

# Language Assistant Programs and CLIL: Developing and Validating Questionnaires to Determine Program Training Needs

Berenice I. Rocha

Department of English Philology, University of Jaén, Jaén, Spain

**Abstract**—Research on language assistants in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms in the context of Spain has been scarce. Given the unique, demanding nature of CLIL instruction, more investigation into the implementation of language assistant programs in CLIL using validated research tools is essential. Therefore, this paper outlines the process for developing and validating questionnaires created to analyze the perceptions and training needs of language assistants, CLIL teachers, and bilingual program coordinators in relation to effectively implementing language assistant programs in CLIL. In this study, three questionnaires were created for three specific cohorts (i.e., language assistants, CLIL teachers, and bilingual program coordinators). The first step of the double-fold pilot process used to validate the questionnaires entailed an expert rating approach, where the experts rated each item's clarity, precision, and relevance, followed by rating the entire questionnaire's logical order, number of items, and content validity. The second step involved a pilot study conducted among all three cohorts. Next, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each section of the three questionnaires, except for demographic information, and for each questionnaire as a whole. The results show that all sections and questionnaires are internally consistent and thus could be used in a wide array of studies analyzing the implementation of language assistant programs in CLIL. The questionnaires allow the use of data source triangulation to determine the training needs of three cohorts in both their CLIL pedagogical knowledge and language assistant program implementation skills, specifically in a secondary school classroom setting.

**Index Terms**—questionnaire, language assistants, CLIL, validity, reliability

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Language Assistant Programs in the Community of Madrid, Spain

In recent years, language assistants (LAs) have become a crucial part of Spain's educational system at the preschool, primary, and secondary levels. Specifically, language assistants are assistant teachers who are foreigners and are native speakers of the student body's target language. While LAs in Spain come from a variety of countries and assist in multiple languages including French, German, Portuguese, and Chinese, the vast majority are English speakers from English-speaking countries (Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional, 2022a). Multiple education-related organizations, including Bilingual English Development & Assessment (BEDA), La Unión de Cooperativas de Enseñanza de Trabajo Asociado de Madrid (UCETAM), and the Spanish Ministry of Education and Vocational Training, have their own LA programs within their organizations. As the programs operate independently of each other, they have different characteristics such as different pay rates, number of hours worked, hiring criteria and processes, and different types of training resources (Buckingham, 2016, p. 89). Despite this, they share the goal of enabling LAs to support teachers in the development of the student body's foreign language competence (Escuelas Católicas de Madrid, n.d.; Colegios Bilingües Cooperativos, 2017; Comunidad de Madrid, 2022) and fostering students' interest and skills in intercultural situations (Tobin & Abello-Contesse, 2013; Laborda et al., 2020; Comunidad de Madrid, 2022).

Regarding the advantages of implementing LA programs in education, Gerena and Ramírez-Verdugo (2014) reported that primary and secondary students in Madrid described their experience with LAs as positive and referred to LAs as "irreplaceable" (p. 127) language-learning resources. Additionally, the LAs themselves reported positive experiences, such as the perception of having instilled motivation for learning in their students. However, this study also detailed weaknesses in the LA programs, which have been referenced in other reports. For example, the lack of pedagogical training for LAs has been a recurring problem in this context (Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Sánchez-Torres, 2014; Buckingham, 2018a; Ordóñez-Dios & Polo-Recuero, 2020), and other studies have highlighted the unclear job duties and expectations of the LA role (Buckingham, 2016; Buckingham, 2018b; Litzler, 2020; López-Medina & Otto, 2020).

These issues may relate to the fact that although typical LAs tend to be young and inexperienced in education (Buckingham, 2018a), the onus of the success of the LA program is often placed solely on the individual LA (Codó & McDaid, 2019). However, for LA programs to be successful, a team approach involving the LAs, teachers, and bilingual program coordinators (BPCs) must be implemented (Buckingham, 2016). The programs typically offer training tools including handbooks for teachers, LAs, and BPCs outlining the duties of the LA and providing advice for positive LA

implementation in the classroom (Cuesta-Ramírez, 2020). Some programs provide more comprehensive training; for example, BEDA and UCETAM hire the LAs as a part of university programs (Buckingham, 2016, p. 89) and offer them in-depth training throughout the academic year. Despite these resources, studies using questionnaires have suggested that teachers and LAs need more training and clearer guidelines of their roles within the LA programs (Méndez-García & Pavón-Vázquez, 2012; Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Cuesta-Ramírez, 2020; Martínez et al., 2021).

### *B. LA Programs in Content and Language Integrated Learning*

From the scientific literature, it is evident that more educational training is needed for LAs. However, Hibler (2010) suggested that simply hiring LAs with previous educational experience would not address this issue across all contexts, such as content and language integrated learning (CLIL). English speaking LAs may be placed in either English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes, CLIL classes in subjects such as P.E., history, sciences, art, and technology, or in a mixture of both EFL and CLIL classes. Specifically, CLIL refers to the educational approach of teaching and learning content through an additional language (Coyle et al., 2010) and presents a unique situation that influences the LA-teacher dynamic. CLIL is distinctive in that the content teacher does not become a language teacher; rather, the educator uses methods to integrate content and language to stimulate students' cognitive skills and promote cognitive development (Coyle et al., 2010). These characteristics present a challenge for any seasoned educator, and especially for LAs who are unfamiliar with the local educational system, language, culture, and customs.

As mentioned in the previous section, a team approach is necessary for successful LA programs, and this approach is even more important in CLIL. For example, Pérez-Cañado et al. (2021) highlighted that collaboration among various educational, administrative, support, and professional teams is essential to the successful use of CLIL with students with diverse learning paces and abilities. Although CLIL is relatively new and has grown rapidly in Spain, the LA figure is already considered a key part of bilingual education in Madrid (Durán-Martínez & Beltrán-Llavador, 2016).

