

Socioeconomic status and CLIL program intensity: Implications for students' motivation and English exposure in the Community of Madrid Bilingual Program

Forrest Leah Tompkins

Máster en Lingüística Aplicada al Inglés



MÁSTERES
DE LA UAM
2020-2021

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras



Socioeconomic status and CLIL program
intensity: Implications for students'
motivation and English exposure in the
Community of Madrid Bilingual Program

Forrest Leah Tompkins

Tutor: Ana Llinares García

Master's Degree in English Applied Linguistics

Department of English Studies

Faculty of Philosophy and Arts

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Academic year 2020-2021

Abstract

Recent research has praised Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programs for closing class-based achievement gaps in education: when available to all, they may eliminate the correlation between socioeconomic status (SES) and academic performance which is observed in monolingual schools (e.g., Lorenzo et al., 2021). However, public bilingual schools in the Madrid region of Spain are more likely to be accessed by students of advantaged socioeconomic positions (Mediavilla et al., 2019), and their streaming processes may reinforce inequalities among students (Llinares & Evnitskaya, 2021). In line with recent research examining the impact of streaming on socioeconomically disadvantaged students (e.g., Van Mensel et al., 2020) and comparing CLIL students' affective factors and motivation in high exposure (HE) and low exposure (LE) tracks (e.g., Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020; Somers & Llinares, 2021), the present study explores possible differences in SES, CLIL motivation, and exposure to English of HE and LE students at two bilingual (Spanish/English) secondary schools of different overall SES in the Autonomous Community of Madrid (CAM). Like Hidalgo-McCabe (2020), it adopts a critical, sociological perspective on the role of schools in the reproduction of the social status quo, in the transmission of the dominant culture, and in the (de)legitimization of existing forms of symbolic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977, 1986). In addition, this study quantifies differences in SES between tracks and explores how students' CLIL motivation and perceptions of the program may be shaped by their class position. To this end, a questionnaire measuring student's cultural and economic capital, CLIL motivation, perceptions of and preferences for the program, and teachers' use of English was distributed to a sample of LE students and all HE students at a low SES school in a pilot study (Tompkins, forthcoming) and at a high SES school to compare results. At both schools, HE students reported higher levels of cultural capital, CLIL

motivation, and teachers' use of English in CLIL/English subjects than their LE counterparts. Additionally, HE students received more hours of English exposure at the high SES school than the low SES school. Still, the former exhibited lower CLIL motivation, and the students' written responses suggest that this may be related to the extent to which they perceive that English will help them achieve social mobility in their respective socioeconomic contexts. In sum, the greatest access to academic English was disproportionately offered to the highest SES students at the schools in this study, thus further increasing their cultural and symbolic capital, despite their lower assessment of its usefulness.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
1. Introduction	6
2. Theoretical framework.....	9
2.1. Bourdieu on social class.....	10
2.1.1. Forms of capital.....	10
2.1.2. Education and cultural reproduction	11
2.2. Motivation for CLIL	13
3. An overview of the literature.....	14
3.1. SES and educational outcomes: sociology and applied linguistics.....	14
3.2. Socioeconomic segregation in Spanish schools.....	17
3.3. CLIL and SES in the Spanish context	19
3.4. CLIL in the Madrid Region.....	21
4. Materials and methods	24
4.1. Research context	24
4.1.1. Clearwater High School.....	25
4.1.1.1. Socioeconomic backdrop	25
4.1.1.2. Participants and curriculum	26
4.1.2. Pineview High School	27
4.1.2.1. Socioeconomic backdrop	27
4.1.2.2. Participants and curriculum	27
4.2. Instrument	28
4.3. Procedure	31
5. Results.....	32
5.1. Student demographics.....	32
5.2. Socioeconomic indicators.....	35
5.2.1. Cultural capital	36
5.2.2. Economic capital	41
5.2.3. Immigration and SES	44
5.2.4. Unknown responses in educational and occupational levels.....	47
5.3. Teachers' use of English in the classroom	48
5.4. CLIL motivation	51
5.5. Student perceptions of the program.....	53
6. Discussion.....	61

6.1. Limitations	64
7. Concluding remarks	66
8. References.....	68
Appendix.....	76

1. Introduction

Since the turn of the century, the European Union has aimed to increase multilingualism to “unite people,” “strengthen intercultural understanding,” and enhance employability and mobility (European Commission, n.d.). In response, educational institutions throughout Europe have increased the time and resources dedicated to foreign language learning and teaching, especially in the form of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programs, where content subjects such as natural science and history are taught through a vehicular language different from the students’ mother tongue(s). The vehicular language of choice is overwhelmingly the global lingua franca English, for which reason CLIL is often promoted as a means of increasing social mobility (Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020). In Spain, the Comunidad de Madrid Bilingual Program (henceforth, MBP) is one example of an English language CLIL program. At the secondary level, admission to the program is a two-step process in which families first choose whether to send their children to a bilingual or monolingual school, and bilingual schools then place, or “stream,” students into high exposure (HE) or low exposure (LE) tracks according to their proficiency in English, determined by an external language examination. Once enrolled, HE students study academically salient subjects in English, while LE students’ English exposure is limited to more practical subjects such as PE, technology and/or arts and crafts, as well as their foreign language classes. As I have written elsewhere (Tompkins, forthcoming, p. 2), “[b]oth self-selection (Mediavilla et al., 2019) and streaming (Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020) have come under scrutiny, as they may lead to ‘cream skimming’ in which the most socioeconomically and academically select students enter bilingual schools and HE tracks, respectively.”

This criticism has sparked research into the streaming process and its relationship with students' English use, cognitive engagement, motivation, affective factors, and the utility of CLIL for their futures. For instance, Llinares & Evnitskaya (2021) found that, during lessons taught in English, HE students used this language more often than their LE counterparts across regulative and instructional registers (i.e., both when the focus was on planning or content). Teachers also engaged HE students' higher order thinking skills to a greater extent regardless of the language of instruction. As for affect, HE students in Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo McCabe's (2020) study expressed feelings of superiority in relation to their LE peers, and LE students in Somers & Llinares's (2021) study exhibited lower levels of motivation, which the authors attribute to a curriculum that puts students in a situation where "CLIL is unable to do much for them in the future" (p. 852). However, to my knowledge research into socioeconomic factors which may mediate these disparities between HE and LE has been scarce, and the research outlined above has primarily taken place in schools of medium to high socioeconomic status (henceforth, SES). In this scenario, the present study explores how SES relates to streaming, students' opinions about CLIL, and their motivation for it, while also building on Llinares & Evnitskaya (2021) by addressing teachers' use of English across Christie's (2005) registers. It adopts a critical, sociological view of schools as actors in the reproduction of the social status quo, which motivates the following research questions:

RQ1. How do enrollment rates in HE and LE tracks compare between schools of different SES?

RQ2. Within schools, how does students' SES compare between HE and LE tracks?

RQ3. How do students perceive the distribution of their teachers' use of English across LE and HE tracks at schools of different SES?

RQ4. How do students' intrinsic and instrumental CLIL motivation vary across LE and HE tracks at schools of different SES? How are such differences reflected in students' perceptions of the differences between tracks and/or their preferences for learning through English or Spanish?

The responses to these questions build on the results from a pilot study (Tompkins, forthcoming) in which year 10 students' SES, perceptions of teachers' use of English, and CLIL motivation were analyzed quantitatively in HE and LE tracks at one school in a low SES area of the Madrid region. In this context, students in the HE track reported higher SES, more frequent use of English by their teachers across registers, and greater intrinsic CLIL motivation (i.e., motivation from the enjoyment of CLIL classes), despite sharing similarly high levels of instrumental CLIL motivation (i.e., motivation from the perceived usefulness of CLIL to achieve an ulterior motive) with their LE counterparts. These discrepancies between tracks motivated further investigation to determine, on the one hand, whether they held true in other SES areas and, on the other, how they relate to students' perceptions of the program. Thus, the present study repeats the pilot study (Tompkins, forthcoming) in a high SES area of the Madrid region in order to compare results. Additionally, qualitative data on students' perceptions and preferences for CLIL – which was collected, but not analyzed nor reported, during the pilot study – is analyzed, reported, and compared between schools here (see section 5.5.).

After this introductory chapter, the master's thesis proceeds as follows. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical frameworks informing the researcher's understanding of social class, social reproduction, the role of schools, and student motivation. Chapter 3 reviews recent research on SES and achievement gaps, socioeconomic segregation in schools, CLIL and educational equity, and the streaming process in the MBP. Next, Chapter 4 details the

present study's research context, instrument, and methods. Results are presented in Chapter 5 and further discussed in Chapter 6. Finally, Chapter 7 concludes the project and proposes avenues for future research.

2. Theoretical framework

As CLIL programs continue to gain popularity throughout Spain and Europe, increasing attention has been paid to their outcomes in areas such as educational equity (e.g., Lorenzo et al., 2021; Llinares & Evnitskaya, 2021; Mediavilla et al., 2019) and students' motivation and affect (e.g., Somers & Llinares, 2021; Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020). However, as Lorenzo et al. (2021) and Somers & Llinares (2021) point out, applied linguistics lacks the theoretical constructs to evaluate social inequalities and learner motivation specific to CLIL, for which reason they must be borrowed (e.g., from sociology) or created (as Somers and Llinares (2021) have done for motivation). The present paper follows suit, employing a sociological understanding of social class and SES, as well as Somers and Llinares's (2021) "CLIL motivation."

Although motivation and its effects are frequently addressed in bi/multilingualism and second language acquisition (SLA) research, Block (2014) demonstrates that social class has been explored in a rather cursory manner, and often from a culturalist perspective emphasizing race/ethnicity or national identities without addressing the common class experiences that influence learners' access to and use of additional languages. Notably, such experiences may be intertwined with motivation, as "social class embodied in habitus¹ shapes how learners engage with and orient to second language learning processes" (Block,

¹ For Bourdieu, habitus refers to class-based dispositions, such as ways of walking, standing, speaking, eating etc. More on this in Subsection 2.1.2.

2014, p. 154). This chapter presents both concepts with the aim of informing subsequent discussion about their overlapping roles in the MBP.

2.1. Bourdieu on social class

Perhaps the most detailed theoretical framework defining social class is that of Bourdieu (1977, 1986); his ideas dominate the definitions of class and SES² employed in sociological and sociolinguistic research today (Block, 2014). For Bourdieu (1986), definitions of social class must extend beyond economic wealth to include the social and cultural factors that maintain social status quos. He also argues that education systems reproduce inequalities by normalizing the cultural knowledge and habitus of the upper classes, while devaluing that of the lower classes (Bourdieu, 1977).

2.1.1. Forms of capital

Bourdieu (1986) contends that capital, or accumulated labor, underlies “the regularities of the social world” (p. 241) and prevents true meritocracy. The amount of capital that an individual holds in relation to others thus determines his/her position in a social space (Bourdieu, 1991). More specifically, there are three main forms of capital which combine to determine social class in Western societies (Bourdieu, 1986):

- **Economic capital**, comprising income and other financial and/or property assets which may be directly converted into money;
- **Cultural capital**, in its *embodied state* (e.g., knowledge, accent, posture), *objectified state* (e.g., cultural goods: books, art, instruments, etc.) and *institutionalized state*

² As I wrote in Tompkins (forthcoming, p. 6), “Bourdieu (1977, 1986, 1991) and Block (2014) use the term ‘social class’ rather than ‘socioeconomic status.’ The two are often used interchangeably in sociological and sociolinguistic research (e.g., Babbie, 2011), but operational definitions of the latter are usually limited to some combination of income, education, and occupation, whereas (at least in theory) the former also encompasses attitudes and tastes developed during one’s upbringing (Bourdieu’s (1977) ‘habitus’).”

(e.g., academic qualifications), all of which may be indirectly converted into money by, for example, providing access to employment; and

- **Social capital**, or one's social connections and the extent of their respective capital, which may also be indirectly converted into money when, for example, a family friend helps one get a job.

Elsewhere, Bourdieu adds a fourth dimension: **symbolic capital**, “commonly called prestige, reputation, fame, etc., which is the form assumed by the different kinds of capital when they are perceived and recognized as legitimate” (1991, p. 230). For example, two native Spanish speakers may possess the same degree of fluency in a foreign language and, thus, the same degree of cultural capital in this regard, but the speaker of the more prestigious language (say, English versus Arabic in the Spanish context) will possess more symbolic capital. Thus, symbolic capital reflects the degree of social recognition of one's capital, which varies between contexts or “fields.”

2.1.2. Education and cultural reproduction

In Bourdieu's (1986) framework, the upper classes have a near monopoly on socially recognized cultural capital because it requires *time* to develop and transmit, time which economic capital provides. For instance, when economic capital is abundant, caregivers will have more free time to read with their children, take them to museums or concerts, help with schoolwork, and so on.³ Additionally, older children are able to delay their entry into the job market and continue their schooling, thereby acquiring further educational qualifications and the **habitus**, or permanent dispositions (e.g., ways of standing, speaking, walking, feeling, thinking), considered legitimate in educational and professional contexts.

³ Such work may also be purchased by hiring nannies or tutors.

The structure of the distribution of cultural capital first develops in the home, and is then reproduced by the educational system, which is responsible for transmitting the (dominant) culture from generation to generation (Bourdieu, 1977). The extent to which children are familiar with this culture, and the linguistic models through which it is transmitted, will vary according to their upbringing. In Bourdieu's (1977, p. 494) terms, the upper-class children enter school equipped with the "instruments of appropriation" for decoding and internalizing the cultural capital (e.g., academic texts, literature, history, music, art) upon which they will be assessed. However, schools do not explicitly teach these "instruments of appropriation" to a satisfactory extent; rather, they allow cultural capital to become the "monopoly of those social classes capable of transmitting [it] by their own means," (i.e., with the time and resources required for transmission) (p. 494).

At the same time, schools present "academic" linguistic and cultural competencies as objective, classless norms to which everyone has equal access, attributing educational success to merit and hard work and thus increasing its symbolic value (Bourdieu, 1977). Those endowed with legitimized cultural capital continue to accumulate it at an advantage, and its unequal distribution is silently reproduced. The educational system may only escape these "laws of cultural transmission" and ensure equity by explicitly teaching the "instruments of appropriation" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 493), in other words, by explicitly teaching academic literacy skills.

