

A Critical Look at Bilingual Physical Education in Spain

Francisco José Martínez-Hita

Faculty of Education of the University of Zaragoza
f.martinezh@posta.unizar.es

Abstract. The main objective of the article has been to make a review of the most controversial aspects of bilingual education, mainly focusing on the subject of Physical Education. To this end, a search of the scientific literature was carried out in the main databases (*Dialnet*, *Google Scholar*, and *SCOPUS*) taking into account articles dealing with bilingual education, CLIL and Physical Education. In this way, a series of factors have been found that may go unnoticed and are not politically correct to publish as they are criticisms of the fashionable educational trend, bilingualism. The aspects dealt with are included in the following points: the content of the subject to be taught, motivation problems in students, difficulties and exhaustion on the part of teachers, the questioning of an inclusive school and analysis at a political level. These points are firstly discussed in general terms and, after that, more deeply in relation to the subject of Physical Education. All these aspects show that the Spanish educational system is at a crossroads in which it must reflect on the consequences of these changes and propose new alternatives.

Keywords: CLIL, language education, foreign language, educative innovation, challenge.

Kritiškas žvilgsnis į dvikalbį fizinį ugdymą Ispanijoje

Santrauka. Straipsnio pagrindinis tikslas – apžvelgti prieštaringiausius dvikalbio ugdymo aspektus, daugiausia dėmesio skiriant fizinio ugdymo temai. Šiuo tikslu atlikta mokslinės literatūros paieška pagrindinėse duomenų bazėse (*Dialnet*, *Google Scholar* ir *SCOPUS*) ir į analizę įtraukti su dvikalbiu ugdymu, CLIL (integruotu dalyko ir užsienio kalbos mokymu(si) bei fiziniu ugdymu susiję straipsniai. Analizė atskleidė nemažai veiksnių, kurie gali likti nepastebėti ir kuriuos skelbti būtų politiškai nekorektiška, nes jie kritikuoja madingą švietimo tendenciją – dvikalbystę. Nagrinėjami aspektai apima šias kategorijas: mokomojo dalyko turinys, mokinių motyvacijos problemos, mokytojų patiriami sunkumai ir nuovargis bei įtraukiosios mokyklos kvestionavimas ir analizė politiniu lygmeniu. Pirmiausia šie klausimai kūno kultūros dalyko aspektu aptariami bendrai, vėliau siauriau ir giliau. Mūsų radiniai leidžia teigti, kad Ispanijos švietimo sistema atsidūrė kryžkelėje bei tai, kad turėtų būti apmąstyti visi pokyčių padariniai ir pasiūlyta naujų alternatyvų.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: CLIL, kalbų mokymas(is), užsienio kalba, ugdymo inovacijos, iššūkis.

Introduction

Globalization has meant that today's societies need to find a common language in order to complete this economic, technological, social and cultural process. English has managed to prevail over other languages and become the language of reference in the world. This fact has meant a change in the educational systems of the countries to adapt

Received: 22/12/2023. Accepted: 20/09/2024

Copyright © Francisco José Martínez-Hita, 2024. Published by Vilnius University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution Licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) (CC BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

to this situation and to promote the learning of English. In the case of Spain, it is from the Organic Law for the Improvement of the Educational Quality (LOMCE, 2013) where a modernization of the educational system is intended to be carried out having as the main axes the promotion of multilingualism and the Information and Communication Technologies.

These long-term objectives have been turned into the implementation of bilingual programs by the Autonomous Communities of Spain. Programs in most cases have been based on increasing the number of hours of exposure to English for students through the development of other subjects in this language. Solution that was adopted after observing that the previous model based on teaching English through specific subjects did not generate the expected results (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009). In this way, the administration had an easy and cheap solution to increase the time of exposure to English in the educational centers without increasing the costs of hiring more teachers, reducing the pupil–teacher ratios, or splitting a class into two, among many other possibilities.

The problem arises when these programs are implemented, but there is no evaluation and monitoring of them by the administrations. Cenoz et al. (2014) and Rumlich (2020) refer that the time has come to pass an exhaustive and critical examination of these programs in order to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Along the same lines, Nikula et al. (2016) mention the undeniable need to produce much more research to observe the effectiveness of CLIL¹ teaching approaches, which is the most widely used bilingual approach today (Fernández-Rio et al., 2017).

In this way, we could assess the situation in the implementation of these programs and take measures in this regard, as has been done in other countries. In Finland, for instance, one of the pioneering countries in the European CLIL (Jäppinen, 2005), there has been a decrease in the number of schools offering these programs (Nikula, 2010). This same decline is currently happening in Spain (Serrano, 2020).

The area of Physical Education (PE) has become one of the favorite subjects to be used, through CLIL, as a means of learning foreign languages (Salvador-García & Chiva-Bartoll, 2017). This is due to the suitability of the characteristics of the subject (Bae-na-Extremera et al., 2017).

In Malaysia, this process of implementing bilingual programs was carried out in 2002, but, in 2012, Malaysia backed down after failing in their attempt. One of the reasons why it was referred to as a failure, prompting a return to the previous model was that students are not selected for such programs (Paran, 2013). Thanks to the evaluation and monitoring, countries like Hungary have implemented a ‘zero’ year, mainly dedicated to the learning of English to improve the linguistic competence of their students (Paran, 2013).