### *C. Statement of Problem*

Educator training and preparedness are crucial to the success of CLIL (Coyle, 2011), but there is a general lack of training and preparation for the LAs in CLIL settings and ambiguity in the duties and expectations of participants in LA programs. There is a need to define the specific ways in which LA program training can be improved. Additionally, there is a current lack of validated research instruments analyzing the LA programs in CLIL. Thus, this work aimed to develop and validate questionnaires focusing on the training needs of LA program participants in relation to both CLIL pedagogy and appropriately implementing the LA programs in a CLIL classroom. Furthermore, the questionnaires are presented (see appendices A, B, and C) so that they may be applied to future studies investigating the implementation of LAs in CLIL.

## II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Buckingham's (2016) study on the training needs of LAs in Madrid was pioneering in the field and influential to the current study. Some items in the current study's questionnaires were adopted from Buckingham's (2016) questionnaire based on the key elements needed in this area of study and to permit comparison with the results of previous studies. The questionnaires developed in this work were designed to create a new approach in the field of LA research to facilitate novel findings while considering previous related studies using questionnaires (see: Hibler, 2010; Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Buckingham, 2016; Buckingham, 2018a; López-Medina & Otto, 2020 who used a questionnaire adapted from Buckingham, 2016). Additionally, the questionnaire in Pérez-Cañado's (2016b) study and Custodio-Espinar's (2019) self-assessment checklist for CLIL teachers were used to determine key CLIL methods and possible gaps in CLIL teacher training. For the validation process, a double-fold pilot procedure was conducted according to Pérez-Cañado (2016a) and Pérez-Cañado et al. (2021).

## III. INSTRUMENT CHARACTERIZATION

The questionnaires detailed in this paper are used in a larger study that incorporates data triangulation by gathering data from LAs, CLIL teachers, and BPCs. Thus, three separate, parallel questionnaires were created. Each questionnaire includes six sections: demographic information, training and professional development, methodology and materials, coordination and organization, the LA program in practice, and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education/CLIL. The LA questionnaire is in English while the teacher and BPC questionnaires are in Spanish, although they have been translated and presented in English in this paper for the purpose of allowing the questionnaires to be administered in other settings. The teacher and BPC questionnaires will be provided in Spanish for the larger study since the current area of investigation is Madrid, Spain, and therefore the questionnaires are conducted in each cohort's native language to avoid any possible language confusion.

The questionnaires are designed to be self-administered (as defined in Brown, 2001) and completed electronically using Google Forms, with the participants kept anonymous. While the questionnaires comprise both open-ended and close-ended items according to Brown's (2001) suggestion, they predominantly focus on close-ended items both for the participants' convenience and to enable collecting primarily quantitative data. In this vein, qualitative data for the larger study is gathered using classroom observations and individual and group interviews in all three cohorts. The open-ended

items in the questionnaires are inserted to allow the participants to expand upon their previous answers, to obtain information that close-ended items cannot provide, and to enable the participants to share suggestions. The majority of close-ended items use a Likert-type scale (*1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree*). A four-point scale is chosen over a five-point scale to remove the central tendency error, meaning the tendency of respondents to choose the midpoint or neutral option (Garland, 1991). A few check-all-that-apply items appear in the questionnaire, as well as some multiple-choice items, which are mostly for demographic information.

#### IV. INSTRUMENT PLANNING AND DESIGN

Initially, the objectives of the larger, mixed-methods study were outlined and used as a framework for developing the questionnaires. The first objective of the study is to conduct a global analysis of LA programs in Madrid's secondary CLIL classrooms, including examining perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the programs and satisfaction with the training provided from the perspective of LAs, CLIL teachers, and BPCs. The second objective is to perform cross-cohort comparisons to determine if there are any significant differences regarding perceptions of the collaboration, preparedness, training, organization, intercultural respect, and success of the LA programs across the three cohorts. When planning and designing the questionnaires, the researchers prioritized keeping the three questionnaires parallel to allow for cross-cohort analysis. The third objective is to perform within-cohort comparisons to determine key variables that could impact the participants' perceptions of LA programs.

Subsequently, a literature review of studies on LA programs in Spain was conducted to gather information on the current body of research and determine what a new research tool could contribute. Previous studies using questionnaires to analyze LA programs helped determine the key items needed to evaluate LA programs (Hibler, 2010; Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Buckingham, 2016; Buckingham, 2018a; López-Medina & Otto, 2020). Moreover, Pérez-Cañado's (2016b) questionnaire and Custodio-Espinar's (2019) self-assessment checklist for CLIL teachers helped determine key CLIL methods and CLIL teacher training needs.

Additionally, Patton's (1987) classification of questions (i.e., those focusing on behavior/experience, opinion/value, feelings, knowledge, sensory, and demographic characteristics/background) was used as a guide for grouping the items into the following six sections: demographic information, training and professional development, methodology and materials, coordination and organization, the LA program in practice, and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education/CLIL.

##### A. Demographic Information

This segment was designed to gather background information on the participants, including personal and professional information pertinent to the context of LAs and bilingual education. The demographic variables were selected by analyzing questionnaires used in previous studies investigating LA programs or CLIL teacher training needs (Hibler, 2010; Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Buckingham, 2016; Pérez-Cañado, 2016b). The common demographic variables for the LA, teacher, and BPC questionnaires include age, nationality, gender, level of education, and type of school (i.e., public, private, charter, or other). For the LAs, other demographic variables include level of Spanish, which LA program they are employed by, and the subject of their Bachelor degree. The LAs were not asked about their L1 as this study focuses on English speaking LAs. For the CLIL teachers and BPCs, their demographic variables include level of English, number of years of experience working in bilingual education, and the subjects they teach in English.

