# New Insights into Written Competence in CLIL and non-CLIL Programmes: Pedagogical Implications

Silvia Corral Robles. Universidad de Granada, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación y del Deporte de Melilla

Correspondencia a través de **ORCID**: Silvia Corral Robles          iD          **0000-0001-6315-7329**

**Abstract:** Multilingualism has been largely promoted by the European Union through the implementation of a widespread educational approach. An approach that is known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Research on writing development in content and language integrated learning settings is still inconclusive. Thus, the study focuses on the research conducted in order to investigate the development of students' written competence in CLIL and non-CLIL (English as a foreign language) programmes scrutinizing the linguistic, discourse, strategic and sociolinguistic competence. The results of the analysis of the English written competence of 112 fourth year CLIL and non-CLIL secondary education students reveal that in relation to the linguistic competence, the Non-CLIL group resort to their L1 prior knowledge more frequently than the CLIL group. As regards the strategic competence, the 'literal translation' strategy was the most recurrent strategy in the case of the Non-CLIL group. Regarding the discourse competence, CLIL group significantly outperformed their peers in written accuracy. Moreover, both groups presented a similar number of deviations regarding cohesion and coherence. Thus, this paper aims at describing the pedagogical implications derived from the abovementioned results in order to support writing development in secondary school and therefore, CLIL and Non-CLIL practice. These pedagogical implications will help CLIL teachers raise learners' language awareness improving this way their written performance.

**Keywords:** CLIL, Non-CLIL, written competence, pedagogical implications

**Nuevas apreciaciones sobre la competencia escrita en programas AICLE y no AICLE: Implicaciones pedagógicas**

**Resumen**: El multilingüismo ha sido promovido en gran medida por la Unión Europea a través de la implementación de un enfoque educativo generalizado. Un enfoque que se conoce como Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenido y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE). La investigación sobre el desarrollo de la escritura en entornos de aprendizaje integrado aún no es concluyente. Por lo tanto, el estudio se centra en investigar el desarrollo de la competencia escrita de los estudiantes en programas AICLE e ILE (inglés como lengua extranjera) que analizan la competencia lingüística, discursiva, estratégica y sociolingüística. Los resultados del análisis de la competencia escrita en inglés de 112 estudiantes de 4ºESO de la línea AICLE e ILE revelan que, en relación con la competencia lingüística, el grupo que no pertenece a AICLE recurre a su conocimiento previo de L1 con mayor frecuencia que el grupo AICLE. En cuanto a la competencia estratégica, "traducción literal" fue la estrategia más recurrente en el caso del grupo ILE. En cuanto a la competencia del discurso, el grupo AICLE superó significativamente a sus compañeros. Además, ambos grupos presentaron un número similar de desviaciones con respecto a la cohesión y la coherencia. Por lo tanto, este estudio tiene como objetivo describir las implicaciones pedagógicas derivadas de los resultados antes mencionados para apoyar el desarrollo de la escritura en Educación Secundaria y, por lo tanto, en la práctica de AICLE e ILE. Estas implicaciones pedagógicas ayudarán a los maestros de AICLE a aumentar la competencia lingüística de los alumnos, mejorando así su rendimiento escrito.

**Palabras clave:** AICLE, ILE, competencia escrita, implicaciones pedagógicas.

**Introduction**

European society is undergoing constant social, political, economic and educational changes. As a matter of fact, traditional educational approaches are developing into new ways of teachings along with the social changes. This is particularly the case of the methodologies of teaching the English language. The changing times have witnessed the increased relevance of the English language; it has gained ground over the past years. It is getting consolidated as a global language.

However, English is not the only language promoted in Europe. Multilingualism has been largely fostered by the European Union through the implementation of a widespread educational approach. An approach that is known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). It promotes the use of different languages in the educational process. Actually, CLIL refers to:

> situations where subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught through a foreign language (such as English language in Spain) with dual-focused aims, namely the learning of content, and the simultaneous learning of a foreign language. This approach involves learning subjects such as history, geography or others, through an additional language. It can be very successful in enhancing the learning of languages and other subjects and developing in the youngsters a positive 'can do' attitude towards themselves as language learners (Marsh 2000:145).

This approach is spreading quickly to new contexts in Europe and beyond (Eurydice, 2008). The Andalusian context is one of them where CLIL has 'landed' and it seems that the approach is making his way to stay. Nonetheless, in this part of Spain the implementation of this approach has been a huge challenge, as these changes have required a great effort by the individuals concerned, such as the Government, the educational institutions and, above all, all the teachers involved (Corral-Robles and González-Gijón, 2018).