In other countries, such as Germany, measures have been taken to improve educational approaches. For instance, the use of both L2 and the mother tongue to teach subjects was implemented in order to ensure their literacy and to extend the schedule teaching

¹ *Content and Language Integrated Learning*; in Spanish: *Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas* (AICLE).

of those areas taught in another language from two to three hours per week (Siepmann et al., 2021). Therefore, through this paper, it is intended to highlight all those scientific investigations that underline negative aspects about the implementation of bilingual programs in order to, on the one hand, question the positivization from which the bilingual approach benefits (Codó, 2020), and, on the other hand, to highlight the importance of evaluating and continuing to research on the results obtained by these types of programs. Even though it is possibly a challenge-oriented article because of its content, the intention is none other than to show those aspects found in the scientific literature about this subject.

Method

The methodology has been based on a literature review of articles related to the field of CLIL, bilingual education, and Physical Education. The search was carried out in the following databases: *Dialnet*, *Google Scholar*, and *SCOPUS*. Lastly, the inclusion criteria used for writing this article were: (I) the main topic was the analysis of bilingual education; (II) studies that took into account the Spanish context; (III) articles that relate bilingual education and Physical Education; and (IV) articles that showed full text in their digital version.

CLIL in Spain

European authorities have determined that it is beneficial for European citizens to master at least two additional languages. For this reason, in the previous educational reform, Organic Law 8/2013, of December 9, for the Improvement of Educational Quality (LOMCE), these recommendations were taken into account with the aim of promoting multilingualism:

The Law strongly supports multilingualism, redoubling efforts to ensure that students are fluent in at least a first foreign language, whose level of oral and reading comprehension and oral and written expression is decisive in promoting employability and professional ambitions, and therefore strongly supports the incorporation of a second foreign language in the curriculum (p. 97865).

In the new educational law, Organic Law 3/2020, of December 29, which amends Organic Law 2/2006, of May 3, on Education, mention is again made of the promotion of multilingualism in its fifth additional provision. In this way, the EU is still committed to bilingual education, and, to this end, they emphasize the permanent training of all teachers (Art. 102) in foreign languages, regardless of their specialty.

This interest in improving language learning was also due to the poor results of the specific subjects (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009) as mentioned above. Gómez et al. (2014) mention that there are some students who finish the compulsory education, that is, Primary and Secondary, after having studied English language for twelve years, and are not able to acquire the B2 level, and, in many cases, not even B1 within the *Common*

European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). These poor results are perpetuated over time. Spain occupies the 34th position in the world regarding its level of English, tied with Nigeria, and has fallen 4 positions down compared to previous years (EF EPI, 2020). For this reason, to address this problem, AICLE arises as an alternative that allows devote more time of exposure to the new language (Chiva-Bartoll & Salvador-García, 2018).

The measures taken by public administrations have rapidly turned Spain into one of the European leaders in the CLIL practice (Coyle et al., 2010). In the vast majority of cases, around 95%, the foreign language in CLIL is English (Nikula et al., 2016). The number of publications on this topic has been increasing in recent years, as it can be seen in various CLIL bibliographic reviews (Cimermanová, 2021), and especially in the subject of Physical Education (Gil-López et al., 2021).

Despite this, the time of exposure to English outside schools is still insufficient and is considered as an obstacle to achieve the objectives set. Barrios & Milla-Lara (2020) consider it a key factor in the learning of English both in its teaching as a specific subject and through bilingual programs. If we really want to address this problem from a global perspective, we should encourage exposure to the language beyond the classroom walls, as other countries have done for years, as is the case in Portugal, by avoiding dubbing films. In this way, if there were a context outside the school in which language learning was useful, it would help to motivate students to learn the language. Independently of this, it can be said that the incorporation of bilingual education in Spain is a reality today. More and more schools are introducing bilingual programs in their classrooms. However, their questioning and criticism is constant (Fernández-Barrionuevo, 2009), and one can find claims in the media almost daily questioning these programs.

These criticisms may be due to various factors. One of the most likely reasons could be the volatility of the legal framework, since, despite the fact that multilingualism and language teaching are unquestionable goals for any government, the instability of education laws does not seem to help their development (Chiva-Bartoll & Salvador-García, 2018). In addition to the critical voices from the educational community, there is a need for agreement on a new education law or a State Pact for Education. This is unlike what is about to happen, which is a new bill whose duration, as everything seems to indicate, will be determined, like the previous ones, by the length of time the party that has approved it happens to last in the Government.

Content

It seems logical that if students have a greater number of hours of exposure to a foreign language, their level of mastery will increase. Nevertheless, are there any other consequences? Most of the research about bilingualism emphasizes the benefits that such a program has produced in improving English or any other language, but few of those go beyond this and suggest other consequences. Similarly, if one compares an intervention giving priority to English with respect to a control group, it is clear that the first group will obtain better results in the language level.

Marsh et al. (2000) in a large-scale longitudinal study in Hong Kong found that teaching other subjects through English had moderately negative results. It should be mentioned that this research only included students with a late immersion (in high school), and therefore English was perceived by the students as difficult.

In this regard, Calleja-Lameiras & Rodríguez-González (2015) indicate that those learners who participate in CLIL experiences have a high risk of not learning the basic content of the subject, since they had to spend a great deal of time understanding a language that is foreign to them.

Similar results can be found in other studies. Madrid (2011) states that, by the end of primary education, students have not developed their language skills sufficiently, and therefore they are at a disadvantage compared to monolingual students. It also points out that less optimal academic performance levels are obtained among primary school students who study the subjects in L2 compared to their peers who study them in Spanish.

Anghel et al. (2016) report that students who learn Natural Science in their mother tongue score slightly higher marks than those who learn it through CLIL. In addition, they found statistically significant differences in favor of those students with a higher socio-economic level, which is a topic to be addressed later.

