

Subtitling and Dubbing as Teaching Resources in CLIL in Primary Education: The Teachers' Perspective

ALBERTO FERNÁNDEZ-COSTALES

University of Oviedo

Received: 14 December 2020 / Accepted: 18 June 2021

DOI: 10.30827/portalin.v0i36.16228

ISSN paper edition: 1697-7467, ISSN digital edition: 2695-8244

ABSTRACT: This paper explores the use of Audiovisual Translation (AVT) as a didactic tool in schools of Primary Education. The investigation of active subtitling and dubbing in formal contexts has delivered promising results concerning students' motivation, the improvement of translation skills, and the promotion of oral and written comprehension and production. However, research in the field has predominantly concentrated on university students, and there is a paucity of studies scrutinising Primary Education. Also, there is a dearth of articles analysing teachers' voices regarding the use of AVT in the classroom. Moreover, this is the first paper providing empirical results on the combined effects of subtitling and dubbing in bilingual education. The study comprised a sample of 31 teachers working in 8 public schools of Primary Education offering bilingual streams in Asturias, using a mixed design with quantitative (a survey) and qualitative (focus groups) techniques. The most salient findings underline that teachers consider AVT beneficial in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), as it promotes code-switching, students' metalinguistic awareness, and working with the 4Cs in content-subjects. The paper also ponders the challenges identified by teachers concerning the use of AVT in Primary Education.

Key words: Audiovisual translation (AVT), subtitling, dubbing, Primary Education, bilingual education.

Subtitulado y doblaje como recurso didáctico en AICLE en Educación Primaria: la perspectiva del profesorado

RESUMEN: Este trabajo investiga el uso de la Traducción Audiovisual (TAV) como recurso didáctico en Educación Primaria. Los beneficios del subtitulado y el doblaje en contextos formales son evidentes en relación a la motivación del alumnado, la mejora de la competencia traductora y la promoción de las destrezas lingüísticas. Sin embargo, la investigación en este campo se ha centrado en el contexto universitario, y hay una escasez de estudios en Educación Primaria. Igualmente, apenas se han examinado las voces del profesorado sobre el uso de la TAV en el aula. Además, este es el primer trabajo que aporta datos empíricos sobre el uso combinado del subtitulado y el doblaje en educación bilingüe. El estudio toma una muestra de 31 docentes de 8 centros bilingües en Asturias. Se utiliza un enfoque mixto con herramientas cuantitativas (cuestionario) y cualitativas (grupos de discusión). Los hallazgos más importantes subrayan que el profesorado considera beneficiosos el subtitulado y el doblaje en el Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE), ya que promocionan la alternancia de la L1 y la L2, la conciencia metalingüística y el trabajo con

las 4Cs en asignaturas de contenido. El artículo también examina las principales dificultades encontradas por los docentes.

Palabras clave: Traducción Audiovisual (TAV), subtítulo, doblaje, Educación Primaria, educación bilingüe.

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation has always been a critical element in foreign language teaching, with both advocates and strict detractors. The advent of the Communicative Approach brought a tendency to avoid translation in foreign language teaching (Cook, 2010; Lertola, 2018), until the Common European Framework of Reference for the Languages included translation and interpreting as assets to promote language competence (Council of Europe, 2001: 14). The didactic value of translation has been stigmatised in modern didactic approaches due to the connection with the Grammar Translation Method and poor pedagogic strategies in the classroom, with translation being a proxy for teacher-centred and non-communicative didactic contexts (Talaván, 2013). In the last 20 years, the rise of Audiovisual Translation (AVT) as a sub-discipline within Translation Studies – propelled by technological progress, among other factors – has renewed scholarly interest in translation as a pedagogic tool, with subtitling at the forefront of research in the field (Caimi, 2006; López Cirugeda & Sánchez-Ruiz, 2013; Incalcaterra McLoughlin et al., 2018; Lertola, 2016; Talaván & Ávila-Cabrera, 2015) and other modalities –dubbing and audiodescription– being only more recently approached (Calduch & Talaván, 2017; Moreno & Vermeulen, 2017; Sánchez-Requena, 2016, 2018; Talaván & Costal, 2017).