Over the last decades, considerable research work has been undertaken to investigate this approach, its results and many others perspectives. These studies have shown the two opposite sides, from being considered as the perfect approach to teach languages to being put into question. However, research on writing development in Content and Language Integrated Learning settings is still inconclusive. This is the reason why this paper attempts to study this approach from a novel perspective: the effect of CLIL and non-CLIL programmes on the written production of their second language of upper secondary students.

In short, this paper discusses the results obtained, as well as, the possible pedagogical implications of the present study. The combination of the different approaches suggested can be an interesting and successful implementation and it can help other teachers to improve the written competence of their L2 students.

*Objectives*

In this context, the objectives of this present study are the following:

**General Objective**

The main objective of this study is to present the pedagogical implications derived from the results gathered through the analysis of the written productions of the CLIL and non-CLIL participants of two groups of upper secondary education of Granada

**Specific Objectives**

In order to give an answer to the previous general objective, four different specific objectives were formulated:

- To analyse the linguistic competence determining the frequency of occurrence of errors in both groups regarding the lexical competence, the grammatical competence and the orthographical competence.
- To examine the discourse competence identifying the level of coherence, cohesion and textual adequacy in the written productions of both groups.
- To study the strategic competence determining the frequency of occurrence of errors regarding the following strategies: code-switching, transference and literal translation.
- To examine the sociolinguistic competence by the way Spanish learners of English construct texts.

**Method**

**Research design**

A qualitative research with a descriptive design was conducted. This study is focused on the written productions of two groups of CLIL students compared with the productions of two groups of non-CLIL students. Hence, it was considered that the most adequate methodology was content analysis.

**Sample**

The study has evaluated a total number of 112 students in the fourth year of secondary school. The selected groups of students come from two different Secondary Education Schools in Granada; however, all the groups come from public schools. The groups have been organized into: 'CLIL group' who studied their secondary educational period following a CLIL pedagogical approach in English. CLIL means Content and Language Integrated Learning, an approach in which the subjects or part of the subjects are taught through a foreign language, English in this case, and 'Non-CLIL group' who studied their secondary educational period in Spanish, being the subject of English as a foreign language a part of the official curriculum for Secondary Education. The schools were chosen by a non-probabilistic sample of convience. All participants were Spanish native speakers and learners of English as a L2 ranged in age between 15 and 16 years old, which means that age is not a factor that influences the results.

**Instrument**

The instrument used is an already design test (Madrid & Hughes, 2011) which consists of three different types of writing: a short email, an opinion about a school issue and a short story. Demographic information is also asked in an introductory section at the beginning of the test. The test validation was carried out by the dialectic triangulation strategy.

**Data Collection Procedure**

The data collection procedure was carried out following a precise plan. Different steps were taken during the field work:

1. Informing the secondary schools about the research.
2. Obtaining consent.
3. Coordinating the supervisors and the researcher and scheduling the visits.
4. Providing precise information of the research to the students to ensure data quality.
5. Providing the test to the students.
6. Gathering the information.
7. Checking that the data have been gathered properly by the supervisors and the researcher.

Finally, the last step intended to be carried out in the data collection procedure was 'ensuring proper follow up for unavailable participants and unfinished tests'. However, we finally decided to keep the data from the students who were present these days in the classroom. All information gathered is strictly confidential and used for research purposes only.

**Data Analysis Procedure**

The analysis process aims to present data in an intelligible and interpretable form in order to identify relations regarding the research objectives. As it was mentioned before, the analysis determined for this study was a qualitative data analysis, specifically, a content analysis. This type of analysis would enable the researcher to develop a proposal in accordance with the diverse deviations of CLIL and non-CLIL students in order to help them to improve their English writing competence.

The content analysis process follows a deductive-inductive approach which allows the creation of the system of categories. From the deductive perspective, Canale and Swain's theoretical approach (1980), which consistis of an underlying system of knowledge in which four fields are differenciated: linguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence and sociolinguistic competence, was the main source of information to establish the main categories. Secondly, the inductive approach was applied to the written productions of the students in order to extract the most important information from the texts storing it separetly in different subcategories for further study. This process was carried out in the qualitative data analysis software, Nvivo-11.

