BRITISH COUNCIL

ENGLISH LANGUAGE
ASSESSMENT RESEARCH GROUP

HOW BILINGUAL SCHOOLING AFFECTS STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS: THE STUDENT PERSPECTIVE

AR-G/2021/6

**Janina Iwaniec, Ana Halbach,
Miguel Fernández and Lyndsay R. Buckingham**

ABSTRACT

This project explores the reasons behind one of the findings of the English Impact project in Madrid (O'Sullivan, Dunn & Iwaniec, 2018), namely why the differences in English language proficiency and motivation between students from lower and higher socio-economic backgrounds are smaller in the context of bilingual schools than in non-bilingual schools.

To this end, a mixed-methods investigation was carried out with 348 fifteen-year-old students filling in a questionnaire and 77 further students participating in focus group interviews. Whereas the results of the questionnaire show that students in bilingual schools find their teachers less motivating than their peers in non-bilingual schools, the focus groups reveal that this characteristic of teachers is not so important for the former group, who instead value teacher professionalism.

Bilingual learners also appear to be more goal-driven and ambitious in their expectations of themselves. They appreciate that education in English requires more effort, but that it comes with a reward they value, as they see English as a door-opener for their future studies and careers.

In contrast, learners from non-bilingual schools not only tend to stop investing effort when they feel they achieve marks that are good enough, but they are also less confident with their performance and rely more on their teachers' support.

The study shows that bilingual schooling creates a set condition that enables students to develop certain characteristics that allow them to thrive.

Authors

Dr Janina Iwaniec is Senior Lecturer in Teaching English for Speakers of Other Languages at the University of Bath. Her research interests include language learning motivation in a variety of contexts, (second, foreign, EMI), gender role in language learning, and the role of contextual factors in language learning.

Dr Ana Halbach is a full Professor in the Department of Modern Languages at the Universidad de Alcalá (Spain). Her research interests include CLIL, literacy development in the foreign language, and the role of language development for learning. She coordinates the research group 'Language and Education' at her university.

Miguel Fernández is an Associate Professor in the Department of Linguistics Applied to Science and Technology at the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid. He holds a PhD in English Philology (University of Granada, Spain) and two Masters degrees: English Philology (University of Granada, Spain) and Language Testing (Lancaster University, UK). His areas of interest include bilingual education, English for Specific Purposes and language testing.

Dr Lyndsay R. Buckingham is an Assistant Professor in the Modern Languages Institute of the Universidad Pontificia Comillas (Madrid, Spain), where she teaches English, EFL pedagogy and CLIL in the teacher training degrees. Her research interests include bilingual education, foreign language assistants, intercultural competence, and teacher training.

CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND

Proficiency in English is, in many contexts, considered to be a basic skill that is a prerequisite for successful functioning in the job market. For this reason, and in light of the limited results of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction in many contexts, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programs have been created in many countries. In these programs, a foreign language, often English, becomes the medium of instruction to teach various content areas. These courses have the double aim of teaching the subject matter and helping students to develop proficiency in the foreign language (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010).

While much research has gone into evaluating the impact of CLIL on various aspects of learning (see Morton, 2016 and Rumlich, 2020 for an overview), very little is known about how CLIL affects learners from different social strata. This paucity of research notwithstanding, in some contexts there is a strong belief that CLIL schooling contributes to widening the performance gap between students from low and high socio-economic status (SES), so that this kind of program becomes a domain of privilege, where children from families from above-average socio-economic backgrounds can receive a high-quality education that further increases their chances on a competitive job market (Bruton, 2011; Bruton, 2013). It is in this context of lack of evidence, as well as widespread belief that CLIL is by nature selective, that the English Impact study was conducted in the Comunidad de Madrid (Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017).

2. THE ENGLISH IMPACT

The English Impact study (Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017), conducted in Madrid in 2017, set out to map the English language ability among the population of 15-year-old students in the region of Madrid. The researchers also aimed to make a link between language proficiency and motivation, and to explore how attendance at two types of schools, bilingual (CLIL) and non-bilingual, influences students' English capabilities. The unique strength of the study was its two-stage sample cluster design, in which first schools were sampled from the region, and then individual students were randomly selected. This allowed for the sample to be representative of the region. In total, 1774 students from 169 schools completed the Aptis test and the motivational questionnaire. The findings, which form the baseline for future comparisons, showed that students from bilingual schools performed better in English than their peers from non-bilingual institutions. Female students had higher results than male students, and students from high SES backgrounds displayed higher motivation and proficiency than their peers from low SES backgrounds. There was a clear link between proficiency and the internalised aspects of motivation. In contrast, students who drew on their external environment to be motivated tended to perform worse.

Interestingly, however, the English Impact study reported that CLIL has a positive effect on reducing the gap between students from higher and lower socio-economic backgrounds (SES) in terms of language achievement and language learning motivation: "[...] a key finding of the analysis was to show that regardless of socio-economic status, attendance at a bilingual school brings gains in both proficiency and positive underlying motivations" (Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017, p. 85).

This would mean that this program somehow breaks the conditioning effect normally ascribed to students' SES, and which explains a significant degree of variation in their achievement (OECD, 2018). As the OECD (2018) points out, there seem to be certain educational policies that have the potential to remove barriers faced by students from lower SES backgrounds, and CLIL programs in Madrid may be among them.

The English Impact, being a purely quantitative study, did not offer any insights into the reasons for this levelling effect. The study reported on here explores the reasons behind this finding from the perspective of students, thus complementing an earlier study funded by the Comunidad de Madrid, which explored the same question from the perspective of teachers (Halbach & Iwaniec, 2020; Iwaniec & Halbach, 2021). Although no studies to date have tried to offer an explanation for the levelling effect of CLIL observed in the English Impact study, a broader literature review allowed us to speculate about some potential reasons behind this effect. These include English self-concept, as described in the English Impact study, motivational teaching practice, teacher expectations and academic self-concept (as found in Halbach & Iwaniec, 2020; Iwaniec & Halbach, 2021) and extramural use of English (Pavlenko, 2013; Pihko, 2007).

2.1   Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

CLIL has become an increasingly popular approach to education, as its "dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given both to the language and the content" (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010, p.3) promises to contribute to increasing students' proficiency in the foreign language without requiring additional instructional time. This use of the foreign language as a vehicle for instruction has proved its benefits not only to students' overall language proficiency (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2015), but also to their motivation (Lasagabaster, 2020) and their willingness to use the foreign language as a tool for communication (Halbach, 2014; Nikula, 2007).

The dual focus of CLIL requires increased language awareness from the content teacher, as well as extra teacher support for the students who learn in a foreign language (Jaekel, 2020). Hence, teachers are likely to adopt a new teaching methodology which should move the teaching focus from the "transmission of information" to the "understanding and assimilation of contents based on heuristic activity and discovery" (Pavón Vázquez & Rubio, 2010, p. 48). Not many studies, however, prove that this change is actually being implemented. One exception is the study by Pérez Cañado (2018a) who, after examining the implementation of the CLIL approach in three different areas in Spain, concludes that the approach is characterised by a "more student-centred, communicative, and diversified nature of both these aspects [methodology and evaluation], which has led to more active and participative student roles and enhanced collaboration, transversality[1], and multidisciplinarity among teachers" (2018a, p. 388). Conversely, van Kampen, Admiraal & Berry (2018) in the Netherlands observed that CLIL teachers are more aware of the need to scaffold students' understanding and thus modulate the input in CLIL, but that otherwise the methodological changes often related to CLIL have not been transferred into teachers' methodology.

---

[1] From the mathematical concept of being transversal, i.e. intersecting two or more lines. Here, the quality of connecting academic fields and different methodologies.

More recently, Iwaniec & Halbach (2021) were able to identify small changes in Spanish CLIL teachers' methodology, such as greater student-centredness, a more practical approach to teaching and more collaboration between teachers of different subject-areas to create cross-curricular teaching units. This methodological change may lie at the heart of the decreased impact of students' SES on their motivation and language proficiency, as found in the English Impact, but "more evidence on the motivational characteristics of CLIL needs to be empirically investigated" (Sylvén, 2017, p. 56).

2.2   Socio-Economic Status (SES)

Research has amply demonstrated the effect of SES on student achievement. Not only is it one of the factors that recurrently show a great influence on students' scores on the PISA tests (OECD, 2019), but Hattie's (2017) meta-study of 1,200 separate pieces of research on education shows that SES has an effect size of 0.52 (medium-size effect), and Chmielewski (2019) states that the achievement gap between higher and lower SES students has actually increased over the past decades. A number of reasons have been put forward to explain why students from more privileged backgrounds achieve better results than students from lower SES backgrounds. These include, but are not limited to, parents' educational expectations of their children, the amount of time spent on activities promoting achievement (such as reading or homework monitoring), the creation of a supportive learning environment as well as active coping with everyday problems, and even teachers' expectations of children (see Iwaniec, 2018, for a review).

