball, 2011).

However, UNESCO reported in 1953 the risks of a foreign language of instruction in terms of negatively affecting the mother tongue competence. Moreover, UNESCO has encouraged mother tongue instruction in the first educational years since 1953 highlighting its advantages: it is more probable for children to register for school and to have a more successful experience. Also, parents are more likely to be involved in their child's education, keeping in constant communication with the teacher and participating in their child's learning (UNESCO, 1953).

Benson (2004), a principal specialist on the subject of bilingualism and multilingualism education states that the most effective language for learning literacy and content instruction is their L1. He claims that the transition of education taught in L1 to L2 is most efficient later on than early on.

Jim Cummins's hypothesis about linguistic interdependence makes a good point regarding this subject. The author (1984) drew up an 'interdependence hypothesis', affirming that second language competence depends upon the level of the first language (L1) development.

Consequently, Cummins advocates for children to begin general academic education in the child's L1, or mother tongue, until the child is competent in that language. Once the child shows academic proficiency in their first language, this proficiency is able to transfer to a second language (L2), given enough exposure and proper enthusiasm to learn (Cummins, 1984).

Riches and Genesee (2006) reiterated Cummins' findings in their research that focused on the collaboration between first and second language knowledge. They found, like Cummins, that a high proficiency in L1 creates a strong foundation for the acquisition of a L2. In other words, strong first language skills particularly in literacy skills, was related with lasting success in a second language.

Ball (2011) pointed out: “programmes that aim to teach children a majority language to prepare them for school, without at the same time supporting the continued development of L1, risk causing subtractive bilingualism” (p.40). This subtractive bilingualism is a threat if the majority language undermines the child’s mother language. The child must receive formal instruction in their mother language for it to survive, develop and be maintained over their lifespan (Pallier et al., 2003). Learning additional languages at a young age does not guarantee success. There must be educational continuity, suitable instructive philosophies and sufficient resources. It has been shown that providing an intensive L2 education when a child is older, is better than gambling the offset of first language development (Ball, 2011).

According to Genesee, Paradis and Crago (2004), most children are able to acquire a second language not because they have a high intellectual ability, but due to their motivation, support and exposure. Inspiration for a child to want to develop a second language can come from their desire to fit in at school, start or maintain relationships with classmates, communicate effectively, etc. Luckily, given enough will, resources and support, any child regardless of their intellect is able to successfully acquire a L2.

As cited in Ball (2011), Lightbown (2008) summarized the findings of early childhood bilingualism as follows:

- Children are able to acquire two or more languages at an early age.
- Children’s minds are not limited in “space” for languages and bilingualism does not complicate communication.
- Assumed suitable interactive opportunities and language input, the developmental path taken is similar if not the same as the attainment of a single language.
- A few cognitive benefits are related to the growth of competence in more than one language.
- Learning a second or third language at an early age does not guarantee the success and retention of that language. It is dependent on the person’s ability to continue to develop and maintain the language.

2.1.1. CLIL in bilingual education

Grenfell (2002) stated that in order for every citizen to profit from the single market in a united Europe, significance was given to language education. All European member states decided to pursue development in the diversity and quality of language instruction throughout the European Union. It was seen that the key to the construction of Europe was cultural awareness and high language competence. Bilingual teaching and learning was recommended to promote these aspects (Grenfell, 2002).

There are different ways of implementing a bilingual education program, but to be considered as such it should use two languages as media of instruction and include a more or less balanced teaching of the two languages (Ball, 2011).

In the 1990s, CLIL was used as an umbrella term encircling different forms of learning in which language has a key role together with the learning of non-linguistic knowledge (Marsh, 1994).

In respect to the dissimilar modalities, we must remember that the substance of CLIL is integration. Integration focuses on two aspects (Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008):

1. Language learning is integrated in content classes such as biology, chemistry, geography, etc.
2. The content provided by subjects is used in language-learning classes. For example, the language teacher uses the content of the subject Biology to integrate new terminology, jargon, and grammar, into an English class.

CLIL's implementation varies all over Europe. CLIL differs among regions within a country, but also along schools in any given town. This situation is due to the freedom and autonomy of every school and country and also linked to the lack of a regulation or official guidelines regarding its implementation (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

CLIL has gained more importance because learners acquire a foreign language in a natural way, just like they do with their mother tongue (Marsh, 2000). However, it has been criticized as well because CLIL specific materials are scarce and teachers need CLIL training in order to achieve good results.

2.2. Trilingualism

Hoffman (2001) said that multiple descriptions of bilingualism refer overtly to two languages. When referring to trilingualism, the number of three languages is unmistakably stated, but looks like it simply represents an extension of bilingualism. The author quotes Genesee's (1998) definition of multilingualism as the ultimate result of the progression of acquiring many non-native languages.

Hoffman (2001) constructs groups of five distinctive trilinguals:

1. Children who are raised in a home of two different languages that are not the majority language of the community.
2. Children who are brought up in a bilingual society and whose language spoken at home, by one or both parents are different from the language of the community.
3. Children that are bilingual, but obtain a third language in the context of formal education at school.
4. Bilingual children who acquire a third language by immigrating to a country where the majority language is different from the ones they speak.
5. Children who are member of trilingual communities.

While still much smaller than the body of bilingualism research, research on the cognitive consequences of trilingualism is increasing (Chertkow et al., 2010). The effects of trilingualism are important to document (beyond bilingual effects). Determining whether trilingual cognitive advantages are stronger than bilingual cognitive advantages has practical implications for educational programs. If bilingual education is often recommended because of its purported cognitive advantages trilingual education may be advocated for potentially

providing even greater advantages (Christoffels, de Haan, Steenbergen, van den Wildenberg, & Colzato, 2014).

Cenoz (2003) pointed out how the research on bilingualism has helped understand its key role when it comes to learning a third language. Research has shown that the level of bilingualism has an undeniable influence on L3 learning outcomes. This fact is appropriate to explain the effect of bilingualism on general proficiency in the L3.

One of the topics that appear repeatedly when talking about multilingualism refers to how many languages a student can handle. Sometimes, bilingual schools refuse to teach a third language in preschool because students are already learning a second language and they are afraid it could complicate such learning (Pérez Esteve et al., 2008). So another controversial issue refers to the moment of introducing the teaching of a foreign language (L3), and it creates a discussion about its beneficial or malicious effects (Pérez Esteve et al., 2008).

Many studies have demonstrated that children are able to learn three or more languages starting at an early age. In addition, with enough motivation, exposure, periods of formal study and opportunities to practice, they can eventually achieve proficiency in several languages. Nevertheless, despite myths saying young children can 'soak up languages like a sponge', the truth is that language proficiency does not appear during the early years. Research has shown that language acquisition takes a long time (Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1991).

It is important to note that although generally, bilingual education uses the same psychological criteria, its implementation in the school can vary significantly depending on many different aspects. For instance, the social presence of the vernacular language in the school, families' attitudes towards a bilingual organization, or the number of students can have a remarkable influence. That's why the development of a united and common proposal about the introduction of a third language in a bilingual school, does not make much sense, however it

does make sense to establish when is the best time to start teaching it (Pérez Esteve et al., 2008).

2.2.1. CLIL in trilingual education

Trilingual education involves the formal use of three languages in the curriculum. After L2 and L3 have been introduced, all selected languages become media of instruction. Formal instruction in L1 continues as a subject of study, to warrant support for children to become academically competent. (Ball, 2011).

Merino and Lasagabaster (2015) say that according to Eurydice (2006), several European countries (Austria, Estonia, Luxemburg, Latvia, Netherlands, and Spain) deliver trilingual CLIL programs joining the national language with two foreign languages, or the national language with a foreign language and the minority language.

Countries such as Canada, United States, New Zealand, and other EU countries are evaluating their bilingual and multilingual education programs that are being applied in schools. Several varieties occur in the distribution of each methodology, and their implementation varies widely, as does the cultural, educational and family context. Costs, teacher training and political agendas are some factors that influence program choices (Ball, 2011).

CLIL per se is considered a challenge because it demands additional effort from students and teachers, and it also entails the costs from the lack of CLIL materials. This challenge increases when it is implemented in a bilingual context (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015). However, Muñoz and Navés (2007) say that CLIL is a useful tool to promote multilingualism and it contributes to the normalization of the minority language in school.

The application of CLIL projects in schools of communities that use two languages in formal education, induce concern about the effectiveness of trilingual programs and most importantly, how the increasing presence of English impacts the normal development of the minority language (Lasagabaster

& Sierra, 2009). Nevertheless, there are not many studies that investigate the effect of trilingual CLIL programs on the three languages concerned (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015).

Language advisors have identified essential elements for the development of a successful trilingual project (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013):

- The school needs to be united in the implementation of CLIL, as it affects curricular subjects and social unity.
- School leaders and administration need to be supportive of the project to encourage a sense of community amongst the teachers, students, and families.
- Teachers need to work together to coordinate, design, and implement the project as well as assess the students.

2.3. Bilingual Communities in Spain

In 1978, the Spanish Constitution declared the Spanish language to be the official language of the state. Moreover it states that it is a duty of all Spanish citizens to know the language. The Constitution also acknowledges Spain's multilingual character and it yields legislative power to the autonomous communities to handle language policy and education (Lasagabaster, Vila & Ramallo, 2017).

Galicia, Navarre, the Balearic Islands, the Basque Country and the Valencian community are officially bilingual whereas Catalonia is officially trilingual. Their respective local languages have become co-official with the Spanish language. The rest of the autonomous communities are officially Spanish-monolingual. Language-in-education policies in Spain have been a controversial area for centuries, especially in the six territories with more than one official language (Lasagabaster et al., 2017).

In the last three decades, Spain's plurilingual autonomous communities have successfully achieved the objective of educating students to be bilingual (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). Recently, however, owing to English's importance as a global language, efforts have been made to incorporate it into

the curriculum, potentially turning the bilingual educational model into a trilingual one.