##### B. Training and Professional Development

Vázquez et al. (2020) reported that professional development opportunities for in-service educators are especially essential in CLIL due to this system's challenging nature and educators' need to stay updated on continuous research developments. However, evidence has suggested that teacher participation in professional development training for CLIL skills, including linguistic and methodological skills, is low (Pérez-Cañado, 2017). Consequently, this section of the questionnaires focuses on the CLIL methodological strategies that current teachers and BPCs would like to acquire or strengthen. Similarly, this section asks the LAs about the bilingual education strategies they may know or would like to learn in order to identify CLIL methods that could be implemented in LA training programs. Furthermore, all three cohorts are asked about their perceptions regarding the preparedness of LAs to assist in CLIL and the preparedness of both LAs and teachers to team teach. A cross-cohort analysis of this information could show if LAs, teachers, and BPCs are aligned or discordant in their perceptions.

##### C. Methodology and Materials

To achieve the goal of content and language integration, CLIL teachers must implement a variety of methods adapted for learning through an additional language (Coyle et al., 2010). Although LAs are not expected to have any CLIL pedagogical awareness, prior knowledge and training would help LAs to plan lessons and create materials appropriate for students' needs. Therefore, in the LA questionnaire, items were included that focus on the LA's perceived ability to plan and deliver full lessons, their perceptions of the materials the content teachers create, and whether they have knowledge of the principles of bilingual education teaching methods.

The teacher and BPC questionnaires include items related to more intricate and in-depth CLIL methods, some of which were adopted from Custodio-Espinar's (2019) self-assessment checklist for CLIL teachers. For example, these questionnaires ask whether the teachers and BPCs think they promote autonomous and independent learning in the students, as well as if they are able to anticipate language challenges in the classroom.

#### *D. Coordination and Organization*

Buckingham's (2016) investigation into LA programs in Madrid showed that communication and coordination at various levels within each LA program required attention and improvement. Accordingly, the questionnaires in this study intend to assess whether LAs, teachers, and BPCs feel there is sufficient communication between themselves, whether they think the BPCs are active in supervising the LAs, and whether they feel the teachers manage the LAs' class participation and plan ahead. Sánchez-Torres (2014) reported that a major complaint of LAs was that they were not given enough notice regarding lesson plans, therefore the questionnaires also aim to examine whether the participants believe the LAs are given ample notice before class time when they need to prepare an activity or material.

#### *E. The LA Program in Practice*

Previous studies (Buckingham, 2016; Buckingham, 2018b; Litzler, 2020; López-Medina & Otto, 2020) have highlighted ambiguity in the job duties of LAs, therefore it is crucial to assess whether this ambiguity remains an issue. Indeed, such uncertainty could produce differing expectations between LAs and teachers, which could cause misunderstandings and lead to ineffectively utilizing LAs as linguistic and cultural learning resources (Buckingham, 2016). Correspondingly, it is important to determine whether the BPCs and teachers respect the boundaries of the duties that the LA must not perform. For example, the handbook for the Spanish Ministry of Education's LA program states that an LA cannot perform tasks such as teaching in the classroom alone, supervising recess, grading exams, or conducting meetings with parents (Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional, 2022b). Additionally, items concerning respecting LAs' racial identity and cultural individuality have been included in the questionnaires, as further research is needed in these areas according to Codó and McDaid's (2019) ethnographic study. This study cast a critical light and new perspective on LAs in Spain, stating that LA programs may be promoting native-speakerism, idealizing certain English varieties, and exoticizing the LA.

#### *F. Theoretical Underpinnings of Bilingual Education/CLIL*

Pérez-Cañado's (2016b) study on in-service CLIL teacher training needs included questionnaire items related to the participants' knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings of CLIL due to a previously demonstrated need for more research on this topic (Rubio-Mostacero, 2009). Relatedly, this short section of the questionnaires developed in this study aim to examine whether the three cohorts are familiar with the origins and driving forces of CLIL in a European context, as well as whether they are familiar with the empirical data on the effects of CLIL on student learning. Indeed, the need for educators to be updated on the latest scientific findings is especially pertinent in CLIL, which is newer than traditional teaching methods and has been experiencing a rapid growth in research.

As with CLIL pedagogy, LAs are not expected to understand the underpinnings of CLIL in Europe. However, learning about the origins and CLIL's impact on student learning would help LAs understand the context of their working environment through an empirical lens.

### V. INSTRUMENT VALIDATION

The double-fold pilot procedure according to Pérez-Cañado (2016a) and Pérez-Cañado et al. (2021) was used for validating the questionnaires in the present study. The first step of this procedure involved an expert rating approach, whereby 15 experts were chosen to review the LA questionnaire by providing ratings from 1 (lowest) to 6 (highest) across six categories, including the clarity, precision, and relevance of each item, as well as the logical order, number of items, and content validity of the entire questionnaire. Only the LA questionnaire was subjected to the critical scrutiny of the expert raters since the LA, teacher, and BPC questionnaires are parallel. The expert panel comprised three LAs, three CLIL teachers, three EFL teachers, three BPCs, and three tertiary educators with experience in CLIL research. The experts were individually selected by the researchers due to the experts' extensive knowledge or firsthand experience with both LA programs and the Spanish educational system. Once all 15 expert reviews were collected, the mean score for each category was calculated separately. Each item with a score of 3 or lower in the categories of clarity, precision, or relevance was automatically eliminated, and any item with a score between 3 and 4 was reviewed and either modified or eliminated. Additionally, items for which the review scores had a standard deviation higher than 0.95 were reviewed. All the ratings for the overall questionnaire regarding the logical order, number of items, and content validity presented favorable results, although modifications were made to the order and number of items based on comments from the experts.