There are few studies that focus specifically on how SES affects different aspects of foreign language learning (Iwaniec, 2018; Kormos & Kiddle, 2013; Lamb, 2012), despite the fact that language proficiency, English in particular, is increasingly becoming a valuable asset, or in some cases a necessity, on the job market (Graddol, 2006). The existing body of research does show that students from more privileged backgrounds have a more robust language learning self-concept than their lower SES peers (Iwaniec, 2018; Kormos & Kiddle, 2013; Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017). They also appear to have more concrete plans of how they can use their language skills in the future (Carr & Pauwels, 2005), as they are often presented with more meaningful and frequent opportunities to use it in their current lives, for example, through travelling or access to more language-related resources. Students from higher SES backgrounds are more likely to be encouraged and supported by their parents in their language learning efforts than their less privileged peers, as they have more material resources to, for example, pay for extra tuition for their children, and even help them with their learning as more educated parents are more likely to speak at least some English (Iwaniec, 2015). Finally, parents from higher SES have been seen to have a more autonomous parenting style that generates higher expectations for students and strengthens their self-concept and motivation (Butler & Le, 2017).

Not much attention has been given so far to the way students' SES influences academic achievement in CLIL-type educational provisions, partly because when SES is mentioned in research on CLIL, it is often from the perspective of CLIL attracting students from higher SES. However, with CLIL programs becoming ever more widespread, especially in countries like Spain, the context in which the research project reported on here took place, it seems unlikely that this segregation can be maintained. In fact, the data from both the English Impact study (Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017) and the research carried out by Halbach & Iwaniec (2020) suggest that there are no substantial differences between students' SES in bilingual and non-bilingual schools in the Madrid area.

The few studies that have been published on the impact of students' SES on their performance in CLIL programs show rather contradictory results. On the one hand, three studies, Anghel, Cabrales & Carro (2016), Alejo & Piquer-Píriz (2016) and Pérez Cañado (2018b) conclude that students from lower SES benefit less from CLIL than students from more privileged backgrounds. This contrasts with a study by Fernández Sanjurjo, Arias Blanco & Fernández-Costales (2018) which shows that it is the students from higher SES whose performance is negatively affected by CLIL. Finally, to further complicate this issue, apart from the English Impact study already mentioned, two further studies, Rascón Moreno & Bretones (2018) and Lorenzo (2019) point to a levelling effect of CLIL, since the differences in academic achievement between students of lower and higher SES are reduced in the bilingual cohort studied if compared to the monolingual cohort.

The operationalisation of SES is far from straightforward and varies from study to study, with some studies employing single variables, such as place of residence, income or parental education, and others employing combinations of similar variables. This large variation is a result of divergence among contexts. Yet, Lindo (2014) asserts that three indicators appear to be more readily acceptable and thus more frequently employed in educational research, namely, parental education, parental income and parental occupation, with parental education often explaining more variance than the other two. Recently, in the light of the difficulty to find a satisfactory operationalisation, some researchers have even called for a move away from the "unitary concept of SES" (O'Connell, 2019). In this study, we follow the operationalisation of SES adopted in the English Impact study (O'Sullivan et al., 2018). The study employed the method developed by Caro and Cortés (2012), who suggest collecting information on parental level of education, parental job, and household possessions, and then using principle components analysis to create a single scale of SES that captures the complexities of the context under research.

3. METHODOLOGY

As stated above, the aim of the present research project is to find out why the discrepancy in motivation and language achievement between students from lower and higher SES backgrounds is smaller in bilingual than in non-bilingual schools, as found in the English Impact study (Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017). The question that guides the research can be formulated as:

What are the factors that explain the curbed impact of SES on students' level of English and motivation in bilingual schools if compared to non-bilingual schools, from the perspective of students?

Our research was further guided by these sub-questions informed by the literature review.

1. Are there any differences in students' self-concept, both general academic and English, between students in bilingual and non-bilingual schools?
2. Is there any difference in what students from bilingual and non-bilingual schools value about education?
3. Is there any difference in how students from bilingual and non-bilingual schools perceive teachers and their teaching?
4. Is there any difference in how students in bilingual and non-bilingual schools use English?
5. Is there any difference in parental expectations between parents of students in bilingual and non-bilingual schools?

RQs 1, 3, 4, 5, will be answered by both quantitative and qualitative data while RQ2 will be addressed using qualitative data only.

To shed some light on these questions, the difference between bilingual and non-bilingual schools is being studied from the perspective of the students. For this purpose, a mixed-methods design was utilised, with questionnaire and focus group interviews with 15-year-old students in their fourth year of Obligatory Secondary Education (ESO, in its acronym in Spanish) as the main methods of data collection.

3.1   Questionnaire

In the first phase of the project, a questionnaire for students in the fourth year of secondary education (age 15) was developed. While the questionnaire was used in Spanish, the English version has been included in Appendix 1. The design of the questionnaire was informed by the preliminary results obtained in the previous study from the teachers' perspective carried out by Halbach & Iwaniec (2020) and Iwaniec & Halbach (2021). The questionnaire included questions about students' background, their learning, the teaching they received, and their use of English outside school.

The background section was designed to collect information about the participants' gender, age (to confirm that they were all 15 years old), class attended (to confirm that they in the 4th year of ESO), class profile, school type and their socioeconomic status (measured by parents' education level, household possessions, and parents' job level). The participants were also asked about the details of the amount of time spent abroad, both in English-speaking, and non-English-speaking countries.

The main part of the questionnaire was designed to collect data about potential reasons why the proficiency and motivation of students in bilingual schools is less influenced by their SES if compared to students in non-bilingual schools. Roughly, two types of questions were developed for this purpose: questions on students' learning and questions on classroom teaching, and they contribute to defining the following scales.

- English self-concept – students' views of themselves as learners of English based on their past experiences and social comparison. This scale was adopted from Iwaniec (2014).
- Academic self-concept – students' views of themselves as learners in general based on their past educational experiences and social comparison with peers from their school. This scale was adopted from Marsh (1986).
- Teacher expectations – students' perceptions of what teachers think they are capable of. This scale was developed specifically for this study.
- Extramural use of English – the extent and amount of extracurricular use of English among 4th ESO students. This scale was adapted from the questionnaire developed by Sundqvist & Sylvén (2014).

For the scales of English self-concept, academic self-concept and teacher expectations, the participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with the statements using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 10 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Success and failure attribution were multiple choice items. Students responded to the extramural use of English scale using a frequency scale from "daily" to "never or almost never".

The section on teaching focused on motivational teaching practice – students' perceptions of the use of motivational teacher strategies by their teachers. This scale was developed for the purpose of this study based on Dörnyei's (2001) Components of a Motivational L2 Teaching Practice. However, in contrast to the original framework, specific aspects of L2 use were omitted, so that the scale could be applied to any teacher. In fact, students were asked to identify one teacher who had taught them the previous Tuesday in the first period and answer the questions thinking about this teacher. The students were also asked what subject this teacher taught and in what language. They were asked to respond to these questions using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 10 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree).

The questionnaire was initially written in English, then translated into Spanish, and checked for accuracy through a back-translation. It was subsequently piloted in three secondary schools with different profiles, resulting in a few minor changes to the original survey. During the pilot phase, researchers were present in the schools while students completed the survey with the aim of answering questions and getting student feedback about questions that were potentially confusing. Finally, the questionnaire was digitised and uploaded to the onlinesurveys.ac.uk platform. At the beginning of October 2019, requests for collaboration were sent out to schools that had participated in the previous phase of the investigation, as well as to other schools with which the researchers had contact. Calls for collaboration were also posted on social media.

Most of the students were recruited by their teachers, who received their invitation from the research team. In some of the schools, students completed the survey in the computer lab with the supervision of their English teacher. The rest of the students completed the survey from home by accessing the link provided by either their teacher or classmates. In total, 348 eligible students completed the questionnaire. This included 176 female (50.6%), 163 (46.8%) male students, and eight (2.3%) students identifying as belonging to the 'other' category. A total of 238 students reported to be enrolled in bilingual schools (68.4%) and further 110 in non-bilingual schools (31.6%).

SPSS 26 was used for questionnaire data analysis. The initial analysis of the pilot data included factor analysis (Maximum Likelihood with Direct Oblimin rotation) to confirm the structure of the scales. The analysis also included comparing students' scores on the scales emergent from factor analysis. Students' responses were compared based on the type of school they attended (bilingual vs. non-bilingual) using t-tests. Additionally, comparisons were made between the scores of students on the factors emerging from the motivational teaching practice scale dependent on the type of teacher and language in which this teacher taught (English teacher, content teacher teaching in Spanish, content teacher teaching in English) using ANOVA. Chi-square tests for independence were also used to compare students from the two types of schools in their use of extracurricular English and their reported travels abroad.

