

Seven common misconceptions in bilingual education in primary education in Spain

Slavka Madarova, Department of Modern Philology, University of Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares-Madrid 28801, Spain
Jesus Garcia Laborda*, Franklin Institute, Faculty of Education, University of Alcalá, Guadalajara-19001, Spain
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0125-4611>

Suggested Citation:

Madarova, S. & Laborda, J.G. (2020). Seven common misconceptions in bilingual education in primary education in Spain. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 15(2), 358-368. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i2.4605>

Received December 5, 2019; revised February 8, 2020; accepted April 1, 2020.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Huseyin Uzunboylu, Higher Education Planning, Supervision, Accreditation and Coordination Board, Cyprus.

©2020 United World Center of Research Innovation and Publication. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Foreign language bilingual education has been common in many countries all over the world for many years after the Quebec issue in the 1970s. However, after all these years, bilingual education still remains as a criticized way of education. This research essay examined the most significant criticism by summarizing it into seven common misconceptions of the bilingual education schooling system in Spain in general education English-Spanish 1st—12th grade. A lot of criticism has been directed towards the differences between regular mainstream classes and bilingual classes especially in Primary education. This paper looks at seven commonly addressed issues. The paper especially focuses on Primary education but most revision matters also relate to secondary and even higher education. Special interest is paid to cognitive, social, economic, mode of bilingual education, role of the immigrant students and parents' attitudes. The conclusion leads to the understanding that English-Spanish bilingual education is not pernicious but, on the contrary, benefits the cognitive a linguistic development of most school children.

Keywords: bilingual education; misconceptions; CLIL; immersion; cognitive; socio-economic;

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Prof. Dr. Dr. Jesús García Laborda, Franklin Institute – Facultad de Educación, Universidad de Alcalá, Guadalajara-19001, Spain *E-mail address:* jesus.garcoialaborda@uah.es / Tel.: +34-949 20 97 36

1. Introduction

1.1 Beginnings of Bilingual Education Program in Spain - The British Council program

The first steps towards establishing a bilingual program in Spain were taken in 1996 when it was introduced in Spain. A cooperation between the British Council and Spanish Ministry of Education and Science led to establishment of 43 State Primary Bilingual schools with over 1200 students, in 10 provinces of Spain (Dobson, Pérez Murillo & Johnstone, 2010, p. 5). In 2009 there was a decrease in the number of State Secondary schools adhered to the program, which has been explained as a result of establishing the new bilingual programs in various provinces of Spain and consequent change from the original to the new programs (Dobson, Pérez Murillo & Johnstone, 2010, p. 14).

Up to now, ten Primary schools from the original program still operate in the Province of Madrid. The main difference between these schools and the ones that belong to the current public Bilingual Program of Province of Madrid is the implementation of “integrated British-Spanish curriculum” of the original schools (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 69). Furthermore, those participating schools also count with Linguistic Assessors (language assistants), who either are usually native or native-like speakers of English (Dobson, Pérez Murillo & Johnstone, 2010, p. 14).

In this paper, we intend to present significant evidence that some of the common criticism found in several papers (Anghel, Cabrales & Carro, 2015) instead of addressing a traditional procedure to look into the teaching of foreign language for overall improvement (Selimi, 2017) . By so doing we state the main problems into headings and our rebuttal. These criticisms are mostly cognitive, social, and economic.

1.2 Bilingual program implemented in Madrid

Based on the data provided by the Consejería de Educación de Madrid (Regional Ministry of Education of Madrid) for the Academic year 2017-2018, it was the Academic year 2004-2005 when the bilingual program was introduced to 26 state schools in the Province of Madrid. Since then the program has grown and nowadays it counts with 369 Primary state schools (About 67% of the total number of schools in the region), 152 Secondary state schools and 204 Chartered schools (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 42). This number is ever growing, with a proposition of extending the said bilingual program to other languages, such as French and German, by creating language sections (so far there are 15 French and 4 German language sections) (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 47, graph 1) or even the increase of tri-lingual schools.