For the modifications, the qualitative assessment of the expert comments engendered a slight reordering of the sections. Specifically, the section on the theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education/CLIL was originally the first section after the demographic information. However, the experts noted that the questions in the theoretical underpinnings section could be challenging for LAs to answer and thus may discourage them from completing the rest of the questionnaire. This suggestion aligned with Brown's (2001, p. 56) suggestion to order questions from easiest to most difficult to answer.

Furthermore, several experts mentioned that the questionnaire felt too long. These comments were considered when reviewing items with a mean score between 3 and 4. Overall, the LA questionnaire for the next phase, the pilot study, comprised 40 items (not including the demographic information) after eliminating nine items from the original draft.

The second step in the double-fold pilot procedure was the pilot study, which was conducted with 10 participants from each cohort, totaling 30 participants. The participants were chosen by the researchers for their experience as LAs, CLIL teachers, or BPCs in secondary schools in Madrid. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each section of each questionnaire, excluding the demographic information, open-ended response items, and yes/no items. In this step of the process, three items were deleted because their initial Cronbach’s alpha scores highlighted that they were not internally consistent with the rest of the section. An additional item was deleted because redundancy was identified. As with the first stage of the pilot study, modifications made to one questionnaire were reflected in the others. Table 1 below depicts the final Cronbach’s alpha results, demonstrating that the questionnaires and the sections within the questionnaires are all internally consistent according to George and Mallery’s (2003) scale, where a Cronbach’s alpha above .9 is considered excellent, above .8 is considered good, and above .7 is considered acceptable.

TABLE 1  
CRONBACH’S ALPHA RESULTS

	BPC Questionnaire	Teacher Questionnaire	LA Questionnaire
Training and professional development	.725	.781	.764
Methodology and materials	.812	.856	.719
Coordination and organization	.767	.877	.732
The language assistant program in practice	.734	.738	.737
Theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education/CLIL	.904	.851	.864
Overall Questionnaire	.903	.934	.824

Ultimately, the final number of items after the pilot study (not including the demographic information) was 36 for the LA questionnaire, 32 for the teacher questionnaire, and 35 for the BPC questionnaire. The questionnaires all successfully passed the validation process, confirming their validity and reliability, and were ready to be deployed to all three cohorts for the purpose of the data collection.

## VI. CONCLUSION

According to the literature review, there is a current lack of validated research instruments investigating LA programs in CLIL. Therefore, this work aimed to develop and validate questionnaires intended for evaluating LA programs to determine the training needs of three cohorts (i.e., LAs, CLIL teachers, and BPCs) regarding CLIL pedagogy and the ability to successfully implement the LA program in a CLIL setting. Previous studies have suggested that LAs need more CLIL pedagogical training (Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Sánchez-Torres, 2014; Buckingham, 2018a; Ordóñez-Dios & Polo-Recuero, 2020), and that teachers and LAs need more training and clearer guidelines regarding their duties within the LA programs (Méndez-García & Pavón-Vázquez, 2012; Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014; Cuesta-Ramírez, 2020; Martínez et al., 2021). Therefore, the questionnaires aim to determine the specific training topics and resources that would help fill these gaps. The first objective of the questionnaires is to evaluate the current state of LA programs in CLIL and to investigate the three cohorts’ perceptions regarding the functionality of the programs and satisfaction with the training provided. A second aim is to perform cross-group comparisons to identify significant differences in the perceptions of these cohorts. Third, the questionnaires aim to determine the variables that could affect the participants’ perceptions by analyzing the demographic variables. Each subsection of the questionnaires (demographic information, training and professional development, methodology and materials, coordination and organization, the LA program in practice, and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education/CLIL) was selected based on the literature review and determining where further research is needed.

To validate the questionnaires, a double-fold pilot process was conducted. Specifically, after the questionnaires were created, a panel of 15 experts in the field critically analyzed the LA questionnaire and rated each item based on its clarity, precision, and relevance. Additionally, the experts rated the overall questionnaire based on logical order, number of items, and content validity. Lastly, the experts provided observations and recommendations to improve the questionnaire in open-ended comment sections. The quantitative and qualitative results from the expert reviews facilitated modifications, including changing in the structure of the questionnaires, a reduction in the number of items, and the elimination of items that were not clear, precise, or relevant. The subsequent part of the validation process involved conducting a pilot study of the questionnaire with 10 members of each of the three cohorts. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient value was calculated

for each questionnaire as a whole, as well as each section, with the exception of demographic information, open-ended items, and yes/no items. After eliminating inconsistent or unnecessary items, the researchers confirmed all three questionnaires were reliable according to the Cronbach's alpha scores.

The questionnaires presented in this paper are ready to be employed in future studies analyzing LA programs in CLIL. Specifically, they could be utilized in other autonomous communities in Spain due to the popularity of LA programs throughout the country. Furthermore, the questionnaires are not limited to a Spanish context, as both LA programs and CLIL have a wide international reach. These questionnaires allow future studies to evaluate LA programs to determine the training needs for both CLIL pedagogy and LA program implementation skills in one robust instrument. Additionally, the implementation of data source triangulation facilitates the development of a holistic view of LA programs, which could be used to improve the experience of all participants.

#### APPENDIX A. LANGUAGE ASSISTANT QUESTIONNAIRE

This appendix presents the questionnaire for language assistants. The participants are instructed that the values for the Likert-type responses are as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.