To date sociologists and researchers in the field of (content and) second language learning (e.g., Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020) continue to employ Bourdieu's (1977, 1986, 1991) ideas to connect learning outcomes with social class. Summarizing recent work on class in SLA, Block (2012, pp. 193-194) writes that "some children come to the task of second language learning in school settings better prepared because they have already acquired a

kind of educational capital which is more the province of middle-class households than working class and poor households.” In the Spanish context, Martín Rojo (2015) explores how teachers’ evaluations of students’ symbolic capital exacerbate its unequal distribution: both immigrant children learning Spanish and Spanish children enrolled in bilingual programs (often with English as a medium of instruction) complete their secondary studies in an additional language, yet teachers’ differential expectations for these groups produce differential curriculums which recognize and develop the cultural capital of only the latter. Teachers’ expectations for different groups were also observed in Llinares and Evnitskaya’s (2021) study, which identified different interactional patterns in HE and LE groups in the MBP, where higher order thinking skills were more enhanced in HE. Such differences in HE/LE motivate the focus on SES in the present study, which contributes to existing research by exploring how the benefits of CLIL may be differentially distributed along class lines.

2.2. Motivation for CLIL

For Bourdieu (1977), students’ motivation is tied to the value that educational systems assign to their existing cultural capital. When lower-class children realize that their symbolic products and habitus “have less value on the educational market [...] and on the economic market” because “they are more removed from [...] the educational norms of those social classes capable of imposing the [...] criteria of evaluation” (p. 495), many unconsciously gauge their probabilities for success as being quite low and become reluctant to invest the time and effort necessary to compete with higher-class peers. In this way, educational systems encourage their “self-elimination” while maintaining the illusion of an academic meritocracy: they fail to acknowledge that “the laws of the academic market determine aspirations by determining the extent to which they can be satisfied” (p. 496). Following this

line of thought, Block explains that “in foreign language contexts, long-term expectations as regards academic achievement might differ considerably along social class lines, with high expectations being inclusive of a positive disposition towards the study of a foreign language and low expectations framing such study as of little use,” (2007, p. 189, as cited in Block, 2012, p. 195). In other words, higher SES students accustomed to educational success may be more motivated to learn the foreign language, especially in the case of English, which Block (2012) links to middle-class aspirations of global citizenship.

These relationships between social class, academic success and student motivation justify the present study’s focus on motivation and SES in the MBP, which groups students according to their success on English language exams. It employs Somers’s and Llinares’s (2021) notion of intrinsic and instrumental “CLIL motivation,” which is specific to learning content *and* language in an integrated way, unlike former approaches that addressed motivation for content and language separately. Adapting Gardner’s (1985) integrative and instrumental motivations in SLA to the CLIL context, they define intrinsic motivation as “the participation in CLIL classes for its inherent satisfaction,” and instrumental motivation as the perceived “usefulness of participating in a CLIL programme as a means to achieve an ulterior motive” (in this case academic or professional) (Somers & Llinares, 2021, pp. 843-844).

3. An overview of the literature

3.1. SES and educational outcomes: sociology and applied linguistics

In sociology and other disciplines, definitions of SES draw on Bourdieu’s (1986) forms of capital, operationalizing it as a composite variable including education (cultural capital),

income (economic capital), and occupation (primarily economic capital)⁴ (e.g., National Center for Educational Statistics, 2012). When this operationalization is not possible (e.g., due to privacy laws, underage participants, school regulations, etc.), other indicators of cultural and economic capital, such as books or other possessions, may be employed (Broer et al., 2019). The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), for instance, operationalizes SES as parental education, books at home and home possessions, while the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) also includes parental occupation and family wealth (Murillo & Martínez-Garrido, 2018). In sum, the oft-employed notion of SES may be operationalized differently according to the resources/data available to the researcher (Broer et al., 2019).

In an overview of recent studies on socioeconomic inequality and educational outcomes, Broer et al. (2019, Chapter 2) highlight the consistently positive correlation between SES and academic achievement, which varies in magnitude across social and educational contexts. Some experiences constraining the educational attainment of lower SES students include underfunded schools, overcrowded classrooms, absent parents, poor housing, peer/social pressures, poor home literacy environments, and a lack of extracurricular activities and academic tutoring (Block, 2014). In line with Bourdieu (1977), many sociologists conclude that differences in available capital influence short- and long-term educational outcomes (e.g., Buchmann, 2002), exploring either one form of capital (e.g., Lareau, 2011 on economic; Paino & Renzulli, 2013 on cultural; Rogošić & Baranović, 2016 on social) or some combination thereof (e.g., Barone, 2006).

⁴ Social capital is often left out of SES measures, perhaps because it is more difficult to operationalize in survey research.

In the USA, sociology of education research suggests that SES-based achievement gaps are well-established before the onset of schooling (Downey & Condrón, 2016) and thus reflect larger societal inequalities, as supported by international data (Condrón, 2011). This has led some (e.g., Downey & Condrón, 2016) to question the critical view of schools (e.g., Bourdieu, 1977, 1986) which positions educational institutions as primary actors in the reproduction of the social status quo. However, it is also true that disadvantaged and minoritized groups (whether due to SES, race/ethnicity, or academic performance) perform better academically when integrated with more advantaged peers (e.g., Schwartz, 2010; Reardon & Owens, 2014) and worse when concentrated with similarly disadvantaged peers⁵ (e.g., Aikens & Barbarin, 2008; Horn, 2013), leading scholars to warn against socioeconomic segregation between schools (Aikens & Barbarin, 2008) and within them via streaming (Horn, 2013). In sum, schools do not create social inequality, but some policies and practices, such as the distribution of students, reproduce existing inequalities and could be altered to reduce them.⁶ Indeed, many researchers position education as the key institution in which social class develops (see Block, 2014, for an overview), and large national and international research projects use socioeconomic segregation as a measure of educational equity (e.g., Reardon & Owens, 2014; Murillo & Martínez-Garrido, 2018).

While sociologists continue theorizing and debating about social class, its reproduction, and its role in education (e.g., Evans et al., 2010; Downey & Condrón, 2016), few applied linguists discuss how language and class intersect to maintain social status quos, instead mentioning SES superficially or focusing on micro-level experiences and outcomes (Block,

⁵ In addition to peer influence, teachers' expectations of students, stemming from their evaluations of students' existing cultural and symbolic capital, may also produce such negative effects (Martín Rojo, 2015).

⁶ This fact is not lost on Downey & Condrón (2016), who argue that schools may either reduce, reproduce, or exacerbate existing inequalities depending on the context and policy in question.

2014). Block (2014) provides a detailed overview of research on social class in sociolinguistics, bi/multilingualism, and SLA; here I will highlight that which is most relevant to learning content through English as a vehicular language. Within English programs, social class may influence acquisition: Olshtain et al. (1990, as cited in Block, 2014, p. 148) found that middle class Israeli adolescents had higher levels of Cummins's (2000) cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) than their lower-class peers, which correlated with better performance in their English classes. Elsewhere, class-based differences were also observed in the quality of English language learning programs available to students: in Korea (Park, 2009) and India (Ramanathan, 2005), higher class students enroll in courses which better prepare them to use English for international communication, academic and professional work, while lower-class students' English studies only serve them in their immediate, local environments. Block (2014, p. 141) concludes that, despite promises of upward social mobility for English learners, the symbolic value of different Englishes varies across contexts: that which is considered more academic and Western holds greater prestige in the global market. Indeed, in the MBP, where HE students study more cognitively challenging subjects in English, and LE students are limited to other more practical subjects, the symbolic value of participation in each track is quite different (see further discussion in Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020 and Section 3.4.).

3.2. Socioeconomic segregation in Spanish schools

In an in-depth analysis of the 2015 PISA data on the "economic, social and cultural situation" of students' families, Murillo and Martínez-Garrido (2018) found that Spanish schools are some of the most socioeconomically segregated in the European Union, surpassed only by Eastern European countries such as Bulgaria, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Romania and

Hungary. For socioeconomic segregation, Spanish schools score 0.38 on the Gorard index (of unevenness, i.e., 38% of students would need to change schools to achieve an even distribution of students of different SES) and 0.32 on the Isolation index (i.e., there is a 32% probability that students of a minority socioeconomic group (of high or low SES) will go to school with others from their same group). Moreover, children with the highest SES are the most segregated, suggesting an “elitization” of the school system. However, these figures vary between regions: the Balearic Islands, Galicia, and Castilla and León have some of the lowest school segregation rates in the European Union (0.27/0.25, 0.28/0.27 and 0.30/0.26 on the Gorard and Isolation indices, respectively), while Madrid has the highest (0.41/0.33).

Straying from the general trend, segregation rates in Madrid are above the national average for the students of lowest SES, but slightly below average for those of highest SES (Murillo & Martínez-Garrido, 2018). Thus, while most Spanish schools experience an “elitization” process segregating the highest SES students, Madrid schools also observe high levels of segregation for the lowest SES students. Murillo and Martínez-Garrido (2018, pp. 54-55) attribute these differences to Madrid’s school selection policies and “quasi-market systems” in education (i.e., allowing parents to choose freely between schools according to established ranking systems), as well as the implementation of the MBP and its selection processes, according to which “los niños, niñas y adolescentes con más recursos asisten a este tipo de centros, dejando a los que más dificultades tienen fuera de los mismos”⁷ [children and adolescents with more resources attend these types of centers, leaving behind those who have the most difficulties]⁸. Importantly, these are *indirect* causes of school segregation: higher SES parents may pay more attention to ranking systems and/or invest

⁷ For further discussion, see Section 3.4.

⁸ This translation is my own.

more resources into their children's English studies, which in turn allows them to enroll in higher-quality schools and/or bilingual programs, but children are not excluded from centers nor programs based on their SES.

3.3. CLIL and SES in the Spanish context

In increasingly globalized economies and increasingly competitive job markets, one form of cultural capital is gaining unprecedented importance: language. Bourdieu (1991) wrote extensively about language as capital with symbolic power, especially as regards the socially valued forms of a majority language, but these ideas must now be extended to include second/foreign languages.⁹ Outside of Anglophone countries, professional proficiency in socially recognized foreign languages (especially English) is positioned as the key to social mobility (European Commission, n.d.), so the way this linguistic capital is distributed largely influences the socioeconomic prospects of youth coming of age today.

Nearly three decades ago, the European Commission established a 1 + 2 policy under which Europeans would learn two foreign languages in addition to their mother tongue (European Commission, 1995). To meet this goal without adding hours to the school day, many member states developed CLIL programs, in which content subjects are taught through a second/foreign language. CLIL has expanded rapidly throughout Europe because it increases exposure to the target language, and it is thought to help learners gain communicative competence "more quickly, naturally and effortlessly" than traditional foreign language teaching (Comunidad de Madrid, 2016, p. 55). In Spain, CLIL has been credited with granting children of all socioeconomic groups access to a foreign language

⁹ Block (2014) provides some guidance in this direction, outlining how applied linguists can begin to discuss class issues more critically.

education because it is offered at public primary and secondary schools at no additional cost to the parents (Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020; Lorenzo et al., 2021).

Indeed, Andalusia established its first bilingual schools in low income rural and urban areas¹⁰ with the aim of closing the gap in foreign language acquisition between students with and without access to private language academies (Lorenzo et al., 2021). Their efforts have been largely successful: Rascón and Bretones (2018) and Lorenzo et al. (2021) demonstrate that Andalusian bilingual schools promote educational equity in both English and content subjects. While Andalusian monolingual schools exhibit a “staircase effect” in which students’ SES directly correlates with their academic performance,¹¹ no such correlation is observed in the region’s bilingual schools, and this has been ascribed to the role of the CLIL program through discriminant analysis (Rascón & Bretones, 2018). In fact, student performance at lower SES bilingual schools in Andalusia is on par with that of higher SES bilingual schools, perhaps because a “language across the curriculum” approach supports the academic literacy of lower SES students (Lorenzo et al., 2021). Rather than taking for granted students’ knowledge of the language of instruction, as in monolingual schools, successful bilingual curriculums promote greater language awareness and may thus moderate differences in language capital that could otherwise lead to SES-based achievement gaps (Lorenzo et al., 2021). In other words, they may teach Bourdieu’s (1977) “instruments of appropriation” more explicitly than their monolingual counterparts.

¹⁰ School segregation rates in Andalusia are lower than in Madrid and Spain in general (0.32/0.28 on Gorard and Isolation indices, respectively), but higher than in the Balearic Islands, Castilla and León and Galicia.

¹¹ As in Bourdieu’s (1977) theories of cultural reproduction in education.

3.4. CLIL in the Madrid Region

Unfortunately, studies carried out in the Community of Madrid have not been as promising: they indicate that the public bilingual program may reproduce or exacerbate inequalities among students (Anghel et al., 2016; Mediavilla et al., 2019; Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020; Llinares & Evnitskaya, 2021). Unlike in Andalusia, admission to the MBP at the secondary level is determined by both school choice and streaming, which may play a role in the social stratification of the student population (Mediavilla et al., 2019; Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020). Regarding school choice, Mediavilla et al. (2019) found that, when choosing between bilingual and monolingual schools for their children, families seem to self-select based on perceptions of the former as academically rigorous institutions. They report that higher SES students have “abandoned monolingual public schools, to mostly concentrate in bilingual schools,” whereas lower SES students remain in monolingual schools, perhaps with the hope of better ensuring academic success (*ibid.*, p. 18). At the primary level the academic benefits of CLIL indeed seem to vary along socioeconomic lines: in Anghel et al.’s (2016) study, participation in the MBP had a negative effect on the learning of social studies and science content through English for students whose parents did not have a college education. As a result of these factors, bilingual schools become “more select in socioeconomic and academic terms” than monolingual schools, which Mediavilla et al. (2018) refer to as “cream skimming” (p. 14). Such uneven access to bilingual programs, their potential benefits, and thus to English may help higher SES students to develop additional language capital while lower SES students are left behind.

As for streaming, at the end of primary school MBP students take an external English proficiency examination which determines their exposure to English at the secondary level: those who pass may enroll in the HE track, and those who do not are enrolled in the LE track,

where CLIL subjects are fewer and less academically salient. In line with recent research on educational streaming, which observes that socioeconomically disadvantaged students are less likely to enter more selective tracks (e.g., Van Mensel et al., 2020 on streaming in CLIL; Horn, 2013 for non-CLIL), Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe (2020) found that HE students in the MBP possess greater social and cultural capital than their LE peers, as reflected in their use of private teachers when preparing for the English proficiency examination (p. 8). Once admitted, HE students “receive more opportunity to develop English in contexts that will allow them to transfer that proficiency later on,” (Somers & Llinares, 2021, p. 852) while also gaining symbolic capital from doing so: educators, parents and students alike place a higher value on the HE curriculum since it teaches more cognitively demanding subjects through English, which in turn may influence teachers’ expectations of students and their approach to content (Llinares & Evnitskaya, 2021; Martín-Rojo, 2015).