In 1993, The Education Reform Act was developed partly in order to address the poor English test's results in Spain. Therefore, English introduction in the curriculum was advanced 3 years, requiring the teaching of the language to begin at the age of 8. However, Catalonia and the Basque Country took the lead and implemented experimental programs in which foreign language instruction started at age 4.

In 1996, the Ministry of Education and the British Council signed a collaboration agreement, in which Spain adopted bilingualism as an educational model. A bilingual curriculum was then implemented in 42 primary schools across Spain, consisting of 40% of the teaching hours in English (Aparicio, 2009).

The wish to improve foreign language proficiency expanded all over Spain, which is why a greater amount of CLIL programs have also been implemented in the last few years (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009). When CLIL is applied to the Spanish bilingual communities, education is followed in both co-official languages plus one or two foreign languages, making those schools plurilingual as a consequence.

2.3.1. Catalonia

Catalonia has a population of 7 million people. According to the official survey of 2009 conducted by *Observatori de la llengua Catalana*, 97.4% of the population understands Catalan and 85% can speak it (Pons & Sorolla, 2009, p. 31).

As Lorenzo and Piquer (2013) point out, Catalonia is an autonomous region where the Catalan language is considered an indispensable part of its history and culture. After the Spanish Civil War, during Franco's dictatorship (1939-1975) Catalan language was prohibited and only Spanish was taught and learned in school. Once democracy was restored, Catalonia fought for the recuperation of Catalan language, its presence in social life and in the educational policy.

In 1992, a new immersion program was implemented (*Decreto 75/1992*) in which Catalan (L1) was established as the vehicular language of instruction and Spanish the second (L2) (Lasagabaster, 2003). Evidence from Catalan immersion programs shows that Catalan students learn both Catalan and Spanish without substantial differences compared to students from other parts of Spain (Vila, 2004).

At the beginning of the 21st century Catalonia had a massive immigration boom. The plurilingualism of the students (with 300 different languages) started to be seen as an enormous opportunity and gift for the future, as well as an enriching factor for the school and surrounding community (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2016). The Catalan government contributed immensely with active participation in initiatives across Europe to provide a solid base of educational strategies for language teaching, learning, and assessments (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013). As education authorities realized the possibility of enrichment of their school communities, they became more interested in promoting language diversity. These authorities understood that language diversity was a powerful tool and could be extremely useful for future citizens in Europe. They then started to develop programs for implementing language learning in schools (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013).

The main concerns of school language projects are to consolidate the past experiences of Catalan immersion and to include a new need for another language of instruction in schools (English). One of the challenges of plurilingualism in Catalan schools is the ability to integrate immigrants from all over the world (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2016).

Lorenzo and Piquer (2013) are certain that the achievement of the Catalan immersion programs is one component that has helped innovative teachers to improve foreign language teaching methodologies, involving progressive implementation of CLIL programs in Catalonia.

Since the late 1990's, the most renowned specialists in CLIL were visiting Catalonia annually both to train teachers and to directly observe experiences in

the rich plurilingual arena of the schools. Some international experts in the field that visited Catalonia were David Marsh, Do Coyle and Philip Hood. These experts participated in seminars, conventions and courses to share the wealth of ideas and teaching principles (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013).

CLIL in Catalonia started in 1999 with the launch of several projects designed to improve the quality of teaching and learning of foreign languages (CLIL being one of the innovation lines). Among these pioneer actions, there is a need to mention the Orator Plan (1999-2004), which consisted of granting students to take part in immersion stays so that they could improve their foreign language proficiency. It later evolved to *Plans Experimentals de Llengües Estrangeres* (2005-2006), which sought to promote integrated schools projects. In 2005, the Catalan Ministry of Education launched the Plan of Action for the Promotion of Third Languages (2007-2015) in compulsory education (*Pla d'Impuls a les terceres llengües*) including several strands, among others, teachers training in CLIL (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). The current Plan of Action is called *Marc pel plurilingüisme*, which aims at improving the linguistic and communicative competence in a plurilingual framework achieving competent students in Catalan, Spanish and at least one foreign language by 2018 (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2016).

Moreover, Lorenzo and Piquer (2012) note that multiple schools have created different blended options to innovate on their classes of foreign language. Some include language project work, ICT for foreign language teaching and flexible schedule organization to increase foreign language instruction, language volunteers, teacher assistants and International Exchange programs. All these are examples of strategies that are being implemented in bilingual schools in order to integrate a third language of instruction.

Thus, the application of CLIL in Catalan bilingual schools is varied. This diversity can be appreciated at all levels of education, in the subjects being taught in a foreign language or in the types of students involved in CLIL within the same school (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013).

Although schools have adopted approaches somewhat differently from each other, they all have common goals in mind. These goals have been organized and overseen by The Department of Education and they include developing multilingual school projects that offer students the opportunity to learn several languages at an early age. The general structure incorporates first, social unity that guarantees equal mastery of Spanish and Catalan, and second, to widen student's possibilities of studying a third or another foreign language in the context of curricular topics (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013).

The Catalan government has played a key role in the development of CLIL across Catalonia. In 2005, the government integrated CLIL within the framework of the 'Strategic Agreement to promote internationalization of the Catalan economy, strengthen its competitiveness, and improve the quality of employment' (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005). In 2008, a new Strategic Agreement took into account the ever-changing European economic situation and recognized the importance of foreign language learning for empowering future generations (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2008). The new agreement consisted of a plan for developing English learning in school. A third strategic outline for educational policy-making was in the governmental plan in 2011, the *Pla de Govern 2011-2014* (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2011). Language learning skills were again placed on a pedestal and included as part of the educational strategies for improving Catalan society, making the scope for learning wider and more transversal.

It is evident that a third language has become part of the language baggage that every student receives in Catalan schools. As we have seen, there have been many different language projects that share common features and all of them promote: CLIL, project work, active involvement of students, emphasis on spoken language skills, precedence to teacher training, improvement of teaching models (including language assistants) and finally, the increased time during which students are exposed to a foreign language.

The main challenge from now on is to evaluate if the fact of including CLIL in Catalan schools (introducing English as a third or fourth language, for many of

the immigrant students) will or will not affect the educational results in the future.

○ **Studies**

In the last grade of elementary education in Catalonia, every student is required to take an official exam that assesses English, Spanish, Catalan and Math competence. These results are collected by the *Avaluació de les competències bàsiques de l'alumnat de sisè curs de l'educació primària*.

The students' results of recent years show clear improvement (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2012) as well as results published by the *Institut d'estadística de Catalunya* confirmed that there had been a significant increase over the years in the number of Catalan students who had developed a third and fourth language (IDESCAT, 2008).

In 2013, Lorenzo and Piquer (2013) analyzed the evolution of the results of these official exams concerning languages competences. They found:

- The number of students at the end of elementary education with a high level of Catalan competence is increasing.
- The number of students at the end of elementary education with a high level of Spanish competence is consistently growing.
- The number of students at the end of elementary education with a high level of foreign language competence is not really increasing, but the number of students at middle levels of success seems to be improving.

Results for the last 4 years (including last year 2016) show how Catalan students have maintained their scores. This could be seen as a success as the high scores did not decrease over this time. Regarding English competence, although we cannot see a significant rise, it is important to point out there has been a decrease in the number of students with low scores. Moreover, from 2013 to 2016, the percentage of students scoring high levels increased in every competence (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2016b).

Comparing these results with those of other Spanish autonomous communities, we can see that Catalonia is not at a disadvantageous position when assessing students in Spanish (L2) and English (L3) (Piquer & Galvés, 2013).

Analysis of student's results in foreign languages is a relatively recent issue in Catalonia. It is important to stress Vallbona's (2011) study conducted in Catalonia, in which she compared elementary students who studied Science in English through CLIL to those who did it in Catalan (over a period of one year). Data were gathered on their productive and receptive skills and the author demonstrated that CLIL methodology provided a greater English competence in some of the variables analyzed (dictation, lexical complexity and fluency and accuracy in writing skills).

Roquet's longitudinal study (2009) is also worth mentioning as it has traced the implementation of a CLIL program in science with various groups of ESO for over two years. Findings from this study showed to what extent CLIL approach is successful in each of the skills analyzed of English performance.

2.3.2. Basque Country

The Basque Country has a population of 3 million people. Basque and Spanish are co-official languages in the Basque Country. In this bilingual community, Spanish is the majority language spoken by almost everybody and Basque is the minority language fluently spoken by approximately 35% of the Basque population (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009).

The 18th century was decisive in the decline of the Basque language, due to the absolutist Bourbon monarchy that introduced Spanish as the only official language. Other factors have determined the evolution of the Basque language, such as the small number of speakers, its limited territory and administrative divisions (Lasagabaster, et al., 2017).

After Franco's dictatorship, a desire to recover the Basque language was triggered. Consequently, Basque became a symbol of identity and of belonging to the country. Since Basque acquired co-official status with Spanish in 1978, both

languages are used as medium of instruction in school. Depending on the school's linguistic model, time allotted to teaching through one or the other language varies (Lasagabaster et al., 2017).

The Basic Law for the Normalization of the Use of Basque (1980) was designed to guarantee the competence of the Basque language in secondary Education. Since the passing of this law, the current education system in the Basque Country offers bilingual education in three different linguistic models (Lasagabaster, 2003):

- Model A: Spanish is taught as a vehicular language while Basque is taught only as a subject covering three class hours a week.
- Model B: An early partial immersion program where both Spanish and Basque are used as the language of instruction.
- Model D: A total immersion program where Basque is the language of instruction and Spanish is a subject. This model is aimed at students whose L1 is Spanish and for the maintenance of Basque language.