3.2   Focus group interviews

Students who indicated in the questionnaire their willingness to participate in the second part of the study were contacted for the focus groups. Starting at the end of November 2019, the first seven focus groups were conducted with small groups of between 6 and 8 volunteer students in the schools who decided to be part of the study. These interviews were audio- and video-taped and then transcribed. Due to the lockdown as a result of the COVID pandemic, the data collection process was interrupted in March 2020 and could only be resumed in November of that same year. In this second phase, data from non-bilingual schools were collected, since there was only one non-bilingual school represented among the first seven focus groups that had been held. Due to restrictions, the three focus groups that were held in November 2020 had to take place through an online platform (Zoom and Blackboard Collaborate), and students from these groups came from different schools. These conversations were, again, video-recorded and transcribed for analysis. Throughout the study, six focus groups were held with a total of 46 students from bilingual schools; four focus groups were held with a total of 31 students from non-bilingual schools.

The interviews were structured around a series of questions that focused on different aspects of their studies and tried to probe into students' perceptions of bilingual education:

1. Is learning subjects in English an advantage or a disadvantage? In what sense?
2. Why did you choose to be (or not) in a bilingual school?
3. Do you have to work hard to do well in your classes in English? Or is it a matter of being good at languages?
4. How much help do you receive outside school?
5. Do you think teachers teaching in English are different from those teaching in Spanish? Why? In what sense?
6. Do your parents place importance on learning English? Do they encourage you to take extracurricular classes?

The analysis of the qualitative data used a thematic approach and went through several iterations to come up with a list of themes and subthemes (see Appendix 2) that would guide the final analysis of the transcripts:

1. Reading of two transcripts and definition of first set of codes.
2. Use of codes to analyse two conversations and add / delete codes as necessary.
3. Revision of initial set of codes by adding / deleting and organising themes into codes and subcodes.
4. Testing of Inter-Coder Reliability (ICR) by having two researchers analyse three different transcripts. All three researchers working on the qualitative data analysis were paired up with one of the other two researchers working with qualitative data to assure greater reliability.
5. Analysis of the rest of the transcripts by two researchers in changing pairs. The final average of Cohen's Kappa coefficient for ICR across all transcripts and among the three researchers was calculated to be 0.544 ("moderate"), while percentage agreement was calculated at 94.9%.

Once transcripts had been coded, researchers met to share first insights (see Appendix 3) and on the basis of these, went back to the coded excerpts and grouped them to identify emerging trends.

4.   RESULTS

4.1   Quantitative findings

The first step in the analysis of the questionnaire was to conduct factor and reliability analysis of the hypothesised factors. This analysis confirmed the structure of the English self-concept. The teacher expectations factor was, however, part of the academic self-concept (see Table 1 for the detailed results). Hence, the academic self-concept scale includes items from the teacher expectations scale. This is not a surprising finding as academic self-concept is past-oriented and one of its sources is appraisals from important others, such as teachers. Further, the exploratory factor analysis of the items grouped together under the heading Motivational Teaching Practice pointed to the existence of two separate factors, labelled 'motivational teacher' and 'professional teacher'. The 'motivational teacher' scale focuses on practices that promote higher levels of motivation and interest in the classroom, such as creating a comfortable atmosphere, making classes interesting, caring for and respecting students, whereas the 'professional teacher' scale focuses on teacher practices that enable students to progress in their learning, such as providing clear instruction and explanations, goal setting in classes and efficient use of class time.

Table 1: *The results of factor analysis*

Factor	NOFI*	Reliability	Eigenvalue	% of VE**	Mean	SD***
English self-concept	4	.963	3.61	90.33	7.11	2.56
Academic self-concept	11	.945	7.20	65.45	6.32	2.00
Motivational teacher	12	.954	7.88	65.66	7.37	1.94
Professional teacher	4	.908	3.14	78.44	7.64	2.12

*Number of final items   ** Variance explained   *** Standard deviation

No significant differences between the scores of students from bilingual (M=7.15, SD= 2.62) and those from non-bilingual schools (M=7.02, SD=2.43) were found on the scales of English self-concept (RQ1). Similarly, no significant differences were found on the scale of academic self-concept (bilingual M= 6.17, SD=1.97; non-bilingual M=6.60, SD=1.97). This suggests that students in both bilingual and non-bilingual schools feel equally confident about their general academic ability as well as their ability in English.

In relation to RQ3, similarly, there were no significant differences between students from bilingual programs (M=7.52, SD=2.16) and those from non-bilingual programs (M=7.89, SD=2.03) on the scale of professional teacher. However, significant differences were observed on the scale of motivational teacher (t=-3,185, sig.=.002). Students from bilingual schools reported their teachers to be less motivating (M=7.14, SD=1.92) than their peers from non-bilingual schools (M=7.85, SD=1.89).

Additionally, when students were asked to think about a specific teacher when answering questions from the scales of professional and motivational teacher, some differences emerged. The three groups of teachers were English teachers, subject teachers teaching content in Spanish, and subject teachers teaching content in English.

There was a significant difference between students thinking about the three groups of teachers on the scale of professional teacher (F=10.62, sig.<.001). The post hoc analysis (see Table 2) revealed that there was a significant difference between subject teachers (Spanish) and subject teachers (English), with students evaluating their subject teachers (English) more positively than those who were thinking about content teachers (Spanish). The differences on the scale of motivational teacher, while following the same overall pattern with subject teachers (English) being evaluated highest and subject teachers (Spanish) being evaluated lowest, did not reach significance (F=2.60, sig.=.076).

Table 2: *Comparison of scores of the three groups of teachers on the scales of professional and motivational teacher*

	N	Professional teacher		Motivational teacher	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
English teachers	47	7.87	1.73	7.43	1.67
Subject teachers (Spanish)	232	7.63	2.32	7.22	2.06
Subject teachers (English)	66	8.61	1.15	7.84	1.61

When it comes to other factors, the use of English outside of school was explored for the two groups of students (RQ4, see results in Appendix 4). Only one factor reached significance, 'I speak in English'. The percentage of students reporting they do it daily was almost twice as high in bilingual schools than in non-bilingual schools. Combined, 79.4% of students from bilingual schools reported speaking English at least a couple of times a month, compared to 67.3% of their peers from non-bilingual schools. In contrast, whereas 20.6% of students from bilingual schools claimed they speak English a couple of times a year or less frequently, this percentage was higher for students from non-bilingual schools (32.7%).

The students were also asked about stays abroad, both in countries where English is the main language and in countries where they sometimes use English (see results in Table 3). These differences were not significant between the two groups. However, there is a significant difference between students taking extracurricular classes in English in bilingual and non-bilingual schools. The picture, however, is not straightforward. Whereas more students from bilingual schools reported that they take more than 4 hours of extracurricular English classes (18.7%) than their peers from non-bilingual schools (8.2%), they were more likely not to engage in any extracurricular classes (50.6%) than students from non-bilingual schools (44.5%). At the same time, higher proportions of students from non-bilingual schools reported that they take between 1–2 and 3–4 hours of extra English classes (20% and 27.3% respectively), as compared to 14.9% and 15.7% students from bilingual schools. Therefore, it seems that students from bilingual schools do not tend to take extracurricular classes, but if they do, they attend four or more hours a week. On the other hand, students from non-bilingual schools are more likely to take extracurricular classes, but fewer hours a week.

Table 3: *Travel abroad and extracurricular classes among bilingual and non-bilingual students*

Travel		Never	Two weeks or less	A month or less	Between 1–3 months	More than 3 months	Pearson Chi-square	Asymptotic significance
How much time have you spent in English-speaking countries?	Bil.	40.3%	23.5%	14.3%	10.1%	11.8%	2.68	.613
	Non-Bil	34.5%	20.9%	20.0%	11.8%	12.7%		
How much time have you spent in other countries where you sometimes use English?	Bil.	23.5%	28.2%	19.7%	14.3%	14.3%	1.35	.853
	Non-Bil	25.5%	31.8%	15.5%	12.7%	14.5%		
Extracurricular		**None**	**1–2 hours**	**3–4 hours**	**More than 4 hours**	**Pearson Chi-square**	**Asymptotic significance**	
How many hours a week do you attend extracurricular classes in English?	Bil.	50.6%	14.9%	15.7%	18.7%	12.3	.01	
	Non-Bil	44.5%	20.0%	27.3%	8.2%			

In terms of SES, different variables were taken into consideration to analyse the construct, in line with Caro & Cortés's (2012) method. Those variables included parents' education and employment, on the one hand, and household possessions, on the other.

A chi-square test of independence showed that there was no significant association between type of school (bilingual vs. non-bilingual) and parents' education ($x2$ (5) = 4.9, p = .428); see Table 4 for details. When it comes to job levels, in Table 5 it can be seen that there are proportionally more students with parents performing higher level jobs in non-bilingual schools than in bilingual ones. It is not clear why this might be the case but perhaps this result is due to the convenience sampling of the participants. Yet, the chi-square test pointed to the differences in parents' jobs not being significant. Taken together, these results suggest that students with more highly educated parents or those in more prestige jobs were not over-represented in either type of school.