The schools chosen to partake in the bilingual program are selected based on a set of requirements published by the Regional Ministry of Education (Consejería de Educación). Each school within the program counts with the Bilingual Program Coordinator and Language Assistants. Position of Language Assistants are filled by university graduates from English speaking countries who arrive to Spain based on agreements established between the Regional Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Education and the Fulbright Commission (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 54).

Teachers in both Primary and Secondary schools must be in possession of the Linguistic certificate specified for their teaching position, at a level of C1. In-service teachers’ training, provided by The Regional Ministry of Education, offers teachers a variety of options on how to improve and maintain their language level, including university run courses and stays abroad (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 51).

Students in State Bilingual Primary schools study English from their 1st year. Students within the Bilingual Program not only learn English as a foreign language, but they also receive content classes

where English is used as a language of instruction. Moreover, “the State Bilingual Primary Schools, in addition to English language lessons, teach at least three subjects in English, with the exception of Mathematics and Spanish Language and Literature” (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 60).

State Secondary schools offer their students two options: Bilingual Program and Bilingual section. First one provides five hours of English language per week plus one subject taught in English, whereas the second one counts with five hours of Advanced English Curriculum which includes not only English language but also literature and three to four subjects taught in English (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 62).

Each year, students undergo an external evaluation, designed by the Regional Ministry of Education and carried out by internationally recognized institutions such as the Trinity College Board of Examinations or Cambridge Assessments. In State Primary Education, this takes place in the 6th year and in the Compulsory State Secondary Education in the 4th year (Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018, p. 55). As well as that, students also participate in the international projects to strengthen the relationships between language and culture (Mowlaie & Arasteh, 2017).

1.3 Comparative results

1.3.1 Bilingual versus non-bilingual students in general

In 2018, Enrique-Abellán and Martínez-Ramón from the University of Murcia carried out a study comparing bilingual and non-bilingual groups in the Compulsory Secondary Education. They considered various characteristics of those groups related to their socio-demographic situation, teaching of English and academic performance. This comparison has shown numerous differences. The most significant was related to students who failed and had to repeat the full year or to retake particular subjects.

Enrique-Abellán and Martínez-Ramón (2018) stated that “while 93.5% of the students in bilingual groups did not fail any subject last year, only 51.2% of the students in non-bilingual groups did not fail any subject” (p. 66). Moreover, the researchers have examined the coping strategies of bilingual and non-bilingual students and observed that 41.3% of bilingual students used the problem solving strategy, compared with only 16.3% of non-bilingual students (Enrique-Abellán & Martínez-Ramón, 2018, p. 67). Similar results in EFL in Iran were observed by Namaziandost, Imani, & Ziafar, 2020)

Another finding that emerged from this study was the students’ reasoning for undertaking the bilingual program. In the bilingual group, this was predominantly due to the choice of their parents, closely followed by their interest in English. Reasons in the non-bilingual group were ‘unstated’ in the first place and followed by declaring that the program was too demanding combined with students disliking English in general (Enrique-Abellán & Martínez-Ramón, 2018, p. 64).

1.3.2 Bilingual versus non-bilingual students in BEP (Bilingual Education Project)

A comparison between bilingual and non-bilingual students must take into consideration, among other factors, the type of the bilingual program. A study carried out jointly by the team that prepared the Report of Bilingual Education Project (BEP) – Dobson, Pérez Murillo and Johnstone – presents the results obtained from comparison between bilingual and non-bilingual students in BEP. This study, approved by MECD and British Council was prompted by the fears of bilingual students’ parents who were afraid that 40% of English instruction in British Council Bilingual schools was taking its toll on their children’s Spanish skills (Dobson, Pérez Murillo & Johnstone, 2010, p. 85).

The study compared, among other variables, the writing done in Spanish by students of 2nd year of Compulsory Secondary Education studying in Bilingual Program of British Council and students of a non-bilingual Program in four different educational institutions. Even though the sample was relatively small, the results have shown that the writing skills of Spanish students from the Bilingual Program were superior to those who were in the non-bilingual section. Authors concluded that bilingual education proved beneficial to overall education and not only to the foreign language development (Dobson, Pérez Murillo & Johnstone, 2010, p. 88).