The latest has become the most requested choice, since it has proved to be successful in Basque and Spanish competence when compared to the other two models. Given the fruitful experience of these programs and the expansion of the innovative CLIL educational approach around Europe, a new trilingual program (Basque, Spanish and a foreign language) emerged in the late 1990s (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015).

In 2003, the Basque Government began to develop multilingual programs in an experimental way. The so-called 'Multilingual Experience' is developed during ESO with at least seven hours a week in a foreign language. During the Baccalaureate, 25% of the subjects are taught in the foreign language. In addition, three other programs have been developed: 'Early Start to English', which introduces English from childhood and the 'INEBI' and 'BHINEBI', which introduce English through content in primary and secondary education (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). The main objective of these programs is to develop communicative competence, therefore a communicative approach is followed and a functional use of the language is expected.

CLIL's implementation became popular in Basque public schools since the beginning of the 21st century (Lasagabaster, 2008). CLIL programs have been implemented all over the region with wide diversity (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009).

Following Osa (2004), Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) pointed out that some authors warned that CLIL popularization could endanger all the efforts done to foster the vernacular language.

○ **Studies**

David Lasagabaster and Juan Manuel Sierra stated in 2009 that there was an urgent need to analyze the effect of CLIL programs on the development of the three languages in question. Especially in bilingual contexts such as the Basque Country, because it is undeniable that the addition of a third language in the curriculum will inevitably reduce the amount of time devoted to the minority language (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009).

Thus this was the aim of Merino and Lasagabaster's study conducted in 2015. The goal in their work was to examine the impact a CLIL trilingual program could have on the students' L1 and L2 development, as well as the effect on the students' general English competence. The sample was made up of students at secondary level from eight schools from Bilbao, over a one-year period. It was comprised of two research groups: a CLIL group, which received twice the exposure to English as the control (non-CLIL) group.

Results of the study showed that (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015):

- The CLIL group had higher scores in all language skills concerning English proficiency.
- The CLIL group's average was higher for Basque competence (specifically in reading comprehension and written production).
- Differences between groups were not meaningful in the case of the Spanish language, although the CLIL group's results were significantly higher in written production.

Another relevant study conducted in the Basque Country is the MET project (*Proceso de experimentación del Marco de Experimentación trilingüe*), undertaken from 2011 to 2013 in the Basque Country. The main goal was to analyze the evolution of trilingual experiences, to find out key elements and also to create improvement plans. The Basque Institute of Evaluation and Research (ISEI-IVEI) laid the evaluation process.

MET aimed at the creation of a framework for promoting multilingual education. Different plurilingual programs were evaluated in order to create a subsequent framework to propel Basque language, consolidate bilingualism and activate English. Schools and families participated voluntarily. MET should serve as a model of intern coexistence in where the three languages could harmoniously live together, and at the same time obeying the linguistic objectives under the Basque and Spanish law.

Through the evaluation and implementation of MET, they wanted to unearth, among others, if:

- Students' competence in L1 and L2 (Basque and Spanish) was the same compared to their counterpart students from a non-trilingual CLIL school.
- Students' competence in English was the same or higher compared to their counterpart students from a non-trilingual CLIL school.
- Students' performance in non-linguistic competences such as Math and Science was the same compared to their counterpart students from a non-trilingual CLIL school.

During three years (2011-2013), they compared the evolution of the students' competence from MET schools (MET group) to students' competences from regular bilingual schools (Control Group) and found out that:

- The Basque competence is not negatively affected by the introduction of English as a vehicular language in the curriculum.
- The MET group performed better in Basque reading comprehension at secondary education. Both groups performed similarly in elementary education.

- The Spanish competence is not negatively affected by the introduction of English as a vehicular language in the curriculum.
- The MET group performed better in Spanish reading comprehension at elementary education. Both groups progressed in parallel at secondary education.
- The Met group has increased its competence in English more than the Control group in the period of experimentation at elementary and secondary education.
- Math competence of the MET group is not negatively affected by the introduction of English as a vehicular language in the curriculum.
- The MET group performed better in Scientific competence in both Primary and secondary education.

Finally, another study of our interest is that conducted by Catalán, Ruiz de Zarobe and Cenoz (2006) that analyzed English performance by primary students enrolled in CLIL programs, compared to students that learned English as a school subject. Primary school children participating in the CLIL school outperformed the students of traditional programs.

2.4. Canada

We want to dedicate a section of this work to talk about the influence that Canada has had in the development of multilingualism worldwide. As far as the legislative framework in trilingualism is concerned, the case of Canada is of the biggest relevance because it was the first country in the world to have an official policy of multiculturalism in 1971 (Lasagabaster, 2005). It is important to bear in mind that 55% of the Canadian population was not born in Canada.

Currently, three languages coexist in this country: the English-speaking population, the French-speaking one and the speakers of indigenous languages. Canada's linguistic model is oriented toward multiculturalism that fosters the integration of the languages and culture living together in the country, without the deterioration of any of them (Lasagabaster, 2005).

Swain and Lapkin (1991) conducted a study of 300 students that studied in a bilingual program in which half the curriculum was taught in French and the

other half in English. They compared linguistic competence of different groups of students, but the results showed significant positive differences between the students that mastered a L1 different than English (L2) and French (L3). Those students that had a different mother tongue at home (L1), and thus were developing trilingualism, had better results. Even more interesting is the fact that there were no differences between those students whose L1 was a romance language or not, contrary to what would be expected due to a typological proximity to French. Swain (1991) concluded that there is a transfer of knowledge between languages that makes the learning of an additional language easier.

In Canada, some schools provide total immersion only in English or only in French, but Genesee (1998) describes the multilingual education in Montreal, where we can also find double immersion programs, in which English and French are both language of instruction. In addition, there are platforms of double immersion in Hebrew and French directed to the Jewish community that had English as L1 and who lived in predominantly English-speaking districts of the city. The curriculum is divided half in French and half in Hebrew, and then English is added as a subject from the third year of primary school. This is also known as early double immersion program.

In another type of school the three languages are used for instruction from the beginning, increasing the presence of French (while decreasing that of English) as the educational system progresses. This program is called late double immersion program. For the implementation of these programs, the students' stay in the center had to be extended to 32 hours a week, so that there was sufficient time to meet the demands of a trilingual instructional program (Lasagabaster, 2005).

A 7-year study was developed in which academic results from the students of late and early immersion program and students from a total English and total French immersion were analyzed and compared. The results were considered very positive: concerning French competence there were no significant differences between those students from a double immersion program compared

to those who only studied in French. This fact was very impressive, since the double immersion programs devote less time to French than the total immersion programs. However, the school with the late double immersion did score lower on the French tests, so that the beneficiaries with respect to this language were students of the programs of early double immersion. In English competence, the same results were found. There were no differences between students coming from a total English immersion when compared to those coming from double immersion. This was also very surprising considering that in early immersion programs English was not introduced after a few years of school. As for Hebrew, they found out that students with early double immersion outperformed the late double immersion in their results, suggesting that the use of L1 during the first courses of immersion may interfere with the learning of a second language (Lasagabaster, 2005).

Other studies have been carried out to analyze the foreign language competence (French) of those students enrolled in an immersion program. Mougeon, Rehner and Nadasdi (2004) studied more than a dozen sociolinguistic variables (pertaining to phonology, lexicon and morphosyntax of oral French) and concluded that students in immersion programs outperformed students who took classes in formal French instruction. These positive results are another confirmation of how immersion bilingual programs help improve the development of a second language (Mougeon et al., 2004).

To sum up, immersion programs in Canada have been under investigation since the early 1980s. As a result, more research has been carried out to evaluate their effectiveness: it has shown positive and negative results and it has served as feedback to improve them. In addition, it has opened the door for further research to take place in other countries and programs.

2.5. Attitudes toward English and CLIL

As pointed out by Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009),

The literature offers a wide range of definitions for the word ‘attitude’. One of the most widely quoted is by Sarnoff (1970: 279; quoted by Ó Riagain, 2008), who defines an attitude as “a disposition to react

favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects”. As regards language attitudes, the objects that provoke a favourable or an unfavourable reaction are language related. (p. 1)

Attitude can also be defined as a group of philosophies or values that arise over a period of time given the sociocultural environment in which the person is raised. It has been upheld that positive attitude accelerates learning (Dörnyei, 1998; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985). If the learner is apprehensive or has a negative attitude toward learning, he/she will not show progress in learning.

Attitude is strongly linked to motivation, which can be defined as the driving force in any situation. In their early studies, Gardner and Lambert (1972) found that attitude and motivation were the two factors most strongly associated with learners' L2 achievement.

In regards to language attitudes, Marsh (2000) says that a primary aftermath of CLIL is to create a proficiency in two languages, but also “nurture a *feel good* and *can do* attitude toward language learning in general” (Marsh, 2000, p.14). It may be frequent that CLIL solely acts as a foundation in which a student may be driven to take interest in another language. CLIL can also provide a student with an appreciation for their home language if that home language is different from the broader environment (Marsh, 2000).

Marsh (2000) emphasizes that achievement in higher-level language proficiency positively affects a student's desire to continue to learn and develop their language competence.

Research studies done in different frameworks have shown that, attitude does indeed affect one's appeal and motivation to learn a foreign language, but these attitudes also vary from language to language and within different age groups (Dewaele, 2005; Lasagabaster, 2005; Lasagabaster & Huguët, 2007).

2.5.1. Students' attitudes

○ Catalonia

Tragant and Muñoz (2000) studied the attitudes from students from 3 different Catalan schools that had started studying English at the age of 8 (first group) and at the age of 11 (second group). The results showed that there was a more positive attitude in accordance with higher number of classes taken (rather than their age or starting age of learning English).

In a very similar study one year later, the same authors analyzed the attitudes toward English of 923 Catalan students. The results proved that the better their results were in English competence, the more positive were the attitudes (Tragant & Muñoz, 2001). No evidence was found that the initiation age had any significant difference. The study also reconfirmed that the students that had more exposure to English (hours of foreign language teaching) had more positive attitudes.