**Results**

This study aimed at describing the pedagogical implications that derive from the results gathered through the analysis of the written productions of the CLIL and non-CLIL participants of two groups of upper secondary education of Granada. It also intended to examine the linguistic competence regarding the lexical competence, the grammatical competence and the orthographical competence; the discourse competence identifying the level of coherence, cohesion and textual adequacy; the strategic competence regarding code-switching, transference and literal translation and finally, the sociolinguistic competence.

The following results summarise the specific objectives of this study:

| Categories | Nº of errors | Percentages |
|---|---|---|
| **Linguistic Competence** | 960 | 66,16% |
| **Discourse Competence** | 303 | 20,88% |
| **Strategic Competence** | 188 | 12,96% |
| **Nº of errors in total** | 1.451 | 100% |

Table 1. The distribution of errors in CLIL and non-CLIL students
*Source: Data adapted from Corral-Robles (2017)*

As reported in table 1, the results of the analysis of the English written productions of 112 fourth year CLIL and non-CLIL secondary education students shed some light on the most problematic areas regarding the written competence. As it is shown in figure 1, the linguistic competence is the area in which a higher number of deviations is found, a total of 960 errors; followed by the discourse competence in which 303 errors were identified. The percentage of errors related with the strategic competence was a total of 12,96%. These results are explained in detail in the part of the discussion.

**Discussion**

*Linguistic Competence (CL)*

As it was mentioned before, the linguistic competence was studied in relation to the grammatical competence (CLG), lexical competence (CLL) and orthographic competence (CLO). Both groups presented a higher number of deviations in relation to the subcategories CLG and CLO. Regarding the orthographic competence (CLG), understood as a set of conventions for writing in a language (CEF, 2001), it has to be said that this subcategory was divided into two aspects: orthography (CLOO) and punctuation (CLOP).

The most problematic area for the CLIL and the non-CLIL group was punctuation (CLOP). Punctuation are signs and symbols used to make the writer's meaning clear and, therefore, they serve as a road sign that guides the reader. Most students from both groups tend to discard punctuation marks or introduce them when it is not necessary. Here, it follows the most significant examples found:

1.  Regarding the use of comma (CLOPC), 94 errors were found:

First example:

> Student 04 – Reference 3 – 0.27%
> For example Ø volleyball Ø tennis Ø football Ø judo

In this example, the student discards the use of commas, meanwhile, the rule in this case is that 'when listing items in a sentence, use comma punctuation to separate words or phrases of three or more'.

Second example:

> Student 18 – Reference 2 – 0.13%
> Hi Michael Ø how are you?

The rule says: 'when writing letters, use a comma after the greeting of a friendly letter and the closing in all letters'.

2.  Regarding the use of period (CLOPP), 36 deviations were distinguished:

First example:

> Student 07 - Reference 1 - 1,50%
> When I was having the shower. I slipped and I fell down

The student uses a period in the middle of the sentence, instead of using a comma as the rule says: 'when starting a sentence with a dependent clause, use a comma after it'.

Second example:

> Student 08 – Reference 3 – 0,34%
> I think that it's very useful because if all the people wear uniforms there wasn't be any bullies because of the clothes and you don't have to think what you have to wear the next day because you wear the uniform every day.

These kind of sentences are known as run-on sentences or fused sentences in which two or more complete sentences are put together without using a proper punctuation. This example is directly related to the sociolinguistic aspect that will be discussed further down.

3. Regarding the use of exclamation mark (CLOPE), 27 errors were identified:

Example:

> Student – Reference 1 - 0,76%
> ¡It was really terrible!

In English, this punctuation mark is only used at the end of a sentence. This is a clear example of L1 transference. In relation to this, it is important to highlight that the Non-CLIL group resort to their L1 prior knowledge more frequently than the CLIL group, being L1 interferences their major source of error due to their lack of adequate linguistic knowledge in L2.

As it has been shown in these representative examples, punctuation has become a great hurdle among students. It has to be mentioned that no more examples of other punctuation marks are considered as none of the students used them, just the three signs presented above.

### Strategic Competence (CE)

Speaking in a L2 can sometimes cause linguistic problems and limitations due to this fact there exist some strategies to compensate and therefore, maintain effectiveness of communication. The three strategies the participants of this study used were: code-switching (CEAC), transference (CEAE) and literal translation (CEAT). As it is shown in the graphic below, it must be stressed that the 'literal translation' strategy was the most recurrent strategy in both groups. However, no great differences were found with regard to the code-switching strategy and the transference strategy between the two groups.