Further, principle component analysis was conducted to derive a full measure of SES for the population. Variables including parents' education, job level and possessions were entered. Likewise, a chi-square test of independence showed no significant difference between the type of school and SES composite (x^2 (1) = .427, *p* = .514), thus, again, showing that the distribution of students from different SES in bilingual and non-bilingual schools is roughly the same.

Table 4: *Parents' level of education (%)*

Level of education	Bilingual	Non-bilingual	Total
Pre-primary	0.4	0	0.3
Primary	4.3	4.5	4.3
Secondary	10.2	9.1	9.9
High school	17.0	11.0	15.0
Vocational school	11.0	11.8	11.3
Bachelor degree	33.2	30.0	32.2
Masters or higher	23.9	33.6	27.0

Table 5: *Parents' job level (%)*

Job level	Bilingual	Non-bilingual	Total
Lower-level worker (e.g. cleaning staff, clerk, farmer, bricklayer)	10.6	9.0	10.2
Skilled mid-level worker (e.g. electrician, mechanic, police, laboratory technician)	24.7	15.5	21.7
Mid-level professional (e.g. doctor, teacher, architect, lawyer)	37.4	35.5	36.8
Higher-level manager (e.g. head of medical service, manager of a company)	27.3	40.0	31.3

4.2   Qualitative findings

The results of the focus group interviews are described hereinafter, having been grouped by the themes that were identified in the transcript analysis. Each theme that emerged is explored through direct quotes and general opinions and perceptions stated by the focus group participants. The themes include students' views of themselves as learners, students' perceptions of their teachers, students' extramural use of English including extracurricular classes, and finally their parents' views of the importance of English.

4.2.1   Students' view of themselves (RQ1)

To obtain an idea of students' view of themselves as learners, participants were asked about their opinions about studying English and subjects in English, their reasons for choosing a bilingual school (or not), their relative effort in the classroom, and their expectations for the future. While participants discussed their abilities regarding English and general academia, they often did so in an integrated way; thus, they are reported in this way.

Among all participants, there was a general feeling that students who choose to study in a non-bilingual program do so because they would not be able to study in a bilingual program, thus suggesting that they are academically inferior. Participants M2A4, U1A9 and U1A2, all from non-bilingual schools, suggested that students who are "good at" English, or those who have studied in a bilingual program from the beginning, can or should go to a bilingual school.

By contrast, it would be preferable for those "not good at" English to not study in a bilingual program because they will inevitably fail or achieve lower marks. Many students in non-bilingual programs deemed themselves unable to study in a bilingual program because they were not achieving good marks and they would inevitably do worse in a bilingual program, demonstrating that they consider it more difficult. One participant (S2A8), who had switched from a bilingual program to a non-bilingual program because she had to retake the year, said:

> *When I changed to the non-bilingual track, many people questioned my decision because there's a general feeling that non-bilingual education is for stupid people. I don't know whether they learn more content, but I think that bilingual education is better looked upon.*

Three further participants switched from a bilingual track to a non-bilingual track, all citing academic difficulties and supposing that they would do better in a monolingual setting. Student U1A3 from a non-bilingual school reported that "a subject like Biology is already difficult in Spanish, so it should be even more difficult in English" to suggest that the content would be much more difficult to understand and master in a second language, and they would not be prepared to follow the lessons. On the other hand, students in bilingual schools generally feel very confident when following lessons in English, as shown by the words of S1A4, who said, "I can express myself better in English than in Spanish. I feel that my vocabulary is richer in English." Bilingual program students also seem to be more driven by specific and loftier goals, which suggests an optimistic view of their own future and higher concept of themselves than their peers in non-bilingual schools. All participants from bilingual schools referred to attending university, while only some of the non-bilingual program students mentioned this possibility. Two participants from bilingual programs specified their chosen fields: medicine (HF2A3) and aerospace engineering (S1A3). In contrast, one student (M1A7) in a non-bilingual program referred to a person wanting to study a vocational program "or even go to university", implying that this possibility was more remote.

Several participants from bilingual programs mentioned studying abroad. For example, S1A1 stated he "wanted to study secondary school in Ireland, but I couldn't. Now I would like to do college abroad, but I am not sure if it will be possible." Five other students in bilingual programs mentioned that they would study abroad in the future, while only two students from non-bilingual programs described similar plans. For U1A3, "it is not necessary to learn so much English because we are going to study and work in Spain," an opinion shared by some other students from non-bilingual schools.

Participants were also asked about the amount of effort they had to make in different types of classes in an attempt to establish their level of self-confidence and perception of ability. Students in bilingual schools recognise that studying in a bilingual program requires more effort and greater attention (E2A4, E2A5). Many of them find learning in Spanish easier, with some exceptions who pointed out that they have been studying in English throughout their school years, and therefore find it easy. One participant (HF2A5) clarified that she understood lessons equally in Spanish or English, but that studying for exams was easier in Spanish. Most of the students in bilingual schools seem confident with their English considering the number of years they have studied the language and contents in English. They tend to consider that the extra effort is worth the reward of proficiency in another language, particularly English. The idea is summed up in this quote from participant E1A5:

> *[Learning] in Spanish is better because it's our native language and we understand better. But, of course, I think knowing English helps us prepare for the future, too, for future jobs and such.*

When asked about the effort they had to make in different classes, students in non-bilingual programs spoke of effort in inverse proportion to how "good at" English they were. If they were able to achieve a passing mark, they did not have to study as much, but some referred to having to study a considerable amount in order to pass. In fact, they tended to speak more about their marks than those in bilingual schools, suggesting a more extrinsic motivation. M2A4 stated that she "only think[s] about getting good marks. Classes in general are difficult for me, and I am not just talking about English." In general, students in non-bilingual programs shared this vision and mentioned their difficulties in content subjects more often than those in bilingual programs. Several of them felt that they would not be able to study content subjects in English given the effort they already had to make in those content subjects taught in Spanish. As participant U1A2 puts it,

> If I fail here, imagine what would happen if it were in English.

4.2.2   Students' views of their schools (RQ2)

Participants were asked what they thought of their schools, and there was a range of responses. Students in non-bilingual programs mainly focused on describing the state of the facilities and learning materials, the social environment and the teachers (which is further described below). Some criticised the facilities and materials while others said they were adequate. M1F5 stated, "I don't like the facilities because it is an old school." On the other hand, M2F1 and M2M1 criticised the materials in their school, saying that they are deteriorated even though it is a relatively new school: "The school is new, but some of the materials are broken" (M2M1). Several participants found it agreeable to know most of the other students in the school and get along with them. For example, participant M2A5 stated,

> For me, it's a plus that, since the school is in a small town, we all know each other. And this makes it easier. There aren't many conflicts.

Participants in bilingual programs, on the other hand, provided different observations, mainly focused on the type of educational program as well as the teachers. For example, one student (S1A4) responded that the school prepared them well for the university entry exam:

> They prepare us very well for the Selectividad[2]. They told me that this is the best school that prepares you for the future.

Only one student (S2A3) referred to teaching materials, in a positive way, and another student agreed (S2A1).

When asked about their decision to attend a bilingual or non-bilingual school, most students referred to making the choice due to the location of the school in reference to their homes. Several participants from bilingual schools, but none from non-bilingual schools, also referred to the quality of the educational program (teachers and academic levels) and the existence of a bilingual program that influenced the decision: "People talk very highly of this school, the teachers, the standard of teaching and everything in general" (E2A8). Most students from non-bilingual programs focused on the school's location and the fact that most of their friends from primary school would also go to the chosen school. When asked whether they would consider taking their future children to a bilingual school, all students in bilingual schools, with the exception of one, said that they would.

---

[2] Selectividad is the common name for the University Entry Exam

This overwhelming majority contrasts with a much lower proportion among students in non-bilingual programs.

4.2.3   Students' perceptions of teachers (RQ3)

Students in bilingual schools tended to view their teachers differently than their counterparts at non-bilingual schools. Those in bilingual programs evaluated their teachers in reference to their levels of English, occasionally comparing them to their own (for example, participant S1A2 considered his language level to be superior to that of some teachers). At the same time, other students justified teachers' English level by saying, "they studied how to teach their subject, not how to teach it in English" (S1A1), and that what matters most is the effort they put into their explanations and lessons (S2A8). Students in both types of schools also placed considerable importance on the ability of their teachers to explain concepts well, suggesting that a good explanation equals good teaching.
For example, a student from a bilingual school (HF1A3) said,

> It also depends on the teacher. Last year we had a teacher with whom we got good marks because he/she explained things well to us, in Spanish and in English. So it really depends a lot on the teacher and on how he/she explains things.

However, students from non-bilingual schools expressed much more dependence on their teachers for moral support, emphasising their availability to answer questions, their level of "caring" for the students, and their general level of personal attention. Participant M1A6 summed up this perception, saying that:

> a teacher is good when he explains, when he repeats things, he asks you how you are doing, and if he gives you some moral support, that's good. A good relationship between teacher and student is key.