These findings were confirmed in Hidalgo-McCabe’s (2020) dissertation on streaming and students’ socialization in different socioeconomic areas of Madrid, which analyzed the interplay between stakeholders’ (administrators, teachers, and parents) stances and pedagogical practices in HE and LE classrooms. Highlighting the meritocratic logic which justifies the streaming process by attributing participation to academic excellence, she found that the positioning of HE students as “high achievers” was even more pronounced in the working class context. Moreover, she linked the HE program’s more dialogic teaching practices with the development of prestigious *habitus* in her year 7 participants, adding that they were “being immersed in a set of ritualised practices that could be distinctive of a social position at the school,” (p. 284-285). Thus, from a sociological standpoint, the HE CLIL program is a means of accumulating both cultural (language

knowledge) and symbolic (prestige) capital, but how and to whom such capital is awarded determines which social groups benefit most from the MBP.

MBP students are well aware of the educational and professional benefits of participating in the HE track. In Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe (2020), students in both tracks thought HE was better for their futures, associating it with more career opportunities and social mobility. Furthermore, HE students “thought that they belonged to an elite, to the best class, thus denoting that they felt superior” (p. 11). This awareness of unequal opportunities may impact motivation: Somers and Llinares (2021) found “low-intensity students to be less strongly motivated, intrinsically and instrumentally,” which the authors attributed to curricular differences, namely, that LE students “have much fewer CLIL subjects (6 h per week), which are also less ‘academically inclined,’” (p. 849). Both groups understand the significance of English for their futures, as evidenced by their relatively high instrumental motivation levels, but “low proficient students find themselves in a situation where because of the limited exposure and academic status of the subjects, CLIL is unable to do much for them in the future” (ibid., p. 852).

In sum, recent studies suggest that the MBP may reinforce social stratification among students. Higher SES students are more likely to choose a bilingual education (Mediavilla et al., 2019), at which point they can use their social and economic resources to obtain the academic support necessary to enter HE programs (Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020). Participation in HE then allows students to accumulate cultural and symbolic capital in the form of foreign language knowledge, which in turn gives them a competitive edge in a globalized job market (European Commission, n.d.). Students from poor socioeconomic backgrounds are eligible to participate in the MBP, but school choice and streaming are more likely to indirectly exclude them than their higher SES peers. Even

so, to my knowledge few researchers have addressed SES differences between HE and LE tracks in the MBP, with the exception of Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe (2020), who observed differences in social and economic capital within a larger study, and Hidalgo-McCabe (2020), who investigated social class and students' socialization. Thus, the present study contributes quantitative data on the socioeconomic landscape of two schools in the MBP, as well as its relationship with student motivation, in order to pinpoint issues deserving of further analysis.

4. Materials and methods

4.1. Research context

In the present study, a 52-item questionnaire measuring students' demographics, SES, perceptions of and motivation for CLIL, and classroom dynamics (see Section 4.2.) was distributed at two public bilingual high schools in the Madrid region of Spain, one in a low SES area and the other in a high SES area, both part of the MBP, during the same academic year (2020-2021). The study was first carried out at the lower SES school in December 2020 as a pilot study (Tompkins, forthcoming), then repeated at the higher SES school in May 2021 to compare results.

In both schools, the extent to which the curriculum is taught in English is regulated by the Spanish Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport's (2017, April 7) order, which specifies the minimum subjects to be taught in English in order to participate in the MBP (and receive the corresponding state funding), yet also allows schools to teach additional subjects in English if there are sufficient resources and demand. The present study focuses on the last year of compulsory secondary education with the intentions of (1) comparing results with parallel data of Llinares and others in the LongAd-CLIL project at a future time, and (2)

observing trends in student motivation and perceptions of the program after having (nearly) completed it. In this grade, LE students receive at least 7 weekly hours of instruction in English and HE students at least 11 hours. Since fewer students were enrolled in HE at the schools in this study, participants included all HE students and a sample of LE students in grade 10 (4th of ESO). Teacher availability and school-specific factors also influenced the selection of participants, as detailed below.

4.1.1. Clearwater High School

4.1.1.1. Socioeconomic backdrop

The first school, here referred to as Clearwater High School, is in a working-class town south of Madrid capital. As compared to the Community of Madrid as a whole, the town has higher unemployment rates and lower income per capita (Comunidad de Madrid, 2015): the average salary in 2018 was €10,076 after taxes (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, n.d.a), with the regional average being €13,279 (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, n.d.b). Its most important economic sectors for employment are agriculture, commerce, transportation, and hospitality. The percentage of indefinite work contracts is lower than in the Community of Madrid as a whole, suggesting less job security (Comunidad de Madrid, 2020). The town also has a greater percentage of immigrants: 18.3% of the population has a foreign nationality, as compared to 13.2% in the Community of Madrid (Instituto de Estadística de la Comunidad de Madrid, 2019). Nearly half (46.9%) of the immigrant population (and 81.6% of the non-Spanish European population) comes from Romania, followed by Morocco (20.6%) and various American countries (15.6%), including Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador (in that order).

4.1.1.2. Participants and curriculum

At Clearwater High School, there were 34 respondents to the questionnaire: all eight students enrolled in HE and a sample of LE students: 14 from the “academic math/science” group and 12 from the “humanities” group. All LE participants had the same English teacher, who described the academic math/science group as “high performing” and the humanities group as “low performing.” At Clearwater, students in LE are grouped according to their academic interests, not their level of English, but teachers observe correlations between English level and group assignment because LE students exhibiting lower overall academic performance, including level of English, tend to concentrate in the humanities group, which is perceived as “easier.” Both groups were included in this study to represent more adequately the entire LE track. Conforming with the minimums established by the Spanish Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (2017, April 7), all grade 10 students receive one hour of English lessons per day (5 hours/week), as well as Physical Education in English (2 hours/week). HE students also have History and Geography (3 hours/week) and their weekly tutorial (1 hour/week) in English, accounting for an additional 4 hours/week. Table 1 shows the total number of students enrolled in HE and LE in each grade at Clearwater High School: only 6.5% of grade 10 students (and 8.2% of all students in compulsory secondary education) were enrolled in HE during the 2020-2021 school year. Due to the low enrollment rates, this year the HE students in grades 8, 9 and 10 were combined with an LE group, studying only the English and History and Geography subjects separately.

Table 1. Clearwater High School: Student enrollment in HE and LE per grade level.

Grade level	High Exposure	Low Exposure
1º ESO (Grade 7)	19	177
2º ESO (Grade 8)	12	169
3º ESO (Grade 9)	15	140
4º ESO (Grade 10)	8	115

4.1.2. Pineview High School

4.1.2.1. Socioeconomic backdrop

The second school, here referred to as Pineview High School, is in an upper-class, urban neighborhood. Within the City of Madrid, which has a higher income per capita and lower unemployment rate than the regional averages (Comunidad de Madrid, 2020; Comunidad de Madrid, 2015), the district where the school is located boasts of the highest income per capita: €28,190 after taxes in 2018 (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, n.d.a). The most popular professions among its residents include professional, scientific, and technical work (18.4%), wholesale, retail, and vehicle repair (11%), healthcare and social services (8.7%), and education (8.6%) (Ayuntamiento de Madrid, n.d.). In terms of immigration, only 9.5% of residents hold a foreign nationality (lower than the regional average of 13.2%), 43.9% of which are American, including Venezuelans, Paraguayans, and Colombians (in that order), and 37.3% of which are European, with fairly even distributions of Italians, Romanians, French, and Portuguese (Instituto de Estadística de la Comunidad de Madrid, 2019). In the neighborhood surrounding the school, only 7.2% of residents hold a foreign nationality, with slightly more Europeans (41%) and fewer Americans (42.3%) than the district of which it forms part (Instituto de Estadística de la Comunidad de Madrid, 2019).

4.1.2.2. Participants and curriculum

At Pineview High School, there were 48 respondents, 30 from the HE group and 18 from an LE group. Only one LE group was available in this case, and they had a different teacher from the HE group. In LE, the curriculum taught in English at Pineview is like that of Clearwater, meeting the minimum requirements: all HE and LE students receive daily English lessons (5 hours/week) and Physical Education in English (2 hours/week). In the HE track, however, students specializing in academic math and science (all HE students in 2020-2021) also study

Biology and Geology (3 hours/week) and Physics and Chemistry (3 hours/week) in English, in addition to the obligatory History and Geography (3 hours/week) and weekly tutorial (1 hour/week), thus accounting for 10 more hours of instruction in English than their LE peers and 6 hours more than the HE Clearwater students. The other specializations available at Pineview are humanities and applied math/science, which do not offer additional subjects in English, but during the 2020-2021 school year all HE students were enrolled in academic math/science. Table 2 shows the total number of students in HE and LE in each grade at Pineview High School: nearly a quarter (24.6%) of students in grade 10 were enrolled in HE, as well as nearly a third (31.4%) of all students in compulsory secondary education.

Table 2. Pineview High School: Student enrollment in HE and LE per grade level.

Grade level	High Exposure	Low Exposure
1º ESO (Grade 7)	46	88
2º ESO (Grade 8)	26	46
3º ESO (Grade 9)	25	50
4º ESO (Grade 10)	31	95

4.2. Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of 52 items (15 questions) measuring students' demographics (age, year of birth, parents' and students' birthplace), SES (parents' occupation/education, household size, number of books/IT devices in the home, use of information resources), perceptions of the program (language preference for subject learning, perceived pedagogical differences), CLIL motivation (extent of agreement with a set of statements), habits related to language learning (use of English outside school), and classroom dynamics (teachers' use of English, classroom activities). The full questionnaire is available in the Appendix. For this dissertation, responses to 30 items were analyzed, specifically those in questions 1-11, 13 and 15. Questions 12 (use of English outside school) and 14 (classroom

activities) were excluded for time and space reasons, since the present study focuses on SES, motivation, and use of English, but they may be used in future endeavors.

The first portion, taken from the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (2017, May 6), deals with student demographics and SES (Questions 1-9). It asks for participants' gender (Question 1), year of birth (Question 2), and whether they and their parents were born in Spain (Question 3). Then various socioeconomic indicators approximate households' levels of economic and cultural capital. Economic capital is operationalized as: the current or most recent occupation of each parent (Question 9), household size (Question 8), and the number of information technology (IT) devices per household member (Questions 6 and 7). Here, occupation replaces income because the researcher could not ask students about income directly. Household size then estimates how thinly the available economic resources are stretched, relative to the socioeconomic context of the area.¹² Finally, IT devices are quantified to assess the households' material possessions, as well as the students' access to digital information when learning in a semi-presential mode during the COVID-19 pandemic. As for cultural capital, it is operationalized as: the highest level of education achieved by each parent (Question 4), the number of books in the home (Question 8), and the frequency of use of books, press, encyclopedias, computers, and the internet (Question 5), thus representing its institutionalized state, objectified state, and embodied state, respectively. The number of books at home has been chosen to represent the objectified state because it correlates positively with children's reading skills (Van Bergen et al., 2017) and later academic outcomes (Aikens & Barbarin,

¹² Since students' SES within each school were quite similar, the distribution of household sizes in HE and LE helps gauge the degree of economic strain in each track.

2008),¹³ thus facilitating the transmission and accumulation of cultural capital. However, owning cultural goods does not imply having the embodied means of appropriating them (knowing how to use them), for which reason frequency of use was included. Due to the mostly quantitative nature of the study, embodied cultural capital has been measured in an admittedly cursory manner, and social capital has not been measured, but such variables offer promising insights for more ethnographic work on social class in CLIL.

The second set of items analyzed (Questions 10, 11, 13 and 15, taken from Somers and Llinares (2021)), measures students' opinions and experiences in the program. Question 13 asks how often participants' English language and CLIL teachers use the English language in their respective subjects to explain/teach materials (instructional register) and give instructions (regulative register), measured on a Likert scale from 1 (always) to 6 (never). Question 15 assesses intrinsic and instrumental motivation according to participants' agreement with a set of statements (a subset of those in Question 15 in the Appendix, as in Somers & Llinares (2021)), also measured on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The translations below belong to Somers & Llinares (2021, p. 847):

Intrinsic motivation:

- I enjoy learning subjects through English.
- I enjoy participating in English in subjects taught through English.
- I enjoy the classes taught through English.

Instrumental motivation:

- Studying subjects in English is useful for me because I'll need it for my future studies.
- Studying subjects in English is useful for me in finding a good job.

¹³ This correlation could be due to the importance of the number of books itself or because it "a proxy for how much value the family places on reading" (Van Bergen et al., 2017, p. 155).

- Studying subjects in English is useful for me because people will respect me more if I speak English well.
- Studying subjects in English is useful for me because English is an important language in the world.

The short answer questions (10 and 11) ask which language students prefer to learn subjects through and whether they believe these subjects are taught differently in each language. Their responses have been used to qualify the data on student motivation.

4.3. Procedure

The method of administering the questionnaires depended on teachers' and administrators' preferences amidst the ongoing development of the COVID-19 pandemic. At Clearwater High School, students were learning semi-presentially: groups were split in half (alphabetically, according to last names), and attended face-to-face sessions on alternate days. Thus, the researcher attended the school on two consecutive days, administering the questionnaire to one half of the HE group and then the other. This procedure also facilitated the sampling of half of the academic math/science LE group and half of the humanities LE group, again on consecutive days. The researcher told participants that the questionnaire was affiliated with the UAM, aimed to better understand students' experiences at bilingual schools, and was anonymous and voluntary.

At Pineview High School, teachers preferred that the researcher not visit the school in person. Instead, the questionnaires were left at the front desk and addressed to the Head of English, who administered them to his HE group and provided them to another teacher for her LE group. Each packet included instructions for administering the questionnaires, which explained how to present them to students without giving away the objective of the research, anticipated possible difficulties, and suggested means to resolve them. A few days

later, the completed questionnaires were collected from the front desk to undergo the same analysis applied to those from Clearwater (Tompkins, forthcoming), detailed below.

5. Results

In this chapter, the results from questions 1-11, 13, and 15 on the questionnaire (see Appendix and 4.2. above) are presented in sections. Section 5.1. details student demographics: gender, year of birth, and students' and parents' birthplace. In Section 5.2., the socioeconomic indicators in LE and HE at each school are discussed. It is further broken down into Subsections 5.2.1. on cultural capital (parental education, books in the home, and use of information resources), 5.2.2. on economic capital (parental occupation, IT devices, household size, and IT devices per household member), 5.2.3. on the relationship between immigration (students' and parents' birthplace) and SES, and 5.2.4. on unknown responses (no response or uninterpretable responses) for parents' educational and occupational categories. Next, Section 5.3. discusses students' perceptions of teachers' use of English in instructional and regulative registers in HE and LE at each school and assesses the statistical significance of the differences between tracks. In Section 5.4., students' CLIL motivation in HE and LE at each school are presented, tracks and schools are compared, and statistical significance is assessed. This data is qualified in Section 5.5., where Clearwater and Pineview students' language preferences for learning subjects and their opinions on pedagogical differences between HE and LE are analyzed.