Literal Translation is a strategy used to build a bridge between L2 and L1 (Kremer and Koppe, 2007). This strategy is frequently used at basic and intermediate levels due to the their lack of knowledge of the L2. The most signficant examples are shown below:

Examples from the CLIL group:

First example:

> Student 30 - Reference
> Because all the clothes you buy are for go out.
> *"Porque toda la ropa que compras es para salir"*

Second example:

> Student 21 - Reference
> I think that a uniform has to be confortable because you are with him six hours all the days.
> *"Pienso que un uniforme tiene que ser cómodo porque estás con él seis horas todos los días.*

Third example:

> Student 04 - Reference
> The liberty of wear the things that you want.
> *"La libertad de llevar las cosas que tú quieras"*

Examples from the Non-CLIL group:

First example:

> Student 05 – Reference 3 – 2,22%
> because the students need freedom in they put.
> *"porque los estudiantes necesitan libertad en lo que se ponen".*

Second example:

> Student 19 – Reference 1 – 2,58%
> the man had the body very bad and a long time died in the hospital
> *"el hombre tenía el cuerpo muy mal y hace tiempo murió en el hospital"*

Third example:

> Student 24 – Reference 2 – 1,47%
> This accident isn't a mundial accident and nothing seeming…
> *"Este accidente no es un accidente mundial ni nada parecido"*

As it can be seen, students from both groups tend to employ literal translation due to their lack of proficiency in their second language. In fact, Deller and Rinvolucri (2002) claim that other languages different from the mother tongue are born in the mind through the first language. This means that at least at early stages students need to use literal translation. However, this strategy, in which they translate the sentences word by word, can cause misunderstandings as they are not using expressions or words that sound natural to a native speaker.

In relation to transference, it can be said that this strategy also helps students to compensate their lack of proficiency in the language through the creation of non-existent words in L2. These errors are known as interlingual errors, which means, that they have been caused by the negative transference from the mother tongue. Kremer and Koppe (2007, 446) claim that 'it is inevitable that learners use L1 as a resource and make certain right or wrong suppositions, based on their experience with the mother tongue'. In the analysis of the written productions, these errors have been identified in both groups. The following examples are the most significant ones:

CLIL group

First example:

Student 05 – Reference 1 – 0,90%
They covered my knee with a _vend_ – *"Cubrieron mi rodilla con una venda"*

Second example:

Student 09 – Reference 1 - 0,22%
Police, _bombers_ and nurse went there – *"policías, bomberos y enfermeros fueron allí"*

Third example:

Student 27 - Referencia 2 - 0,24%
I want to _preparate_ myself for do the audition – "Quiero preparme para hacer la prueba"

Non-CLIL group

First example:

Student 11 - Reference 1 - 0,63%
I'm _inscriting_ in a football school – "Estoy inscrito en un club de fútbol"

Second example:

Student 24 - Reference 1 - 1,12%
The uniforms are _molest._ – "Los uniformes son molestos"

Third example:

Student 15 - Reference 1 - 1,12%
The dog was _tired_ in floor. – "El perro estaba tirado en el suelo"

### Discourse Competence (CD)

Discourse competence implies the ability to manage the discourse in terms of cohesion (CDC), coherence (CDH) and textual adequacy (CDA). As it is presented in the graphic below, the CLIL group significantly outperformed their peers in textual adequacy. Nevertheless, in relation to coherence and cohesion, it has to be said that both groups presented a similar number of deviations.

As mentioned before, textual adequacy is one of the most problematic areas in relation to discourse competence, at least for the non-CLIL group. According to Corral-Robles (2017), textual adequacy is related to the structure, pertinence and compressibility of the text. The writer has to meet the standards of the specific situation in which the text is written, the topic, and the characteristics of the receiver and the sender.

In the analysis of the written productions of the participants, it could be observed if they met the characteristics of the three specific texts they were required to write: an email, a short story and an opinion. The most relevant piece of information that can be stated is that both groups had difficulties to adapt their writing to the structure of the email. However, the non-CLIL group showed a higher frequency of errors. This fact can be observed in the following examples from the non-CLIL group:

First example:

Student 12 – Reference 2 – 0,44%
['I have just started to do karate too! Yes I love it! It's the best sport I ever seen. I go every Monday and Wednesday. Well, I used to reed but now I usually go shopping!] [See you soon].