Among students in non-bilingual schools, there was a certain frustration with teachers who seemed more concerned with getting through all of the content instead of making sure that students understood the lesson. M2M1 stated, "Every time we cover more content, and I don't think it's good". Rather than being concerned with covering the contents, they would like teachers to dedicate time to understanding real-life tasks: "instead of covering so much content, they [teachers] could explain how to write a CV, how to prepare taxes, or how to rent an apartment" (M2F1).

4.2.4   Extramural use of English and extracurricular classes (RQ4)

Joining extracurricular activities and finding external support are measures taken by several students to complement what they do in school and seek a more practical approach to learning English.
Several bilingual program students stated they attend a language school, and two additional bilingual students said that a private teacher goes to their house to help them with English. One of them also mentioned going to Ireland to do a summer language course. Conversely, only two bilingual program students mentioned attending after-school classes for help with subject classes. Participants from non-bilingual schools, on the other hand, tend to require help for both English and other subjects, and they spoke much more often about receiving informal support whenever they need help.
For example, participant M1A2 said, "I've never gone to after-school classes, but many times, I have had questions here and there, and I ask someone who knows."

Nine students mentioned they ask their siblings or friends for help when they have questions about English or other subjects, while three of them said they go to a language school. There is also a notable difference in the reasons given for attending a language school. In general, students from bilingual schools tend to search for additional support to complement what they do in class or even to practice skills that are not frequently covered in class, such as speaking. However, those participants in non-bilingual schools who attend language schools do so because they need help with English, i.e. to pass their exams at school.

All participants were asked about using English in their free time for less academic purposes, and many of them mentioned listening to music in English, watching movies and TV series in English, playing video games with people in other countries, and travelling abroad. In general, the level of motivation towards using English outside class for such activities is higher in bilingual students. However, students in non-bilingual schools are also aware that their use of English outside of class is relevant. For example, participant M3A6 said that understanding oral English is easy as students "are familiarised with English because games, movies, songs and practically everything that they do on the Internet is in English". However, when asked directly whether they use English outside school, the majority of non-bilingual program students stated they do not. On the other hand, bilingual program students tend to seek out opportunities outside school to practice their English, not only by watching TV or listening to music, but also by speaking with friends, family or by interacting with others while playing video games. Only a few participants from bilingual programs did not refer to using English for fun activities, while only a few participants from non-bilingual programs recognised using English in their everyday lives for entertainment purposes.

4.2.5 Parents' views (RQ5)

All the students reported that their parents support and encourage them to continue learning the language, independently of how proficient the parents are in English. The most common reasons expressed for learning English (from their parents' perspective) were work, travel and getting to know other cultures. There were no clear differences in the number of participants in bilingual and non-bilingual schools whose parents spoke, or did not speak, English. One student from the bilingual program declared that "in my family they have to write articles in English, since they work in Science" (S2A5), highlighting a specific job-related reason for learning English. E2A2 stated, "I speak in English with my mother at home", and E2A6 "ha[s] some friends in school whose parents speak English". In addition, most participants from both types of schools pointed out that learning English will generally broaden students' future opportunities.

Other than this observation of parents' consideration of the benefits of learning English, and despite prompting from interviewers, participants generally did not offer a lot of information about their parents' views. Some students in non-bilingual schools mentioned that their parents do not speak English, but they encourage them to learn English. M1M2 stated, "My parents do not speak English at all, but they want me to learn it. They cannot help me, so I have to make my own effort."

5. DISCUSSION

In this exploratory study, we set out to discover which factors help to curb the influence of SES in bilingual schools in Madrid. Even though the analysis of the data from the questionnaire reveals little variation between students in bilingual and non-bilingual programs, looking at the quantitative results that do vary significantly between groups and the qualitative data from the focus group interviews, we can identify some features that could be accountable for the different impact of SES in bilingual and non-bilingual schools.

As regards the first research question, about students' self-concept (RQ1), students in bilingual schools seem to be more confident about their academic abilities. Unlike their peers in non-bilingual schools, they do not talk about marks, nor do they question their ability to study in a language that is not their mother tongue, even though for some of them this is a clear handicap, as shown by the fact that they require external support to be able to deal with English as a foreign language and as a vehicle for learning. Almost no student in bilingual school looks for support with learning the content subjects either informally or formally through extra-curricular classes. In contrast, students from non-bilingual programs seem to be less confident and worry about their school performance, seeking out support, whether formal or informal, to supplement their schooling in a variety of subjects, including English.

Interestingly, the quantitative findings showed no difference in the factors of English self-concept or academic self-concept. This may be because students would tend to compare themselves to those that surround them, as well as connect their self-concept to the marks they receive. Therefore, students in non-bilingual schools are comparing themselves to their non-bilingual peers and those in bilingual schools are comparing themselves to their bilingual peers. Yet, they would not naturally compare themselves to peers in other types of schools, a comparison which would likely yield different results. It is also possible that, given the importance they place on extrinsic factors, students in non-bilingual schools are comparing themselves relative to the marks they receive while those in bilingual schools compare themselves relative to their communicative ability, due to their increased awareness of English as a communication tool.

The second research question asked about what students value in school (RQ2), Here, another important difference between bilingual and non-bilingual students became apparent when they were asked about the reasons for their choice of school and when they were invited to comment on the school itself. Rather than focus on the facilities or the social atmosphere, students from bilingual schools talk about their school offering a good quality education, being responsive to their interests and preparing them well for the university entrance exam. In order to benefit from this higher quality education, which the general public seems to see as the result of the implementation of bilingual education, these students are also willing to put in greater effort, knowing that studying in a foreign language will require higher levels of attention and greater dedication. Some of these students even seek out opportunities to develop skills, such as speaking, that they feel are not being developed enough in the classroom, implying a greater ambition in pursuing their goals.

When asked about motivation by teachers, and thus about how they perceive their teachers (RQ3), students in bilingual schools give a lower score to their teachers than students in non-bilingual schools. However, when this was mentioned in the interview, it seems that students from bilingual schools are not really as concerned about this quality in their teachers as their peers from non-bilingual schools, since they do not display the same dependence on teachers for more personal support. Instead, they are interested in their teachers' professional skills. Whilst they do assess some teachers' levels of English negatively, they also justify this perceived lack of skill by making reference to their training as content specialists rather than English teachers. It is this latter aspect to which students seem to assign greater value, as their evaluation of content teachers who teach in English is higher on the professional scale. These, then, seem to be students who value their teachers as professionals who do a good job rather than as motivators who care for them on a more personal level. It may also be that the students identify with their teachers as users of a foreign language who are still developing their skill to communicate – hence their comments about their training as content teachers (for similar results, see Halbach & Iwaniec, 2020). In contrast, students in non-bilingual schools repeatedly referred to the level of caring that teachers display, supporting the results from the quantitative data, and implying that they more often look to teachers for personal support (for similar results, see Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017).

It is clear for students in bilingual programs that they may achieve higher levels in the foreign language by using it as the language of schooling. Additionally, in their opinion, this language will allow them easier access to the job market, but also makes it possible for them to study abroad in the nearer future. More immediate still, students in bilingual schools make more frequent use of their English outside school than students in non-bilingual schools (RQ4), including using the language for oral interaction on an almost daily basis, even though, like their counterparts in non-bilingual schools, bilingual students complain that speaking is not present enough in their English lessons. This shortcoming does not seem to limit these students' willingness and ability to speak in English, a language that has an immediate relevance and use in their lives. This may be the result of a greater confidence in their use of English stemming from using English to learn, as a vehicular language.

Knowing exactly why CLIL students show these characteristic traits, and how they come about – whether they are part of the reason why students choose to stay in bilingual education when given the choice, or whether they are a result of CLIL programs – is difficult. Nevertheless, there are a few characteristics of bilingual programs that may explain why these students show higher levels of motivation – and performance – independently of their SES. Firstly, there is the added challenge of learning in a language that is not one's own (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010), that students are not only willing to accept but also willing to meet by putting in greater effort. It may be that the challenge is in itself motivating in an educational system often characterised by repetition of the contents and a rather teacher-fronted methodology, as seen in this participant quote, "It's more fun, you pay greater attention because it's not your language" [E2A5]. However, a second aspect that may increase this motivation is the fact that what causes this greater difficulty is actually perceived as relevant, and, possibly "cool" as it opens the doors to youth culture. As Roiha & Mäntylä (2021) point out, using language as a vehicle for communication is motivating in itself. Even more, as Pavlenko (2013) and Pihko (2007) show, using a foreign language in a meaningful context also has an effect on students' positive self-concept, thus making it possible to face the added challenge of studying through a foreign language. In the present study, students from non-bilingual schools have demonstrated a lower self-concept, evident in the fact that they do not feel able to study in a bilingual school or take part in free-time activities in English, as well as the need for affective support from their teachers.