##### Section 1: Demographic Information

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Nationality:

USA  UK  Ireland  Australia  India  Canada  South Africa  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender:

Female  Male  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Level of education:

Doctorate  Master  Undergraduate degree completed  Undergraduate degree in progress

University degree:

Education-related  Not education-related

If your university degree is not education-related, what is your degree in? \_\_\_\_\_

Previous informal teaching experience (tutoring, summer camp, etc.):

None  Less than 1 year  1–2 years  3–5 years  6–10 years  More than 10 years

Previous formal teaching experience:

None  Less than 1 year  1–2 years  3–5 years  6–10 years  More than 10 years

Level of Spanish:

None  A1  A2  B1  B2  C1  C2  Unsure

Previous language assistant experience in Spain:

None  1 year  More than 1 year

Type of school you are assisting in:

Public  Private  Charter  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Language assistant program you are currently involved in:

Spanish Ministry of Education and Vocational Training  BEDA  UCETAM  MEDDEAS

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

How many schools are you assisting in this year?

1  2  3  More than 3

##### Section 2: Training and Professional Development

1. Please check all the acronyms/words/phrases that you are familiar with without having to look them up:

CLIL  BICS/CALP  Scaffolding  4 Cs of CLIL  LOTS/HOTS  Bloom's Taxonomy  Project-Based Learning  Task-Based Learning  Student-Centered Learning  Pluriliteracies  I am not familiar with any of these

2. What training has been provided for you by your program to prepare you for the role of language assistant? (Check all that apply):

A clear definition of the role and duties of the language assistant  Information about Spain's educational system  Basics of the bilingual school system and its teaching methodologies  Definition or basics of CLIL  The teaching of non-English subjects such as history, art, science, etc.  Classroom material creation  Team teaching techniques  Conversation/oral language class techniques  Corrective feedback techniques  Legal and administrative processes for language assistants (residency, permit, etc.)  Spanish language or culture  Practical information about Madrid  None of the above  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

3. The MOOC I completed for the Ministry Program was useful for my language assistant duties. (If you are not with the Ministry Program, please leave blank)	1	2	3	4
4. The training I received from the program adequately prepared me for my assisting duties in content classes (e.g., science, history, art).	1	2	3	4
5. The training I received from the program adequately prepared me for team teaching.	1	2	3	4
6. The teachers I work with are prepared for team teaching.	1	2	3	4

7. I attended the orientation session provided by my program.

Yes  No  An orientation session was not provided by my program.

8. If an orientation session was provided, but you did not attend, what was the reason for your absence? \_\_\_\_\_

9. During my first week, I was given at least two days as an observation period, where I observed various classes to become familiar with how the school and classes function.

Yes  No

10. What language assistant training, if any, would you like to receive?

**Section 3: Methodology and Materials**

11. When asked to plan a full class, I know how to carry out this task.	1	2	3	4
12. When asked to lead a full class, I know how to carry out this task.	1	2	3	4
13. The materials I prepare for bilingual education classes are dynamic and innovative.	1	2	3	4
14. The materials prepared by the teachers in bilingual education classes are dynamic and innovative.	1	2	3	4

15. If you are aware of websites/apps/resources for finding and creating class materials, how did you find out about them? (Check all that apply)

Previous work experience  My university education  The language assistant program  Teachers I work with  My Bilingual Program Coordinator  Other language assistants  Social media  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

16. If you have knowledge of any principles of bilingual education teaching methods, where did you gain this knowledge? (Check all that apply.)

Previous work experience  My university education  The language assistant program  Teachers I work with  My bilingual program coordinator  Other language assistants  Social media  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 4: Coordination and Organization**

17. The bilingual program coordinator and I communicate frequently.	1	2	3	4
18. The bilingual program coordinator is active in supervising me.	1	2	3	4
19. There is sufficient communication between the teachers and I to be prepared for classes.	1	2	3	4
20. The classroom teachers manage my participation in the classroom and plan ahead.	1	2	3	4
21. I am given ample notice and time to prepare activities for class.	1	2	3	4
22. I am given help and guidance when needed.	1	2	3	4
23. I feel comfortable asking teachers and my coordinator for help and guidance when I need it.	1	2	3	4

24. Someone from the school contacted me prior to my arrival at the school to clarify details pertaining to my first day.

Yes  No

**Section 5: The Language Assistant Program in Practice**

25. I am familiar with the job duties of the language assistant role.	1	2	3	4
26. My experience as a language assistant is what I expected at the beginning of the year.	1	2	3	4
27. My coordinator and the teachers understand and respect the boundaries regarding the duties that the language assistant is <i>not</i> supposed to conduct.	1	2	3	4
28. I help the teachers of the bilingual program with their English skills.	1	2	3	4
29. My cultural and racial identity are respected by all school staff members.	1	2	3	4
30. I independently pick which aspects of my culture I teach the students.	1	2	3	4

31. Which subject (besides English) do you feel most confident assisting in?

32. Which subject (besides English) do you feel least confident assisting in? \_\_\_\_\_

33. What are the strengths of the language assistant program? \_\_\_\_\_

34. What are the weaknesses of the language assistant program?

---

### Section 6: Theoretical Underpinnings of Bilingual Education/CLIL

35. I have knowledge pertaining to the origins and driving forces of CLIL (bilingual education) in Europe.	1	2	3	4
36. I have knowledge pertaining to the effects of CLIL (bilingual education) on student learning according to evidence-based research.	1	2	3	4

### APPENDIX B. TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This appendix presents the questionnaire for the teachers. The participants are instructed that the values for the Likert-type responses are as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.