Second example:

Student 08 – Reference 1 – 0,65%
['I play tennis in my free time and I go on Monday and Wednesday. I play basketball too but it is on Friday and Saturday. I want to become a good basketball player and the best tennis player'].

The pertaining structure of an email to be used effectively is as follows:

1. Greeting: "Dear Rachel", "Hey Rachel"...
2. Identification of self: "This is Jamie", "It is Jamie"
3. Body part: reason for email, situation and/or action plan
4. Closing line: "Hope everything is fine", "Looking forward to your reply"
5. Sing-off: "Best wishes", "Warm regards"

These five parts need to be included if we want to follow expectations for style and pertinence. As it can be seen in the previous examples from the non-CLIL group, they just took into account one part of the structure or at most two parts: the body part and the closing line. Meanwhile, in the CLIL group, it could be found examples like the following one where all the parts are included:

Student 27 – Reference 2 – 1,23%
[Hi, Michael,] [it's Laura]. [What's up? I'm glad that you finally started to do karate.] [About me you already know, I'm still going to the gymnasium everyday and sometimes I do some kick-boxing too. But I can't do kick-boxing everyday because teacher only comes to my gymnasium once a week on Wednesday.] [Hope everything goes fine.] [Kisses] [L.]

### Sociolinguistic Competence

According to Canale and Swain (1980, 1983), the sociolinguistic competence is the learners' ability to employ effectively the target language in social interaction emphasizing the importance of appropriate communication, in terms of target culture, as it cannot be denied the existent interrelation between culture and language (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino and Kohler, 2003). The strong relation between

these two aspects makes the native speaker of a language aware of language appropriateness. Therefore, they have particular expectations towards the language produced by second language learners. When both need to communicate, there is an increased likelihood for misunderstandings and cross-cultural conflict, as they have different cultural thought patterns. That is the reason why second language learners have to learn how to communicate effectively and sound native-like in multiple social contexts.

In terms of written competence, Kaplan (1984: 51) claims that 'each language and each culture has a paragraph order unique to itself and in each culture there are particular expectations'.The romance group belongs to latin-based languages such as Spanish, Italian or French. According to Grabe and Kaplan (1996) and Trujillo (2001), Spanish writers tend to structure the text in a more complex way and hence, they tend to create longer sentences using a flowery style**.**

Hence, one of the objectives of this study was to examine the sociolinguistic competence by the way Spanish learners of English construct texts. To do so, the study of the contrastive rhetorical component (Kaplan, 1984) – a sociolinguistic component concerned with discourse patterns - needed to be addressed through the implemention of the T-unit analysis, which is based on Hunt's proposition (1970).

The T-unit analysis allowed us to explore the level of syntactic complexity of the written productions of the students and hence, the organisation patterns they employ. The average mean value of the syntactic complexity indices obtained from the analysis of the written productions of both groups. The results indicate that the CLIL group produced a higher number of short sentences (S) and T-units (T) and a lower mean length of sentence (MLS) which means that the CLIL students appear to have a better adequacy to the English-like pattern (Corral-Robles, Madrid and González-Gijón, 2017).

**Pedagogical Implications**

As it can be observed in the analysis of the written productions of the students, the CLIL group outperforms the non-CLIL group in relation to the written competence. Hence, it can be stated that the implementation of the CLIL approach has a positive effect on the written competence in a second language. Needless to say that these findings are limited to this particular study, even though numerous studies support these results.

Nevertheless, despite the lower frequency of errors and therefore, the better results of the CLIL group, this does not mean that we have not found errors in the CLIL group. The deviations of both groups could be treated if the methodology is adapted to them. Hence, this paper aims at describing the pedagogical implications derived from the abovementioned results in order to support writing development in secondary schools and therefore, CLIL and Non-CLIL practice. After having analyzed the results of a study, as researchers and teachers, we should make the necessary changes in our teaching in order to provide, in this case, the most effective way to ease the students in the writing process and motivate them to write.

The analysis of the written productions has allowed us to observe the deficiencies, as well as, the difficulty regarding the writing aspects. As it has been mentioned in the introduction, numerous authors (Hedge, 1988) consider writing as the Cinderella of the communicative skills, relegating the skill to a secondary importance. In fact, in Spain in secondary education, writing is the skill where less attention has been paid to (Nunan, 1991; Alcaráz Varó, 2000; Palmer Silveira, 2001). Nonetheless, in the last decades,

this fact is changing and L2 teachers are becoming more and more aware of the importance of this skill. As Manchón, R. et al. in McLaren, Madrid and Bueno (2005, p.378) state 'writing can certainly contribute to the achievement of general education aims associated with the students' personal and intellectual growth'.