Similarly, the results of a study carried out in Castile and Leon in 2017 with the group of BEP (Bilingual Education Program) and NBP (Non-bilingual Program) students demonstrated not only that subtractive bilingualism did not take place but also proved that Bilingual Program helped students in their path towards additive bilingualism instead (Soledad Santa Maria Luna, 2017, p. 42).

1.3.3 Bilingual versus non-bilingual students in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

Following study carried out by Madrid and Corral Robles in 2018 that compared Bilingual and Non-bilingual programs a step further, since it incorporated Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The authors focused on the written competence of students from Bilingual and Monolingual Programs in Secondary Education; namely, it centred on writing skills of two groups of students from State Compulsory Secondary Education – one that studied through CLIL and another that studied English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The results have shown that the CLIL students outperformed their counterparts in writing of structured English texts (Madrid & Corral Robles, 2018).

However, the most important finding of the study was that “the EFL students turn more to their native language to handle their lack of competence in English and are more affected than the CLIL students by interference from their native language” (Madrid and Corrales Robles, 2018, p. 179). Therefore, the authors suggested incrementing CLIL hours in Bilingual Programs instead of implementing more hours of teaching English only.

2. Research question

Parents are often the harshest critics of the bilingual programs. Their concerns are usually based on perceptions and not hard facts. Cummins (2013) in his article published in the *Journal of Parents and Teachers* reacts to parents’ fears that the bilingual programs will decrease their children's performance in their own language. It is not surprising at all that his article appears in a publication focused on bringing together the two parts involved in the education process – educators and parents. Doubts are ever present when bilingual programs are being implemented anywhere in the world and Spain is no exception to this rule. The question that arises from this situation and that needs to be answered is as follows: Are the negative popular opinions about Bilingual Education in Spain real? In order to settle this dilemma, a bibliographical analysis will be implemented.

3. Methodology

3.1. Literature review

As Grosjean (2010) states in his book *Bilingual: Life and Reality*, there are many definitions of what constitutes a bilingual person, based on the needs for such definition, be it work, study or raising children; however, he would use the one that describes them as “those who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday life” (p. 4). One of the closing arguments in his book is related to the longevity of myths about bilingualism. For instance, research carried out fifty years prior stated

that bilingualism affects children's intelligence and should not be supported. Since then most of these ideas have been contradicted but the common misconceptions are still lurking in the background, especially when it comes to the parents questioning the pros and cons of their children's bilingual education.

Bulk of research in bilingual education comes from the US and Canada, where immersion, maintenance and heritage language programs were implemented. Results of studies done over the last decades after implementation of the bilingual immersion programs in Canada in the 1960s show that the fears of parents can be in general considered exaggerated (Cummins, 2013). Cummins (2013) affirms that "a finding common to all forms of bilingual education is that spending instructional time through two languages entails no long-term negative effects on students' academic development in the majority language" (p. 7).

Nonetheless, some regions of Spain do have their own experience with bilingual education programs. Namely, the autonomous communities of Catalonia, Valencia, Balearic Islands, Galicia, Basque Country and Navarra have implemented the minority languages in various degrees in preschool, primary and secondary education. Huguet, Lasagabaster and Vila (2008) refer to a national level study carried out in 1998 that examined the reading comprehension in Spanish in autonomous communities with students who were about to finish their compulsory secondary education. This study revealed that Basque and Catalan students' scores were on average either above or close to the national mean. According to the authors, these results suggest that "the use of Basque and Catalan as vehicle languages, either in maintenance programs or in immersion programs, does not negatively affect the normal development of the majority language, Spanish" (Huguet, Lasagabaster & Vila, 2008, p. 233).

Immersion programs seem to be successful in an environment where an exposure to L2 exists outside of the classroom (e.g. English / French / minority language is spoken as a second language). However, the question is what will happen in the monolingual environment with little to no exposure outside of classroom hours and with a limited number of speakers outside of class with whom the students could interact. One of the options to reach a bilingual competence in such case is mentioned by Romanovski (2018) who speaks of the notion of Non-Native Bilingualism (NNB) in the monolingual environment of Poland. NNB is defined as "a conscious decision to speak to the child in a foreign language (a parent's L2) in a natural way" (Romanovski, 2018, p. 4), where active interaction between the parents and children should amount to 30% per week and not fall beneath 20% in the L2 of their choice (p. 5).