Vallbona (2011) also analyzed the students' satisfaction with the CLIL approach in her study about English proficiency. The results were overwhelmingly positive: 80% of the students said they wanted to continue learning through CLIL, 74% claimed they had improved their vocabulary skills and 75% felt totally fulfilled with CLIL.

Lasagabaster and Huguet (2007) analyzed the attitudes of 309 university students. They found a significant correlation between the of competence in the three languages and the attitudes towards them. Moreover, while 80% presented favorable attitudes toward Catalan, neutral attitudes were found to Spanish and English.

○ The Basque Country

In 2004, Osa (as cited in Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009) warned about the risks an increasing implementation of CLIL and foreign language presence could entail. On one hand, it could deteriorate the students' academic outcomes on their L1 and L2 and on the other hand, it could negatively affect their motivation and attitude toward a foreign language (English) (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009).

A study by Cenoz in 2001 in the Basque Country, when the CLIL approach was freshly implemented, produced a noteworthy outcome. This study analyzed three different groups of students' attitudes toward English. The first group comprised of students, ages 9-10 years old (fourth year elementary education) and the second group of students, ages 13-14 years old (second year secondary education). The final group consisted of students, ages 16-17 years old that were in their first year of high school (Cenoz, 2001).

Results showed that the oldest group had significantly less positive attitudes toward the foreign language. Cenoz (2001) explains these results with the different teaching methodologies used in elementary and secondary education. Young learners enjoy the oral-based and student-centered approach, whereas in high school grammar and vocabulary become more prominent and the methodology is much more teacher-centered. It seems that there is a decline in positive attitudes the older the students get. This leads us to wonder whether the use of a CLIL type approach may help to diminish the effect of these educational factors (Cenoz, 2001).

Research studies indicate that the more positive the students' attitudes, the higher their L2 achievement. For this reason it is important to analyze the attitude of students toward CLIL programs when compared to the regular teaching of English as a FL.

In 2009, Lasagabaster and Sierra conducted a research in which they wanted to find out whether students enrolled in a CLIL school had more positive attitudes toward English as FL than those in non-CLIL schools. Moreover they wanted to discover if CLIL students would show more positive attitudes toward the two other languages (Spanish and Basque) than their non-CLIL counterparts (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009).

Students had to choose an adjective from: interesting, useful, important, pleasant, appealing, easy, nice or necessary. They analyzed the results of 287 secondary students from four different Basque schools and they showed:

- CLIL students held significant more positive attitudes toward English. Students' most provided adjectives were: necessary, important and useful.
- Non-CLIL students showed lower scores. "Easy" and "appealing" were the two least chosen adjectives.

These results confirm that CLIL students place great importance on English and on its instrumental value, whereas non-CLIL students do not find it very attractive and in addition more complicated.

Regarding the effect of CLIL programs toward the two official languages in the Basque Country results were that CLIL students showed a more positive attitude toward both Basque and Spanish. Therefore, CLIL students not only showed more positive attitude toward English, but also to the two other languages present in school.

2.5.2. Teachers' attitudes in Spain

Pena Diaz and Porto Requejo (2008) carried out a study on teacher's views on CLIL amongst 150 elementary-level schools in Spain. This study uncovered that a specially designed training program for teachers was heavily needed in order to alter their opinions. Teachers revealed two important components that were missing: time and confidence. They disclosed there was a lack of time in and outside the classroom to complete activities with students. The shortage of confidence was in themselves, not being proficient in the additional language. In response to these results, authors suggested the creation of an online teacher-training course. Participants of the study also showed they were interested in practical knowledge on their subjects, yet claimed they did not need additional training in bilingual methodology.

A study by Dafouz, Núñez, Sancho and Foran in Madrid (2007) found positive attitudes toward CLIL's implementation from teachers and students. They discovered that most of the teachers who were surveyed were ready and willing to be involved in CLIL programs and to help develop materials to support the project, given that financial and organizational support was provided.

Johnson (2012) carried out a similar study of small scale among five PhD lecturers at a teacher training college in Alcalá de Henares, Spain. He focused not only on the participants' beliefs, but also on how they were developed and changed over a two-and-a-half year period. The conclusions suggested that the additional CLIL training course given over that short period of time was indeed found to be useful deeming it an overall success. The course increased the teachers' knowledge of CLIL and gave them the tools needed to teach through an additional language (English). Additionally, it created a positive attitude towards CLIL, which in turn encouraged them to use the approach in their classroom.

Cots et al. (2010) analyzed teachers' attitudes from Catalonia and the Basque Country toward multiculturalism. Results were very positive in all the aspects; 95,6% of the teachers showed positive attitudes toward accepting and adapting to a multicultural society, 83,3% of the teachers supports that the school must respect all students' cultures and play a key role to promote them and among more results, 81,1% of the teachers felt responsible for developing students' linguistic competence.

Vallbona (2011) found generally enthusiastic assessment of the CLIL experience by teachers. However, a number of problems and challenges for the teachers were also identified, most of which related to a lack of training, inadequate language proficiency, and lack of time and resources.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1. Bilingualism and Trilingualism

The academic proficiency of a child's first language has significant consequences in L2 and L3 development (Cummins, 1984; Riches & Genesee, 2006). It is important to bear in mind that children can learn a second language in very comparable ways, but factors such as culture, status, language, and social setting influence the ways they learn language, which results in varying modes of language learning (Ball, 2011).

Cenoz (2003) stated that the level of a child's bilingualism has a major influence on their L3 achievement. We found evidence that being bilingual benefits the acquisition of a third language in Canada's studies. Therefore, there is a correlation: the better the bilingual students are, the better outcomes they have in L3. These results are usually linked to bilinguals' more developed metalinguistic awareness, which stems from being able to compare and reflect on their two languages before learning a third one. Genesee (1998) points out that the Canadian results can be explained by the fact that dual immersion programs require a greater linguistic effort, which can lead to the generation of general language learning strategies that favor their acquisition.

The best time to introduce a foreign language as language of instruction seems to be a controversial issue. In any case, the introduction of a foreign language will not undermine the child's mother tongue, as long as formal instruction does not disappear in order to not lose and maintain the language's development.

Children can learn several languages in their early years, and although language proficiency takes time to appear, bilingualism and trilingualism provide beneficial outcomes beyond knowing more than one language.

3.2. CLIL Bilingual education and CLIL Trilingual education

As pointed out by Martinez (2011) "As Coyle (2010: vii) states, 'we are entering a new era in the development of content and language integrated learning (CLIL)'. Over the last decade, we have witnessed an explosion of interest in CLIL in Europe" (p.93).

Due to the fact that schools already have tight schedules to increase the number of hours of instruction in the foreign language, CLIL provisions have been adopted as the most effective way of foreign language teaching (Ruiz de Zarobe, Sierra & Gallardo del Puerto, 2011).

Even though a lot of CLIL programs and initiatives have emerged in the last decades, all of them are very different and its implementation varies in every region and country. The diverse communities of Spain have been developing successions of programs with one similarity in mind: the goal is to accomplish communicative proficiency in second and foreign languages (Fernández Fontecha, 2009). The projects and programs can be categorized into two main contexts (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010):

1. Monolingual societies where Spanish is considered the principal language, with one or two vehicular languages.
2. Bilingual communities where Spanish and another co-official language such as Basque or Catalan are the languages of instruction with one or two foreign languages.

If CLIL bilingual programs intend to help learners to achieve a high expertise in the foreign language (L2) and majority language (L1), a CLIL trilingual program should aim, in addition, for the harmonic development of a third language (L3), most likely a minority language.

We have seen that trilingualism is about merging three languages. Those bilingual communities will have to make space to introduce a third language of instruction in their curriculum. Therefore, reducing the amount of time devoted to either L1 or L2.

A trilingual program is definitely a bigger challenge; it demands additional effort from students and teachers, more coordination among teachers and headmasters and support from the administration. Moreover, extra costs can be added and families have a key role in developing a safe and positive environment.

Although it seems complex, bilingual programs have a certain experience that they can benefit from, and research has shown that CLIL is a very useful tool to promote multilingualism and foster cultural diversity.

3.3. Bilingual communities in Spain

Catalonia and the Basque Country have served as a model of successful CLIL mainly because of two factors. First, the support granted to vernacular languages since the 1980s has paved the way to incorporate foreign language teaching in a system where two languages were already accommodated in the curriculum. Second, according to European guidelines, the promotion of linguistic diversity has encouraged the teaching and learning of other foreign languages.

The fact that these communities already offered bilingual instruction, undoubtedly, gave them an advantage when taking on instruction in foreign language. Firstly, teachers from bilingual schools were open to the addition of a third language of instruction. Further, the teaching staff was used to teaching content through two languages and, therefore, could benefit from the use of non-traditional methodologies.

We have seen that many programs over the years have been developed in order to promote multilingualism for the last years in both communities. Also, we have reviewed their most relevant studies concerning attitudes and linguistic competence.

○ Catalonia

As we have seen in the previous section, the Catalan government has done many efforts to foster the Catalan language in school. At the same time, the *Departament d'Ensenyament* has developed a variety of action plans, in the last few years, to aid the mastery of foreign languages and to promote the most modern language and content integrated methodologies for teaching them.

There is a growing interest in research in CLIL programs in Catalonia, although studies are still very scarce. We can say that a large majority of schools with CLIL-projects have enlarged students' plurilingualism in a way that had never

been seen in Catalonia, reaching the initial goals of the project and beyond (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013).

Lorenzo and Piquer (2013) conducted great research about CLIL's evolution in Catalonia in which they analyze the linguistic results of the Catalan official exams. Vallbona (2011) and Roquet's (2009) studies provided evidence about the effect of CLIL concerning students' English competence, and Vallbona also explored teachers and students' attitudes toward CLIL.