Along these same lines, Fernández-Riesgo (2017) shows deficiencies in learning on the part of the student of the contents related to Natural Sciences taught in English. Students have problems learning concepts from the curricular area taught in English, and they incur issues in expressing said contents and concepts in Spanish.

These are similar results to those published by Otwinowska & Foryś (2017) in primary schools in Poland, where non-CLIL students score higher in Science, but not significantly higher than the CLIL groups (7.97 for non-CLIL, 7.36 for CLIL: $p = .078$). However, feelings of frustration and resentment are evident in CLIL students.

The results of these studies can be understood from the perspective of the Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1994) which argues that students' working memory may be overloaded when simultaneously processing new content and the foreign language. This could lead to worse results for those bilingual groups.

Bravo-Torija et al. (2016) compared two CLIL groups by introducing digital notebooks in one of them, and their results were that, although both groups improved over the course, the notebook group scored better in identifying the main idea and secondary ideas, as well as in establishing relationships with previous knowledge.

As can be seen in this last paper, lower levels are still observed in key aspects, such as identifying the main idea, that can be corrected by introducing other elements.

In the specific case of the subject of Physical Education, various studies have been carried out in which the decrease in motor engagement time in classes has been evidenced, or, in other words, a decrease in the time that students are in movement has been observed (Martínez-Hita & García-Cantó, 2017; Martínez-Hita et al., 2023). In this sense, Ordóñez-Dios et al. (2024) mentions that this type of teaching, in PE classes, can truly endanger the learning of the contents of the subjects that use another language as a medium for their teaching.

This is where the importance of monitoring the CLIL teaching approaches lies in order to be able to correct any deficiencies that may occur in the implementation of these bilingual programs.

Motivation

The motivation of students towards language learning is one of the main concerns of teachers (Baena et al., 2018), and it is also one of the factors recognized by researchers as key to the success in learning other languages (Ghazvini & Khajehpour, 2011).

In the case of Physical Education, students did not embrace the subject with particular enthusiasm, unlike what is usually published in the relevant literature (Pérez-Murillo, 2013). Along the same lines, Ramos & Ruiz (2011) and Hernando (2015) warn that the foreign language may negatively affect students' interest in the subject of Physical Education.

Gómez-Ruano (2018) points out that students have certain expectations about the area of Physical Education, and the implementation of CLIL may cause them to no longer think the same way about the subject. It may be perceived as tedious and boring by the students. Along the same lines, Gómez-Ruano (2018) mentions that if we add to the above the inherent problems of understanding a foreign language, it can lead to resistance towards the subject of Physical Education.

These results can be seen in research such as Shishido & Kashiwagi (2020) who refer to three reasons why students were inactive during PE sessions: (1) lack of motor or sports skills; (2) unwillingness to participate; and (3) problems experienced in communicating with peers.

In this last section, those who have problems communicating, Codó (2020) states that students with a good command of English are willing to try, but those with a lower level, in general, are not. This does not mean that they refuse to use English completely, but rather that they pronounce English words in a mocking tone or make funny statements. In addition, in extreme cases, several students outright sabotaged CLIL classes. Similarly, several teachers reported difficulties in carrying out the sessions in English. These difficulties are also reflected in other studies (Salvador-García et al., 2018), where students' fear of the language is mentioned, although as they progress in the program, it diminishes.

Other authors go slightly further and suggest that learning a foreign language could generate stress and anxiety in students (Arnaiz & Guillen, 2012; Baena-Extremera & Granero-Gallegos, 2015; Figueras et al., 2011) with all that this may entail, and how harmful this could be to language learning as well as their academic and personal lives.

For this reason, great care must be taken in the planning of bilingual programs in order to avoid these possible consequences, as they may already be happening in some cases, especially if we take into account that students declare that CLIL classes are too challenging for them, and that they experience certain linguistic difficulties (Codó, 2020).

It should not be forgotten that the main objective of PE is to promote lifelong participation in physical activities, and it can only be achieved if students enjoy them (Mitchell

et al., 2013). There is some concern among researchers about the incorporation of English into the PE subject, which could be altering its normal development (Martínez-Hita & García-Cantó, 2017). Gómez-Ruano (2018) also outlines this problem and clarifies that priority should be given to learning the motor skills, which is what is explicitly reflected in the PE curriculum, and English should be used as a vehicular language. In this vein, Martínez-Hita (2022) conducted a study which showed that specific CLIL training improved students' motor engagement time values in bilingual Physical Education classes.

For the above reasons, there is a need to evaluate and monitor bilingual programs in order to mitigate the possible consequences that may be caused by their implementation. Fernández-Barrionuevo and Baena-Extremera (2018) propose strategies to promote the less motivating part of Physical Education in CLIL differentiating by gender. In the case of girls, the introduction of language learning is more positive than in the case of boys. In the latter case, it is the opposite, the boring factor is the language, while the motivating factor is the Physical Education class as such.

Teachers

As is the case with students, in the case of teachers, there is also exhaustion and demotivation that could affect the educational process. It is essential that administrations should take action in this regard before it is too late, given the importance of CLIL in the multilingual aspirations of the Spanish education system (Salvador-García & Chiva-Bartol, 2017).

The above-listed symptoms of exhaustion and demotivation in some cases even lead to stress for teachers when they observe how their students fail to understand explanations and feel insecure about sentence construction. In addition, there is a feeling of frustration as the students' attention is diminished, and there is a loss of engagement motor time as well as time spent on the actual task (Espinosa et al., 2016; Martínez-Hita & García-Cantó, 2017). Subsequent research has demonstrated the difficulty of implementing CLIL in terms of achieving a balance between content and language, which translates into the existence of two profiles: those oriented to the content without paying sufficient attention to the language and those focused on the language without paying sufficient attention to the content (Villabona & Cenoz, 2021).