#### Section 1: Demographic Information

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Nationality:

Spain  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender:

Female  Male  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Level of education:

Doctorate  Master  Undergraduate degree

Administrative Situation:

Functionary with definitive post  Functionary with tentative post  Non-functionary interim post  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

General teaching experience:

0–2 years  3–5 years  6–8 years  9–11 years  More than 11 years

Experience teaching in bilingual education:

0–2 years  3–5 years  6–8 years  9–11 years  More than 11 years

Level of English:

A1  A2  B1  B2  C1  C2

Subject(s) you teach in English:

Natural Science  Social Science  Math  Music  P.E.  EFL  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of school you are employed at:

Public  Private  Charter  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Section 2: Training and Professional Development

1. Please check all the acronyms/words/phrases that you are familiar with without having to look them up:

CLIL  BICS/CALP  Scaffolding  4 Cs of CLIL  LOTS/HOTS  Bloom's Taxonomy  Project-Based Learning  Task-Based Learning  Student-Centered Learning  Pluriliteracies  I am not familiar with any of these

2. What training has been provided for you by the language assistant program to prepare you for the role of working with the assistant? (Check all that apply):

A clear definition of the role and duties of the assistant  Team teaching techniques  A guide/handbook about how to utilize the assistant in the classroom  None of the above  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

3. I have knowledge of the basic principles of bilingual education teaching methods.	1	2	3	4
4. The language assistants are adequately prepared for assisting in content classes.	1	2	3	4
5. I have had sufficient training to know how to team teach with a language assistant.	1	2	3	4
6. The language assistants are prepared for team teaching.	1	2	3	4

7. What training regarding working with language assistants, if any, would you like to receive? \_\_\_\_\_

#### Section 3: Methodology and Materials

8. I anticipate the challenges pertaining to English that students will face in my class.	1	2	3	4
9. I promote independent and autonomous learning from the students.	1	2	3	4
10. The language assistants promote independent and autonomous learning from the students.	1	2	3	4
11. When the language assistant is asked to plan a full class, they know how to carry out this task	1	2	3	4

12. When the language assistant is asked to lead a full class, they know how to carry out this task	1	2	3	4
13. The materials I prepare for bilingual education classes are dynamic and innovative.	1	2	3	4
14. The materials prepared by the language assistant for bilingual education classes are dynamic and innovative.	1	2	3	4

**Section 4: Coordination and Organization**

15. The bilingual program coordinator and I communicate frequently.	1	2	3	4
16. The bilingual program coordinator is active in supervising the language assistant.	1	2	3	4
17. There is sufficient communication between the language assistants and I to be prepared for classes.	1	2	3	4
18. I manage the language assistant’s participation in my class and plan ahead.	1	2	3	4
19. The language assistant is given ample notice and time to prepare activities for class.	1	2	3	4
20. The language assistant is given help and guidance when needed.	1	2	3	4

**Section 5: The Language Assistant Program in Practice**

21. I am familiar with the job duties of the language assistant role.	1	2	3	4
22. My experience working with the assistant is what I expected at the beginning of the year.	1	2	3	4
23. The language assistant fulfills all of their job duties.	1	2	3	4
24. I understand and respect the boundaries regarding the duties that the language assistant is <i>not</i> supposed to carry out.	1	2	3	4
25. The language assistant helps the teachers of the bilingual program with their English skills.	1	2	3	4
26. The language assistant’s cultural and racial identity are respected by all school staff.	1	2	3	4
27. The language assistant independently picks which aspects of their culture they teach to the students.	1	2	3	4
28. The language assistant seems confident and comfortable assisting in the subject they teach with me.	1	2	3	4

29. What are the strengths of the language assistant program?

30. What are the weaknesses of the language assistant program?

**Section 6: Theoretical Underpinnings of Bilingual Education/CLIL**

31. I have knowledge pertaining to the origins and driving forces of CLIL in Europe.	1	2	3	4
32. I have knowledge pertaining to the effects of CLIL on student learning according to evidence-based research.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C. BILINGUAL PROGRAM COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

This appendix presents a questionnaire for bilingual program coordinators. The participants are instructed that the values for the Likert-type responses are as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.

**Section 1: Demographic Information**

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Nationality:

Spain  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender:

Female  Male  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Level of education:

Doctorate  Master  Undergraduate degree

Administrative situation:

Functionary with definitive post  Functionary with tentative post  Non-functionary interim post  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

General teaching experience:

0–2 years  3–5 years  6–8 years  9–11 years  More than 11 years

Experience working as a bilingual program coordinator:

0–2 years  3–5 years  6–8 years  9–11 years  More than 11 years

Level of English:

A1  A2  B1  B2  C1  C2

Subject(s) you teach in English:

Natural Science  Social Science  Math  Music  P.E.  ESL  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of school you are employed at:

Public Private Charter Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 2: Training and Professional Development

- Please check all the acronyms/words/phrases that you are familiar with without having to look them up:  
CLIL BICS/CALP Scaffolding 4 Cs of CLIL LOTS/HOTS Bloom's Taxonomy Project-Based Learning Task-Based Learning Student-Centered Learning Pluriliteracies I am not familiar with any of these
  - What training has been provided for you by the language assistant program to prepare you for the role of coordinating and supervising the assistant? (Check all that apply):  
A clear definition of the role and duties of the language assistant A guide/handbook about how to resolve possible issues the language assistant may face A guide/handbook about how to coordinate/supervise the assistant None of the above Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 3. I have knowledge of the basic principles of bilingual education teaching methods. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. The language assistants are adequately prepared for assisting in content classes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. The bilingual education teachers are prepared for team teaching.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. The language assistants are prepared for team teaching.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
- During their first week, the assistant was given at least two days as an observation period where they observed classes to become familiar with how the school functions.  
Yes No Unsure
  - What training related to coordinating/supervising the language assistant, if any, would you like to receive? \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 3: Methodology and Materials