Unfortunately there is not any specific study that compares the linguistic competence (L1 and L2) of Catalan students enrolled in CLIL trilingual projects to Catalan students enrolled in a regular school (where English is only a subject rather than a language of instruction). However since there is not any significant change in the Catalan official exams' results, and especially due to the high levels not decreasing, it seems that there is a growing positive evolution.

- **The Basque Country**

We have seen the efforts from the Basque government to revive and prevent Basque language loss, and to promote the two co-official languages of the autonomous community. After the law in 1993, where three different bilingual programs were implemented in schools, Model D proved to be the most successful and consequently is the most demanded one. This will entail a growing presence of the Basque language in the next coming years.

Moreover the government also exposed the need to include the foreign language teaching, and multiple initiatives have been taken to promote multilingualism.

The elaboration of MET was considered a great advantage for providing directions to foster multilingualism in school and it is also important to stress Merino and Lasagabaster's (2015) research in the Basque Country. The authors conducted many studies regarding CLIL, language competence and linguistic attitudes providing a great variety of information from this bilingual context.

They compared L1 and L2 competence from students enrolled in a CLIL trilingual school to students enrolled in a non-CLIL school. Their study provided the evidence we were looking for about linguistic competences.

3.4. Languages Competences

o English competence

In the case of the foreign language acquisition, there are many studies that have focused on CLIL's impact on English performance all over Europe. They all have proved that CLIL helps improve foreign language competence due to its innovative methodology.

For instance, one study conducted in the Netherlands by Admiraal, Westhoff and De Bot (2006), found evidence that those secondary students enrolled in CLIL programs had better English competence compared to those enrolled in non-CLIL programs. Specifically their scores were higher in oral proficiency and reading comprehension.

In our Spanish bilingual context, we have seen that Catalan and Basque CLIL students outperformed Catalan and Basque non-CLIL students in English proficiency (Roquet, 2009; Vallbona, 2011; Catalán et al., 2006). Nevertheless, the students that participated in the non-CLIL group are still bilingual students learning English as a subject.

Many other studies around Europe have demonstrated CLIL's positive effects on foreign language learning. However, our goal was to compare the English competence of students enrolled in CLIL trilingual schools to students enrolled in CLIL bilingual schools, in order to find out whether English performance was better in a CLIL trilingual project. For example, comparing students' English proficiency from a student from a CLIL school from the Basque Country to one student from a CLIL school from Madrid. Unfortunately we have not found any study that has investigated this topic.

- **Majority language competence**

All children must master the dominant language of the country they live in in order to have the same successful opportunities (Ball, 2011). So far, results of official Catalan exams and Basque studies have shown that the competence in Spanish (L2) is not negatively affected by the implementation of CLIL.

Taking into account that we have seen that the more exposure to English, the better results in the competence, it would be logical to think that the reduction of exposure to L1 or L2 could also involve the weakening of these languages.

However, that correlation in Spanish language appears as questionable or non-existent. This could be explained by the fact that the students only obtain English input in school, whereas they keep having Spanish inputs when they leave school (at home, on TV, on the streets...).

In addition to the studies conducted in the Basque Country and the Catalan official exams that demonstrated that there is no detrimental effect on students' L2, we also had a look at PISA's (Program for International Student Assessment) results. This test assesses all Spanish students' competence in Spanish reading skills, among other areas, and it is a great tool to have an overall view of the different autonomous communities as well as of the whole country.

Looking at the 2012 and 2015 results, we can see how out of the 17 regions, Catalonia moved from the 5th position to the 6th and the Basque Country from the 8th to the 13th. In the three areas assessed in PISA's test (Reading, Mathematics and Science), Catalonia is above the average for the European Union and Spain. Therefore, we have another evidence through which we can infer that these bilingual communities are not in a disadvantageous position compared to the rest of Spanish autonomous communities.

- **Minority language competence**

We have seen Jessica Ball's (2011) statement that says that it is a mistake to think that a child's first language will suffer from the acquisition of a second or

third language. As long as instruction is provided to continue their L1 development, no deterioration should happen.

We found some authors that were very critical toward the implementation of CLIL alleging that it could entail negative attitudes and lower proficiency in the minority language. However, results found in Catalonia and in the Basque Country, have shown that their minority languages have not been undermined by the increasingly presence of English in CLIL programs. Moreover, outcomes on both vernacular languages have improved.

Ball (2011) also explains three strategies for children to retain their mother tongue; interaction in L1 with the entire community that surrounds the child; continued formal instruction and displaying positive attitudes toward L1 from their family and culture. These three strategies seem to be fulfilled in Catalonia and the Basque Country.

3.5. Support and resources for a trilingual program

Spain and Estonia are the only countries in where their governments have been pioneers developing and funding coherent policies for CLIL's implementation (Dalton-Puffer, 2011).

There is a great diversity in the implementation of CLIL programs, but as we have seen, Catalonia and the Basque Country are examples that benefited from the support of their public institutions to foster multilingual programs.

In article 157 from the LOE (*Ley Órganico de Educación*), the Spanish law reinforces foreign language teaching by means of establishing different programs (BOE, 2006). It is in this context, where autonomous communities started developing different projects with the main objective of improving communicative competence in foreign language (Martínez, 2011).

Catalonia's government (*Department d'educació de la Generalitat*) has implemented a lot of European initiatives, among others; PELE, PILE, Orator plan etc. with the common aim to improve foreign language teaching and learning.

In the Basque Country the ISEI-IVEI (The Basque Institute of Evaluation and Research in Education) contributed to the exhaustive evaluation project of MET. In 2000, Mondragon University developed the *Modelo de Plurilingüismo Aditivo* that served for future investigations in the organization for multilingual plans. Other projects like INEBI, Multilingual Experience have also taken part of the construction to lead educational plans toward plurilingualism.

Finally, it is remarkable to point out that the Catalan and Basque law provided a great support since their 1980s role in the maintenance of their respective vernacular languages. Both regional governments took the lead to develop immersion programs in which L1 became the language of instruction, promoting therefore its learning. These bilingual programs were of extraordinary help when schools had to integrate English and create a trilingual program.

3.6. Students and teacher's attitudes

Regarding teachers attitudes, we have gone through a few studies that have demonstrated a positive attitude toward plurilingualism and multiculturalism. Moreover, we have found positivity and motivation toward CLIL's implementation. Although teachers are aware of some limitations, such as their own proficiency in the foreign language or the lack of CLIL material, they still remain positive to adopt this methodology.

Among the studies mentioned, they do not distinguish between the attitudes of teachers from CLIL trilingual schools and those of teachers from CLIL bilingual schools. Nevertheless, none of those studies have shown negative attitudes from teachers implementing CLIL, thus we could infer that teachers from trilingual CLIL projects have a similar disposition. It would be next to discover whether teachers in trilingual schools hold more positive attitudes toward English than teachers from bilingual schools or if perhaps they feel a lot more pressure and are overwhelmed with trilingualism.

In addition, teachers need to be aware of their attitudes towards diversity, especially those that are public in front of the students because they have an

impact in how the students see themselves and others. They should contribute to create a process toward multilingualism and offer a role model for children to be respectful and tolerant toward language and culture diversity (Cots et al., 2010; Lasagabaster & Huguet, 2007).

Regarding students' opinions, they are not stable across Europe, we find many differences depending on each educational context and country. However, general results seem to indicate that CLIL students see the approach as beneficial for their education and prospective future.

The study conducted in the Basque Country by Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) has shown how CLIL students have more positive attitudes toward the three languages (Basque, Spanish and English) than non-CLIL students. In Catalonia, Vallbona (2011) demonstrated very positive attitudes of Catalan students toward CLIL. Huguet and Lasagabaster (2007) also conducted a study that showed a correlation with those students that had received more intense tuition in English with better attitudes towards this language. As CLIL guarantees a considerable increase in the amount of exposure to English, we could say that based on this correlation, CLIL will play a key role in developing positive attitudes toward English.

Lastly, results in Catalonia and the Basque Country seem to indicate that CLIL may be a very useful approach to keep students interested in the learning of foreign languages.

3.7. CLIL benefits and challenges

According to the Eurydice (2006) report, research has shown generally positive results for CLIL as a potentially beneficial framework for both language acquisition and knowledge building: “where evaluation has been conducted both on pupil performance and the suitability of the methodologies adopted, the results have proved very encouraging” (p.57).

The main objective in European education policies in the last decade has been to promote multilingualism and increase language diversity. CLIL has been found

to be the most effective and efficient program to accomplish this goal. Moreover, “CLIL may be seen as a way to support the community’s bilingual situation and its minority language, through its enhancement of multilingualism and multiculturalism” (Muñoz & Navés, 2007, p.162). Reflecting on the noteworthy number of studies revealing the positive effects of CLIL, we can say it should be reinvigorated in schools.

CLIL is an approach that can reach all types of learners no matter their differences in ways of learning. It provides students with a positive attitude towards language learning, as well as an opportunity to engage and nurture the development of language awareness (Marsh, 2000).

- **CLIL challenges**

CLIL’s implementation has also received some criticism but due to its relatively recent appearance we have to wait for more research to prove for certain that this approach is fully efficient. So far we have evidence that in Spain’s bilingual contexts it has provided positive outcomes, academically and socially.

In trilingual schools, the challenge is to keep the high and balanced scores of student’s L1 and L2 while fostering and improving student’s foreign language skills. Once these programs have a longer life, we will have access to more reliable evidence.

It is true that this research is hard to conduct taking into account that there is a great diversity in CLIL’s implementation from region to region and even from school to school. Official guidelines would be helpful to foster more homogeneity among trilingual and bilingual schools.

Moreover, national tests would provide useful data to compare the language competence from the different autonomous communities. Additionally, every school should submit their programs to an external or internal evaluation, in order to improve and have more fruitful results.