A bilingual program with English as a second language implemented in Spain can be defined as a program set to "promote bilingualism and biliteracy among students from the majority social group (e.g., Spanish speakers in Spain) by using a second language (e.g., English) as a partial medium of instruction" (Cummins, 2013, p. 6). Besides standard bilingual programs Spain also opted for incorporating Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) into its schools. This has happened, according to Gallardo Del Puerto and Martínez Adrián (2013), as an answer to the EU's calls for multilingual citizens and due to the failure of early English classes in Primary education (p. 26). As Bruton (2013) stated, "what makes CLIL so attractive in current L2 pedagogy is that the content is expected to give the use of the foreign language (FL) a communicative purpose" (p. 588). CLIL has produced good results – in general, students joining CLIL classes performed better than non-CLIL EFL students and there was no worsening of their mother language skills (Cummins, 2013, p. 8). In addition, students from bilingual programs have better command of English than students who have learnt the language in EFL/ESL classes (Cummins, 2013, p. 7). Llinares, Morton and Whittaker (2013) assure that one of the biggest advantages of CLIL is that it foments interaction in the classroom more than the traditional EFL/ESL classes (p. 17).

Since CLIL is teaching through language, students participate in more meaningful activities that allow them to use their English. However, Spain still dwells on a tradition of grammar based teaching. Halbach (2018) criticized the use of CLIL based on traditional grammar teaching and proposed another approach to the issue – a literacy approach, turning away from grammatical structures (p. 216). This would mean “a natural link to the content subjects, and thus makes this approach especially suitable for CLIL programs” (Halbach, 2018, p. 216). She reasoned that “students participating in CLIL-type programs come to their foreign language classes with different needs and attitudes than regular FL learners in schools” (Halbach, 2018, p. 217).

Bilingual education in Spain also suffers from contradictions fuelled by parents of students who either do or do not participate in bilingual programs. On the one hand, parents want their children to be involved; on the other hand, they are afraid that they will miss out on the standard curriculum. Study carried out by Enrique-Abellán and Martínez-Ramón (2018) revealed an interesting fact. Even though parents tended to criticize the bilingual programs, in case of the Secondary school in Murcia that participated in the project, 37.5% of students –the highest percentage– have stated that they partake in the program due to their parents’ decision.

One of the objectives of bilingual education researchers in Spain is to establish how to remediate the fear of parents about bilingual education. Publication Don’t Worry, Mum and Dad... I Will Speak English! by Van Wechem and Halbach, released in 2014 had as its main goal to address the most prominent doubts parents have about their child’s language development. It is based on personal experiences of both researchers with bilingual education, not only from academic surroundings but also coming from their own families, raising bilingual children. Van Wechem and Halbach (2014) state a range of reasons related to learning of a second language, including personal, social, cultural and economic (p. 8); however, they consider as the most important advantage of bilingual education the cognitive part (p. 10).

3.2. Seven most common common misconceptions within bilingual education

When talking about bilingual education and its effects, following common misconceptions are widely discussed and used in place of hard facts.

Misconception 1: bilingual education does stop the learning of the first language

To disprove this Misconception, studies have been carried out to assess how bilingual education influences the L1 competence within the environment of Spain. Navarro-Pablo and López Gándara (2020) in their article about the effects of CLIL on L1 competence cite various authors who state that CLIL aids in formation of BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) not only in L2 but also in L1. The authors further affirm that “skills transfer between languages”; moreover, “research done in CLIL shows that the learning of a second language has positive effects on learners’ performance in their L1” (Navarro-Pablo & López Gándara, 2020, p. 20). To support this finding, around 97% of teachers and around 89% of students participating in the study have stated that language awareness among students participating in bilingual education (under CLIL) has risen (Navarro-Pablo & López Gándara, 2020, p. 32). Krashen (1999) also states that “there is strong evidence that literacy transfers across languages, that building literacy in the primary language is a short-cut to English literacy” (p. 111).