Contrary to popular belief, writing is a skill that needs to be specifically addressed and taught (Calsamiglia y Tusón, 1999). Numerous authors such as Cassany (1990), Serafini (1993) o Hyland (2003) have made different pedagogical proposals for the improvement of the writing skill based on the analysis of their studies. In our study, we aim at presenting a combination of different approaches that may help the development of the writing skills. These approaches are considered taking into account the most problematic areas of the different competencies developed in the present study. To do so, each of the four competences will now be addressed in consecutive order:

1. Linguistic competence regarding the lexical competence, the grammatical competence and the orthographical competence.

The first approach we propose in this paper is the '*approach based on error correction*'. The treatment of the error in a L2 classroom remains a controversial issue. There exist two strong opinions in which errors are considered either undesirable that need to be prevented from occurring or great evidences for the cognitive process of the language learning in which learners are involved. In the same way, some studies indicate that errors do not need to be treated directly as it can disrupts the process of language learning discouraging the students from learning the language. However, we advocate for dealing the error through different strategies that involve the students to raise awareness of their own errors (Ferris, 2002). The following are some ideas for treating the error in a L2 classroom:

✓ Introducing the error in class:

1. Laugh at mistakes
Authors such us Cornett (1986), Gardner and Lambert (1972), Gorham and Christophel (1990) and Provine (2002) suggest that humour has a positive effect on the process of learning a L2. The negative feelings that appear when the students need to communicate in the L2 disappear, if teachers create a relaxed atmosphere. Therefore, laughing at mistakes can be a great way to feel more relaxed when they occur and at the same time, it is a way of sharing the mistakes with other classmates what make them aware of this potential deviation.

2. Error lists
Teach your students to know more about their own deviations and the reasons why they are caused. Following an etiological criteria, errors can be classified into "Inter-lingual errors" which are caused by the negative transference from L1 or "Intra-lingual errors" that are caused due to the confusion a language learner experiences within a newly acquired language. The creation of error lists regarding this classification could make them aware of the origin something that facilitates their process of learning.

3. Posters
The display of posters that include the mistakes that irritates the student or the teacher, a mistake that the student thought he would not do it again or a mistake that the student realised it was not correct and he knows how to correct it or not. This is a way of highlighting frequent errors to make them more visible and probable less likely to be caused again.

4. Error auction

Games have a significant role in L2 classrooms as they provide students a situation in which they learn without barriers (Martinson and Chu, 2008). Therefore, introducing games in order to deal with their own errors may help the students to prevent them. The game 'error auction' consists of buying the correct sentences using sentences where their own mistakes are included.

The second approach suggested is the '*approach based on grammar basis*'. Despite the emerging trends about the communicative language teaching approach in which interaction is the ultimate goal of the learning process and the topics are far from being the ones dealt in traditional grammar, we would like to pay attention to some grammar aspects that have been forgotten in the L2 classroom.

✓ Introducing forgotten aspects of grammar in class:

1. Punctuation is the great forgotten area in English class. When teaching grammar, L2 teachers are mainly focused on the grammar or lexical competence rather than focusing on the orthographic competence regarding the use of punctuation markers in the written productions.

The written code is a very important part of the language and most of the times; teachers assume students know the rules of punctuation. However, far from being acquired in Spanish, it has been shown in the analysis of the written productions that they do not know the rules in English. This problematic can become a real hurdle among students and create potential misunderstandings between the writer and the reader. This is the reason why we advocate for addressing directly this neglected grammar aspect in L2 classroom.

2. Strategic competence regarding code-switching, transference and literal translation

✓ Introducing the lexical transference approach in class

When learning a second language, the mother tongue plays a very significant role. As a matter of fact, Kellerman and Sharwood (1986, p.42) comments "there are enormous quantities of evidence for the influence of the L1 on L2 when it comes to lexis". The traditional pedagogy to teach the lexis is by introducing a certain amount of vocabulary through the reading of texts or providing lists of vocabulary. However, this vocabulary should be explained providing collocative or grammatical meaning in order to get a fully perspective of the use of the words. Besides, teachers should also deal with the words that are likely to be transferred from their mother tongue or the ones that come out in class.