Teachers have a difficult task ahead of them, as teaching a subject in another language is not easy. Furthermore, it should be taken into account that, as we will see later, teachers have not been trained for this, and that in-service training in bilingualism and specifically in CLIL is conspicuous by its absence. Therefore, teachers need to be patient and have a sense of humor in order to develop their teaching work in the best possible way (Gómez-Ruano, 2018).

The problem already starts at the beginning, as Gutiérrez et al. (2018), in a study on the perception of the competences of students in the Degree in Primary Education with a mention in Physical Education, states that the competences that are least valued are: "Knowledge of a foreign language" and "Computer skills applied to the field of study,"

which are two of the basic pillars on which our educational system is based. However, this is not a new problem, Bruton (2011) already mentioned the need to avoid these serious deficiencies in linguistic competence, as a poor application of this approach would considerably undermine its effectiveness.

The importance of a high level of linguistic competence is unquestionable, but it is equally necessary to complement it with specific training in bilingual methodology. Different studies show the limitations regarding the teachers' knowledge of language beyond a superficial level (Forey & Polias, 2017) along with the difficulties of integrating language and tasks (Constantinou, 2015) in the specific case of Physical Education teachers. But there are not only gaps at the linguistic level, but also at the methodological level of teaching curricular subjects in another language (Cabezas-Cabello, 2010; Estrada, 2021; Pavón et al., 2020).

It is worth noting that it is alarming that the majority of teachers who teach Physical Education in a foreign language have not received methodological training to ensure the correct development of the approach (Ordóñez-Dios et al., 2024). Furthermore, taking into account the good results offered by specific CLIL training in Physical Education (Martínez-Hita, 2022), these facts result in two out of three teachers stating that the use of a foreign language led them to using more directive teaching styles, which is something contrary to what can be expected from a bilingual program.

Therefore, one of the most important lines of action to be carried out as soon as possible is the training in language competence for CLIL teachers, which should become a fundamental axis for the successful implementation of bilingual programs, and specifically in CLIL (Pérez-Cañado, 2015). It should also include specific training on how to plan CLIL sessions, as the mastery of a language does not mean that one possesses sufficient knowledge how to redirect, transmit and teach any of the curricular content through another language.

Furthermore, not only is extra training required of teachers, but participation in bilingual programs demands significantly more planning time (Chiva-Bartoll et al., 2018), which leads to an increased workload (Alfonso & Pladevall-Ballester, 2020; Forey & Cheung, 2019; Salvador-García & Chiva-Bartol, 2017). In some cases, teachers' feelings about this work overload were that they felt being exploited by the system (Codó, 2020). One of the causes of this excessive workload is the lack of CLIL materials (Moore & Lorenzo, 2015; Charunsri, 2019), which means that teachers are required to be continually developing their own materials, in many cases with the best of intentions, but without sufficient knowledge how to do so. As an example, each teacher would be trying to build their own house with the sticks they have, instead of the administrations proposing a group of experts to help create general guidelines on how these bilingual approaches should be carried out, as could be the case with the Active Teaching Units (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2014).

For all these reasons, teachers do not feel that they receive sufficient support from the educational administrations (Chiva-Bartoll et al., 2018), not only within economic terms, but also in terms of work recognition for the permanent contest for replacing teachers, while also facing other long-term problems.

However, if you ask the teachers of these programs, there may be a small reward for which some agree to take part in. This is the opportunity to have groups with a good attitudinal and academic level, thanks to the previous selection made for these bilingual positions. At this point, we can only wonder: is the bilingual school really inclusive?

Inclusive education

It was after the LOE (2006) that a significant change took place, replacing what had previously been known as integration with the principles of standardization and inclusion in the classroom. To this end, they are based on non-discrimination and effective equality in both access to and permanence in the education system (Lorenzo, 2009).

Later, with the LOMCE reform (2013), few changes were introduced in relation to the approach to inclusion. In spite of the fact that Fernández and González (2015) consider that there is a step backwards in terms of coeducation by introducing the possibility of public funding for centres which separate students by sex, a similar line of work to LOE is maintained, as can be seen in its Article 79bis point 2 which states that: “The schooling of students with learning difficulties will be regulated by the principles of standardization and inclusion and will ensure their non-discrimination and effective equality in access to and permanence in the education system” (LOE, p. 54).

This understanding of education emanates from both the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948 and the *Declaration of the Rights of the Child*, which explicitly mention compulsory and free education under conditions of equal opportunity. Furthermore, *UNESCO* (2017) proposes inclusive and equitable quality education as one of the priority objectives for the *Agenda 2030* in the field of education.

In view of the points raised above, it seems contradictory that the only recourse is to subdivide students into categories according to their participation in the bilingual program. These measures have been defined with the fashionable prefix pseudo-inclusive, since, despite starting from inclusive principles, they involve curricular and organizational measures of an exclusive nature (Arnaiz, 2019).

In these terms, we return to a past stage characterized by segregation and separation. Without a doubt, when a class has homogeneity, it is the simplest way to be able to give any lesson, but it can hardly be achieved if it is not in an artificial and sought-after way. However, this approach differs greatly from the positions that consider that the classroom should not distort the reality in which we live, a plural and diverse society just as it should happen in the classroom (García-Rubio, 2017).

Laorden and Penafiel (2010) in an analysis of the management teams’ perception of the operation of bilingual programs highlight that 69% of their respondents state that they find difficult to attend to students with Specific Needs of Educational Support (SNES), with 33% having problems following the lessons in English.