In contrast, bilingual school students' more positive self-concept is seen in greater inclination to study abroad (something considered more difficult), their aspirations toward highly qualified professions, their enthusiasm to apply their English language skills in their everyday lives, and their disposition toward critiquing their schools and teachers from linguistic and academic points of view.
This coincides with the findings of the English Impact study that:

> *these [bilingual] students have internalised the value of learning English to a greater extent than students in non-bilingual schools, with greater levels of confidence and more robust visions of themselves as successful English users in the future. Their experience of communicating in English on a day-to-day basis gives them immediate evidence for the role of English for communicative purpose, with evidence suggesting a lower need amongst these students to look to external impetus to perform competently in English.*
> (Shepherd & Ainsworth, 2017, p. 85)

It seems, then, that changing the language of instruction in CLIL contexts reproduces some of the conditions found in higher SES contexts for students from all types of SES. There is a meaningful use of the foreign language that would generally result from opportunities to travel and be in touch with the target language culture for the students from higher SES (Carr & Pauwels, 2005). This meaningful use of English leads to a higher self-concept and motivation for all students, independently of their SES background. The need to make an extra effort to learn in this foreign language – and succeed in doing so – also leads to a better self-concept, and probably contributes to the fact that students in CLIL are more goal-driven and less dependent on teachers for motivation, as seen in our study.

While there seems to be little difference between the level of parental support in the two types of schools (RQ5), it can be argued that CLIL programs also foster the more autonomous parenting style, typical of higher SES contexts. Most parents, especially from lower SES contexts, cannot help their children with their schoolwork, thus making them more responsible and autonomous. As seen in the study, this allows students in bilingual school to develop a certain independence of their teachers that contrasts with non-bilingual students' look to teachers for support, patience and encouragement.
By recreating these conditions, CLIL seems to offer students from lower SES a context that resembles that of higher SES families and leads to a better self-concept, greater autonomy and higher levels of intrinsic motivation.

6.   CONCLUSION

The present study investigated what causes the decrease of the impact of SES on students' proficiency in English and motivation in bilingual schools as compared to non-bilingual schools. We were able to observe a difference in students who attend bilingual and non-bilingual schools, both in the way they perceive education in general and in their approach towards language learning. Bilingual program students can be considered to have a higher level of autonomy in the learning process as well as a more rigorous perception of teachers and their teaching methodology. By contrast, students in non-bilingual schools demonstrate more dependence on their classmates and teachers, as they have a greater need for a friendly and welcoming environment as well as supportive teachers. Additionally, bilingual students appear to perceive English in a different way to their peers in non-bilingual schools. For them, English is a language through which they learn, and which can open up future opportunities; hence, the greater effort employed is a worthwhile investment. At the same time, it has an intrinsic appeal as the medium of youth culture, while in the case of non-bilingual program students, English is something to be learnt, often to satisfy external pressures such as getting a satisfactory mark.

It seems that this difference in students' profile, which is independent of their SES background, may be the result of CLIL recreating some of the conditions normally found in high SES contexts. First of all, the meaningful use of the foreign language as a vehicle for learning leads to a higher self-concept and increases motivation. Higher expectations derived from the fact that bilingual education is perceived as more difficult and prestigious also lead to a better self-concept. Finally, the fact that many parents cannot help their children with schoolwork makes students more autonomous and responsible, two characteristics that are fostered through the more autonomous parenting style of higher SES families. This means that even though their family background may not promote the development of a healthy academic self-concept, intrinsic motivation, autonomy and responsibility, studying through a foreign language in a CLIL program goes some way to redress this situation. This makes it possible, then, for all students to succeed, independently of their SES background.

As any study, this one comes with some limitations. First, the sample is not fully representative of the region where the study has been conducted, as a snowball sampling approach was used. Additionally, the number of participants from bilingual schools was higher than the number of those from non-bilingual schools. The data collection was influenced by the fact that some data were collected during the COVID pandemic, which to some degree made it difficult to contact schools and to recruit participants. These circumstances may have also influenced how students recruited during the pandemic perceive their schooling, which could differ from the perceptions of those students who participated in the study prior to the pandemic, as the methodology changed from face-to-face to hybrid teaching, with students following classes on alternate days via streaming. The greater need for teacher support expressed by students in focus groups conducted during the pandemic, for example, having to follow lessons from home, although it should be acknowledged that similar comments were made by students from non-bilingual schools before the pandemic. Similarly, the fact that the interviews were conducted online rather than face-to-face during the pandemic might have made it more difficult for some students to speak and follow the conversations.

However, others might have found that the additional level of privacy helped them to express their opinions. Finally, some students experienced difficulties with their Internet connections during the interviews, which may have influenced their willingness and ability to contribute their thoughts.

This is one of the first studies exploring how bilingual programs can have a positive effect on limiting the gap caused by students' SES. This study examined the perspective of students only. However, other important stakeholders, such as teachers or parents, could also provide useful insights. Parents may provide further information about their reasoning when choosing between a bilingual and non-bilingual school, perhaps leading to the identification of an important factor that is related to this choice, thus explaining student motivation that is unrelated to SES. Similarly, the adoption of other methods, such as classroom observations combined with student and teacher reflections could provide deeper insights into the topic. For example, classroom observations could potentially point to a difference in the methodologies employed in bilingual schools vs. non-bilingual schools, which could explain differences in student motivation and autonomy.

REFERENCES

Alejo, R., & Piquer-Píriz, A. (2016). Urban vs. rural CLIL: An analysis of input-related variables, motivation and language attainment. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 29*(3), 245–262. doi:10.1080/07908318.2016.1154068

Anghel, B., Cabrales, A., & Carro, J. M. (2016). Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: The impact beyond foreign language learning. *Economic Inquiry, 54*(2), 1202–1223. doi:10.1111/ecin.12305

Bruton, A. (2011). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? Re-evaluating some of the research. *System, 39*(4), 523–532. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.08.002

Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some of the reasons why … and why not. *System, 41*(3), 587–597. doi:10.1016/j.system.2013.07.001

Butler, Y. G., & Le, V.-N. (2017). A longitudinal investigation of parental socio-economic status (SES) and young students' learning of English as a foreign language. *System*, *73,* 4–15.

Caro, D. H., & Cortés, D. (2012). Measuring family socioeconomic status: An illustration using data from PIRLS 2006.

Carr, J., & Pauwels, A. (2005). *Boys and foreign language learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chmielewski, A. K. (2019). The global increase in the socioeconomic achievement gap, 1964 to 2015. *American Sociological Review*, *84*(3): 517–544. doi:10.1177/0003122419847165

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. London: Pearson Education.

Fernández Sanjurjo, J., Arias Blanco, J. M., & Fernández-Costales, A. (2018). Assessing the influence of socio-economic status on students' performance in content and language integrated learning. *System, 73*, 16–26. doi:10.1016/j.system.2017.09.001

Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next*. London: British Council, available from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/pub_english_next.pdf

Halbach, A. (2014). Teaching (in) the foreign language in a CLIL context: Towards a new approach. In R. Breeze, C. Llamas Saiz, C. Martínez Pasamar & C. Tabernero Sala (Eds.), *Integration of theory and practice in CLIL.* (pp. 1–14). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Halbach, A., & Iwaniec, J. (2020). Responsible, competent and with a sense of belonging: An explanation for the purported levelling effect of CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 1–15. doi:10.1080/13670050.2020.1786496

Hattie, J.A.C. (2017). *Visible learning Plus: A synthesis of 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Oxon: Routledge.

Iwaniec, J. (2014). Motivation of pupils from southern Poland to learn English. *System, 19 (1),* 9–12.

Iwaniec, J. (2015). Motivation to learn English of Polish gymnasium pupils. PhD thesis, Lancaster University.

Iwaniec, J. (2018). The effects of parental education level and school location on language learning motivation. *The Language Learning Journal*, *48*, 427–441.
https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1422137

Iwaniec, J., & Halbach, A. (2021). Teachers' views on their methodology and their profiles: in search of the possible reasons for the levelling effect of CLIL. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.*

Jaekel, N. (2020). Language learning strategy use in context: The effects of self-efficacy and CLIL on language proficiency. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, IRAL, 58*(2), 195–220. doi:10.1515/iral-2016-0102

Kormos, J., & Kiddle, T. (2013). The role of socio-economic factors in motivation to learn English as a foreign language: The case of Chile. *System 41*(2), 399–412.

Lamb, M. (2012.) A self-system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning 62* (4), 997–1023. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719

Lasagabaster, D. (2020). Motivation in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) research. *The Palgrave Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning* (pp. 347–366). Cham: Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-28380-3_17
Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-28380-3_17

Lindo, E. J. (2014). Family background as a predictor of reading comprehension performance: An examination of the contributions of human, financial, and social capital. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *32*, 287–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.03.021

Lorenzo, F. (2019). *Educación bilingüe en Andalucía. Informe de Gestión, Competencias y Organización*. Sevilla: Agencia Andaluza de Evaluación Educativa. Consejería de Educación. Junta de Andalucía.

Marsh, H. W. (1986). Verbal and math self-concepts: An internal/external frame of reference model. *American Educational Research Journal, 23,* 129–149.