5.1. Student demographics

Table 3, reproduced from Tompkins (forthcoming), shows student demographics in the HE and LE tracks at Clearwater High School. As I explain there (*ibid.*, p. 10):

In terms of gender, both tracks are evenly split between girls and boys. There are considerable differences in year of birth, suggesting that more students in the LE track repeated a grade. The HE track is more academically selective, which was also reflected anecdotally when an LE student referred to the HE students as “*los listillos*” while completing the questionnaire.

Regarding immigrant status, the percentage of students with parents born outside of Spain (likely¹⁴ second-generation immigrants) is similar in both tracks, but there were no students born outside of Spain (likely first-generation immigrants) in the HE track, as compared with 15.38% in LE.

Table 3. Clearwater High School: Student demographics in HE.

Student gender	High Exposure	Low Exposure
Male	4 (50%)	13 (50%)
Female	4 (50%)	13 (50%)
Year of birth	High Exposure	Low Exposure
2005	7 (87.5%)	15 (57.69%)
2004	1 (12.5%)	6 (23.08%)
2003	0	4 (15.38%)
Unknown	0	1 (3.85%)
Born outside of Spain	High Exposure	Low Exposure
Student	0	4 (15.38%)
1 parent	1 (12.5%)	2 (7.69%)
2 parents	2 (37.5%)	11 (42.31%)

Whether someone was born in Spain is not indicative of their lived experiences, so it is useful to explore how this duopoly interacts with SES (Block, 2012). In both schools, there were slight differences between the SES of students born outside of Spain, or whose parents were born outside of Spain, and their tracks’ averages, which will be further

¹⁴ Here, “likely” acknowledges that no direct indicator of immigration status was used in this study. Instead, students were asked whether they and their parents were born outside Spain. This information nearly always indicates immigration, but people may also be born outside their country of origin for other reasons, e.g., if their parents were living/working abroad at the time of birth.

discussed in Subsection 5.2.3., after the overall data on SES indicators has been presented in 5.2.1. and 5.2.2.

Table 4 shows student demographics in the HE and LE tracks at Pineview. In terms of gender, students in HE were overwhelmingly (70%) male, as compared to 50% in LE. In LE, two students did not specify their gender, selecting both options or neither. Students' years of birth again suggest that the HE track is more academically selective: all HE students were born in 2005 and thus unlikely to have repeated a grade. In contrast, nearly a quarter of LE students were born in 2004, and 16.67% did not report their year of birth. Unlike the Clearwater data, a greater percentage of HE than LE students at Pineview were born in another country (16.67%/11.11%), had one parent born in another country (16.67%/11.11%) and/or had two parents born in another country (13.33%/11.11%). These figures were also higher than the percentages of residents holding foreign nationalities in the surrounding neighborhood (7.2%) and district (9.5%) (Instituto de Estadística de la Comunidad de Madrid, 2019). The socioeconomic profiles of likely first- and second-generation immigrants in HE and LE will be discussed in Subsection 5.2.3.

Table 4. Pineview High School: Student demographics in HE and LE.

Student gender	High Exposure	Low Exposure
Male	21 (70%)	9 (50%)
Female	9 (30%)	7 (38.89%)
Not indicated	0	2 (11.11%)
Year of birth	High Exposure	Low Exposure
2005	30 (100%)	11 (61.11%)
2004	0	4 (22.22%)
2003	0	0
Unknown	0	3 (16.67%)
Born outside of Spain	High Exposure	Low Exposure
Student	5 (16.67%)	2 (11.11%)
1 parent	5 (16.67%)	2 (11.11%)
2 parents	4 (13.33%)	2 (11.11%)

5.2. Socioeconomic indicators

In this section, the results from the socioeconomic portion of the questionnaire are presented as cultural capital (Subsection 5.2.1.) and economic capital (Subsection 5.2.3.).

Students indicated their cultural capital by selecting:

- Their parents' highest level of education, from a list of options available in the Spanish system (see Appendix: Question 4);
- The frequency with which books, digital or print newspapers, encyclopedias and reference texts, computers or tablets and the internet are used in their household (every day or almost every day, once or twice a week, once or twice a month, never or almost never) (see Appendix: Question 5); and
- The number of books in their home (0-10, 11-50, 51-100, 100-200 or >200) (see Appendix: Question 8).

Students indicated their economic capital by identifying:

- Their parents' current or most recent primary occupation, selected from a list of general occupational titles with examples of the professions included in each category (see Appendix: Question 9);
- The number of IT devices in their home (e.g., computers, tablets, smartphones, electronic books) (see Appendix: Question 6); and
- The number of people who live with them, without including themselves (see Appendix: Question 7).

The results from each school are presented in Tables 5-8, within their respective subsections. The options for educational and occupational levels were condensed from

those of the original questionnaire for the sake of simplicity and space, and instead follow Gil Flores's (2013) model. In education, no studies and incomplete primary/secondary studies were condensed into one category. Similarly, all voluntary, non-university studies are presented as a single category (rather than two, as in Appendix: Question 4), as are graduate-level University studies (3–5-year degrees). In occupation (see Appendix: Question 9), options (c) skilled workers and artisans, (d) skilled workers in agriculture, cattle raising, and fishing, and (e) machinery operators in factories or workshops, are presented as: "artisans and skilled workers in agriculture, fishing, manufacturing, construction and mining." Workers in (f) hospitality and sales, and (g) personal services, security and protection, were condensed into "workers in hospitality, security/protection, personal services, salespeople and low-ranking military. Finally, (h) small business owners, (i) administrative employees, and (j) technicians and support workers were condensed into: "technicians, support workers, administrative employees, and small business owners." The rest of the occupational and educational categories remain unchanged, with the exception of the "unknown" category, which has been added to represent students who did not answer the corresponding question, or whose response was not interpretable (e.g., because they marked multiple boxes where only one should have been selected or wrote words instead of numbers, but see Subsection 5.2.4. for more on this). The relationship between students' cultural and economic capital and their immigration status within and between groups and schools is discussed in Subsection 5.2.3.

5.2.1. Cultural capital

Institutional, objectified, and embodied forms of cultural capital were operationalized as parents' educational level, number of books in the home, and median use of information resources, respectively. To calculate central tendencies, all indicators were placed on a

numerical scale: educational level from 0 (unknown¹⁵) to 6 (PhD), books from 1 (0 to 10 books) to 5 (>200 books), and the use of information resources from 1 (never or almost never) to 4 (daily) for each of the five resources (books, press, encyclopedias/reference books, computers, and the internet), accounting for a total score from 4 to 20.

At Clearwater High School, the cultural capital of HE students was slightly higher than that of LE students (see Table 5, adapted from Tompkins (forthcoming)): “the median score for education level was 2 (primary or secondary studies) for all parents of students in both tracks, while the median score for number of books was 2.5 (between 11 to 50 and 51 to 100) for HE and 2 (11 to 50) for LE,” (ibid., p. 12). HE students also indicated that information resources were used more frequently in their households at a median of 16.5, as compared with 15.5 in LE. As reported in Tompkins (forthcoming, pp. 12-13), the percentages calculated for education levels and number of books

suggest that students with greater-than-average cultural capital tended to concentrate in the HE tracks, while students with lower-than-average cultural capital tended to concentrate in the LE track. The percentage of parents with education levels above the median (i.e., with voluntary studies, at any level) was 14.88 percentage points higher in HE than LE, and the percentage below the median (i.e., who did not complete primary/secondary studies) was 10.15 points higher in LE than HE.¹⁶ There were also considerable differences amongst the fathers: most HE fathers

¹⁵ “Unknown” (uninterpretable) responses were included on this scale because they correlated with the lowest scores on other indicators of SES, as discussed in Subsection 5.2.3. Not counting them would likely bias the calculation of the median education to reflect a higher level. However, “not applicable” responses (presumably due to the absence of a parent, but see further discussion in Section 6.1.) were not included in the calculations.

¹⁶ These calculations reflect only the reported and interpretable responses, thus excluding the “unknown” responses, which correlated with lower scores on other SES indicators and were also more frequent in LE than HE (see Subsection 5.2.4).

(62.5%) had completed voluntary studies (as compared with 23.08% of LE fathers), yet nearly half (42.31%) of LE fathers had not completed primary or secondary education (as compared with 25% of HE fathers). Similarly, the percentage of families with more than 11 to 50 books was 11.54 points higher in HE than LE, while the percentage with less was 6.73 points higher in LE than HE.

I have repeated these results here so that they may be compared with those from Pineview High School, outlined below.

Table 5. Indicators of cultural capital at Clearwater High School (Grade 10 sample).

Highest level of education achieved	High Exposure			Low Exposure		
	%Mothers	% Fathers	%Both	% Mothers	%Fathers	%Both
Unknown	12.5	12.5	12.5	15.38	15.38	15.38
No studies or incomplete primary/secondary studies	12.5	25	18.75	15.38	42.31	28.85
Primary or secondary studies	50	0	25	34.62	19.23	26.93
Voluntary, non-university studies	12.5	62.5	37.5	26.93	19.23	23.08
Graduate-level university studies: 3-5 year degree	0	0	0	0	3.85	1.93
Postgraduate university studies: Master's degree	12.5	0	6.25	3.85	0	1.93
Postgraduate university studies: PhD	0	0	0	3.85	0	1.93

Number of books in the home	% High Exposure	% Low Exposure	Median use of information resources	High Exposure	Low Exposure
0 to 10	12.5	19.23		16.5	15.5
11 to 50	37.5	42.31			
51 to 100	37.5	26.92			
101 to 200	12.5	3.85			
> 200	0	7.69			

At Pineview High School, the median cultural capital was also slightly higher in HE than LE (see Table 6). The median score for parental educational level was 4 (graduate-level university studies) in both tracks, and the median score for number of books was 4 (101 to 200) in HE and 3.5 (between 51 to 100 and 101 to 200) in LE. The median use of information resources was also higher in HE at 18.5, as compared to 17 in LE. Furthermore, the percentage of parents with education levels above the median (i.e., with postgraduate university studies, at either level) was 8.88 points higher in HE than LE, while the percentage below the median (i.e., without university studies) was 13.33 points higher in LE than HE.¹⁷

¹⁷ This calculation also reflects only the reported and interpretable responses.

As regards number of books, the percentage of families with more than 101 to 200 books was 15.55 points higher in HE than LE, while the percentage with less was 13.34 points higher in LE than HE.

Table 6. Indicators of cultural capital at Pineview High School (Grade 10 sample).

Highest level of education achieved			High Exposure			Low Exposure		
			%Mothers	% Fathers	%Both	% Mothers	%Fathers	%Both
Unknown			3.33	3.33	3.33	0	5.56	2.78
No studies or incomplete primary/secondary studies			0	3.33	1.67	5.56	5.56	5.56
Primary or secondary studies			10	3.33	6.67	0	5.56	2.78
Voluntary, non-university studies			20	20	20	27.78	38.89	33.33
Graduate-level university studies: 3-5 year degree			33.33	46.67	40	33.33	38.89	36.11
Postgraduate university studies: Master's degree			23.33	16.67	20	27.78	5.56	16.67
Postgraduate university studies: PhD			10	6.66	8.33	5.56	0	2.78

Number of books in the home	% High Exposure	% Low Exposure	Median use of information resources	
			High Exposure	Low Exposure
0 to 10	0	16.67	18.5	17
11 to 50	13.33	11.11		
51 to 100	23.33	22.22		
101 to 200	20	22.22		
> 200	43.33	27.78		

As expected, levels of cultural capital were much higher at Pineview High School than at Clearwater High School, reflecting the high SES of the surrounding area and the socioeconomic segregation discussed in Murillo and Martínez Garrido (2018). Within their unique socioeconomic contexts, HE students at both schools reported slightly more cultural capital than LE students on all indicators. The degree of difference between HE and LE across schools was comparable: the difference in median use of information resources was 1 point at Clearwater and 1.5 points at Pineview, and the percentage-wise differences in above- and below-average education levels and numbers of books at both schools ranged from 6.73 to 14.88 percentage points (see above). However, some variation was observed. At Clearwater, the difference between tracks was greater for students with cultural capital above the median (14.88 percentage points for education, 11.54 for books) than for those below the median (10.15 percentage points for education, 6.73 for books). This finding suggests an “elitization” of the HE program at this school, i.e., that students with above-

average cultural capital may be concentrated in HE to a greater extent than that to which students with below-average cultural capital are concentrated in LE. At Pineview, the opposite was true for education levels: there was a greater difference between tracks for students below the median (13.33 percentage points) than above the median (8.88 percentage points). For books, the difference in percentage points was only slightly higher for students above the median (15.55) than below (13.34). Thus, at Pineview, the higher SES school, there appears to be a lower degree of elitization in HE than at Clearwater, the lower SES school. Future research should explore whether this finding holds true at other schools in the MBP.

In line with Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe (2020), at both schools HE students reported greater cultural capital than their LE counterparts, which may reflect their advantage in educational contexts. In families with high levels of cultural capital, academic knowledge and the means of expressing it will be more familiar to parents, and thus more easily transmitted to their children (Bourdieu, 1977). More specifically, higher parental educational attainment has been linked to the development of learning-related behaviors, as well as reading and mathematics skills (Morgan et al., 2009), while growing up in homes with many books (likely due to its relationship with the value placed on reading) “endows children with tools that are directly useful in learning at school: vocabulary, information, comprehension skills, imagination, broad horizons of history and geography, familiarity with good writing, understanding of the importance of evidence in argument, and many others” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 189). In sum, the higher levels of cultural capital in the HE track may indicate stronger academic support at home, as well as tools and skills for educational success.

5.2.2. Economic capital

Economic capital was operationalized as parents' occupation, household size and (median) IT devices in the home. To gauge central tendencies, occupation was placed on a numerical scale from 0 (unknown) to 7 (professionals), according to the categories in Tables 7 and 8, and medians were then calculated for occupation, total household size (a value of 1 was added to account for the respondent), total number of IT devices, and number of IT devices per person. For the latter, each students' number of IT devices was divided by their total household size, and the resulting values were used to calculate the median IT devices/household member in each track.