We have also talked about the lack of materials and the additional costs that CLIL entails. It is true that materials are not as abundant but it can also be seen as an opportunity for teachers to innovate and create their own materials.

Lastly, governments are increasingly offering CLIL teachers' training to provide support and facilitate the process of preparing lesson plans and improve teachers' foreign language skills.

We are nowadays living a difficult economic situation but this situation may change in the future, both on the economic aspect and on the experience and expertise of CLIL teachers.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This study has attempted to present the main effects of CLIL's implementation in a bilingual community. We have done an extensive research that has reviewed many studies to find out the main implications of using CLIL in a bilingual school, in terms of academic outcomes and social responses from teachers and students.

In order to put an end to this master's dissertation, we want to draw some conclusions from the initial objectives described in the study. The introduction of a third language of instruction in a bilingual school evoked a vast amount of questions. Having now conducted the research, we will attempt to answer those questions.

Is it more difficult to implement CLIL in a bilingual school than in a monolingual one?

It is undeniable that the introduction of another language (in either a monolingual or bilingual school) demands more organization, resources and coordination. Teachers are required to look for new methodologies, improve their foreign language skills and coordinate even more among themselves.

The fact that a school is already bilingual is a big advantage. The common thought is that students and teachers already have a lot of work, so introducing a third language might make it even more complex. While it is definitely challenging, it is not necessarily more difficult than converting a monolingual school into a bilingual one.

Bilingual schools have had to develop many strategies to deal with foreign language instruction: they have created their own resources and have generated a structure that has set the stage for the introduction of another language.

The Catalan and Basque immersion programs have provided the experience that has helped them integrate CLIL in an easier way. All the coordination required for an effective bilingual curriculum gave them an ideal field to grow towards.

In other words, previous work developed for the consolidation of a bilingual program has been very useful for the creation of a trilingual curriculum. Teachers are used to experimenting with new methodologies and are open to welcome more languages (Lorenzo & Piquer, 2013).

What strategies or resources does a CLIL trilingual school use?

The truth is that we have not done an accurate research regarding this question. However we have found some evidence that provides us with some ideas of the resources that trilingual schools might use.

Firstly, in order to appropriately develop a plurilingual program, it is important to have the support of the entire community (e.g., government, families and headmasters). We have seen in Spain how governmental institutions have endorsed the evolution toward the integration of three languages in the school curriculum.

Secondly, we have revealed how trilingual schools benefited from having a bilingual curriculum in the first place. The successes of the immersion programs in Catalonia and the Basque Country have helped pave the way for implementing CLIL. They have been able to transform and adapt those strategies developed initially for bilingual education into new ones tackling the integration of a third language, for instance, starting with teachers' coordination.

In the Basque Country they have evaluated their own multilingual programs in order to find out their weak and strong features. This has provided them indeed with reliable evidence to improve their multilingual projects. In Catalonia, for example, the schools participating in the Plan of Action receive funds from the administration. Moreover, they are eligible for teacher education schemes, native teaching assistants and pedagogical assessment. Both English specialists and non-specialists receive English language training (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

High-quality teaching has to be a key element if CLIL programs are to succeed in any context. Research studies carried out in many different contexts conclude that CLIL can be very productive as long as teacher training is taken seriously.

In addition, if teachers, educators and caregivers create an environment conducive to the existence of plurilingualism, praise and admire it, our children will grow safe and secure. The positive and respectful attitude toward language diversity is essential to ensure that multilingualism becomes an enriching experience for the child (Elke & Montanar, 2007).

Finally, we want to point out that it is nearly impossible to describe the specific strategies that a trilingual CLIL school uses due to its diversity and freedom in its implementation. Every autonomous community has its own preferences, and they can tackle CLIL with different rigor, political support and economic investment. There are many factors such as the type of school, the school decision of the syllabus to be taught in English and the availability of qualified teachers that makes every school structure different.

Hence, in spite of increasing efforts to promote CLIL, Catalonia and the Basque Country are still far from having a sound CLIL policy (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

🚩 In a trilingual context, will the minority language be undermined?

Another doubt that arose from this main question was: Is there any fear that CLIL could lead to the loss of the minority language? The answer to this question was impossible to find out due to its specific personal character. However, we can ensure that there should not be any fear about the deterioration of the minority language proficiency.

Since Spanish bilingual regions have made enormous efforts to revitalize the minority language (we have seen the case of the Catalan and Basque languages), the use of English as language of instruction has raised more controversy in these contexts than in monolingual regions.

Some critical voices still deem CLIL to be a potential menace to the L1. Nevertheless other authors like Smith (1931) and Jessica Ball (2011) explain that with L1 development, a child will not suffer by the introduction of another language, unless support and instruction to L1 competence is withdrawn.

Thanks to Catalan and Basque immersion programs, students' L1 has been potentially developed and used as main language of instruction. Moreover, these programs have been proved successful to create efficient bilingual students (Spanish and vernacular language). Their vernacular language is part of their cultural identity; hence we have seen evidence of its population and government protecting it. Therefore, these communities provide a considerable amount of exposure and positive attitudes to maintaining the mother tongue, meaning its instruction will likely not disappear.

Merino and Lasagabaster (2015) stated that CLIL's effect on L1 development needs wider research, as scholars have focused more on foreign language acquisition. In any case, CLIL aims at both the adequate development of students' L1 and L2 so that it can be labelled as a successful program.

CLIL implementation could reasonably increase the fear of L1 decline, due to the fact that CLIL undeniably involves the reduction of the amount of time teaching in L1. However, in our research on the Catalan and Basque context's latest studies, we found that CLIL does not have a detrimental effect on students' L1 competence, as no significant differences emerge when CLIL and non-CLIL students' L1 performance is compared.

To conclude, we can say that the measures that were taken to protect the minority languages have not been jeopardized by the introduction of CLIL in education and that Catalan and Basque language have not been undermined.

In addition, the majority language (Spanish) has not been adversely affected neither. Even in a multilingual school in which three languages are used as a means of instruction, students' L1 and L2 development is not negatively affected.

Are the three languages learned with the same competence?

This might be the goal of many plurilingual schools, but researchers of multilingual acquisition have underscored the need to have more information on the development of each language when children are learning more than one language at the same time (Yavas, 2007).

The future challenge is to foster students' English proficiency while ensuring that CLIL implementation does not have any detrimental effect on the development of L1 and L2. Moreover, it should provide a balanced development of the two co-official languages in order to promote an integrated multilingual policy (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

In the Spanish bilingual contexts investigated in this dissertation, we have found that trilingual schools have efficiently developed this balance on L1 and L2. Moreover, students' content knowledge and their Spanish performance (L2) are at least as good as students from monolingual regions, as we can see in PISA's latest results in 2012 and 2015 (Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema Educatiu, 2014, 2017).

The general conclusion of the official Catalan exams is that the results show high scores on L1 and L2, a tendency that is becoming stable in the last few years. This means that plurilingual programs are successfully achieving Catalan bilingual students (L1 and L2) and are very slowly showing achievements in English competence.

In the Basque Country, Lasagabaster's study (2010) and the MET groups (2013) showed significant evidence of better English performance in CLIL trilingual Basque schools, as well as same or better scores concerning L1 and L2 performance compared to non-CLIL students.

Despite the efforts and new methodologies that have led to effective foreign language teaching, English competence is not yet developed with the same proficiency as the two other languages of instruction. Children are mostly only

exposed to English within the school community but they do not receive more input outside the classroom. This is a big drawback that clearly affects its development and makes a significant difference among the three languages competence achieved by the students.

In any case, we cannot forget that CLIL approach does not aim at achieving English native competence, but at improving quality teaching and communicative foreign language skills. Research has confirmed CLIL to be successful in these objectives.

✚ Is the English performance of those students coming from a CLIL trilingual school, better than that of students coming from a CLIL bilingual school?

We have found evidence from different studies all over Europe that confirms that CLIL students tend to outperform non-CLIL students in English competence.

In the Spanish bilingual communities we had a look at Catalán et al.'s (2006) study (developed in the Basque Country), and Vallbona (2011) and Roquet's (2009) studies (developed in Catalonia) that analyzed the acquisition of English as L3. Same results were found: children enrolled in CLIL programs obtained higher scores than children in non-CLIL programs. English proficiency is showing clear improvement, although the general average is still far from the desired levels.

Unfortunately, there are no studies that compare the English performance of CLIL trilingual schools to CLIL bilingual schools, for instance, CLIL Catalan students to CLIL students from Madrid. Initially, we wanted to find out whether CLIL's implementation in a bilingual school would entail better or worse English outcomes than CLIL's implementation in a monolingual school.

We have not found any specific study that has done this comparison yet. However, we can conclude that CLIL helps improve foreign language learning

regardless of the educational model in which students participate (bilingual or plurilingual).

There are no national tests that assess all Spanish students in their English competence. If trilingual communities were to have an advantage in English performance, it would be reflected in national exams.

Swain's (1991) study in Canada showed that trilingual students had better results in foreign language learning, inferring that a transfer of knowledge is done among languages. Most studies coincide in identifying bilinguals as better foreign language learners than monolinguals when comparable groups are analyzed (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). However, specific research in our bilingual contexts is needed in order to answer the question with reliable evidence.

What are the attitudes from the teachers and the students of trilingual schools that have implemented CLIL?

We have found several studies that analyze students' attitudes toward CLIL in different contexts over Europe. Generally, students are positive toward English and multilingualism.

Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2009) study conducted in the Basque Country revealed that students enrolled in CLIL trilingual projects held more positive attitudes toward English and also toward the two co-official languages (Basque and Spanish) than those students enrolled in a non-CLIL school. This confirms that students are aware of the importance of learning English; moreover, they do not think of it as a threat to their culture, identity or mother tongue.