Misconception 2: newcomers to a new country learn the national language more slowly than local people

One of the factors that influence the popularity of this Misconception is the age of the newcomers. According to a study carried out by Bialystok and Miller (1999), it is the age of arrival that has a significant influence on L2 acquisition. When examining two groups of students (Chinese and

Spanish) who learnt English after their arrival to Canada they reported that “learners who arrived before they were 8 years old performed the same as native speakers on a grammaticality judgement task by the time they were at least university age” (p. 143). However, it is important to point out that “children who arrive in a country before the age of formal schooling and receive all their education in the new language undoubtedly have a different experience in learning the language of that country than all other language learners (Bialystok & Miller, 1999, p. 144).

Krashen (1996) reiterates that “the crucial variable here is the quality of child's education in the primary language” (p. 20). To illustrate, he mentions success stories of limited proficiency immigrants (with Spanish in Argentina and English in the US) who succeeded in the mainstream classroom without bilingual education. However, he also points out that these children arrived with several years of schooling in their own language thus cognitively prepared to acquire L2 and had support in L1 in the subject matter at home, either through tutors or parents (Krashen, 1996, p. 18). Therefore, it could be concluded that it is in fact better to maintain the L1 at home to help children acquire L2 quicker, since as Krashen (1996) says “we would much rather teach a child in the kindergarten who does not speak English but who is well-adjusted and ready for school than a child who has picked up some English (from an imperfect model) but who has not been communicating very well with his parents” (p. 13). Moreover, the preference of the second generation of children drifts towards the language of the country they were born in, being exposed to it on a daily basis and the risk exists that their L1 will gradually fade away.

Misconception 3: the best way to learn a language is through "total immersion"

The framework of immersion programs counts, among others, with the following points: students follow curriculum in L2 that is mirroring the L1 curriculum, taught by bilingual instructors in a classroom that is steeped in the culture of L1 and with limited exposure to L2 outside of it; moreover, the goal is additive instead of subtractive bilingualism (Cummins, 1998, p. 35). As mentioned by Johnstone in the *Evaluation Report Online Supplement* (2011), “the research on immersion Programs elsewhere already referred to suggests that, where the appropriate conditions for immersion education are put in place, then children’s command of their first or their national language can in fact be enhanced rather than compromised and their sense of identity strengthened” (p. 8).

However, it has to be mentioned that the immersion programs do not produce the same results in all the camps. Cummins (2013) refers to findings from the French immersion program study where students were reported to have considerably good results in receptive skills (understanding and reading) but their productive skills (writing and speaking) were not showing the same progress – both compared to the native French speakers (p. 7). This was contributed to the input – reading and writing occurred almost exclusively in the classroom context and contact with native speakers outside of classroom environment was limited.

Misconception 4: children learning English should have at least half of the classes in English, at the expense of the first language

The most conclusive to this Misconception has been the research carried out in the field of neurolinguistics, namely when dealing with patients suffering from aphasia. As stated by Gómez-Ruiz (2010), several reports have shown that “the brain of a bilingual or polyglot does not have a separate area for each language, nor unique regions” (p. 450). The author further states that the question is not whether L1 is located in different parts of the brain than L2 but more about distinguishing between metalinguistic knowledge (located in the medial temporal structures and posterior association areas of both hemispheres and related to conscious learning using declarative memory) and implicit linguistic competence (located in the frontobasal and cerebellum structures, inferior parietal region of the left hemisphere and related to incidental acquisition using procedural memory) (Gómez-Ruiz, 2010, pp. 450-451). An excerpt from the table used in the article *Bilingualism and the Brain: Myth and Reality* by Gómez-Ruiz (2010, p. 450) shows the following distinctions:

Table 1 Characteristics of metalinguistic knowledge and implicit linguistic competence. Bilingualism and the Brain: Myth and Reality by Gómez-Ruiz (2010, p. 450)

	metalinguistic knowledge	implicit linguistic competence
L1	Vocabulary	Grammar
L2: high command	Vocabulary	Grammar
L2: poor command	Vocabulary + Grammar	—

Van Wechem and Halbach (2014) speak about disadvantages related to bilingualism that have to do with the vocabulary and context in which each language is used. Bilingual children use the grammar structures in the language they feel more comfortable with even if it is not the language that has the original structure in it (Van Wechem and Halbach, 2014, p. 32). They further state that differences between bilingual and monolingual children where bilingual are slower to recognize the differences between the wrong and right grammar structures disappear after a while of learning, in higher grades in school and they are related to the exposure to the language, which is 50% of each (Van Wechem and Halbach, 2014, pp. 32-34).