At Clearwater High School, most indicators of economic capital had similar medians between tracks, but again, students with greater-than-average economic capital were more frequently found in the HE track, and students with lower-than-average economic capital were more frequently found in the LE track (see Table 7, reproduced from Tompkins (forthcoming)). The median occupational level for both tracks was 3 (artisans and skilled workers in manufacturing, mining, etc.), and the percentage of parents with an occupational level above the median was similar in HE (31.25%) and LE (28.86%),¹⁸ but parents working in the three most lucrative professions were nearly twice as frequent in HE.

¹⁸ The percentage of parents below the median was higher in HE, but this was surely influenced by the fact that this calculation did not include the unknown/unreported occupational level of 23.07% of LE parents (and 0% of HE parents), which correlated with lower scores on other indicators of SES, discussed in Subsection 5.2.4.

Table 7. Indicators of economic capital at Clearwater High School (Grade 10 sample).

Current or most recent occupation	High Exposure			Low Exposure		
	%Mothers	% Fathers	%Both	% Mothers	% Fathers	%Both
Unknown	0	0	0	15.38	15.38	15.38
Not applicable (Absent parent)	0	0	0	11.54	3.85	7.69
Has never been employed	12.5	12.5	12.5	19.23	0	9.62
Unskilled workers	50	12.5	31.25	7.69	11.54	9.62
Artisans and skilled workers in agriculture, fishing, manufacturing, construction, mining	12.5	37.5	25	3.85	53.85	28.85
Workers in hospitality, security/protection, personal services, salespeople, low-ranking military	12.5	0	6.25	26.92	3.85	15.39
Technicians, support workers, administrative employees, and small business owners	12.5	12.5	12.5	7.69	7.69	7.69
Managers of companies or public administrations and high-ranking officials	0	12.5	6.25	3.85	0	1.93
Professionals, scientists, and scholars	0	12.5	6.25	3.85	3.85	3.85

Number of IT devices in the home	% High Exposure	% Low Exposure	Number of people in household	% High exposure	% Low exposure
Unknown	12.5	7.69	2 to 3	37.5	26.92
0 to 3	0	7.69	4 to 5	62.5	50
4 to 6	12.5	34.62	6 to 7	0	15.38
7 to 9	62.5	30.77	8 to 9	0	3.85
10 to 12	12.5	19.23	10	0	3.85

Median IT devices in the home	High Exposure	Low Exposure	Median IT devices/ household member	High Exposure	Low Exposure
	7	7.5		2.33	1.58

As reported in Tompkins (forthcoming, pp. 13-14):

Differences were particularly salient for fathers, with 37.5% of HE fathers in the three most lucrative positions, compared to 11.54% of LE fathers. In the LE track, “not applicable” was selected for 11.54% of mothers and 3.85% of fathers, indicating that these parents were not present (due to death, living elsewhere, etc.).¹⁹ No HE students selected “not applicable” for either parent. Similarly, the median household size was 4 in both tracks, but nearly a quarter (23.08%) of the LE students had 6 or more members in their household, as compared with 0% in HE. The most notable difference was the median IT devices per household member: there were 2.33 devices per household member in HE and only 1.58 in LE, due to differences in

¹⁹ However, this may have been caused by students’ misinterpretations of the questionnaire, as discussed in Section 6.1.

household size. No HE students reported having one device or less per family member, yet this was the case for 27.9% of LE students, over half of whom had less than one device per member. In addition to indicating lower economic capital in the LE track, this finding reveals a disadvantage for LE students learning semi-presentially during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Again, these results have been reproduced so that they may be compared with those from Pineview.

Differences in economic capital between HE and LE at Pineview High School were less pronounced than at Clearwater, but occupational levels were higher in HE (see Table 8). The median value for occupation in both tracks was 5 (technicians, support workers, administrative employees, and small business owners), accounting for 38.89% of LE parents and 26.67% of HE parents. However, the percentage of parents with an occupational level above the median was 22.77 points higher in HE than LE,²⁰ while that of parents below the median was 5.01 points higher in LE than HE. Even so, the median household size was the same in both tracks (4), with nearly identical percentages below the median and no households with more than five members in either track. The median IT devices were similar (10 in HE versus 9.5 in LE), as were the median IT devices per household member (2.59 in HE and 2.67 in LE). In sum, students in both tracks benefited from high economic capital, but HE parents more frequently held the most prestigious occupations.

²⁰ Differences in distribution among the top three professions may be more indicative of symbolic capital than economic capital, as the actual income of scholars and technicians, for example, may be similar (or, indeed, the technician may earn more than the scholar), despite the greater prestige associated with the academia. See further discussion in Block (2014), Chapter 2.

Table 8. Indicators of economic capital at Pineview High School (Grade 10 sample).

Current or most recent occupation	High Exposure			Low Exposure		
	%Mothers	% Fathers	%Both	% Mothers	%Fathers	%Both
Unknown	0	0	0	0	11.11	5.56
Not applicable (Absent parent)	10	6.67	8.33	0	5.56	2.78
Has never been employed	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unskilled workers	3.33	0	1.67	11.11	5.56	8.33
Artisans and skilled workers in agriculture, fishing, manufacturing, construction, mining	0	6.67	3.33	0	5.56	2.78
Workers in hospitality, security/protection, personal services, salespeople, low-ranking military	20	10	15	22.22	16.67	19.45
Technicians, support workers, administrative employees, and small business owners	23.33	30	26.67	38.89	38.89	38.89
Managers of companies or public administrations and high-ranking officials	3.33	13.33	8.33	0	5.56	2.78
Professionals, scientists, and scholars	40	33.33	36.67	27.78	11.11	19.45

Number of IT devices in the home	% High Exposure	% Low Exposure	Number of people in household	% High exposure	% Low exposure
Unknown	0	11.11	2 to 3	23.33	22.22
0 to 3	0	0	4 to 5	76.67	77.78
4 to 6	6.67	16.67	6 to 7	0	0
7 to 9	33.33	27.78	8 to 9	0	0
10 to 12	30	27.78	10	0	0
13 to 15	10	5.56	Median IT devices/ household member	High Exposure	Low Exposure
16 to 18	10	5.56		2.59	2.67
19 to 21	10	5.56			

Median IT devices in the home	High Exposure	Low Exposure
	10	9.5

The degree of difference in economic capital between HE and LE was higher at Clearwater than at Pineview: at the former, HE students scored higher on all indicators, whereas at the latter HE students only reported an advantage in parental occupation. In the higher SES area, then, there may be a weaker relationship between parents' economic resources and students' tracking than in the lower SES area, where the students with least resources were less frequently found in the HE program. The small sample in this study is by no means representative of the MBP, but it does indicate a pattern worth exploring in larger-scale research.

5.2.3. Immigration and SES

As mentioned in Section 5.1., differences were observed between the SES of students born outside of Spain, or whose parents were born outside of Spain, and their respective tracks'

averages. At Clearwater, the distributions of parental educational/occupational levels for likely first- and second-generation immigrant students in both HE and LE were similar to each track's averages, with the exception of voluntary studies in HE, which were more frequently completed in families where one or more member was born outside Spain (62.5%) than on average (43.75%). However, other indicators in LE suggest that the overall socioeconomic profile of likely first- or second-generation immigrants students was slightly lower than average. Despite similarities between their *reported* parental educational and occupational levels and the tracks' averages, the percentage of unreported or uninterpretable responses was far above average (30.77% for education and 23.08% for occupation, versus the LE average of 15.38% for both indicators), and Tompkins (forthcoming) observed that these (lack of) responses correlated with lower cultural/economic capital on other indicators (median IT devices/household member, books in the home, household size), as detailed in the following subsection (5.2.4.). Due to this disparity, in the present study the LE first- and second-generation immigrants' scores on these indicators have been compared with the track's averages: these students also have a larger median household size (5 versus 4), with 30.77% reporting households of 7-10 members, and fewer median IT devices per household member (1.27 versus 1.58), with a third reporting fewer than one device per member. The median number of books was the same (11-50), although a greater percentage of the likely immigrant students reported 0-10 books in the home (30.77% versus 19.23%).

Likely first- and second-generation immigrant students at Pineview had a different socioeconomic profile from those at Clearwater. In HE, their parents had a higher educational and occupational status than the group's average. A slightly higher percentage

of their parents held master's degrees (27.27% versus 20%),²¹ and 50% were employed as professionals, scientists, and scholars (as compared to 36.67% in all of HE). This was not the case in LE, where the parents of likely first- and second-generation immigrants had slightly lower educational and occupational levels than the LE average: most (55.55%) worked in hospitality, security/protection, personal services, and sales, as compared to 19.45% in all of LE, where more lucrative office jobs (61.12%) prevailed. One possible (albeit purely speculative) explanation is related to the high percentage of European immigrants in the neighborhood, comprising 41% of those holding a foreign nationality. Due to the presence and prestige of CLIL throughout Europe (European Commission, n.d.; Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020), it is possible that EU nationals are more inclined to enroll their children in HE CLIL programs than other immigrant groups or even Spaniards. As discussed later (Section 5.5.), whether students or their families were born outside of Spain also seems to correlate with their individual opinions of the bilingual program.

To summarize, the relationship between (likely) immigration status and SES varied across schools and tracks. At Clearwater, likely first- and second-generation immigrants in HE reported a similar SES to their track's average, while those in LE scored lower than average on multiple indicators, and many did not report their parents' education and occupation. At Pineview, likely first- and second-generation immigrants in HE reported higher-than-average parental occupation and education, while those in LE reported lower-than-average levels. In both schools, then, it seems that lower-SES immigrant students enroll in LE, while average or above-average SES immigrant students enroll in HE.

²¹ The distribution of other University degrees was quite similar between these parents and the HE averages (40.91%/40% for 3–5-year degrees, 9.09%/8.33% for PhDs).

5.2.4. Unknown responses in educational and occupational levels

At Clearwater High School, as reported in Tompkins (forthcoming, p. 15), “five students, four in LE and one in HE, did not indicate their parents’ educational level, occupational level or both.” There is no way of interpreting their lack of response, but these students did score lower on other SES indicators than their peers in both tracks:

their median number of IT devices per household member was lower (1.3), their median household size was larger (5 members), and they had fewer books at home (40% had 0-10 books, 40% had 11-50 books and 20% had 51-100 books). Moreover, four of the five students were either immigrants or the children of immigrants, suggesting a flaw in the questionnaire: the options offered were complex and based on the Spanish system, so participants whose parents studied elsewhere, worked multiple jobs or were unemployed may have had difficulty checking one box or another. In an improved version of this study, the options available would be condensed to those presented in Tables [5-8], rather than the long list used in the questionnaire (ibid.).

Two LE students at Pineview High School also did not report the educational and/or occupational levels of their fathers, albeit for seemingly different reasons. In one case, the respondent may have had limited contact with her father, as she specified that only one other person (possibly her mother) lived with her. She may not have understood that “not applicable” was the most appropriate option to select. The other respondent provided his father’s educational level and birthplace, but not occupation, and had average scores on all other socioeconomic indicators.

5.3. Teachers' use of English in the classroom

As discussed in Section 4.2., Question 13 on the questionnaire (see Appendix) asked participants how frequently their English language and CLIL teachers used English in the classroom, from 1 (always) to 6 (never), when teaching content/explaining materials and when giving instructions about what to do in class (two separate items). These two ways of using English correspond with Christie's (2005, as cited in Llinares & Evnitskaya, 2021) instructional and regulative registers, respectively.

At Clearwater, as discussed in Tompkins (forthcoming), HE students perceived that their teachers used English for teaching content more often than for giving instructions, whereas LE students did not perceive any differences in this regard (see Table 9). Moreover, HE students perceived that their teachers used English for both purposes more often than did the LE students. To assess the statistical significance of the differences between tracks, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and T-tests were used. Since the data for teaching content in English was non-parametric, as evidenced by the HE data's p-value of 0.036 on the Shapiro test, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was run, and it indicated a statistically significant difference between teachers' use of English when teaching content in HE and LE (see Table 9). HE students indicated that teachers used English "always" or "almost always," whereas the LE group indicated that they used English "a lot." The data on giving instructions was parametric (the Shapiro test gave a p-value of 0.366 for HE and 0.080 for LE, and the variance test a p-value of 0.475), so the T-test was run, but the differences between tracks did not reach statistical significance. In this case, students perceived similar use of English by their teachers in both track: HE students reported that they used English "almost always" or "a lot," while LE students again indicated that they used English "a lot."

Table 9. Clearwater High School: Median use of English by teachers in HE and LE.

	Median High Exposure	Median Low Exposure	Significance
Explaining and teaching content	1.5	3	p = 0.024 (Wilcoxon)
Giving instructions	2.5	3	p = 0.122 (T-test, not significant)

At Pineview, HE students reported that their teachers used English “almost always,” both for explaining and teaching content and for giving instructions, and LE students said the same for the former (see Table 10). However, LE students also perceived that their teachers used English less frequently (“quite a bit”) for giving instructions. The statistical significance of the comparisons between tracks were assessed. The data on explaining and teaching content was non-parametric, as evidenced by p-values of 3.275e-06 for HE and 0.004 for LE on the Shapiro test, so the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was run, determining that the similarities in use of English between tracks were statistically significant (p = 0.045). The data on giving instructions was also non-parametric, as evidenced by p-values of 0.0002 for HE and 0.013 for LE on the Shapiro test, and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test determined that the differences between tracks were statistically significant (p = 0.002).

Table 10. Pineview High School: Median use of English by teachers in HE and LE.

	Median High Exposure	Median Low Exposure	Significance
Explaining and teaching content	2	2	p = 0.045 (Wilcoxon)
Giving instructions	2	4	p = 0.002 (Wilcoxon)

At both schools, LE students, who receive fewer hours of instruction in English per week, reported less English exposure during those hours. The subjects studied in English in LE are not only fewer and less academic, then, but they may also offer fewer opportunities to

practice receptive skills. This observation supports Somers and Llinares's (2021, p. 852) claim that a Matthew effect exists in the MBP:

High proficient students receive more opportunity to develop English in contexts that will allow them to transfer that proficiency later on, whereas low proficient students find themselves in a situation where because of the limited exposure and academic status of the subjects, CLIL is unable to do much for them in the future.

Comparisons between schools yield somewhat conflicting results. HE students from the lower SES school (Clearwater) reported that their teachers used English more frequently than those of the higher SES, HE students at Pineview when explaining content, but less frequently when giving instructions. In contrast, LE students reported that Clearwater teachers used English less frequently than Pineview teachers when explaining content, and more frequently when giving instructions. Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were run on all four non-parametric data sets, but the results did not indicate statistical significance.²² The use of English analyzed here was reported and perceived by students, so it is likely influenced by subjective factors, such as the extent to which receiving content/instructions in English challenges them at their individual proficiency levels. A more detailed understanding of the relationship between schools' overall SES and teachers' use of English would require recording lessons and analyzing them according to an objective framework, which would be an interesting avenue for future research to explore.