3. Discourse competence regarding coherence, cohesion and textual adequacy.

✓ Introducing communicative functions in class

The third approach we suggest is 'approach based on communicative functions' regarding the discourse comptence and, particularly, the textual adequacy. As it has been mentioned in the discussion section, most of the participants from the non-CLIL group and some of the CLIL group experienced difficulties when writing the different types of the texts they were required. One of the most troublesome types was the letter as you are expected to follow the structure which consists of at least five parts.

In the same way as in the previous aspect, teachers tend to take for granted that students know how to write a letter, an opinion, an essay or a short story, among others. The knowledge of these types of writing is important as we encounter writing every day of our lives. This is the reason why introducing the teaching of communicative functions explicitly in L2 class is important.

4. Sociolinguistic competence

✓ Introducing contrastive analysis in class

Most of the language teaching methods focus on linguistic competence. In the past decades, teachers were strongly determined to teach learners the perfect grammatical knowledge. Nowadays, on the contrary, the trend is to teach them to communicate. However, there is still a gap that needs to be filled. Students probably know how to communicate in English in a better way than other generations; nonetheless, the majority of students tend to use bookish or ill-adapted sentences causing disruptions in the communication.

This is the reason why the fifth approach we suggest is 'contrastive analysis approach'. This approach supports the idea that language and culture are intertwined. Culture plays an enormous role in the process of acquisition of a language. This fact changes the way a language is learnt as it helps the students to predict points in common by comparing systematically the language and culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the student.

The main objective of this study is to present the pedagogical implications derived from the results gathered through the analysis of the written productions of the CLIL and non-CLIL participants of two groups of upper secondary education of Granada. Once the results were described and discussed, in this paper we attempted to contribute to this area of knowledge by focusing on the pedagogical implications that go with these results.

In order to do so, a comparative analysis based on the L2 written productions of CLIL and non-CLIL Spanish groups of upper secondary education was carried out. To contribute to the achievement of the specific objectives (mentioned above) a qualitative research with a descriptive design was conducted and it was considered that the most adequate methodology was content analysis.

In our study, the classification of the different competences proposed by Canale and Swain (1980, 1983) was the main source of information when the system of categories was created. This classification of the four competences: linguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence and sociolinguistic competence helped us to establish the specific objectives in order to analyse the written productions. Therefore, the structure of the discussion section and the pedagogical implications follows the order of the four specific objectives.

The findings drawn from the analysis of the linguistic competence of both groups reveal that the most problematic area for the CLIL and the non-CLIL group, regarding the linguistic competence, was punctuation (CLOP). Most students from both groups tend to discard punctuation marks or introduce them when it is not necessary. Hence, in the part of the pedagogical implications we advocated for an '*approach based on grammar basis'*, where the forgotten aspects of grammar such as punctuation should be taken into account in a L2 classroom.

Regarding the strategic competence, it could be said that literal translation and transference were the two most frequent strategies in both groups. The influence of the L1 can be seen in the two groups, nonetheless, the non-CLIL group tends to resort to their prior knowledge of L1 more frequently than the CLIL group. Therefore, in order to minimise this influence, we suggested to introduce the '*lexical transference approach'* in class in which the pedagogy used to teach the lexis is far from the traditional one.

In relation to the discourse competence, it is important to stress that textual adequacy was one of the most problematic areas in relation to discourse competence, at least for the non-CLIL group. In the analysis of the written productions of the participants, it could be observed that both groups had difficulties to adapt their writing to the structure of the email. Then, the approach suggested was the '*approach based on communicative functions'* regarding the discourse competence and, particularly, the textual adequacy in order to teach directly the communicative functions that are related to the different types of writing.

Finally, in relation to the sociolinguistic competence, it can be stated that both groups presented difficulties to adapt their writing to the English patterns. Therefore, we suggested the 'contrastive analysis approach' in which culture has a key role in the process of learning a language. Recent studies (Walker, 2006; Xing, Wang and Spencer, 2008) have obtained promising results after having introduced this aspect in class.

In short, the combination of the different approaches suggested can be an interesting and successful implementation and it can help other teachers to raise learners' language awareness improving this way their written competence of their L2 students.

## References

Alcaráz Varo, E. (2000). *El inglés profesional y académico*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Canale, M. (1983). "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy", in J. C. Richards y R. W. Schmidt (eds.), *Language and Communication,* 2-27. London: Longman.