Along the same lines, Pena and Porto (2008) point out the difficulties attending to this type of students by teachers due to the fact that individual attention in these programs is lower. Moreover, teachers consider that these needs must be responded before addressing the learning of a second language.

Durán-Martínez et al. (2020) carried out a study on how these supports are handled in bilingual programs, by clearly distinguishing between Primary and Secondary Education. In Primary schools, support is provided about 47% of the time in the classroom, while in Secondary schools it is provided in a more segregated way.

A recent study by Bustos et al. (2023), contextualized in an area of the Autonomous Community of Madrid, shows how students with special educational needs and educational compensation are enrolled in a significantly higher proportion in non-bilingual centers than in bilingual centers, thereby highlighting the segregation that is carried out through bilingual programs.

For these reasons, the explanation for not including a student in the bilingual program lies in his or her own difficulties, which are increased by a greater effort from the academic point of view (Durán-Martínez et al., 2020). If we add to this the fact that those students with a higher socio-economic level score statistically better results (Anghel et al., 2016) and that the influence of the educational level of the parents also affects them significantly (Pérez-Cañado, 2019), as these same authors mention, the burden of elitism in these types of programs should be questioned. Finally, it remains to be asked where this role of education as a social lift lies.

In this sense, based on the European project CLIL for all: *Attention to Diversity in Bilingual Education* (ADiBE), work is being done in this direction. This is mainly due to criticisms related to elitism and segregation (Gortázar and Taberner 2020) towards the CLIL approach. The one-size-fits-all model (Pérez-Cañado et al. 2021) no longer fits in CLIL scenarios, and it must be adapted to the realities of each context.

Political leaders

Politicians are responsible for designing such bilingual programs. They are often unaware of the teaching and the realities of the classroom (Johnson, 2017). The result can only be educational policies that privilege a second language over the curricular subjects (Paran, 2013).

This is due to what Codó (2020) calls the ‘CLIL policy’ or, in other words, the positization to which academics have put this educational approach, despite the fact that the success of this type of program seems to be more related to the high academic level of the students than to the approach itself (Paran, 2013).

In the results of the studies, positive effects can be observed in relation to language learning, but there is still not enough evidence to know the impact on the curricular subjects used to increase the time of exposure to this new language (Hughes & Madrid, 2019). Therefore, many more studies are needed to compare the oral output of CLIL and non-CLIL learners, while not only emphasizing the amount of use of the new language (Martínez-Adrián, 2020).

Pérez-Cañado (2017) states that non-linguistic subjects, such as Physical Education, are undervalued when this methodological approach is applied. This idea arises because it is easier and has less repercussion when experimenting with the subjects that are less

valued by the educational community than, for example, science subjects (Espinosa et al., 2016). These authors justify the reasons why it is easier to introduce CLIL in Physical Education, highlighting among them (1) the limited amount of theory, which makes it easier not to lower the subject content too much; (2) in many cases, a single teacher teaches at all levels, which makes it easier to implement the bilingual program; (3) sports vocabulary is similar to the terms used in English; and (4) PE is a subject which does not have any weight in the university entrance exam.

Ultimately, it is the teachers of each subject, as well as the researchers, who try to learn a little more about the consequences of implementing a new language in the subject (Martínez-Hita et al., 2022) in relation to improving the quality of bilingual Physical Education by designing sessions that address the CLIL approach, as well as knowing and contributing to improving the quality of the tasks outlined in the subject (Coral & Lleixà, 2013) while using evidence-based education.

Conclusion

Researchers have identified Spain as one of the European countries of reference in the implementation of CLIL. However, the results are not as expected, due to Spain finding itself in the last positions as far as the language mastery, despite the efforts made by the administrations in this line. The educational policies implemented have not managed to develop an effective model of multilingualism yet, and, in the case of proposals with good results, equal opportunities to access them are questioned (Ordóñez-Dios et al., 2024).

It is possible that the expected results may be too ambitious, so it is necessary for public administrations to make a strong commitment to this model if they believe it is the right one to improve the education system. To do so, they must make decisions and set clear guidelines for this language policy.

It is essential to continue researching the consequences of implementing bilingual programs and how it affects the major issues analyzed in this article: subject content, student motivation, teachers, inclusion, and decision-making at the political level.

On the other hand, it is essential to continue studying the repercussions of bilingual programs in the educational context in order to identify their strengths and weaknesses, to learn more about the integration of L2 into other subjects, and to optimize this methodology. Therefore, there is a clear need to evaluate CLIL in order to take action on its implementation, and to amend those aspects which would contribute to improving this approach (Martínez-Hita et al., 2022).

In the case of Physical Education in particular, the health benefits of physical activity for individuals and society are unquestionable. If it is shown that the introduction of a new language may be affecting the normal functioning of the subject, distorting it in some way and making difficult to achieve the objectives, contents and competences, the question should be raised of how to make up for the good reception of a new language in the framework of the subject of Physical Education.