Vallbona's (2011) study also demonstrated very positive attitudes from Catalan students toward CLIL. Lasagabaster and Huguet's (2007) study revealed that the better the students' competence was, the better attitudes they held. Marsh (2000) also found out that the more hours students had been learning English, the better their attitudes were. Further, the more they know the language, the more motivated they feel to keep learning it.

Overall, CLIL develops self-confidence and multicultural awareness (Marsh, 2000). Students react positively toward CLIL implementation regardless of whether they are in a CLIL trilingual school or CLIL bilingual one. Nevertheless, students' attitudes from contexts in where more than two languages are in contact, "is an issue that deserves to be examined in more depth" (Merino & Lasagabaster, 2015, p.11).

Regarding teachers' attitudes, results of Dafouz, Núñez, Sancho and Foran's (2007) study about teachers' attitudes in Madrid revealed that they held a positive attitude toward CLIL implementation. Few studies developed in Spain prove that they are open and committed to provide continuity to these projects, even though they are well aware of the challenge it implies.

Furthermore it would be interesting to investigate and compare students' and teachers' attitudes from CLIL trilingual schools to CLIL bilingual ones. It would be worth exploring if there are any significant differences.

Lastly, it is important to bear in mind that motivation for language learning is multifaceted and can be enhanced by a wide range of different actions (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

Is CLIL a successful approach to foster tri- or plurilingualism?

Research conducted around Europe has revealed that CLIL learners usually outperform non-CLIL learners in general proficiency. Through the development of this dissertation we have found evidence that the implementation of CLIL in a bilingual community has brought with it very positive results, especially regarding the development of the three languages in question.

Evaluation of plurilingual programs in the Basque Country (MET) has provided evidence that CLIL does not have any detrimental effect on L1 and L2 competence and that it helps improve foreign language learning.

In addition, CLIL is not only beneficial for its academic outcomes, but also because it nurtures positive attitudes toward language learning in general. Learners may ultimately take an interest in other languages and cultures as well. Therefore, CLIL also fosters multicultural awareness.

Finally, CLIL seems to have the support from the school leaders and the administration, which have been supportive of these plurilingual projects. Students are motivated and teachers are willing to get involved in CLIL projects and commit to its continuity.

Despite the limitations and the challenges, CLIL is, indeed, one of the best innovations to tackle multilingualism.

Final conclusions

- CLIL's implementation in a bilingual school has a positive impact in students' performances of the three target languages and in general proficiency.
- More extensive research will determine whether a longer period of instruction, adequate exposure to English and the use of a suitable methodology will provide even better results in linguistic competences.
- Moreover, CLIL develops positive attitudes from students and teachers toward English, and it fosters multicultural awareness. CLIL plays a key role in the general European strategy toward the promotion of multilingualism and language diversity.
- There are a variety of plurilingual programs, but all must be respectful and see the learning of languages as a way of both enlarging students' understanding of the complex global world and of increasing the possibilities of entering other cultures and societies.
- In order to implement CLIL in a bilingual school, the involvement of the entire educational community and stakeholders is needed. Parents, caregivers and

administration must be involved in order to provide learners with opportunities to further develop the three languages.

- Teachers' cooperation and teamwork are vital components to the successful implementation of a CLIL approach at any given educational school. Coordination among teachers and administrative support is required to make CLIL effective.
- Public institutions play an important role in terms of administrative support in CLIL implementation. They should put together different projects, work with specific goals that promote plurilingualism, create budgets and evaluate the effectiveness of the programs implemented.
- More research concerning the influence of CLIL on bilingual communities is needed to fully understand the reality of CLIL in a plurilingual context. There is a lot to investigate due to its recent implementation, and more studies are required in order to reach more definite conclusions. As Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) conclude, Spanish CLIL programs are on the right track, but the real impact of these programs will not come until a few years.

5. Future lines and limitations

All along the development of the theoretical framework of this master's dissertation, we could see that there is a lot of information about CLIL bilingual schools but much less on CLIL trilingual schools.

We have found some great studies that have analyzed CLIL in Spain and around Europe, regarding foreign language acquisition and attitudes toward its implementation. Other interesting research has been found about CLIL's implementation in Spanish bilingual contexts, such as Catalonia and the Basque Country, thanks to authors like David Lasagabaster, Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe and Ángel Huguet.

What we were really looking for was information about what challenges faced bilingual communities that had to cope with transforming their schools in trilingual ones due to CLIL's implementation. We wanted to discover the effects that CLIL had in those bilingual communities in order to compare them to monolingual communities. We have not found any study that put in relation the differences and complexity of a CLIL trilingual school versus a CLIL bilingual one.

In addition, Spain has decentralized education to autonomous communities in order to accommodate the demands of their co-official languages. That means all regions are implementing CLIL at different paces; consequently, there is a variety of CLIL bilingual and trilingual programs all over Spain that makes the comparison a difficult task.

We have found evidence that CLIL so far does not negatively affect the competence of students' L1 and L2 neither their attitudes. Moreover, we have not been able to compare English proficiency from trilingual students to bilingual ones.

Further investigation will provide better insights and hopefully soon more studies will be done in this area, as some authors have called for more to be conducted. CLIL is still in an experimental phase, therefore we will have to wait

a few years to observe its evolution and obtain more reliable results. This is why we conclude that longitudinal studies are needed to help find out the lack of information about the challenges and tasks faced by CLIL trilingual schools compared to CLIL bilingual schools.

6. Bibliography

Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G. & De Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of Bilingual Secondary Education in the Netherlands: Students' Language Proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation* 121 (1), 75-93. DOI: 10.1080/13803610500392160

Aparicio, M. E. (2009). Análisis de la educación bilingüe en España. *Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales*, 12, 1-4. Retrieved from <https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/430-2013-10-27-ICEIpaper12.pdf>

Ball, J. (2011). *Enhancing learning of children from diverse language backgrounds: Mother tongue-based bilingual or multilingual education in the early years*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002122/212270e.pdf>

Benson, C. (2004). *The importance of mother tongue-based schooling for educational quality*. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitorin Report 2005, The Quality Imperative. UNESCO. Stockhom University <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001466/146632e.pdf>

Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). *Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 National Survey*. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 27(3), 301-320. doi:10.1037/0008-400x.27.3.301

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy and cognition*. Cambridge: University Press Retrieved from: <http://assets.cambridge.org/97805216/32317/sample/9780521632317ws.pdf>

Cenoz, J. (2001) Three languages in contact: Language attitudes in the Basque Country. In D. Lasagabaster & J.M. Sierra (Eds.), *Language Awareness in the Foreign Language Classroom* (pp.37-60). Zarautz: University of the Basque Country.

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 71-87. doi:10.1177/13670069030070010501

Chertkow, H., Whitehead, V., Phillips, N., Wolfson, C., Atherton, J., & Bergman, H. (2010). Multilingualism (But Not Always Bilingualism) Delays the Onset of Alzheimer Disease: Evidence From a Bilingual Community. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders*, 24(2), 118-125. doi:10.1097/wad.0b013e3181ca1221

Christoffels, I. K., Haan, A. M., Steenbergen, L., Wery P. M. Van Den Wildenberg, & Colzato, L. S. (2014). Two is better than one: bilingual education promotes the flexible mind. *Psychological Research*, 79(3), 371-379. doi:10.1007/s00426-014-0575-3

Collier, V.P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 509-531. doi: 10.2307/3586923

Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema Educatiu (2017). *PISA 2015. Síntesi de resultats*. Quaderns d'avaluació 36. Retrieved from http://csda.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/consell_superior_d_avalua/pdf_i_altres/static_file/Quaderns-36.pdf

Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema Educatiu (2014). *Els resultats de PISA 2012 a Catalunya*. Quaderns d'avaluació 27. Retrieved from http://csda.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/consell_superior_d_avalua/pdf_i_altres/static_file/quaderns-27.pdf

Cook, V. (1993). Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition. *Sage Journals*, 11(1), 90-94. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-22853-9

Cots, J.M., Ibarra, M., Lasagabaster, D., Llorca, E. & Sierra, J.M. (2010). *Plurilingüismo e interculturalidad en la escuela. Reflexiones y propuestas didácticas*. Barcelona: Horsori

Cummins, J. (1976). *The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: a synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first and second language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp.70-89). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dafouz, E., Núñez, B., Sancho, C. & Foran, D. (2007). Integrating CLIL at the tertiary level: Teachers' and students' reactions. In D. Wolff & D. Marsh (Eds.), *Diverse contexts, converging goals. Content and language integrated learning in Europe* (pp.91-102). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Foreword. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. Sierra & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts* (pp.9-10). Bern: Peter Lang.

Deawele, J.M. (2005). Sociodemographic, psychological and politico-cultural correlates in Flemish students' attitudes toward French and English, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26, 118-137.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31 (3), pp. 117-135. doi:10.1017/S026144480001315X Retrieved from <http://www.zoltandornyei.co.uk/uploads/1998-dornyei-lt.pdf>

Eurydice (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.