9. The teachers anticipate the challenges pertaining to English that students will face in their bilingual education classes.	1	2	3	4
10. The language assistants anticipate the challenges pertaining to English that students will face in bilingual education classes.	1	2	3	4
11. The teachers promote independent and autonomous learning from the students.	1	2	3	4
12. The language assistants promote independent and autonomous learning from the students.	1	2	3	4
13. When the language assistant is asked to plan and lead a full class, they know how to carry out this task.	1	2	3	4
14. When the language assistant is asked to plan and lead a full class, they know how to carry out this task.	1	2	3	4
15. The materials prepared by the teachers in bilingual education classes are dynamic and innovative.	1	2	3	4
16. The materials prepared by the language assistants in bilingual education classes are dynamic and innovative.	1	2	3	4

### Section 4: Coordination and Organization

17. I communicate with the bilingual education teachers frequently.	1	2	3	4
18. I communicate with the language assistant frequently.	1	2	3	4
19. I am active in coordinating and supervising the language assistant.	1	2	3	4
20. There is sufficient communication between the language assistants and the bilingual education teachers to be prepared for classes.	1	2	3	4
21. The bilingual education teachers manage the language assistants' participation in their classes and plan ahead.	1	2	3	4
22. The language assistant is given ample notice and time to prepare activities for class.	1	2	3	4
23. The language assistant is given help and guidance when needed.	1	2	3	4

- Someone from the school contacted the assistant prior to their arrival at the school to clarify details pertaining to their first day.  
Yes No Unsure

### Section 5: The Language Assistant Program in Practice

25. I am familiar with the job duties of the language assistant role.	1	2	3	4
26. My experience coordinating/supervising the assistant is what I expected at the beginning of the year.	1	2	3	4
27. The language assistant fulfills all of their job duties.	1	2	3	4
28. I understand and respect the boundaries regarding the duties that the language assistant is <i>not</i> supposed to carry out.	1	2	3	4
29. The language assistant helps the teachers of the bilingual program with their English skills	1	2	3	4

30. The language assistant's cultural and racial identity are respected by all school staff.	1	2	3	4
31. The language assistant independently picks which aspects of their culture they teach to the students.	1	2	3	4
32. What are the strengths of the language assistant program?				
33. What are the weaknesses of the language assistant program?				

**Section 6: Theoretical Underpinnings of Bilingual Education/CLIL**

34. I have knowledge pertaining to the origins and driving forces of CLIL in Europe.	1	2	3	4
35. I have knowledge pertaining to the effects of CLIL on student learning according to evidence-based research.	1	2	3	4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to warmly thank her dissertation advisor for being an unwavering source of guidance, encouragement, and inspiration. She also extends her deepest gratitude to the teachers, language assistants, bilingual program coordinators, and research experts who generously contributed their time and expertise toward the questionnaire validation process. No funding was received for this project.

REFERENCES

[1] Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge University Press.

[2] Buckingham, L. R. (2016). *The role of language assistants in a bilingual primary school: Theory, practice and recommendations* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de Alcalá.

[3] Buckingham, L. R. (2018a). Language assistants' views on the training provided by bilingual programs in Madrid. *PULSO. Revista de Educación*, (41), 225-250. <https://doi.org/10.58265/pulso.5174>

[4] Buckingham, L. R. (2018b). Defining the role of language assistants in the bilingual classroom. *Revista Tecnología, Ciencia y Educación*, (9), 38-49. <https://doi.org/10.51302/tce.2018.173>

[5] Codó, E., & McDaid, J. (2019). English language assistants in the 21st century: Nation-state soft power in the experience economy. *Language, Culture and Society*, 1(2), 219-243. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lcs.00017.cod>

[6] Colegios Bilingües Cooperativos. (2017). *Auxiliares de conversación nativos como embajadores de su cultura*. [Native language assistants as ambassadors of their culture]. Retrieved October 10, 2023, from <https://colegiosbilinguescooperativos.com/auxiliares-conversacion/>.

[7] Comunidad de Madrid. (2022). *Madrid Comunidad Bilingüe*. [Madrid Bilingual Community]. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from <https://www.comunidad.madrid/servicios/educacion/madrid-comunidad-bilingue>.

[8] Coyle, D. (2011). *Setting the CLIL Agenda for Successful Learning: What Pupils Have to Say*. Plenary conference at the II Congreso Internacional de Enseñanza Bilingüe en Centros Educativos. Universidad Rey Juan Carlos.

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

[10] Cuesta-Ramírez, M. T. (2020). *Language Assistant collaboration in bilingual programmes. How to make CLIL lessons productive*. Universidad de Jaén. Universidad de Córdoba. Retrieved September 5, 2023, from <https://hdl.handle.net/10953.1/13065>.

[11] Custodio Espinar, M. (2019). Los retos del docente AICLE. [The challenges of the CLIL teacher]. *Padres y Maestros*, 378, 24-30. <https://doi.org/10.14422/pym.i378.y2019.004>

[12] Durán-Martínez, R., & Beltrán-Llavador, F. (2016). A regional assessment of bilingual programmes in primary and secondary schools: The teachers' views. *Porta Linguarum*, 25, 79-92. <https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.53890>

[13] Escuelas Católicas de Madrid. (n.d.). *Auxiliares de conversación: Información*. [Language assistants: Information]. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from <https://www.ecmadrid.org/es/auxiliares-de-conversacion/informacion-publico>.