References

- Alfonso, C., & Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2020). Effects of focus on form on primary CLIL students' foreign language performance in task-based oral interaction. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 8(1), 53-79. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.17028.alf>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12305>
- Arnaiz, P., & Guillén, F. (2012). La ansiedad en el aprendizaje de una lengua extranjera en contexto universitario: Diferencias interpersonales. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 17(1), 5-27. <http://hdl.handle.net/10553/43211>
- Arnaiz, P. (2019). La educación inclusiva: Mejora escolar y retos para el siglo XXI. *Participación Educativa. Revista del Consejo Escolar del Estado*, 6(9), 39-52. <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/dam/jcr:559207c7-2901-4d6e-82a3-b016d74adaa3/pe-n9-art03-pilar-arnaiz.pdf>
- Baena-Extremera, A., & Granero-Gallegos, A. (2015). Versión española del Sport Satisfaction Instrument (SSI) adaptado al aprendizaje de la Educación Física bilingüe en inglés. *PortaLinguarum*, 24, 63-76. <http://hdl.handle.net/10481/53800>
- Baena-Extremera, A., Gómez-López, M., & Granero-Gallegos, A. (2017). Aprendizaje de la Educación Física bilingüe a partir de las metas de logro y el clima de aprendizaje. *Porta Linguarum*, 28, 81-93. https://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero28/6%20Baena.pdf
- Baena-Extremera, A., Granero-Gallegos, A., Baños, R., & Ortiz-Camacho, M. (2018). Can Physical Education contribute to learning english? Structural model from self-determination theory. *Sustainability*, 10(10), 3613. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103613>
- Barrios, E., & Milla-Lara, M. D. (2020). CLIL methodology, materials and resources, and assessment in a monolingual context: An analysis of stake holders' perceptions in Andalusia. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 60-80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1544269>
- Bravo-Torija, B., Martínez-Peña, B., Embid, B., Carcelén, N., & Gil-Quílez, M. J. (2016). El reto actual del bilingüismo en Educación Primaria. ¿Cómo conseguir que los alumnos aprendan ciencias y aprendan inglés? *Campo Abierto*, 35(1), 173-187. <http://hdl.handle.net/10662/7203>
- Bruton, A. (2011). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? Re-evaluating some of the research. *System*, 39(4), 523-532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.08.002>
- Bustos, A. J., Peláez, C. & Montero, I. (2023). Bilingüismo y segregación del alumnado con necesidades de apoyo educativo: Un estudio de caso en la Comunidad de Madrid. *Revista de Investigación en Educación*, 21(3), 399-412. <https://doi.org/10.35869/reined.v21i3.4978>
- Cabezas-Cabello, J. (2010). A SWOT analysis of the Andalusian Plurilingualism Promotion Plan (APPP). In P. C. M. L. (Ed.), *Proceeding sof the 23rd GRETA Convention*. Joxman.
- Calleja-Lameiras, C., & Rodríguez-González, M^a M. (2015). La evolución del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE) en Galicia. *Revista de Estudios e Investigación en Psicología y Educación*, 9(1), 19-22. <http://revistas.udc.es/index.php/reipe/article/view/211>
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011>
- Charunsri, K. (2019). The challenges of implementing content language integrated learning in tertiary Education in Thailand: A review and implication of materials. *Advances in Language and Literary studies*, 10(4), 125-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.10n.4p.125>
- Chiva-Bartoll, O., & Salvador-García, C. (2018). Educación Física y plurilingüismo: Una mirada al futuro inmediato. *International Journal of Sports Humanities*, 1, 23-32. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1171947>

- Chiva-Bartoll, O., Salvador-García, C., & Isidori, E. (2018). Nuevas miradas de la Educación Física: Implicaciones del enfoque metodológico CLIL. *Opción*, 34 (87), 835-855. <https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/opcion/article/view/23899/24344>
- Cimermanová I. (2021). A Review of European Research on Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Integratsiya obrazovaniya = Integration of Education.*, 25(2), 192-213. <https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.103.025.202102.192-213>
- Codó, E. (2020). The dilemmas of experimental CLIL in Catalonia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 43(4), 41-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1725525>
- Constantinou, P. (2015). Academic language in Physical Education. *Strategies*, 28(3), 9-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2015.1025169>
- Coral, J., & Lleixà, T. (2013). Las tareas en el aprendizaje integrado de educación física y lengua extranjera (AICLE). Determinación de las características de las tareas mediante el análisis del diario de clase. *Retos: Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, 24(1), 79-84. <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/retos/article/view/34532/18657>
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press
- Durán-Martínez, R., Martín-Pastor, E., & Martínez-Abad, F. (2020). ¿Es inclusiva la enseñanza bilingüe? Análisis de la presencia y apoyos en los alumnos con necesidades específicas de apoyo educativo. *Revista Bordón*, 72(2), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2020.71484>
- EF EPI (2020). Índice EF de nivel de inglés. Una clasificación de 100 países y regiones en función de su nivel de inglés. https://www.ef.com.es/assetscdn/WIBIwq6RdJvcD9bc8Rmd/legacy/_/~~/media/centralef-com/epi/downloads/full-reports/v10/ef-epi-2020-spanish-euro.pdf
- Espinosa, P., Espinosa, J., Espinosa, A., & Pérez, E. (2016). Physical Education through English teaching experience. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 2(2), 239-248. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/340212>
- Estrada, J. L. (2021). Diagnosis of training needs among AICLE teachers in initial training. *European Journal of Child Development, Education and Psychopathology*, 9 (1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.32457/ejpad.v9i1.1402>
- Fernández, N., & González, N. (2015). La LOMCE a la luz de la CEDAW. Un análisis de la coeducación en la última reforma educativa. *Journal of Supranational Policies of Education*, 3, 242-263. <https://revistas.uam.es/jospoe/article/view/5650>
- Fernández-Barrionuevo, E. (2009). Crítica sobre el trabajo en grupos en la EF bilingüe: Consideraciones teóricas y aplicaciones prácticas. *Innovación y experiencias educativas*, 20(1), 1-19. https://archivos.csif.es/archivos/andalucia/ensenanza/revistas/csicsif/revista/pdf/Numero_20/ELISEO_FERNANDEZ_2.pdf
- Fernández-Barrionuevo, E., & Baena-Extremera, A. (2018). Motivation in Physical Education and foreign language learning in CLIL teaching: Gender differences and implications for future studies. *Porta Linguarum*, 30, 207-220. <https://doi.org/10.30827/digibug.54070>
- Fernández-Riesgo, Lucía (2017). Bilingüismo y educación bilingüe en español-inglés en centros de primaria y secundaria de la Comunidad de Madrid. Descripción y análisis. Tesis Doctoral. E-Prints Complutense. <https://eprints.ucm.es/id/eprint/49371/>.
- Fernández-Río, J., Hortigüela, D., & Pérez, A. (2017). Educación bilingüe, streaming y metas sociales en estudiantes de secundaria. *Revista de Educación*, 377(1), 30-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2017-377-352>
- Figueras, S., Flores, C., & González- Davies, M. G. (2011). Educació Física en anglès: Percepcions dels estudiants entorn d'una experiència metodològica en el marc universitari. *Aloma: revista de psicologia, ciències de l'educació i de l'esport Blanquerna*, 29(1), 61-80. <http://www.revistaaloma.net/index.php/aloma/article/view/112>