²² The P-values on the Wilcoxon signed-rank test are as follows: Teaching content in HE at Pineview and Clearwater: $p = 0.730$, teaching content in LE at Pineview and Clearwater: $p = 0.128$, giving instructions in HE at Pineview and Clearwater: $p = 0.186$, giving instructions in LE at Pineview and Clearwater: $p = 0.806$.

5.4. CLIL motivation

To measure motivation, students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with a series of statements, from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), as explained in Section 4.3. The average score for each set (instrumental and intrinsic) was calculated for each student, and the median of these averages was calculated for HE and LE at each school, with a lower score indicating higher motivation.

At Clearwater High School, students in both tracks indicated higher instrumental than intrinsic motivation (see Table 11). The HE track's median intrinsic motivation was higher than that of the LE track, and this parametric data (Shapiro tests: $p = 0.129$ for HE, $p = 0.154$ for LE; Variance test: $p = 0.151$) reached statistical significance on the T-test ($p = 0.009$). Since the data for instrumental motivation was non-parametric, as evidenced by p -values of 0.002 for HE and 0.012 for LE on the Shapiro test, the Wilcoxon test was used in this case. The difference in instrumental motivation between tracks did not reach statistical significance ($p = 0.814$); the medians suggest that students in both tracks recognize the value of English in their academic and professional futures.

Table 11. Clearwater High School: Intrinsic and Instrumental CLIL motivation in HE and LE.

	Median High Exposure	Median Low Exposure	Significance
Intrinsic motivation	1.5	2.33	$p = 0.009$ (T-test)
Instrumental motivation	1.25	1.5	$p = 0.814$ (Wilcoxon, not significant)

At Pineview High School, students again indicated higher instrumental than intrinsic motivation in both tracks (see Table 12). Between tracks, HE students were slightly more intrinsically motivated than LE students, and LE students were slightly more instrumentally motivated than HE students. Neither difference reached statistical significance. The data on intrinsic motivation was parametric (Shapiro tests: $p = 0.059$ for HE, $p = 0.064$ for LE;

Variance test: $p = 0.529$), so the T-test was used ($p = 0.179$). The data on instrumental motivation was non-parametric, as evidenced by p-values of 0.001 for HE and 0.009 for LE on the Shapiro tests, and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used ($p = 0.462$).

Table 12. Pineview High School: Intrinsic and Instrumental CLIL motivation in HE and LE.

	Median High Exposure	Median Low Exposure	Significance
Intrinsic motivation	2	2.33	$p = 0.179$ (T-test, not significant)
Instrumental motivation	1.63	1.5	$p = 0.462$ (Wilcoxon, not significant)

Comparing the two schools, the HE students at Clearwater reported slightly higher levels of intrinsic and instrumental motivation than those at Pineview, while the median motivation levels in LE were identical at both schools. To gauge the statistical significance of the differences between the HE groups, the T-test was run on the intrinsic motivation data, which was parametric (Shapiro tests: $p = 0.129$ for Clearwater, $p = 0.059$ for Pineview, Variance test: $p = 0.225$), and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test on the instrumental motivation data, which was non-parametric (Shapiro tests: $p = 0.002$ for Clearwater, $p = 0.001$ for Pineview). The former was statistically significant, at $p = 0.015$, but the latter was not ($p = 0.7163$). The same process was followed for the LE data, but it did not reach statistical significance ($p = 0.330$ for the T-test on intrinsic motivation, $p = 0.930$ for the Wilcoxon signed-rank test on instrumental motivation). The higher levels of motivation observed in the lower SES students in HE at Clearwater may indicate their greater need/desire to use English for upward mobility in the job market, as opposed to their higher SES counterparts at Pineview, who may be more secure in their class position, a point which Heller (2006, as cited in Block, 2014) also makes about lower- and middle-class students' motivation in French immersion programs in Canada. Rascón & Bretones (2018) also observed higher motivation in lower SES students in primary school but found that the trend reversed at the

secondary level. Such observations justify further research into the relationship between class and motivation for learning (through) English, especially more qualitative studies.

5.5. Student perceptions of the program

Students expressed strong opinions in their responses to the two short-answer questions on the questionnaire, “Do you prefer learning subjects in English or Spanish?” (Question 10) and “Do you think subjects (biology, history, etc.) are taught differently in English and Spanish?” (Question 11), which provided insight into their perceptions of the program and motivation for participating in it. For Question 10, students ranked their language preference from “much more in English,” assigned a value of 1, to “much more in Spanish,” assigned a value of 5, and the middle point, “the same” was assigned a value of 3. Students were then asked to justify their response. For Question 11, students ticked “yes” or “no” and were asked to justify their response. The median language preferences expressed by students within each track at both schools can be found in Table 13.

Table 13. Clearwater and Pineview: Median language preference for subject learning.

Clearwater High School		Pineview High School	
HE	LE	HE	LE
2.5	3	3	4

At both schools, students in HE expressed a stronger preference for learning in English than those in LE. Students at Clearwater, the lower SES school, also expressed a stronger preference for learning in English than their Pineview counterparts enrolled in the same tracks: on average, Clearwater HE students had a slight preference for learning in English and LE students were indifferent, whereas Pineview HE students were indifferent and LE students preferred learning in Spanish. This is consistent with the higher levels of CLIL motivation in the Clearwater HE track, discussed in the previous section.

In HE at Clearwater, the most common justification for preferring learning in English, or not having a preference, was being “used to” learning in English, as in the following quotations (translations are my own):

More in English:

“Lo he dado desde pequeño y ya estoy acostumbrado”

I've been studying it since I was little and now I'm used to it.

The same:

“Estoy más acostumbrada a dar historia, biología, educación física y plástica en inglés, entonces prefiero que se quede igual [...]”

I'm more used to studying history, biology, P.E. and arts and crafts in English, so I prefer it stay the same [...]

“[...] me gusta dar por ejemplo biología en inglés uno porque ya estoy acostumbrada [...]”

I like studying, for example, biology in English, one because I'm already used to it [...]

Other justifications included personal enjoyment and a desire to improve their English skills:

Much more in English:

“El inglés [...] es un idioma que me encanta.”

English [...] is a language that I love.

More in English:

“Siempre es bueno hablar fluido otro idioma que no sea el tuyo. Y más el inglés que se habla en todo el mundo.”

It's always good to speak another language that isn't your own fluently. And more so English, which is spoken all over the world.

“Porque creo que el español lo domino perfectamente y me gustaría lo mismo con el inglés”

Because I think I've mastered Spanish perfectly and I'd like to do the same with English.

However, students also worried about the simplification of the content in CLIL classes:

More in Spanish:

“[...] se reduce el temario ya que es complicado estudiarlo en inglés y tener la misma cantidad de contenidos. Por eso, prefiero que no se reduzcan los contenidos y estudiarlo en español.”

The syllabus is reduced because it's complicated to study it in English and have the same amount of content. That's why I prefer not to reduce the content and to study it in Spanish.

More students expressed this concern in Question 11, regarding whether subjects were taught differently in English and Spanish, although others disagreed:

Yes:

“Porque algunos profesores acortan el temario al ser en inglés [...]”
Because some teachers shorten the syllabus when it's in English [...]”

“Creo que en español se profundiza un poco más.”
I think they go a little deeper in Spanish.

“Porque se reduce el temario para que sea más 'fácil' [...]”
Because they reduce the syllabus so that it's "easier."

No:

“Porque damos el mismo temario, solo en distinto idioma.”
Because we study the same syllabus, just in a different language.”

In LE at Clearwater, students who preferred learning through English highlighted its utility for improving their proficiency in this language, while those who preferred learning in Spanish worried that their low proficiency in English would impede their content learning:

More in English:

“Porque me ayudaría a aprender más inglés de lo que estudio.”
Because it would help me to learn more English than what I study.

“Siento que así podemos mejorar nuestro inglés y hablarlo y utilizarlo más.”
I feel that this way we can improve our English and speak it and use it more.

“Porque quiero aprender y mejorar más mi inglés.”
Because I want to learn and improve my English more.

(Much) more in Spanish:

“Porque no tengo muchas bases de inglés como para aprender todo en inglés.”
Because I don't have enough of a foundation in English to learn it all in English.

“No se me da tan bien el inglés entonces primero me perfeccionaría.”
I'm not so good at English, so first I would perfect it.

“Las asignaturas deben darse en la lengua materna porque si no lo entiendo en español, menos lo voy a entender en inglés.”
Subjects should be taught in the mother tongue because if I don't understand it in Spanish, I'll understand it even less in English.

Students who selected “the same” also tended to express one of these two opinions, or to emphasize the importance of balance:

The same:

“Porque será mucho más difícil el aprendizaje.”

Because the learning must be more difficult.

“Porque las asignaturas en inglés te proporcionarán como más costumbre manejar el inglés [...]”

Because the subjects in English will get you like more used to managing English.

“Porque el inglés y el español me gustan casi por igual y prefiero saber cosas de los dos.”

Because I like English and Spanish almost the same and I prefer to know things about both.

“Pienso que debería haber un equilibrio entre ambas.”

I think there should be a balance between the two.

“Porque me parece que el inglés es fundamental pero si damos muchas cosas en inglés nos vamos a liar y vamos a suspender.”

Because I think that English is fundamental, but if we study a lot of things in English we’re going to get confused and fail.

Regarding Question 11, LE students at Clearwater were evenly split between those who believed subjects were taught differently in English and those who did not. The former tended to mention the additional difficulty of learning in English, and the latter the equivalence of the content, for example:

Yes:

“[...] en inglés va a ser distinto y un poco difícil [...] en español te sentirás mejor porque dominas el idioma y entender [sic] los contenidos [...]”

[...] in English it’s going to be different and a little difficult [...] in Spanish you’ll feel better because you’ve mastered the language and understand the content [...]

“Por la parte de información sí que es igual pero es más difícil de aprender”

The information part is the same but it’s harder to learn.

No:

“No porque las lenguas son diferentes pero dan el mismo temario.”

No because the languages are different, but they teach the same syllabus.

At Pineview, the HE students' responses to Question 10 expressed a high level of confidence in their English abilities, regardless of their preference for learning in one language or another, as reflected in comments such as:

The same:

"Me da igual aprender el contenido en un idioma u otro porque puedo hablar fluido en los dos idiomas."

I don't mind learning content in one language or another because I can speak both languages fluently.

"Me da exactamente igual sacaré un 10 en todas, total tengo proficiency"

I don't care at all, I'll get a 10 (A+) in all [subjects], I have total proficiency.

"La lengua da igual, tengo masterizada ambas [...]"

The language doesn't matter, I have them both mastered.

More in Spanish:

"Yo puedo dar las clases en inglés sin ningún problema ya que lo hablo y entiendo fluidamente"

I can take classes in English without any problem because I speak and understand it fluently.

Although students also mentioned the increased difficulty of learning through English,²³ this group's lower desire to do so (compared with Clearwater) was more frequently attributed to concerns about their tertiary studies and/or ethnolinguistic identities:

Concerns about tertiary studies

(Much) more in Spanish:

"Porque hemos estado desde 1 ESO dando todo en inglés a excepción de lengua y mates y ahora que vamos a bachillerato el siguiente año está todo en español. Teniendo que aprender palabras clave, tecnicismos de biología o física en español de cero."

Because we've been learning everything in English since grade 7 except Spanish and math and now that we're going to baccaureate next year everything is in Spanish. Having to learn the key words and technical terms of biology or physics in Spanish from scratch.

"Fuera de la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria todo se da en español, por lo que todos los tecnicismos aprendidos en inglés son inútiles."

Outside of Compulsory Secondary Education everything is taught in Spanish, so all the technical terms we learned in English are useless.

"[...] pero otro problema es la EVAU."

²³ For example:

"Puede ser que algunos conceptos sean más fáciles de dar en español"

Maybe some concepts are easier to learn in Spanish,

"[...] el inglés me gusta, pero a la hora de asignaturas como Física y Química, es más difícil en inglés"

I like English, but subjects like Physics and Chemistry are more difficult in English.

But the EVAU (University Entrance Exam) is another problem.

Concerns about ethnolinguistic identities

(Much) more in Spanish:

“Porque la historia de España por ejemplo tiene que estudiarse en español, hay cosas fundamentales que hay que dar en nuestro idioma.”

Because the history of Spain for example must be studied in Spanish, there are fundamental things that must be taught in our language.

“[...] aprender la historia de España en inglés es una tontería.”

Learning the history of Spain in English is nonsense.

“Estamos en España y no me parece apropiado dar historia en inglés [...]”

We’re in Spain and I don’t consider it appropriate to learn history in English.

“Porque el castellano es mi lengua materna y veo más sentido en aprender las materias en la misma”

Because Spanish is my mother tongue, and it makes more sense to learn subjects in it.

The latter set of comments came from students born in Spain and whose parents were born in Spain, which surely contributed to their concern about learning Spanish history in a different language. Students born outside of Spain, or whose parents were born outside of Spain, reflected more international identities, and a greater percentage (36.4% versus 10.5% of Spanish-born students/families) preferred learning subjects in English:

(Much) more in English

“Siempre he vivido fuera y estoy más acostumbrada a estudiar en inglés.”

I’ve always lived abroad, and I am more used to studying in English.

**This student was born outside Spain, to parents born in Spain.*

“Porque voy a ir a vivir a Canadá y me gusta el inglés. Es más fácil que el español.”

Because I’m going to live in Canada, and I like English. It’s easier than Spanish.”

**This student was born outside Spain, to parents born outside Spain.*

The same:

“Porque considero que estoy acostumbrado a convivir con ambos idiomas.”

Because I consider myself used to living with both languages.

**This student was born in Spain, to one Spanish-born and one foreign-born parent.*

Regardless of birthplace, and like their Clearwater counterparts, in Question 12 some Pineview HE students commented that classes were taught differently in English and

Spanish due to the difficulty of using a vehicular language, while others perceived no differences. However, this more confident group also frequently highlighted the added difficulty *for the teachers*:

Yes:

“A algunos profesores les llega a costar más esfuerzo dar unas clases en inglés.”
It takes more effort for some teachers to teach some classes in English.

“Porque cuando se dan en español el profesor se expresa mejor [...]”
Because when they're taught in Spanish the teacher expresses themselves better [...]

No:

“Porque el contenido es lo mismo. La única diferencia es que en inglés a veces es difícil para los profesores [...]”
Because the content is the same. The only difference is that in English sometimes it's difficult for the teachers [...]