Research has consistently provided results that support the use of subtitling – and, more recently, dubbing – to promote the learning of foreign languages (Incalcaterra McLoughlin et al., 2018). However, to date, the investigation of AVT in foreign language learning has mostly focused on university students, with few projects devoted to Secondary Education (Navarrete, 2013, 2018; Sánchez-Requena, 2016, 2018) and virtually none investigating the application of subtitling and dubbing in Primary Education. This status quo may be justified by the difficulties of conducting experimental research in early educational stages, the reluctance of some teachers to engage in translation activities, or because, more often than not, research in the field is conducted with university students in translation programmes. In any case, investigating the potential of AVT in early educational stages remains undeveloped. Likewise, research in the field has yet to incorporate the new reality in Europe, where bilingual education has spread in the last decade under Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and the teaching of non-linguistic areas (NLA) through an additional language (any language other than the students' mother tongue). CLIL has proliferated in Primary Education in Europe, with Spain one of the countries where this educational approach has been more consistently implemented (Fernández-Sanjurjo et al., 2028, 2019; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Lorenzo et al., 2020; Madrid & Barrios, 2018; Madrid & Pérez-Cañado, 2004; Pérez-Cañado, 2012, 2017; San Isidro & Lasagabaster, 2019; Pavón, 2018). The use of subtitling and dubbing in bilingual education, however, has been neglected so far, despite the relevance of bilingual literacies, language transfer, and code-switching (the use of the L1 and the L2 in the classroom) in CLIL.

This paper aims to fill this research gap by analysing the perception of teachers of bilingual streams in Spanish public schools of Primary Education on the use of AVT for didactic purposes. The objectives of the paper are as follows:

1. Assess the perceptions of teachers of bilingual streams towards using subtitling and dubbing in Primary Education.
2. Evaluate the potentialities of subtitling and dubbing and establish possible advantages and disadvantages of the two modalities according to the teachers.
3. Analyse the suitability and the potential of AVT within CLIL.

To the author's best knowledge, this paper contributes to the fields of Translation Studies, AVT and language teaching by analysing a context – Primary Education – that has largely been ignored (Fernández-Costales, 2017). Also, the investigation examines the combined use of subtitling and dubbing, which has been overlooked, as most studies concentrate on one AVT modality (Lertola & Mariotti, 2017; Talaván, 2019; Talaván & Ávila-Cabrera, 2015). Furthermore, the paper is written from the perspective of teachers' voices, which has been unresearched in this area of study, with only one article considering the perceptions of participating teaching on the use of AVT in formal settings (Alonso-Pérez & Sánchez-Requena, 2018). The research is innovative, as it scrutinises CLIL streams, where subtitling and dubbing have not been investigated so far. In this context, analysing teachers' perceptions is of paramount importance to understand the possible challenges and difficulties teachers (and their students) may have when using AVT in the classroom. The primary aim of the current research is to contribute to the consolidation of a sub-field within AVT by providing new insights from an educational perspective.

2. THE EDUCATIONAL USE OF AVT IN FORMAL SETTINGS

The didactic possibilities of AVT in language teaching have been examined from different angles, with studies concurring that language competence may be favoured in terms of vocabulary acquisition, motivation, fluency, and metalinguistic awareness.

Vanderplank (1988) investigated the use of teletext for vocabulary acquisition and enhancing comprehension skills. This seminal paper set the basis for the research conducted on the educational use of AVT over the last few decades, which has underlined the value of using subtitles as a way to promote vocabulary acquisition, intercultural awareness, and comprehension skills (Díaz-Cintas, 1995; Talaván, 2013; Zabalbeascoa, 2008).

The use of active subtitling has received most attention in the field, and research reports that it may impact noticing and acquisition of linguistic structures as well as “translational salience” (Ghia, 2012; Talaván et al., 2016), listening comprehension (Talaván, 2011; Talaván & Rodríguez-Arancón, 2014), writing skills (Talaván et al., 2016), vocabulary acquisition (Lertola, 2012, 2013), and the promotion of intercultural awareness (Alonso-Pérez & Sánchez-Requena, 2018).

Although research has been predominantly devoted to subtitling, dubbing as a teaching resource in formal settings has also been investigated, with studies reporting promising results:

Dubbing has proven to be influential in enhancing oral production, namely prosodic features and intonation (Kumai, 1996), the promotion of fluency (Danan, 2010), and the improvement of pronunciation (Chiu, 2012). Studies conducted in formal settings conclude that dubbing videos contributes to improving students' oral production and boosts their motivation and willingness to communicate in the classroom (Navarrete, 2013). Furthermore, dubbing activities seem to render positive effects in enhancing students' fluency in spontaneous conversations in the classroom, as concluded by Sánchez-Requena (2016), who also found empirical evidence on the gains of dubbing regarding pronunciation and fluency (2018).

Traditionally, research on the educational possibilities of AVT has been primarily concerned with one modality, and few studies have assessed the combined impact of subtitling and dubbing in formal settings. Hence, it is worth mentioning the quasi-experimental research of Talaván and Ávila-Cabrera (2015), who scrutinised the joint effect of both AVT modalities to conclude that dubbing seems to be preferred by university students, as it enriches their translation skills and their oral production in the foreign language more markedly than subtitling. This pioneering study paved the way for other investigations, such as by Lertola and Mariotti (2017), who established that reverse dubbing and subtitling promotes learners' pragmatic awareness in written productions. In a more recent study, Talaván (2019) found out that creative subtitling and dubbing – i.e., generating alternative dialogues – enhances students' learning of the foreign language, specifically their writing and speaking production.