Morton, T. (2016). Content and language integrated learning. In G. Hall (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of ELT* (pp. 252–264). London: Routledge.

Nikula, T. (2007). Speaking English in Finnish content-based classrooms. *World Englishes, 26*(2), 206–223. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2007.00502.x

O'Connell, M. (2019). Is the impact of SES on educational performance overestimated? Evidence from the PISA survey. *Intelligence, 75*, 41–47. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2019.04.005

OECD. (2018). *Education at a glance 2018*. Paris: OECD. doi:10.1787/eag-2018-en Retrieved from https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/eag-2018-en.pdf?expires=1611922565&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=5541D03AABDED35C68518010920C271B

OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 Results (Volume II): Where All Students Can Succeed*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b5fd1b8f-en.

O'Sullivan, B., Dunn, K., & Iwaniec, J. (2018). Bilingual education in the Madrid region and its effect on motivation and proficiency. *TESOL-SPAIN 41st Annual National Convention 9–11* Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.

Pavlenko, A. (2013). The affective turn in SLA: From 'affective factors' to 'language desire' and 'commodification of affect'. In D. Gabryś-Barker (Ed.) *The Affective Dimension in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 3–28). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pavón Vázquez, V., Prieto Molina, M., & Ávila López, F. J. (2015). Perceptions of teachers and students of the promotion of interaction through Task-based activities in CLIL. *Porta Linguarum, 23*, 75–91.

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018a). CLIL and pedagogical innovation: Fact or fiction? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 28*(3), 369–390. doi:10.1111/ijal.12208

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018b). CLIL and educational level: A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on language outcomes. *Porta Linguarum, 29,* 51–70.

Pihko, M.-K. (2007). *Minä, koulu ja englanti. Vertaileva tutkimus englanninkielisen sisällönopetuksen ja perinteisen englannin opetuksen affektiivisista tuloksista* [Me, School and English. A Comparative Study of the Affective Outcomes of English Teaching in Content and Language Integrated (CLIL) Classes and in Traditional Foreign Language Classes]. Jyväskylä, FI: University of Jyväskylä.

Rascón Moreno, D. J., & Bretones, C. M. (2018). Socioeconomic status and its impact on language and content attainment in CLIL contexts. *Porta Linguarum, 29*, 115–139

Roiha, A., & Mäntylä, K. (2021). CLIL as a vehicle for a positive English self-concept: An analysis of one former student's life course. In K. R. Talbot, M.-T. Gruber & R. Nishida (Eds.), *The Psychological Experience of Integrating Content and Language.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 55–72.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2015). The effects of implementing CLIL in education. In M. Juan-Garau & J. Salazar-Noguera (Eds.), *Content-based Language Learning in Multilingual Educational Environments* (pp. 51–68). Cham: Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_4 Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11496-5_4

Rumlich, D. (2020). Bilingual education in monolingual contexts: A comparative perspective. *Language Learning Journal, 48*(1), 115–119. doi:10.1080/09571736.2019.1696879

Shepherd, E., & Ainsworth, V. (2017). *English Impact. An evaluation of English language capability.* Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/default/files/british-council-english-impact-report-madrid-web-opt.pdf

Sundqvist, P., & Sylvén, L. K. (2014). Language-related computer use: Focus on young L2 English learners in Sweden. *ReCALL, 26,* 3–12. doi: 10.1017/S0958344013000232

Sylvén, K. (2017). Motivation, second language learning and CLIL. In A. Llinares & T. Morton (Eds.), *Applied Linguistic Perspectives on CLIL* (pp. 51–66). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

van Kampen, E., Admiraal, W., & Berry, A. (2018). Content and language integrated learning in the Netherlands: Teachers' self-reported pedagogical practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(2), 222–236. doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1154004

APPENDIX 1:

Questionnaire (English version)

ARAG: The effect of bilingual schooling in Madrid on SES: The student perspective

The current study is a one-year project funded by the British Council, ARAG (Assessment Research Awards and Grants). Its aim is to understand how students from different socio-economic background learn, with a particular focus on learning English, in and outside of school. In this way, we hope that our findings will contribute to improving learning and teaching for all students. The study focuses on the 4th ESO students and their perceptions of their own learning and their teachers' teaching. For this reason, we would like to invite you to take part in this research project. This study has two phases: questionnaire and interviews. In this part, we focus only on the questionnaire.

This questionnaire contains questions about your experiences of learning and teaching in your secondary school, as well as some background questions. There are no good or wrong answers. We want to get to know your true opinion. It will take you no more than 20 minutes to fill in the questionnaires.

The participation in this study is voluntary. To participate, make sure that you first hand in a consent form signed by your parent to your headteacher. You do not have to finish this questionnaire. If there is anything that makes you uncomfortable, you have the right to stop at any time. Once the questionnaire is submitted, it will not be possible to withdraw your answers.

This questionnaire is anonymous but you can leave your email address if you want to be entered in the prize draw or participate in the interview part of the study. We will delete your email address as soon as it is not necessary and we will not use it for any other purpose.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, please do not hesitate to contact any of our research team.

Dr. Janina Iwaniec (Project Lead):   j.iwaniec@bath.ac.uk
Prof. Ana Halbach: ana.halbach@uah.es
Dr. Lyndsay Renee Buckingham: lrbuckingham@comillas.edu
Dr. Miguel Fernández Álvarez: m.fernandez@upm.es

Informed consent
Choose the option that applies to you.

I understand that my participation is voluntary.	yes	no
I understand that I can stop filling in the questionnaire at any point.	yes	no
My parents agreed for me to participate in the study and signed the consent form.	yes	no
I returned a signed parental consent form to my headteacher.	yes	no
I agree to participate in the study.	yes	no

Your learning

How strongly do you agree with the following statements? Answer the questions by choosing one option between 'strongly disagree (1)' to 'strongly agree (10)'.

	Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Strongly agree
I usually get good marks at school.										
I'm hopeless when it comes to academic subjects.										
Based on my previous performance, my teachers think that I can succeed at school.										
I'm better at academic subjects than most of students my age.										
My teachers think I'm a good student.										
Studying comes easy to me.										
I am satisfied with how well I do at school.										
My teachers think that I learn new things quickly.										
Compared to other students, I learn new things quickly for my classes.										
I have always done well in English.										
My teachers are satisfied with how well I do at school.										
I usually get good marks in English.										
I have always done well at school.										
Compared to other students I'm good at school.										
I'm good at English.										
My teachers think that I'm good at academic subjects.										
Studying English comes easy to me.										

Think about a recent test at school that you did well on.
Why do you think you did well on it? Choose one most suitable answer only.

a) Because I had studied really hard.

b) Because I'm clever.

c) Because I was lucky.

d) Because the tasks were easy.

Think about a recent test at school that you did not do so well on.
Why do you think it didn't go well for you?

a) Because I hadn't studied hard enough.

b) Because I'm not good at it.

c) Because the test was really difficult.

d) Because I wasn't lucky.

Teaching

Think about the teacher you had last Tuesday in your first class. What does this teacher teach?

a) English   b) a subject other than English

In what language does this teacher teach?

a) Spanish   b) English

Thinking about this particular teacher, rate the following statements:
(1 'Strongly disagree', 10 'strongly agree')

	Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Strongly agree
My teacher makes me feel that I can succeed.										
My teacher encourages me to work.										
My teacher treats me with respect.										
My teacher presents tasks in a motivating way.										
My teacher connects what we learn to our lives.										
My teacher makes classes interesting.										
My teacher provides feedback in a manner that I'm comfortable with.										
My teacher enjoys teaching.										
My teacher provides adequate support for me to learn.										
My teacher explains things well.										
My teacher promotes cooperation among learners.										
My teacher expects me to do well.										
My teacher is enthusiastic.										
My teacher uses the time in class effectively.										
My teacher is caring.										
My teacher creates a comfortable atmosphere.										
My teacher provides clear instructions.										
My teacher sets clear goals for classes/activities.										

Learning and using English

How often do you do the following activities in English?