“Mis profesores dan a unas clases en español y a otras en inglés y damos exactamente lo mismo. Lo único es que en inglés les cuesta más expresarse y si hay algo que no entendemos, nos lo explican en español.”
My teachers teach some in Spanish and others in English, and we study exactly the same thing. The only thing is that in English it's more difficult for them to express themselves and if there's something we don't understand, they explain it to us in Spanish.

Overall, Pineview HE's language preferences were often based on their ethnolinguistic identities, whether Spanish or international, as well as their transition into Baccalaureate or university programs. They were confident in their English language skills, despite the acknowledged difficulties, and worried about their teachers' proficiency. This was not the case for the Pineview LE students: in Question 10, their language preferences primarily reflected the difficulty of learning through English and, as at Clearwater, their responses did not vary according to their nor their parents' birthplace. For example:

(Much) more in Spanish

“Porque hay asignaturas que son muy difíciles en castellano hay días en los que solo descanso 10 min, si las diese en otro idioma me suicidaría, bueno no tanto jaja pero sería duro.”

Because there are some subjects that are very difficult in Spanish there are days when I only rest for 10 minutes, if I studied them in another language I would kill myself, well not really haha, but it would be hard.

“Porque si es un inglés muy avanzado no me entero.”
Because if it's very advanced English I don't understand.

“Me parece más fácil aprender en español que en inglés.”
I think it's easier to learn in Spanish than in English.

Secondarily, some LE students also mentioned the usefulness of learning through English to improve their proficiency, as in:

The same:

“Porque hay algunas cosas que es mejor estudiarlos en español porque es más fácil para mí, pero el estudio en inglés me ayudaría a mejorar mi nivel.”
Because there are some things that are better to study in Spanish because it's easier for me, but studying in English would help me to improve my level.

Two students expressed concerns about their teachers' competencies and their ethnolinguistic identities, as in HE:

(Much) more in Spanish

“Porque los profesores que dan asignaturas en inglés como historia biología y esas cosas no están muy bien calificados, no tienen mucho nivel de inglés no es que se aprenda más, de hecho se aprende menos y mal.”
Because the teachers that teach subjects in English like history, biology and those things aren't very well qualified, they don't have a high level of English and it's not that you learn more, in fact you learn less and poorly.

“Porque es el idioma del país y hay asignaturas que no tiene sentido estudiar en inglés como lengua, historia o mates [...]”
Because it is the country's language and there are subjects that don't make sense to study in English, like language, history, or math [...]

Regarding Question 11, they also mentioned that the content may be simplified in CLIL:

Yes:

“Porque en inglés las hacen más fáciles y no entran tanto en detalles.”
Because in English they make [the subjects] easier and don't go into so much detail.

“Son más simples en inglés por la dificultad del idioma.”
They are simpler in English because of the difficulty of the language.

“En inglés se suele usar lenguaje menos profesional para facilitar el entendimiento.”
In English they usually use less professional language to facilitate understanding.

“[...] tienen que ir más despacio.”
[...] *they have to go slower.*

It is interesting to note that the Pineview LE students believed that content was simplified in CLIL, whereas at Clearwater it was the HE students who expressed this opinion. Of course, not all LE Pineview students agreed, as others ticked “no” because “se da el mismo temario” (they teach the same syllabus), “es lo mismo pero en otro idioma” (it’s the same but in a different language), and so on, as in other groups.

6. Discussion

This dissertation uses social class to frame a few issues pertinent to (language) education and CLIL research: streaming, teachers’ use of the second language, and motivation. As discussed, CLIL in English is an opportunity for students to develop proficiency in the prestigious lingua franca and improve their prospects in global job markets, if and when this proficiency is deemed suitable for academic and professional contexts (Block, 2014). However, in the present study, this opportunity was disproportionately offered to higher SES students. First, overall enrollment rates varied at schools of different SES (Research Question 1): at the working-class school, Clearwater, only 6.5% of all year 10 students were enrolled in the HE CLIL program, where they were exposed to more academic English, as compared to 24.6% at the higher-class school, Pineview. The latter group also received more hours of instruction in English: over half (54.8%) of their curriculum was taught in English, accounting for 17 hours per week, far more than the 11 hours (35.5%) offered to HE students at Clearwater, due to the additional offerings of Biology/Geology and Physics/Chemistry in English.

Secondly, streaming within schools was also divided along class lines (Research Question 2): HE students exhibited higher levels of cultural capital on all indicators at both schools, and HE students at Clearwater had higher levels of economic capital than their LE peers. In the LE track, where lower SES students were concentrated, fewer hours of English are offered, *and* students at both schools reported that their teachers used less English with them per hour (Research Question 3). The last point merits further research, since the extent of English use was based on students' subjective perceptions, but more ethnographic work on classroom interactions (like Hidalgo-McCabe's (2020) methodology, but focused on class-based, rather than track-based, differences) could explore the quality and quantity of English used by the same teachers in HE and LE groups, and how it relates to social class. Such work could build on Llinares & Evnitskaya (2021), who found that LE students used English less than HE students and that "students' tracking, over language of instruction or subject area" led to "higher enhancement of higher order cognitive skills in the HE group" (p. 27), by researching the role of teachers' language use and social class in this scenario. Overall, the quantitative data collected in the present study suggests a compound effect in which higher SES students had greater access to the HE track across socioeconomic areas, and HE students in the higher-class neighborhood received more English exposure than their working class counterparts. In this way, the highest SES students were granted the most access to the most academic English. Larger-scale, quantitative studies that better represent the MBP program should confirm these results by comparing enrollment rates and hours of English at schools of different SES.

In terms of the impact of tracking for students, social class seems to influence their motivation for and perceptions of their respective CLIL programs (Research Question 4). In line with previous research (Somers & Llinares, 2021), HE students had higher CLIL

motivation than LE students at both schools. Furthermore, HE students at the lower SES school were more motivated than those at the higher SES school, while no differences were observed in LE. This finding breaks with Bourdieu's (1977) theory that the school system demotivates lower SES students by devaluing their existing cultural and symbolic capital. A few factors may be at play here, none of which have been investigated in this study, but which may inspire future research: (1) that the dialogic teaching practices of HE CLIL motivate lower SES students by explicitly teaching the "instruments of appropriation" (Bourdieu, 1977) and thus providing greater access to academic content, (2) that the opportunity to accumulate symbolic capital by participating in HE CLIL is particularly motivating for lower SES students, and (3) that the promise of upward social mobility via English proficiency is motivating. These factors are not mutually exclusive, rather, they may be deeply interconnected.

Student perceptions of the program also varied between the two schools, especially in the HE track. While LE students at Pineview and Clearwater expressed concerns about the added difficulty of learning through CLIL, and HE at Clearwater perceived a reduction in the complexity of the content, Pineview HE students' comments were qualitatively different. They expressed a level of confidence in their English proficiency absent in the other groups, and many highlighted, sometimes quite critically, their teachers' difficulties with English rather than their own. Their concerns centered around learning baccalaureate- and university-level content in *Spanish* after having completed their primary and secondary studies in English, as well as the alleged ludicrousness of learning their country's history in English, in the case of Spanish-born students. Such differences may be related to the combination of their high social class and the additional symbolic capital provided by HE CLIL, since their comments echo those of the middle class participants in Fernández-Agüero

and Hidalgo-McCabe (2020, p. 11): “they proved to be confident and conscious of their capability,” and “they thought that they belonged to an elite, to the best class, thus denoting that they felt superior.” This sentiment was not found in the comments of HE students at Clearwater, which mentioned being “used to” learning in English, along with concerns about the reduction of the syllabus. Pineview HE’s recurring concern about tertiary studies also reflects their class position, since they take for granted that they will continue their education rather than entering the workforce, a mindset which was also adopted by Heller’s (2006) higher class students in French immersion programs in Canada and is perhaps less common among lower-SES students. Indeed, Clearwater students in both tracks were more hopeful about using CLIL to improve their English proficiency, possibly because it is of more immediate utility than a university degree and/or promises upward social mobility, something of less interest to those already secure in their class position.

6.1. Limitations

The present study has explored a few ways that social class may influence HE and LE students’ experiences in the MBP in terms of social stratification, use of English and motivation. However, it is not representative of this program: only two schools have been included, and they were selected according to their connections with the researcher and/or the UAM, as well as their willingness to participate, rather than through random sampling. To better understand how these variables interact in the program, a larger sample would be needed. The same can be said of the selection of participants within schools: a more representative sample of the LE track would include all students in all groups, rather than just one or two, but this was not possible at the time of the study due to teachers’ availability.

Moreover, SES was not treated as a composite variable, as is often done in sociological research (e.g., Broer et al., 2019; Murillo & Martínez-Garrido, 2018), and indicators of the forms of capital comprising it were analyzed instead. Admittedly, the researcher chose not to use or devise a formula to determine the overall SES of each student due to time constraints and her own lack of expertise, but this choice has permitted a more detailed analysis of how cultural and economic capital may be related to streaming in HE and LE. For instance, at Pineview, the economic capital of each track was nearly the same, yet HE exhibited greater levels of cultural capital, in line with Bourdieu's (1977) theory that cultural capital is more determinant of academic success (or, in this case, participation in a more academically selective track). In sum, calculating each students' overall SES is a more holistic approach to the variable, but analyzing the different forms of capital offers more detail, so the aims of each study should inform the researcher's choice.

Finally, certain items on the questionnaire (namely, occupation and education) were not accessible to all students, presumably because the options available were complex and/or based in the Spanish educational system. It may have been difficult for students to select a category if their parents were unemployed, held multiple jobs, had studied outside of Spain, or simply did not discuss their education and occupation with their children. This seems to have been the case for the lowest SES students, especially likely immigrant students in LE at Clearwater, since their disproportionate lack of response created a gap in the data. Similarly, the "not applicable" category seems to have been misinterpreted by students: as indicated on the questionnaire, it was intended to represent the absence of a parent (due to death, divorce, etc.), but some students selected "not applicable" for a parent's occupation after indicating their education, or vice versa. Thus, they may have chosen this option because they did not know how to respond (for example, if the parent

was unemployed, a stay-at-home parent, or had studied outside Spain). To eliminate these issues, a better version of the questionnaire would include broader occupational and educational categories, rather than those specific to the Spanish system.

7. Concluding remarks

To summarize, the present study has explored differences in students' cultural and economic capital, motivation, experiences, and perceptions of CLIL, both between HE and LE tracks and across two schools of different SES. At both schools, students in HE reported greater cultural and economic capital, but the degree of difference between tracks was greater in the lower-SES school (Clearwater). At higher-SES Pineview, differences between tracks were more pronounced for cultural than economic capital. Pineview HE students also received more hours of instruction in English than their Clearwater counterparts, while both LE samples received the minimum number of hours. Similarly, students at both schools reported that their English/CLIL teachers used English more often in HE than LE. Thus, in this study the highest-SES students (HE students displaying greater cultural and economic capital in a high SES area) received the most English exposure: more hours of English than HE students at Clearwater, and more English per hour than LE students at either school.

As for intrinsic and instrumental CLIL motivation, their levels were identical for LE students at both schools, but HE students at lower-SES Clearwater were more motivated than their Pineview counterparts in both categories. Analysis of their responses to the short-answer questions suggested a relationship between the lower-SES students' high motivation and their desire for greater English proficiency and social mobility. In contrast, the highest-class students (Pineview HE) were confident in their English abilities and concerned about completing tertiary studies in Spanish, which may have contributed to

their lower CLIL motivation. In sum, social class appears to shape students' experiences in the MBP both quantitatively, in terms of English exposure, and qualitatively, in terms of their motivation and personal opinions.

These findings encourage future research into social reproduction in the MBP, a relatively new program which, when designed with equity in mind, has the potential to level the academic playing field between low SES and high SES students (Lorenzo et al., 2021). Experts critical of streaming processes have begun exploring differences in teaching strategies and socialization processes between LE and HE (e.g., Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020; Llinares & Evnitskaya, 2021; Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020), and moving forward we may examine more closely their relationship with social class. On the qualitative side, future research may explore the relationship between students' social class and: (1) CLIL teachers' use of dialogic/authoritative teaching styles to engage students' higher-order thinking skills, which Hidalgo-McCabe (2020) links to *habitus* and Martín-Rojo (2015) to teachers' evaluation of students' existing symbolic capital, (2) the use of Dalton-Puffer's (2013) Cognitive Discourse Functions and the development of Cummins's (2000) CALP, and (3) the ongoing development of students' motivation for and perceptions of the HE CLIL. On the quantitative side, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of possible differences in access to CLIL in higher and lower SES areas, both in terms of HE/LE enrollment rates and the hours of English offered, as well as its relationship with academic achievement. It is my hope that research in this field will contribute to ongoing improvements in the CAM's initiative, helping to better ensure educational equity for its participants.