- Forey, G. & Cheung, L. (2019). The benefits of explicit teaching of language for curriculum learning in the Physical education classroom. *English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 91-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2019.01.001>
- Forey, G., & Polias, J. (2017). Multi-semiotic resources providing maximal input in teaching science through English. In A. Ilinares, & T. Morton (Eds.), *Applied linguistics perspectives on CLIL*, 149-169. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.47.09for>
- García-Rubio, J. (2017). Evolución legislativa de la educación inclusiva en España. *Revista Nacional e Internacional de Educación Inclusiva*, 10(1), 251-264.
- Ghazvini, S. D., & Khajehpour, M. (2011). Attitudes and Motivation in learning English as Second Language in high school students. *ProcediaSocial and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1209-1213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.264>
- Gil-López, V., González-Villora, S., & Hortigüela-Alcalá, D. (2021). Learning foreign languages through content and language integrated learning in physical education: A systematic review. *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria De Didáctica De Las Lenguas Extranjeras*, 35, 165–182. <https://revistaseug.ugr.es/index.php/portalin/article/view/15785>
- Gortázar, L., & Taberner P. A. (2020). La incidencia del programa bilingüe en la segregación escolar por origen socioeconómico en la Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid: Evidencia a partir de PISA. REICE. *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación* 18(4), 219–239.
- Gómez-Ruano, M. A. (2018). Aproximación a la metodología de enseñanza de la Educación Física bilingüe. En A. García, J. J. Vilar, E. Ortega y A. Díaz (Eds.), *El futuro de la Educación Física: Nuevos enfoques y aplicaciones metodológicas* (p. 37-70). Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Murcia.
- Gutiérrez, C., Hortigüela, D., Peral, Z., & Pérez-Pueyo, A. (2018). Percepciones de alumnos del grado de en maestro en Educación Primaria con Mención en Educación Física sobre la adquisición de competencias. *Estudios Pedagógicos* 44(2), 223-239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052018000200223>
- Hernando, A. (2015). *Caracterización de los aspectos metodológicos empleados en la enseñanza de la materia de Educación Física en los centros públicos de secundaria con sección bilingüe en inglés de Castilla y León*. PhD Thesis, Universidad de Burgos, Spain.
- Hughes, S., & Madrid, D. (2019). The effects of CLIL on content knowledge in monolingual contexts. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 48-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1671483>
- Jäppinen, A. K. (2005). Thinking and content learning of mathematics and science as cognitional development in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Teaching through a foreign language in Finland. *Language and Education*, 19(2), 148-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780508668671>
- Johnson, D. C. (2017). Critical ethnography of language policy: A semi-confessional tale. In M. Martin-Jones & D. Martin (Eds.), *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and Ethnographic Perspectives* (p. 105–120). Routledge.
- Laorden, C. & Penafiel, E. (2010). Proyectos bilingües en los centros de la comunidad autónoma de Madrid: Percepción de los equipos directivos. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 28(2), 325-344. <https://revistas.um.es/rie/article/view/98101>
- Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4-17. http://www.laslab.org/wp-content/uploads/language_attitudes_in_clil_and_traditional_efl_classes.pdf
- Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa (LOMCE). *Boletín Oficial del Estado*. Madrid.
- Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación (LOE). *Boletín Oficial del Estado*. Madrid.
- Lorenzo, J. A. (2009). Perspectiva legal de la Educación Especial en España (1970-2007). Hacia la plena integración educativa y social de las personas con discapacidad. En M. Reyes & S. Conejero (Eds.), *El largo camino hacia una educación inclusiva: XV coloquio de Historia de Educación* (p. 495-509). Universidad Pública de Navarra <http://hdl.handle.net/11162/45453>