Fernández Fontecha, A. (2009). Spanish CLIL: Research and official actions. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (pp. 3-21). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Retrieved from: <https://books.google.es/books?id=CNHP7Ckph3MC&printsec=frontcover&hl=ca#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Fillmore, L. W. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6(3), 323-346. doi:10.1016/s0885-2006(05)80059-6

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Generalitat de Catalunya (2005). *Acord strategic per a la internacionalització, la qualitat de l'ocupació i la competitivitat de l'economia catalana 2005-2008*. Retrieved from <http://www.istas.ccoo.es/descargas/Acord%20estr%C3%A8gic%20I.pdf>

Generalitat de Catalunya (2008). *Acord strategic per a la internacionalització, la qualitat de l'ocupació i la competitivitat de l'economia catalana 2008-2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.istas.net/web/abreenlace.asp?idenlace=8789>

Generalitat de Catalunya (2011). *Pla de govern 2011-2014*. Retrieved from http://www.gencat.cat/pladegovern/cat/2011_2014/PdG_2011_2014-pdf

Generalitat de Catalunya (2012). *Avaluació de les competències bàsiques de l'alumnat de sisè curs de l'educació primària*. Consell Superior d'Avaluació del Sistema educatiu. Retrieved from http://premsa.gencat.cat/pres_fsvp/docs/2013/01/17/12/04/1364d7cb-0120-41d3-879e-d6e4d59ca90d.pdf

Generalitat de Catalunya (2016). *Report on the integration of immigrants in Catalonia 2015*. Retrieved from http://treballiaferssocials.gencat.cat/web/.content/03ambits_tematices/05immigracio/dades_immigracio/informe_integracio/2015/EN_Informe-integracio-immigracio-2015.pdf

Generalitat de Catalunya (2016b). *L'avaluació de sisè d'educació primària 2016*. Quaderns d'avaluació 35. Retrieved from http://csda.gencat.cat/ca/arees_d_actuacio/publicacions/quaderns_avaluacio/quaderns-avaluacio-35/

Genesee, F. (1998). A case study of multilingual education in Canada. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education* (pp. 243-258). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Genesee, F. & Riches, C. (2006). Instructional issues in literacy development. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence* (pp. 109-175). New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: [https://books.google.es/books?hl=ca&lr=&id=60OpdH4q1VkC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Genesee,+F.+%26+Riches,+C.+\(2006\).+Instructional+issues+in+literacy+development.&ots=VATseMpNmy&sig=zAv7wkJoETnrk6Gu2RV4Q3DGTSY#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.es/books?hl=ca&lr=&id=60OpdH4q1VkC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Genesee,+F.+%26+Riches,+C.+(2006).+Instructional+issues+in+literacy+development.&ots=VATseMpNmy&sig=zAv7wkJoETnrk6Gu2RV4Q3DGTSY#v=onepage&q&f=false)

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a foreign language'*. London: British Council (pg. 72). Retrieved from: <http://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/ec/files/books-english-next.pdf>

Grenfell, M. (ed.) (2002). *Modern languages across the curriculum*. London: Routledge Falmer

Hoffmann, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. London: Longman.

Hoffmann, C. (2001). Towards a description of trilingual competence. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(1), 1-17. doi:10.1177/13670069010050010101

IDESCAT (2008). *Població segons coneixement de l'anglès per gups d'edat quinquennals. Taxes de Catalunya l'any 2008*. Institut d'estadística de Catalunya. Retrieved from <http://www.idescat.cat/territ/BasicTerr?TC=5&Vo=3&V3=3119&v4=4677&ALLINFO=TRUE&PARENT=25&CTX=B>

ISEI-IVEI (2014). *Informe ejecutivo. Evaluación del proceso de experimentación del Marco de Educación Trilingüe (MET)*. Departamento de educación, política lingüística y cultura. Gobierno Vasco. Retrieved from: http://www.isei-ivei.net/cast/pub/MET/MET_2014_informe_ejecutivo.pdf

Jiménez Catalán, R.M., Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., Cenoz, J. (2006). Vocabulary profiles of English Foreign Language learners in English as a subject and as a vehicular language. [Special issue]. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 15,3. Retrieved from <http://www.univie.ac.at/anglistik/views.htm>

Johnson, M. (2012). Bilingual Degree Teacher's Beliefs: A case study in a tertiary setting. *Pulso Revista de Educación* 35, 49-74.

King, K., & Mackey, A. (2007). *The bilingual edge: Why, when and how to teach your child a second language*. New York: Collins. Retrieved from: http://www.languageonthemove.com/downloads/PDF/king_mackey%20preprint.pdf

Lasagabaster, D. (2003). *Trilingüismo en la enseñanza: actitudes hacia la lengua minoritaria, la mayoritaria y la extranjera*. Lleida: Milenio.

Lasagabaster, D. (2005). La presencia de tres lenguas en el currículo: Multilingüismo en los contextos canadiense y español. *Revista de educación*, 337, pp. 405-426. : http://www.revistaeducacion.mec.es/re337/re337_19.pdf

Lasagabaster, D. & Huguet, Á. (Eds.). (2007). *Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts: Language use and attitudes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses, *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 1, 30-41. Retrieved from <http://www.bentham.org/open/toalj/openaccess2.htm>.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL research journal*, 1(2), 1-14.

Retrieved from: http://www.laslab.org/upload/language_attitudes_in_clil_and_traditional_efl_classes.pdf

Lasagabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

Lightbown, P. (2008). Easy as pie? Children learning languages. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-25.

Lorenzo Galés, N. & Piquer Vives, I. (2013). Report and Evaluation of the Development of CLIL Programmes in Catalonia. *Temps d'Educació*, 45, 143-180. Universitat de Barcelona. Retrieved from <http://www.publicacions.ub.edu/revistes/tempsDEducacio45/default.asp?articulo=941&modo=resumen>

Marsh, D. (1994). *Bilingual Education & Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Paris: International Association for Cross-cultural Communication, Language Teaching in the Member States of the European Union (Lingua), University of Sorbonne.

Marsh, D. (2000). *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Retrieved from <http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/clilmatrix/pdf/1uk.pdf>

Martínez, M. (2011). An overview of Content and Language Integrated Learning: origins, features and research outcomes. *Huarte de San Juan. Filología y didáctica de la lengua*, 11, pp.93-101. Retrieved from http://academicae.unavarra.es/bitstream/handle/2454/9341/HSJ_Filolog%C3%ADa_11_2011_Overview.pdf?sequence=1)

Mejisto, P., Marsh, D. & Frigols, M.J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: McMillan.

Merino, J. A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2015). CLIL as a way to multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-14. doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1128386

Mougeon, R., Rehner, K. & Nadasi, T. (2004). The learning of spoken French variation by immersion students from Toronto, Canada. In R. Bayley and V. Regan (Eds.), *The Acquisition of Sociolinguistic Competence [Special Issue] 8*, pp.408-432.

Muñoz, C. & Navés, T. (2007). Windows on CLIL in Spain. In A. Maljers, D. Marsh & D. Wolff (Eds.), *Windows on CLIL*. The Netherlands: European Centre for Modern Languages, 160-165. Retrieved from <http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/CLILmatrix/DOCS/Windows/Windows%20on%20CLIL%20Spain.pdf>

Pallier, C., Deahene, S. Poline, J.-B., LeBihan, D., Argenti, A.-M., Dupoux, E., et al. (2003). Brain imaging of language plasticity in adopted adults: Can a second language replace the first? *Cerebral Cortex*, 13, 155-161.

Paradis, J., Genesee, F., & Crago, M. B. (2004). *Dual language development and disorders: a handbook on bilingualism and second language learning* (Vol. 11). London: Paul H. Brookes.

Pena, C. & Porto, M.D. (2008). Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project. *Porta Linguarum*, 10, pp.151-161. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10481/31786>

Pérez Esteve, P., Sánchez Sola, A., Morató, N., Holgado, J., Medina de la MAza, A. Burillo Blázquez, J., ... Capdevila, M. (2008). *Las lenguas extranjeras en el aula: Reflexiones y propuestas*. Barcelona: Graó. ISBN 9788478274277

Pons, E. & Sorolla, N. (2009). *Informe de la llengua catalana (2005-2007)*. Barcelona: Observatori de la Llengua Catalana – CRUSCAT. Dossier 13. Retrieved from http://www.observatoridelallengua.cat/arxius_documents/informe_llengua_2005-07.pdf

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.

Roquet-Pugès, H. (2009). A study of the acquisition of English as a foreign language: Integrating content and language in mainstream education in Barcelona. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10803/41560>

Rothman, J. (2007). Three Is a Crowd?: Acquiring Portuguese in a Trilingual Environment by CRUZ-FERREIRA, M. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(3), 474-475. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00593_4.x

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., Sierra J., Gallardo del Puerto, F. (2011). *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Smith, M. E. (1931). A study of five bilingual children from the same family. *Child Development*, 2 (3), 184-187. doi:10.2307/1125374

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1991). Heritage language children in an English-French bilingual program. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 47(4), pp.635-641.

The use of the vernacular languages in education (1953). Monographs on Foundations of Education, No. 8. Paris: UNESCO.

Tragant, E. & Muñoz, C. (2000). La motivación y su relación con la edad en un contexto escolar de aprendizaje de una lengua extranjera. In C. Muñoz (Ed.), *Segundas lenguas. Adquisición en el aula* (pp 81-105). Barcelona: Ariel.

Tragant, E. & Muñoz, C. (2001). Motivation and attitudes towards L2: Some effects of age and instruction. In S. Forster-Cohen and A. Nizegorodcew (Eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 1, (pp.211-224). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vallbona González, A. (2011). *Implementing CLIL in the primary classroom: Results and future challenges*. Barcelona: Universitat de Vic. Departament de Filologia. Retrieved from https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/llobres/2011/106809/CON002_AICLE.pdf

Vila, F.X. (2004). El model lingüístic escolar a Catalunya: Balanç i reptes. In F.X. Vila (Ed.) *Llengua, societat i Comunicació*. Centre Universitari de Sociolingüística i Comunicació (pp.1-4). Universitat de Barcelona. Retrieved from <http://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/LSC/article/viewFile/3246/pdf>

Vila, F. X., Lasagabaster, D., & Ramallo, F. (2017). Bilingual Education in the Autonomous Regions of Spain. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 505-517. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_28. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307606744_Bilingual_Education_in_the_Autonomous_Regions_of_Spain

Yavas, M. (2007). Multilingual speech acquisition. In S. McLeod (Ed.), *The international guide to speech acquisition* (pp. 96-100). Clift on Park, NY: Thomson Delmar.

Zarobe, Y. R., & Catalán Ma, J. (2009). *Content and language integrated learning: evidence from research in Europe*. Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.