Misconception 5: dropout rates for students demonstrate the failure of bilingual education

This Misconception might be based on the drop-out rates presented in the research from the US. Krashen (1999) refers to research results which described drop-out rates for Hispanic students in the US and discusses various factors that have contributed to the drop-out from bilingual programs, concluding that the major factor in the decision was not the education itself but rather socioeconomic circumstances, namely desire or need to work instead of continuing with education (p. 121).

In the European context the dropout rates are usually related to the character of bilingual education. A study published in 2012 by Carsten Apsel investigating dropout rates among the students in Germany reveals that there aren't any official statistics which could express on the numerical scale the number of dropouts; nevertheless, he refers to another study which listed 30% dropout rate, based on the fact that CLIL courses in Germany are usually offered to highly motivated well performing students hence creating a 'privileged' cohort within the education (Apsel, 2012, p. 50). Interviews with students who dropped out of CLIL stream revealed that their language proficiency, motivation and learning styles were behind their decision to leave the program since they felt that they were lagging behind the rest of the class. Apsel (2012) recommends evaluating these students' experiences to improve bilingual education programs (see also EL-Daou & Abdallah (2019).

Misconception 6: research is inconclusive on the benefits of bilingual education

Various studies have been published since the bilingual education programs were implemented worldwide. However, most importantly the last decade has seen an increase of studies focused on bilingual CLIL programs in Spain. These studies take into consideration the monolingual character of Spain when assessing the benefits of bilingual education offered to primary and secondary students. To determine the effects of bilingual education in Spain on a content knowledge and on L2 competence, following studies can be taken into consideration:

First, a study by Hughes and Madrid published in 2020 focused on comparison of primary and secondary CLIL and non-CLIL students studying natural sciences in Andalusia. The authors reported that while “no significant difference between the science scores of primary school students who had studied in the L1 and those who had studied in the L2 as part of a CLIL program” were observed, in secondary education the advantage was on the side of CLIL students where “public CLIL students significantly outperformed both public and charter non-CLIL learners” (Hughes & Madrid, 2020, pp.

55-56). Hughes and Madrid (2020) reached a conclusion that the initial disadvantage of starting with CLIL program in the primary education gradually disappears over time and by the end of secondary education the students reap the benefits of bilingual programs, outperforming their peers.

The results of a longitudinal study carried out by Martínez Agudo (2020) in Extremadura, focusing on English language competency, were in line with the previously mentioned study findings; namely, that the students in the primary education showed insignificant differences between CLIL and non-CLIL stream whereas in the secondary education, particularly towards its end, students' skill in use of English were higher. Moreover, the analysis which took into consideration the following first year of non-compulsory secondary education, posterior to the compulsory, has shown significant differences "which suggests that positive CLIL effects continue for at least a year after students leave the secondary CLIL Program" (Martínez Agudo, 2020, p. 41).

Misconception 7: language-minority parents do not support bilingual education because they feel it is more important for their children to learn the national language than to maintain the native language

Children that belong to the language minority, be it newcomers or not, often find themselves in the situation that was described by Bourguet (2006) as submersion education – language of instruction is the majority language of the country they live in and slowly they move towards assimilation. Bourguet (2006) states that "frequent outcome of submersion education is school underachievement and high dropout rates" (p. 642). As it was already mentioned before, a bilingual person's brain does not have two separate areas for the first and the second language; rather, it is a transfer that happens between the skills learnt in first language (L1) towards the second language (L2). Therefore, "for children who are made to operate in a poorly developed language (as is the case in submersion education), cognitive functioning and academic performance may be negatively affected" (Bourguet, 2006, p. 463).