- Madrid, D. (2011). Monolingual and bilingual students' competence in social sciences. In *Studies in Bilingual Education*, ed. D. Madrid, and S. Hughes, 195–222. Peter Lang.
- Marsh, H., Hau, K., & Kong, C. (2000). Late immersion and language instruction in Hong Kong high schools: Achievement growth in language and non-language subjects. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(3), 302–346. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.70.3.gm047588386655k5>
- Martínez-Adrián, M. (2020). ¿Los juntamos? A study of L1 use in interactional strategies in CLIL vs. NON-CLIL primary school learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 58(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2015-0120>
- Martínez-Hita, F., & García-Cantó, E. (2017). Influencia del bilingüismo en el tiempo de compromiso motor en Educación Física. *Retos: Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, 32, 178-182. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i32.51805>
- Martínez-Hita, F.J. (2022). Formación específica en AICLE en Educación Física para mejorar el tiempo de compromiso motor. *Sportis Science Journal*, 8(2), 227-238 <https://doi.org/10.17979/sportis.2022.8.2.8712>
- Martínez-Hita, F. J., García-Cantó, E., Gómez-López, M., & Granero-Gallegos, A. (2023). Influencia de una educación física bilingüe AICLE en el tiempo de compromiso motor. *E-balonmano Com*, 19(1), 55-66. <https://doi.org/10.17398/1885-7019.19.55>
- Martínez-Hita, F. J., Granero-Gallegos, A., & Gómez-López, M. (2022). Diseño y validación de una herramienta para evaluar AICLE en las sesiones de Educación Física. *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria De Didáctica De Las Lenguas Extranjeras*, 37, 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi37.17795>
- Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (2017). Informe 2017 sobre el Estado del Sistema Educativo: Curso 2015-2016. Secretaría General Técnica.
- Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (2014). Unidades didácticas activas. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. https://www.libreria.educacion.gob.es/libro/unidades-didacticas-activas_178890/
- Mitchell, S. A., Oslin, J. L., & Griffin, L. L. (2013). *Teaching sport concepts and skills: A tactical games approach for ages 7 to 18*. Human Kinetics.
- Moore, P. & Lorenzo F. (2015). Task-based learning and content and language integrated learning materials design: Process and product. *The Language Learning Journal* 43 (3), 334-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1053282>
- Nikula, T., Dafoux, E., Moore, P., & Smit, U. (2016). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832%2F9781783096145>
- Nikula, T. (2010). Effects of CLIL on a teacher's classroom language use. In Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Tarja Nikula & Ute Smit (eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*, 105–123. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.7.06nik>
- Ordóñez-Dios, A., Bores-García, D., & Polo-Recuero, B. (2024). Methodological adaptations and training needs of bilingual Physical Education teachers. *Retos*, 61, 267–276. [https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v61.107196Otwinowska, A. & Forys. M. \(2017\). They learn the CLIL way, but do they like it? Affectivity and cognition in upper-primary CLIL classes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20\(5\), 457-480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1051944>](https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v61.107196Otwinowska, A. & Forys. M. (2017). They learn the CLIL way, but do they like it? Affectivity and cognition in upper-primary CLIL classes. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 20(5), 457-480. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1051944)
- Paran, A. (2013). Content Language Integrated Learning: Panacea or policy borrowing myth? *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(2), 317-342. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0014>
- Pavón, V., Lancaster, N., & Bretones C. (2020). Key issues in developing teachers' competences for CLIL in Andalusia: Training, mobility, and coordination. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 81-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1642940>
- Pena, C. & Porto, M. D. (2008). Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project. *Porta Linguarum*, 10, 151-161. <https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.31786>
- Pérez-Murillo, M. D. (2013). The students' views on their experience in a Spanish-English bilingual education program in Spain. In C. Abello-Contesse, P. M. Chandler, M. D. López-Jiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán

- (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st Century: Building on Experience* (p. 179–202). Multilingual Matters.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2015). Evaluación de programas CLIL: Diseño y validación de instrumentos. *Revista de Educación Pulso*, 39, 79-112.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2017). Stopping the “pendulum effect” in CLIL research: Finding the balance between Pollyanna and Scrooge. *Applied Linguistics Review* 8(1), 79–99. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-2001>
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2019). CLIL and elitism: myth or reality? *The Language Learning Journal*, 48, 4-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1645872>
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L., Rascón D. & Cueva V. (2021). Identifying difficulties and best practices catering to diversity in CLIL: Instrument design and validation. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1988050>
- Ramos, F. & Ruiz J. V. (2011). La educación física en centros bilingües de primaria inglés-español: De las singularidades propias del área a la elaboración de propuestas didácticas prácticas con AIBLE. *Revista RESLA*, 24(1), 153-170
- Salvador-García, C. & Chiva-Bartoll, O. (2017). CLIL in teaching physical education: Views of the teachers in the Spanish context. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport* 17(3), 1130-1138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2017.03174>
- Salvador-García, C., Chiva-Bartoll, & Vergaz, J. J. (2018). Percepción del alumnado sobre el uso del método AICLE en Educación Física: Estudio de caso. *Retos: Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, 33, 138-142. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i33.53665>
- Serrano, F. (Director). (2020). La chapuza del bilingüismo. [Película; video online]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LUFzaKdGVBY>
- Siepmann, P., Rumlich, D., Matz, F., & Römhild, R. (2021). Attention to diversity in German CLIL classrooms: Multi-perspective research on students’ and teachers’ perceptions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1981821>
- Shishido, T. & Kashiwagi, K. (2020). A reflective practice for improving teacher students’ abilities in conducting CLIL in Physical Education classes in an overseas teaching project. In S. Sasajima, K. Tsuchiya, B. Kavanagh, K. Tanino and S. Suemori (Eds.), *The Journal of the Japan CLIL Pedagogy Association*, 96-113.
- Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. *Learning and Instruction*, 4(4), 295-312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752\(94\)90003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(94)90003-5)
- Rumlich, D. (2020). Bilingual Education in monolingual contexts: A comparative perspective. *The Language Learning Journal* 48(2), 115–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1696879>
- UNESCO (2017). *La educación transforma vidas*. UNESCO.
- Villabona N. & Cenoz, J. (2021): The integration of content and language in CLIL: A challenge for content-driven and language-driven teachers, *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1910703>