	Daily	One or few times a week	A few times a month	A few times a year	Never or almost never
Read books in English					
Read newspapers in English					
Read comic books in English					
Read other things in English (lyrics, manuals)					
Watch films or clips in English					
Play computer games in English					
Speak with somebody in English					
Communicate with others in English (for example on Facebook, Instagram, via MSM)					
Keep up with everything possible in English (for example MSN, YouTube, Instagram)					

Without counting the hours of English instruction you receive at school, how many extracurricular classes do you have every week to improve your English?

     a) none   b) 1-2 hours   c) 3-4 hours   d) more than 4 hours

How much time have you spent in an English-speaking country?

     a) none   b) two weeks or less   c) a month or less

     d) between 1-3 months   e) more than 3 months

How much time have you spent travelling in other countries, where you can occasionally use English to communicate?

     a) none   b) two weeks or less   c) a month or less

     d) between 1-3 months   e) more than 3 months

Background questions

How old are you? Write your answer here ………

Do you attend 4th ESO? a) yes b) no

What is your gender?

a) male b) female c) non-binary

What is the highest level of school completed by either of your parents, whoever completed the highest level of school?

a) pre-primary

b) primary

c) lower secondary

d) upper secondary

e) post-secondary non-tertiary

f) undergraduate

g) postgraduate

What level of job does the same parent do? If he/she is not working at the moment, please select the option that corresponds to the last job.

a) lower-level support worker (e.g., cleaning staff, shop assistant, farmer, construction worker)

b) mid-level skilled worker (e.g., electrician, mechanic, police, lab technician)

c) mid-level professional (e.g., doctor, teacher, architect, lawyer)

d) senior level manager (e.g., chief of medical services, manager in a company, partner of a law firm, judge)

e) has never worked outside the home

What type of school do you attend?

a) public

b) *concertado* (charter)

c) private

What is the profile of your class?

a) bilingual

b) *sección* (in a public school)

c) *programa* (in a public school)

d) non-bilingual

e) non-bilingual with a specialised program (*Instituto de innovación tecnológica, Instituto impulsor de la actividad física*)

f) other

If you answered "other" in the previous question, please specify:

……………………………………………………………………

What is your first language?

    a) Spanish

    b) Other – please specify:………………………………………..

When did you learn Spanish?

    a) Before I started school

    b) When I was in year 1–3

    c) When I was in year 4–6

    d) Later

How do you think you've learned the most you can in English?

    a) all or almost everything through school work

    b) most of it through school work

    c) most in addition to school work

    d) all or almost everything in addition to school work

Do you have any of these in your home?

Car	a) yes	b) no
Your own bedroom	a) yes	b) no
Aircon	a) yes	b) no
Smart TV	a) yes	b) no
Your own smartphone	a) yes	b) no
Tablet	a) yes	b) no

Who decided to enrol you in your current school?

    a) my parents

    b) myself

    c) it was a joint decision

Why are you enrolled in your current school? Choose all answers that applied.

    a) My parents decided it.

    b) I wanted to go to this school.

    c) It was mine and my parents' joint decision to go to this school.

    d) It was the only school in this area.

    e) This school is closest to home.

    f) This school has a good reputation.

    g) English is important in this school.

Final questions

Would you like to:

a) be entered in the prize draw?	a) yes	b) no
b) participate in the focus group interview		
(every participant will receive a 10-euro voucher)?	a) yes	b) no
c) receive the summary of our findings?	a) yes	b) no

If you answer any of these questions with a yes, please provide your email address (or another medium of communication) below.

……

Please leave your feedback below.

……
……
……

Thank you for your participation in our study.

Your answers will make a difference!

Dr. Janina Iwaniec (Project Lead):   j.iwaniec@bath.ac.uk
Prof. Ana Halbach: ana.halbach@uah.es
Dr. Lyndsay Renee Buckingham: lrbuckingham@comillas.edu
Dr. Miguel Fernández Álvarez: m.fernandez@upm.es

APPENDIX 2: First list of codes

- Methodology
  - o Classroom activities
  - o Teacher attitude/involvement
  - o Assessment
  - o Language assistants

- Learning results
  - o Levels of difficulty
  - o Effect on learning, motivation, attention
  - o Aspects of English
  - o Content

- Extramural learning (anything that happens outside school)
  - o Fun activities (informal, non-academic)
  - o Academic activities

- Importance of English for students
  - o Future
  - o Own life

- Perceptions of language use

- Metalinguistic awareness

- Reasons for school choice (students)

- Use of Spanish

- Parents
  - o Choice of school
  - o Support
  - o Importance of English
  - o English proficiency

- Other topics

APPENDIX 3: List of codes used for the analysis of qualitative data

Extramural learning	Academic (English)
	Academic non-English
	Fun activities (English)
Importance of English for students	Future
	Motivation towards English
	Own life
Importance of Spanish	
Learning results	Aspects of English
	Content
	Effect on motivation, attention
	Levels of difficulty
Metalinguistic awareness	
Methodology	Assessment
	Classroom activities
	Language assistants
	Teacher attitude, involvement
	Teacher explanation, quality
	Teaching materials
Parents	English proficiency
	Importance of English
	Reasons for school choice
	Support
Relating learning opportunities to finances	
Sentiment	Negative
	Positive
Students' views	Reasons for school choice (students)
	Self-efficacy (English, content in Eng)
	Self-efficacy (non-English subjects)
	Understanding of bilingual education

APPENDIX 4:

List of emerging topics with first interpretations

	Both	Bilingual	Non-bilingual
Methodology	Difficulty to explain what they do in class (explanations, exercises)	Had a little more variety tasks (S1 and 2 a little more active; HF more learner-centred)	Want education to be more practical (learning how to do Declaración de la Renta); in E1 they mention doing a CV and value that highly
Understanding of English		English needs practice	English is not a skill (learning grammar)
Teachers		Criticise the teachers' level of English	Look for support in teachers Criticise teachers' ability to explain
School		More goal driven (preparan bien para selectividad)	Criticise facilities Compañerismo; know each other in the school
Studying in English	Criticise studying Spanish history in English Importance of English, but also Spanish		Are more worried about grades; think they wouldn't be able to study in bilingual
Jobs (future)	Both see the importance of English for their future	University studies abroad Mention jobs in companies or engineering; working in tourism	Jobs as waiters (in the centre of Madrid; at the beach) "Estudiar un grado medio o incluso universidad"
Extracurricular activities		Academic support only in language school More fun activities	More informal support (siblings, etc.)
Money		No mention	Mention as a limitation to participate in extracurricular activities

	Both	Bilingual	Non-bilingual
Degree of difficulty	Easier subjects should be in English and more difficult should be in Spanish (degree of memorisation?)		
Studying in English		Have to rely more on memorisation in English than in Spanish because they don't have vocabulary	You will have to rely on memorisation
Use of English outside	Playing videogames helps them improve oral skills especially	A lot	Not so much
English in school	Too little focused on speaking	Bit more skills-focused	Focused on grammar
Assistants	Not much use	A bit more active	Basically used for vocabulary Activities are more fun, but not part of assessment therefore no attention is paid
Parents' proficiency		Higher proficiency	Lower proficiency
Parents' attitude towards English	Very important		
Understanding of bilingual education		No problem switching languages	Misconceptions about bilingual education Contents watered down
Criticism bilingual education		Switching languages for the same subject in different years	

APPENDIX 5: Extracurricular use of English outside of school

	School type	Daily	Once or a couple of times per week	A couple times a month	A couple of times per year	Never or almost never	Pearson Chi-Square	Asymptotic Significance
I read books in English.	bilingual	4.2%	6.7%	14.3%	32.6%	42%	2.49	.65
	non-bilingual	6.4%	9.1%	15.5%	34.5%	34.5%		
I read newspapers in English.	bilingual	2.5%	5.9%	8.8%	9.2%	73.5%	5.31	.26
	non-bilingual	1.8%	1.8%	5.5%	7.3%	83.6%		
I read comic books in English.	bilingual	4.6%	5.0%	8.%	14.7%	67.2%	5.44	.25
	non-bilingual	0.9%	7.3%	4.5%	13.6%	73.6%		
I read other things in English.	bilingual	51.2%	21.4%	11.3%	7.1%	8.8%	5.39	.25
	non-bilingual	38.2%	28.2%	13.6%	10.0%	10.0%		
I watch things in English.	bilingual	38.7%	28.6%	13.4%	11.8%	7.1%	3.43	.49
	non-bilingual	30.0%	30.9%	16.4%	11.8%	10.9%		
I play computer games in English.	bilingual	21.0%	20.6%	14.3%	8.8%	35.3%	4.07	.40
	non-bilingual	20.9%	16.4%	11.8%	15.5%	35.5%		
I speak in English.	bilingual	28.6%	29.8%	21.0%	10.5%	10.1%	13.32	.01
	non-bilingual	16.4%	36.4%	14.5%	20.9%	11.8%		
I communicate in English via online platforms, for example Facebook, Instagram.	bilingual	21.8%	17.6%	17.6%	16.4%	26.5%	5.12	.28
	non-bilingual	12.7%	23.6%	19.1%	19.1%	25.5%		
I keep up with everything possible in English, for example MSN, YouTube, Instagram.	bilingual	31.5%	20.2%	20.2%	10.1%	18.1%	3.03	.55
	non-bilingual	34.5%	15.5%	16.4%	14.5%	19.1%		

British Council Assessment Research Awards and Grants

If you're involved or work in research into assessment, then the British Council Assessment Research Awards and Grants might interest you.

These awards recognise achievement and innovation within the field of language assessment and form part of the British Council's extensive support of research activities across the world.

**HOW BILINGUAL SCHOOLING AFFECTS STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS:
THE STUDENT PERSPECTIVE**

Janina Iwaniec
Ana Halbach
Miguel Fernández
Lyndsay R. Buckingham

www.britishcouncil.org/aptis/research