Another argument against this Misconception is the growing interest for Non-Native Bilingualism (NNB) as mentioned by Romanovski (2018). A study carried out in Poland involving parents and their children with whom they were interacting in an L2 of their choice (English, German, Spanish, etc.) had seen interviewed parents confirming that the children not only did not have any problem of acquiring a new language which was only spoken at home by a non-native speaker but also retained their L1. Seeing that language-minority parents have an advantage of being native speakers of the language it could be considered a great loss not to use this opportunity.

Moreover, Cummins (2013) states that when the necessity to employ the second language vanishes the second language will vanish as well; however, should a necessity arise, the second language will come back (p. 51) – turned around, this could be applied to the situation of the newcomers and potential loss of their language spoken as their native language at home. Finally, Van Wechem and Halbach (2014) observe the necessity of motivation provided for the child by parents, in order to support the use of the second language (p. 42).

4. Conclusions

This paper proved some of the most significant misconceptions of Bilingual Education in Spain by proving that the students' performance is generally better than that of the counterparts of EFL enriched monolingual classes. Additionally, as stated by Pérez Cañado (2020) "attaining bilingualism in monolingual settings poses much more of a challenge, since there is little or no extra-mural exposure to the target language, which is ultimately confined to the CLIL classroom" (p. 1) and it is more motivating. Statistics used by the Ministry evidence also this better achievement not only in English but also in maths and Spanish language and literacy. Obviously, one of the limitations of this paper is the lack of fresh data but it has never been the intention of this paper to elaborate on new results that although need to be revised annually have not shown significant changes in the last years.

What can be observed through this paper is that bilingual education in shows that there is a deep socio-affective-psychological relation among the different issues in bilingual education. It also points

that Subtractive bilingual education is detrimental in many aspects but coordinate/additional bilingual education adds unlimited possibilities to students and kids; as well as that many pre-judgements are based on individual speculative cases but little evidence supports most criticism against bilingual education; and finally, that Governments should support bilingual education especially in area-dominant languages (like Russia and else).

Future study, however, should look at the individual's differences among students, especially immigrant students, despite their mother tongues as well as real deep reasons why some schools outperform the others. Additionally, the implications of this supportive paper indicate that CLIL has a significant position in the Spanish educational system but the effect of CLIL methodology on the long term (after completing high school or even university) and the role of CLIL in the transition between Primary Education still need to be revised. In this sense, this paper has brought interesting food for thought of interest for the general audience but there is still, after all these many years, a long process of validation and improvement that needs to be undertaken.

References

- Anghel, B., Cabrales, A., y Carro, J. M. (2015). Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: the impact beyond foreign language learning. *Economic Inquiry* 54(2), 1202-1223 available on April 18, 2020 at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ecin.12305/full>
- Bialystok, E. & Miller, B. (1999). The problem of age in second language acquisition: Influences from language, structure, and task*. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 2(2), 127-145. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728999000231>
- Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: some of the reasons why ... and why not. *System* 41(3), 587-597. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.001>
- Bourguet, M.-L. (2006). Introducing Strong Forms of Bilingual Education in the Mainstream Classroom: A Case for Technology. *Sixth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT'06)*, Kerkrade, 642 - 646. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICALT.2006.1652523>
- Apsel, C. (2012). Coping with CLIL: Dropouts from CLIL Stream in Germany. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(4), 47-56.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Immersion education for the millennium: What have we learned from 30 years of research on second language immersion? In Childs, M. R. & Bostwick, R. M. (Eds.), *Learning through two languages: Research and practice. Second Katoh Gakuen International Symposium on Immersion and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 34-47). Katoh Gakuen, Japan.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Immersion education for the millennium: What have we learned from 30 years of research on second language immersion? In M. R. Childs & R. M. Bostwick (Eds.) *Learning through two languages: Research and practice. Second Katoh Gakuen International Symposium on Immersion and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 34-47). Katoh Gakuen, Japan
- Cummins, J. (2013). Bilingual Education and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Research and its classroom implications. *Padres y Maestros*, 349, 6-10.
- Dobson, A., Pérez Murillo, M. D. & Johnstone, R. M. (2010). *Bilingual Education Project Spain: Evaluation Report*. Madrid: Gobierno de España Ministerio de Educación & British Council (Spain).
- EL-Daou, B. & Abdallah, A. (2019). The impact of CLIL implementation on Lebanese students' attitudes and performance. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 9(1), 1–13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v9i1.4068>
- Enrique-Abellán, M., & Martínez-Ramón, J. P. (2018). Differences between students in bilingual and non-bilingual groups in a centre for Secondary Education. *Journal of Psychology and Education*, 13(1), 60-72.
- Gallardo Del Puerto, F. & Martínez Adrián, M. (2013). ¿Es más efectivo el aprendizaje de la lengua extranjera en un contexto AICLE? Resultados de la investigación en España. *Padres y Maestros*, 349, 25-28.
- Gómez-Ruiz, M.I. (2010). Bilingualism and the Brain: Myth and Reality. *Neurología*, 25(7), 443-452. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2173-5808\(10\)70082-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2173-5808(10)70082-1)
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Halbach, A. (2018). A literacy approach to language teaching: a proposal for FL teaching in CLIL contexts. *Pulso. Revista de Educación*, 41, 205-223.
- Hughes, S. P. & Madrid, D. (2020). The effects of CLIL on content knowledge in monolingual contexts. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 48-59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1671483>
- Huguet, A., Lasagabaster, D. & Vila, I. (2008). Bilingual Education in Spain: Present Realities and Future Challenges. In Cummins, J. & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 5: Bilingual*