8. References

- Aikens, N. L., & Barbarin, O. (2008). Socioeconomic differences in reading trajectories: The contribution of family, neighborhood, and school contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 235-251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.2.235>
- 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. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12305>
- Ayuntamiento de Madrid. (n.d.). *Distritos en cifras (Información de Barrios)*.
<https://www.madrid.es/portales/munimadrid/es/Inicio/El-Ayuntamiento/Estadistica/Distritos-en-cifras/Distritos-en-cifras-Informacion-de-Barrios-/?vgnnextoid=0e9bcc2419cdd410VgnVCM2000000c205a0aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=27002d05cb71b310VgnVCM1000000b205a0aRCRD>
- Babbie, E. (2011). *The Basics of Social Research* (5th ed.). Wadsworth, CENGAGE Learning.
- Barone, C. (2006). Cultural capital, ambition and the explanation of inequalities in learning outcomes: A comparative analysis. *Sociology, 40*(6), 1039–1058.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0038038506069843>
- Block, D. (2007). *Second language identities*. Continuum.
- Block, D. (2012). Class and SLA: Making Connections. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(2), 188-205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811428418>
- Block, D. (2014). *Social Class in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education* (pp. 487—511). Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J.F. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory of Research for Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–58). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.
- Broer, M., Bai, Y., & Fonseca, F. (2019). *Socioeconomic Inequality and Educational Outcomes: Evidence from Twenty Years of TIMSS*. IEA Research for Education, A Series of In-depth Analyses Based on Data of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11991-1>
- Buchmann, C. (2002). Measuring family background in international studies of education: Conceptual issues and methodological challenges. In National Research Council (Ed.), *Methodological advances in cross-national surveys of educational achievement* (pp. 150–197). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
<https://doi.org/10.17226/10322>
- Christie, F. (2005). Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective. Continuum.
- Condron, D. (2011). Egalitarianism and educational excellence: Compatible goals for affluent societies? *Educational Researcher*, 40(2), 47–55.
<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X11401021>
- Comunidad de Madrid. (2015). *Tipificación socioeconómica y laboral del territorio de la Comunidad de Madrid: Lecciones aprendidas*. Madrid: Consejería de Economía, Empleo y Hacienda de la Comunidad de Madrid.
<http://www.madrid.org/bvirtual/BVCM015624-1.pdf>

- Comunidad de Madrid. (2016). *Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2015-2016. Madrid, a Bilingual Community 2015-2016*. Madrid: Consejería de Educación, Juventud y Deporte. <http://www.madrid.org/bvirtual/BVCM015624-1.pdf>
- Comunidad de Madrid. (2020). *Mercado de trabajo en los municipios madrileños junio 2020*. Consejería de Economía, Empleo y Competitividad. <http://www.madrid.org/bvirtual/BVCM013420-2020-01.pdf>
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*, 216–253. <https://doi.org/10.1515/euja-l-2013-0011>
- Downey, D. B. & Condrón, D. J. (2016). Fifty Years since the Coleman Report: Rethinking the Relationship between Schools and Inequality. *Sociology of Education, 89*(3), 207-220. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0038040716651676>
- European Commission. (1995). *White paper on education and training. Teaching and learning. Towards the learning society*. Brussels.
- European Commission. (n.d.). *About multilingualism policy*. http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/multilingualism/about-multilingualism-policy_en
- Evans, M.D., Kelley, J., Sikora, J., & Treiman, D.J. (2010). Family scholarly culture and educational success: Books and schooling in 27 nations. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 28*(2), 171–197. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2010.01.002>

- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Gil Flores, J. (2013). Medición del nivel socioeconómico familiar en el alumnado de Educación Primaria. *Revista de Educación*, 362, 298-322.
<http://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2011-362-162>
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*, 2nd edition. Continuum.
- Hidalgo-McCabe, E. (2020). *Streaming in CLIL and its Effects on Students' Socialization in School* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Horn, D. (2013). Diverging performances: The detrimental effects of early selection on equality of opportunity in Hungary. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 32, 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2013.01.002>
- Instituto de Estadística de la Comunidad de Madrid. (2019). *T19M5 – Población por municipios, distritos y barrios de Madrid y zonas estadísticas según nacionalidad para cada sexo. Padrón municipal 2019*.
http://www.madrid.org/iestadis/fijas/estructu/demograficas/padron/descarga/pc19t19_m5.xls
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística (n.d.a). *Provincias: Madrid: Indicadores de renta media y mediana*. <https://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Datos.htm?t=31097>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística (n.d.b). *Renta por persona y unidad consumo por comunidades autónomas*. <https://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Tabla.htm?t=9947>
- Fernández-Agüero, M. & Hidalgo-McCabe, E. (2020). CLIL Students' Affectivity in the Transition between Education Levels: The Effect of Streaming at the Beginning of

Secondary Education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1795864>

Llinares, A. & Evnitskaya, N. (2021). Classroom Interaction in CLIL Programs: Offering Opportunities or Fostering Inequalities? *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(2), 366-397.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.607>

Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, Race, and Family life* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Lorenzo, F., Granados, A., & Rico, N. (2021). Equity in Bilingual Education: Socioeconomic Status and Content and Language Integrated Learning in Monolingual Southern Europe. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(3), 393-413. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaa037>

Martín Rojo, L. (2015). The social construction of inequality in and through interaction in multilingual classrooms. In N. Markee (Ed.) *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction* (pp. 490-505). Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mediavilla, M., Mancebón, M. J., Gómez- Sancho, J. M., & Pires, L. (2019). Bilingual Education and School Choice: A Case Study of Public Secondary Schools in the Spanish Region of Madrid. *IEB Working*.

http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/134081/1/IEB19-01_Mediavilla%2bet.al.pdf

Morgan, P. L., Farkas, G., Hillemeier, M. M., & Maczuga, S. (2009). Risk factors for learning-related behavior problems at 24 months of age: Population-based estimates. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37, 401-413. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-008-9279-8>

- Murillo, F. J. & Martínez-Garrido, C. (2018). Magnitud de la segregación escolar por nivel socioeconómico en España y sus Comunidades Autónomas y comparación con los países de la Unión Europea. *Revista de Sociología de la Educación (RASE)*, 11(1), 37-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7203/RASE.11.1.10129>
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2012). Improving the Measurement of Socioeconomic Status for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: A Theoretical Foundation. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/researchcenter/Socioeconomic_Factors.pdf
- Olshain, O., Shohamy, E., Kemp, J. and Chatow, R. (1990). Factors predicting success in EFL among culturally different learners, *Language Learning*, 20, 23-44.
- Ramanathan, V. (2005). *The English-vernacular Divide: Postcolonial Language Politics and Practice*. Multilingual Matters.
- Rascón, D. J. & Bretones, C. M. (2018). Socioeconomic Status and its Impact on Language and Content Attainment in CLIL Contexts. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 115-135. <https://dx.doi.org/10.30827/digibug.54025>
- Reardon, S. & Owens, A. (2014). 60 years after Brown: Trends and Consequences of School Segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043152>
- Rogošić, S., & Baranović, B. (2016). Social capital and educational achievements: Coleman versus Bourdieu. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 6(2), 81–100.

- Paino, M., & Renzulli, L. A. (2013). Digital Dimension of Cultural Capital: The (In)Visible Advantages for Students Who Exhibit Computer Skills. *Sociology of Education*, 86(2), 124–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040712456556>
- Park, J. S.-Y. (2009). *The Local Construction of a Global Language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schwartz H. (2010). “Housing policy is school policy: economically integrative housing promotes academic success in Montgomery County, Maryland.” *The Century Foundation*. [https://tcf.org/content/report/housing-policy-school-policy-economically-integrative-housing-promotes-academic-success-montgomery-county-maryland/?agreed=1ounty,%20Maryland%20\(tcf.org\)&agreed=1](https://tcf.org/content/report/housing-policy-school-policy-economically-integrative-housing-promotes-academic-success-montgomery-county-maryland/?agreed=1ounty,%20Maryland%20(tcf.org)&agreed=1)
- Somers, T., & Llinares, A. (2021). Students’ motivation for content and language integrated learning and the role of programme intensity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(6), 839-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1517722>
- Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport. (2017, May 6). Order ECD/393/2017, of 4 May, regulating the final assessment for Compulsory Secondary Education in the academic year 2016/2017. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, 108, 36868–97. <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/o/2017/05/04/ecd393/con>
- Spanish Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport. (2017, April 7). Order 972/2017, of 7 April, regulating the Spanish-English bilingual high schools in the Community of Madrid. http://www.madrid.org/wleg_pub/secure/normativas/contenidoNormativa.jsf?opcion=VerHtml&nmnorma=9744&cdestado=P#no-back-button

- Tompkins, F. L. (Forthcoming). Socioeconomic Status, English Exposure and CLIL Motivation in High and Low Exposure CLIL Groups. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 5(1).
- Van Bergen, E., Van Zuijen, T., Bishop, D., & De Jong, P. F. (2017). Why Are Home Literacy Environment and Children's Reading Skills Associated? What Parental Skills Reveal. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 52(2), 147-160.
- Van Mensel, L., Hilligsmann, P., Mettewie, L., & Galand, B. (2020). CLIL, An Elitist Language Learning Approach? A Background Analysis of English and Dutch CLIL Pupils in French-speaking Belgium. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 33(1), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1571078>

Appendix

Tu grupo: _____ Sección bilingüe Programa bilingüe
 No escribas tu nombre. El cuestionario es anónimo.



1. ¿Eres chica o chico?

- Chica
 Chico

2. ¿En qué año naciste?

Año: _____

3. ¿En qué país habéis nacido tus padres y tú?

	Alumno/a	Madre	Padre
En España	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
En otro país	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. ¿Cuál es el nivel de estudios más alto que han completado tu madre y tu padre?

(Marca una opción en cada columna. En caso de falta de uno de los dos, marca "No aplicable". En caso de no haber estudiado en el sistema educativo español, marca la opción equivalente).

	Madre	Padre
a. No fue al colegio.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Fue al colegio, pero no completó la Educación General Básica (EGB) o la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria (ESO).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Educación General Básica (EGB) o Educación Secundaria Obligatoria (ESO).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Bachillerato, BUP, COU, Formación Profesional (FP) de Primer Grado, FP de Grado Medio, Grado Medio de Enseñanzas Deportivas, Escuela Elemental de Artes y Oficios Artísticos, Escuela Oficial de Idiomas.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Formación Profesional de Grado Superior, Grado Superior de Enseñanza de Artes Plásticas y Diseño, Grado Superior de Enseñanzas Deportivas.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Diploma Universitario, Ingeniería Técnica, Arquitectura Técnica.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Licenciatura, Grado Universitario, Ingeniería, Arquitectura, Enseñanzas Artísticas Superiores.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Máster Universitario, Máster en Enseñanzas Artísticas.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Doctorado.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. No Aplicable.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Indica la frecuencia con la que se utilizan en tu domicilio los siguientes recursos:

	Todos o casi todos los días	Una o dos veces a la semana	Una o dos veces al mes	Nunca o casi nunca
a. Libros de lectura (papel o digital)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Prensa diaria (papel o digital)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Enciclopedias o libros de consulta (papel o digital)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Ordenador o tableta	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Internet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. ¿Cuántos dispositivos de información digital de uso habitual hay en tu casa?

(Ordenadores, tabletas, Smart phones, Smart TV, libros electrónicos, etc.)

7. ¿Cuántas personas conviven contigo? (Sin incluirte a ti).

8. Aproximadamente, ¿cuántos libros hay en tu casa?

(No incluyas los libros digitales, las revistas, los periódicos ni los libros de texto).

De 0 a 10 libros	De 11 a 50 libros	De 51 a 100 libros	De 101 a 200 libros	Más de 200 libros
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. ¿Qué clase de puesto de trabajo ocupan tu madre y tu padre en sus respectivas actividades laborales principales? Si uno de los dos no realiza un trabajo remunerado actualmente, responde en relación al último realizado.

(Marca en cada columna la **categoría laboral que mejor describa la actividad** de cada uno de ellos. Cada categoría cuenta con una serie de ejemplos. En caso de falta de uno de los dos, marca "No aplicable").

	Madre	Padre
a. Nunca ha tenido un trabajo remunerado.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Trabajador/a sin especialización. Incluye ayuda doméstica y limpieza, empleados/as de mantenimiento de edificios, mensajeros/as, repartidores/as, porteros/as, trabajadores/as no especializados/as en agricultura, ganadería, pesca y construcción...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Trabajador/a especializado/a o artesano/a. Incluye albañiles, carpinteros/as, fontaneros/as, electricistas, conductores/as, maquinistas, trabajadores/as del metal, mecánicos/as, artesanos/as...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Trabajador/a especializado/a en agricultura, ganadería o pesca.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Operario/a de maquinaria en fábricas o talleres.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Trabajador/a en servicios de restauración y comercio. Incluye trabajadores/as de hostelería, dependientes/as, vendedores/as, camareros/as, cocineros/as...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Trabajador/a en servicios personales, protección y seguridad. Incluye auxiliares de vuelo, auxiliares de enfermería o emergencias, trabajadores/as en servicios de seguridad, militares y policías de escalas básicas, bomberos/as, peluquería...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Propietario/a de un pequeño negocio. Incluye propietarios/as de pequeñas empresas (menos de 25 empleados), como tiendas minoristas, servicios, restaurantes...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Administrativo/a. Incluye personal administrativo y contable, secretarios/as, grabadores/as de datos, atención al cliente...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Técnicos/as o ayudantes. Incluye técnicos o ayudantes (de científicos/as, ingenieros/as, informáticos/as, biólogos/as), enfermeros/as, técnicos/as financieros, agentes de negocios..	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Ejecutivo/a o alto/a funcionario/a. Incluye encargados/as de grandes empresas (25 empleados o más) o directores/as de departamentos en grandes empresas, legisladores/as o altos funcionarios/as, oficiales del ejército...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Profesionales. Incluye científicos/as, matemáticos/as, ingenieros/as, arquitectos/as, informáticos/as, profesionales de la biología y la sanidad, profesores/as, profesionales de las leyes, periodistas, escritores/as, artistas, profesionales religiosos/as...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. No aplicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. ¿Prefieres aprender asignaturas en inglés o en español?

mucho más en inglés	más en inglés	igual	más en español	mucho más en español
---------------------	---------------	-------	----------------	----------------------

▼ ¿Por qué?

11. ¿Piensas que se dan las clases (de biología, historia, etc.) de forma distinta en inglés y en español?











- Sí
 No

▼ ¿Por qué sí / por qué no?

12. ¿Con qué frecuencia usas el inglés fuera de clase?	Diariamente	Algunas veces a la semana	Una vez a la semana	Algunas veces al mes	Una vez al mes o menos	Nunca
Ver la tele, películas (con o sin subtítulos en español)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ver videos en Youtube	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Escuchar música / la radio	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hablar con amigos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hablar con tus padres o tu familia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navegar por Internet (Wikipedia, ...)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Videojuegos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leer (revistas, libros ...)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Escribir (chat, correo electrónico ...)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clases particulares de inglés	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. ¿En general, con qué frecuencia usan los profesores el inglés cuando imparten sus asignaturas en inglés?	Siempre	Casi siempre	Mucho	Bastante	Poco	Nunca
Para explicar/enseñar materias.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Para dar instrucciones sobre qué hacer en clase (actividades, ejercicios, ...)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. ¿En general, con qué frecuencia hacéis las siguientes actividades en las asignaturas que dais en inglés?	Casi siempre	Mucho	Bastante	Poco	Nunca
Trabajo en parejas/grupos en clase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proyectos grupales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentaciones orales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discusiones en clase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hacer redacciones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leer textos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Juegos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. ¿En qué medida estás de acuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones?	Totalmente de acuerdo 	De acuerdo 	Ni acuerdo ni desacuerdo 	En desacuerdo 	Totalmente desacuerdo 
Me gusta aprender asignaturas en inglés.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Me gusta participar en inglés en las asignaturas que damos en inglés.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Se me da bien estudiar o pensar en inglés.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Me gusta trabajar en grupo en inglés en las asignaturas que damos en inglés.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Me gustan las clases que damos en inglés.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
					
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí porque lo necesitaré para mis estudios en el futuro.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí para encontrar un buen trabajo.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí porque da más prestigio hablar bien inglés.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí porque el inglés es una lengua importante en el mundo.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí porque me permite comunicarme con extranjeros.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí porque de mayor me gustaría estudiar/vivir en en extranjero.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estudiar asignaturas en inglés es útil para mí para viajar fácilmente.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>