Calsamiglia, B. & Tusón, V. (1999). *Las cosas del decir.* Barcelona: Ariel.

Cassany, D. (1990). Enfoques didácticos para la enseñanza de la expresión escrita. *Comunicación, lenguaje y educación, 6*, 63-80. Madrid.

Cornett, C. E. (1986). *Learning through Laughter: Humor in the Classroom*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation: Bloomington, IN.

Corral-Robles, S. (2017). *La Competencia Escrita en Lengua Inglesa en Alumnos Monolingües y Bilingües de 4º ESO*, Tesis Doctoral, Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Corral-Robles, S.; Madrid, D. & Gonzalez-Gijon, G. (2017). Cultural diversity and its Implications for second language writing. *The International Journal of Diversity in Education*, *17* (1): 1-19.

Corral-Robles, S. & González-Gijón, G. (2018). Effect of CLIL and Non-CLIL Approaches on the Written Competence of Upper-Secondary Students. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Curriculum, 25* (2): 31-43.

Deller, S. & Rinvolucri, D. (2002). *Using the Mother Tongue: Making the Most of the Learner's Language.* London: First Person Publishing.

Eurydice. (2008). *El gobierno de la educación superior en Europa. Políticas, estructuras, financiación y personal académico*. Bruselas: Eurydice.

*Ferris, D. (2002). Treatment of error in second language student writing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.*

Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and Practice of Writing.* Londres: Longman.

Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship of teachers' use of humor in the classroom to immediacy and student learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 46-62.

Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunt, K. W. (1970). "Recent measures in syntactic development", in M. Lester (ed.) *Readings in applied transformation grammar*, Nueva York: Holt, Rinehert and Winston, 179-192.

Hyland, K. (2003). Writing and teaching writing. En Richards, J. C. (Ed.), *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, R. (1984). "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education", en S. Mckay, (ed). *Composing in a Second Language*, Nueva York: Harper & Row, 43-62.

Kellerman, E. & Sharwood Smith, M. (eds.). (1986). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kremer, L.M.S. & Koppe, C.T. (2007). *Translation In The EFL Classroom: How And What To Work.* "Curso de Letras" (online), Vol. 15 No. 15, 2007. Universidade Tuiuti do Parana.

Liddicoat, A., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on Intercultural Language Learning*. Commonwealth of Australia: Department of EST, Canberra.

Madrid, D. & Hughes, S. (eds) (2011). *Studies in Bilingual Education*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Manchón, R. M., Murphy, L., Aguado, P. & Roca, J.. (2005). Learning and Teaching Writing in the EFL classroom. In N. McLaren, D. Madrid and A. Bueno (eds.), *TEFL in Secondary Education*, 377-407. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.

Marsh, D. (2000). *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. Finland: University of Jyväskylä.

Martinson, B., & Chu, S. (2008). "Impact of Learning Style on Achievement When Using Course Content Delivered Via a Game-based Learning Object." in Handbook of Research on Effective Electronic Gaming in Education, edited by R. E. Ferdig, 478-488. Pennsylvania: IGI Global.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*, Londres: Prentice-Hall.

Palmer Silveira, J.C. (2001). "Different approaches to academic writing and their applications to the teaching of ESP summarising", in S. Posteguillo Gomez, I. Fortanet Gomez, y J.C. Palmer Silveira (eds.). *Methodology and new technologies in languages for specific purposes*, Castellon: Universitat Jaume I, 61-75

Provine, R. (2002). The Science of laughter. *Psychology Today*, *33* (6), 58-62.

Serafini, M. T. (1993). *Cómo redactar un tema. Didáctica de la escritura.* México: Paidós, 37-59.

Trujillo, F. (2001). Implicaciones Didácticas de la Retórica Contrastiva para la enseñanza de la lengua. *Lenguaje y Textos 17* (18): 79–90.

Walker, D. (2006). Improving Korean University Student EFL Academic Writing with Contrastive Rhetoric: Teacher Conferencing and Peer-Response Can Help. *Journal of Asia TEFL,* 3 (4): 71-111.

Walter, G. (1990). Laugh, teacher, laugh! *The Educational Digest*, 55 (9), 43-44.

Xing, M., Wang, J., & Spencer, K. (2008). Raising Students' Awareness of Cross-Cultural Contrastive Rhetoric in English Writing via an e-Learning Course. *Language Learning & Technology 12* (2): 71-79.