- Education* (p. 225-235). New York: Springer Science + Business Media LLC. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_127
- Johnston, R. (2011). The BEP and its evaluation in the context of Bilingual education development & research. In Dobson, A., Pérez Murillo, M. D., Johnstone, Richard. *Bilingual education Project (Spain): Evaluation Report Online Supplement*. Madrid: Gobierno de España Ministerio de Educación & British Council (Spain).
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Under Attack: A Case Against Bilingual Education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Krashen, S. (1999). Bilingual Education: Arguments For and (Bogus) Arguments Against. In Alatis, J. E. & Tan, A-H. (Eds.), *Language in Our Time: Bilingual Education and Official English, Ebonics and Standard English, Immigration and the Unz Initiative, Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1999* (pp. 111-127). Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Llinares, A., Morton, T. & Whittaker, R. (2013). Cómo integrar lengua y contenidos en la educación bilingüe. *Padres y Maestros*, 349, 16-20.
- Martínez Agudo, J. (2020). The impact of CLIL on English language competence in a monolingual context: a longitudinal perspective. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 36-47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1610030>
- Madrid, Comunidad Bilingüe 2017-2018 (2018). Consejería de Educación e Investigación, Dirección General de Becas y Ayudas al Estudio
- Madrid, D. & Corral Robles, S. (2018). La competencia escrita de alumnos de programas bilingües y no bilingües de educación secundaria. *RMIE*, 23(76), 179-202.
- Mowlaie, B. & Arasteh, Y.(2017). Relationship between cultural awareness and Iranian EFL learners' motivation. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 7(1), 59-70.
- Namaziandost, E., Imani, A. & Ziafar, M. (2020). An investigation of Iranian EFL teachers and learners' attitudes towards using language learning strategies. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 10(1), 65–71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v10i1.4492>
- Navarro-Pablo, M. & López Gándara, Y. (2020). The effects of CLIL on L1 competence development in monolingual contexts. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1) p. 18-35. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1656764>
- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2020). Implementing bilingual education in monolingual contexts: lessons learned and ways forward. *The Language Learning Journal*, (48)1, 1-3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1695622>
- Selimi, A. (2017). Teaching in multilingual education: Syllabus design based on the principles of multilingualism. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. 7(2), 76-85. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v7i2.2989>
- Soledad Santa Maria Luna. (2017). *Bilingual Education Program's effectiveness based on learners' reading comprehension and writing skills* (Master's Final Project (MFP). University of Valladolid.
- Van Wechem, M. & Halbach, A. (2014). *Don't worry mum and dad, I will speak English. La guía del bilingüismo del British Council School*. Madrid: British Council.