[14] Garland, R. (1991). The midpoint on a rating scale: Is it desirable? *Marketing Bulletin* 2, 66-70.

[15] Gerena, L., & Ramírez-Verdugo, M. D. R. (2014). Analyzing bilingual teaching and learning in Madrid, Spain: A Fulbright scholar collaborative research project. *Gist: Education and Learning Research Journal*, (8), 118-136.

[16] George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

[17] Hibler, A. (2010). *Effective collaboration between native and nonnative speakers in the Spanish CLIL Context: The case of the Language Assistants in primary education*. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Retrieved September 10, 2023, from [https://www.academia.edu/81475950/Effective\\_collaboration\\_between\\_native\\_and\\_nonnative\\_speakers\\_in\\_the\\_Spanish\\_CLIL\\_Context\\_The\\_case\\_of\\_the\\_Language\\_Assistants\\_in\\_primary\\_education](https://www.academia.edu/81475950/Effective_collaboration_between_native_and_nonnative_speakers_in_the_Spanish_CLIL_Context_The_case_of_the_Language_Assistants_in_primary_education).

[18] Laborda, J. G., Vecan, I., & Sauciuc, A. (2020). Teaching culture in the foreign language classroom: Implications for language assistants in bilingual schools. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 194-199. <https://doi.org/10.18844/prosoc.v7i1.4886>

[19] Litzler, M. F. (2020). Native English speakers in Madrid's classrooms: Difficulties reported by assistants. *Tejuelo. Didáctica de la lengua y la literatura. Educación*, 31, 47-76. <https://doi.org/10.17398/1988-8430.31.47>

[20] López-Medina, B., & Otto, A. (2020). Language assistants' expectations towards their role and main functions: The case of Madrid's bilingual schools. *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras*, (33), 95-109.

[21] Martínez, M. J. B., Currás, M. P., & Mellado, M. L. (2021). El rol del auxiliar de conversación en el desarrollo de las competencias lingüística y cultural en los programas bilingües en Educación Primaria. [The role of auxiliary conversation in the development of linguistic and cultural competences in bilingual programs in Primary Education]. *Revista Estudios*, (42), 12.

- [22] Méndez-García, M. D. C., & Pavón-Vázquez, V. (2012). Investigating the coexistence of the mother tongue and the foreign language through teacher collaboration in CLIL contexts: perceptions and practice of the teachers involved in the plurilingual programme in Andalusia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(5), 573-592.
- [23] Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional. (2022a). *La comunidad de Madrid incorpora a sus centros Educativos a 1785 Auxiliares de Conversación extranjeros para colaborar en la enseñanza de idiomas*. [The community of Madrid incorporates 1785 foreign Language Assistants into its educational centers to collaborate in language teaching]. Retrieved May 02, 2024, from [https://mpt.gob.es/eu/delegaciones\\_gobierno/delegaciones/madrid/actualidad/notas\\_de\\_prensa/notas/2022/10/2022\\_10\\_05-02.html](https://mpt.gob.es/eu/delegaciones_gobierno/delegaciones/madrid/actualidad/notas_de_prensa/notas/2022/10/2022_10_05-02.html).
- [24] Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional. (2022b). *Language assistants guide 2022-2023*. Retrieved August 20, 2023, from <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/eeuu/dam/jcr:b7676984-b37b-4fb8-bcec-b03967c56b53/2022-2023-language--assistant-guidelines.pdf>.
- [25] Ordóñez-Dios, A. F., & Polo-Recuero, B. (2020). Teacher perceptions on the role of language assistants in bilingual physical education. *Pulso*, 43, 75-97. <https://doi.org/10.58265/pulso.4800>
- [26] Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Sage.
- [27] Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2016). Evaluating CLIL Programmes: Instrument Design and Validation. *Pulso*, 39, 79-112. <https://doi.org/10.58265/pulso.5078>
- [28] Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2017). CLIL teacher education: Where do we stand and where do we need to go?. *Bilingual Education: educational trends and key concepts* (pp. 129-144). Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- [29] Pérez-Cañado, M. L., Rascón-Moreno, D., & Cueva-López, V. (2021). Identifying difficulties and best practices in catering to diversity in CLIL: Instrument design and validation. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1988050>
- [30] Rubio-Mostacero, M. D. (2009). *Language teacher training for non-language teachers: Meeting the needs of Andalusian teachers for school plurilingualism projects. Design of a Targeted Training Course*. Universidad de Jaén.
- [31] Sánchez-Torres, J. (2014). *Los papeles que desempeñan el 'auxiliar de conversación' y el 'profesor-coordinador' en centros bilingües español/inglés de Sevilla. Un estudio empírico de casos* (Tesis Doctoral). [The roles played by the 'language assistant' and the 'teacher-coordinator' in Spanish/English bilingual centers in Seville. An empirical case study (Doctoral Thesis)]. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- [32] Tobin, N. A., & Abello-Contesse, C. (2013). The use of native assistants as language and cultural resources in Andalusia's bilingual schools. *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century. Building on experience* (pp. 231-255). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090716-014>
- [33] Vázquez, V. P., Lancaster, N., & Callejas, C. B. (2020). Key issues in developing teachers' competences for CLIL in Andalusia: training, mobility and coordination. *The Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 81-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1642940>

**Berenice I. Rocha** received her BA in Anthropology from Northern Illinois University and obtained her MA in English Applied Linguistics from the Autonomous University of Madrid in 2020. Currently, she is a PhD student at the University of Jaén's inter-university doctoral studies in Languages and Cultures (UJA-UHU-UNEX-UCO). Her research interests include CLIL teaching methods and language assistant training needs.