In the context of the current paper, it is also worth noting the investigation by Alonso-Pérez and Sánchez-Requena (2018), as this is the only study that examines the teachers' perspective on the educational use of AVT. Screening a sample of 56 teachers from Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Education from several countries, this paper confirms that teachers acknowledge the potential benefits of AVT and identify students' engagement and the use of ICTs in the classroom as the most salient advantages. The main challenge pinpointed by the participants was that non-university teachers are not familiar with AVT and require specific training.

Overall, research on the educational use of AVT confirms that both modalities are beneficial in terms of language gains for students (i.e., vocabulary acquisition, pragmatic awareness, listening comprehension, prosodic features, and fluency, among others), but also concerning other critical elements in language learning, such as motivation and engagement, willingness to communicate, or intercultural awareness. Nonetheless, there is a dearth of studies confirming these results in Primary Education and examining the perspective of teachers. Moreover, the investigation of AVT in bilingual education remains unexplored, as there is no empirical data on its use in CLIL sections.

3. THE PRESENT STUDY

The quasi-experimental study presented here relies on a mixed research design with quantitative and qualitative data collected from 8 schools in Asturias, one of 17 autonomous communities in Spain. The project was implemented from November to December 2019 in the subjects "Science" (*Conocimiento del Medio*) and "Social Science" (*Conocimiento Social*) in 12 courses of Primary Education (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th).

Teachers devoted 1 hour a week to the use of AVT in the classroom for 8 weeks (8 hours in total). Subtitling activities included interlingual subtitling (L2 to L1 and L1 to L2) as well as “creative subtitling” where pupils generated their dialogues in the L2 for the clips without translating the contents. As for dubbing, students dubbed one character in several clips (L2 to L1 and L1 to L2), two characters (dialogues), and generated alternative dialogues (“creative dubbing”).

The proposal was presented to teachers in July 2019, and permission was requested to start the intervention stage in November¹. A training workshop on the basics of subtitling and dubbing was offered to the teachers, who were also instructed on the use of Aegis-ub for subtitling and Windows Movie Maker for dubbing. This workshop consisted of a 5-hour training session (1 hour for subtitling, 1 hour for dubbing, 1 hour for subtitling tools, 1 hour for dubbing tools, and 1 hour of subtitling and dubbing activities). Teachers were provided with a teaching unit designed by the researcher with written explanations of subtitling and dubbing, software instruction, and a pool of activities to be used with the students.

Clips from three films were chosen by teachers on the basis of difficulty, interest for the students, and the suitability of the contents for the two subjects. The selected films were Pixar’s *Coco* and *Inside Out* for subtitling activities, while *Jurassic World* was used for dubbing². All the activities were carried out in small groups to promote communication among the students (a key issue in CLIL), although independent work was also encouraged through individual assignments outside the classroom. A gamification element was introduced, as students had to vote for the best videos created by their classmates.

3.1. Sample

The investigation sample included 31 teachers of Primary Education working in 8 schools offering CLIL sections. Schools were selected through a non-probabilistic sampling process that followed several criteria: All schools are public (since this is the primary offer in Asturias, and the aim of the current investigation was to assess the use of AVT in mainstream education) and have offered bilingual streams since 2015. The schools were located in urban (4), semi-urban (2), and rural (2) settings.

As for the participating teachers, all have a 4-year degree in Primary Education (*Grado en Magisterio*), while 20 out of the 31 have a Masters’ Degree in CLIL. None of them had any prior knowledge of AVT, and have not previously used subtitling or dubbing as a teaching resource. The characterisation of the sample was as follows: 70% female and 30% male teachers; a mean age of 31.7 years; all teachers have been working in bilingual education for the last 5 years; the mean teaching experience in Primary Education was 6.4 years.

¹ All ethical issues and data protection regulations were taken into account when dealing with the students for the current investigation.

² The films were suggested by the participating teachers, as some had already used them: *Coco* approaches several relevant topics related to Social Science –family and friendship, culture and traditions–, while *Jurassic World* has clear connections with Science –nature and animals, energy, technology, and science–.

3.2. Research tools

Although surveys have been widely used in the field to assess the benefits and drawbacks of AVT in language learning, there is currently only one tool scrutinising teachers' perceptions (Alonso-Pérez & Sánchez-Requena, 2018). However, due to the characteristics of the sample and the goals of the present study, an *ad hoc* questionnaire was designed to meet the research objectives. The survey passed an expert validation, with three independent judges evaluating the suitability of the items. A pilot stage was carried out with a group of 5 teachers working in a CLIL section who did not take part in the project. After the pilot test, the questionnaire was fine-tuned through item analyses, and minor modifications made to guarantee internal consistency. Validation of the scale revealed a Cronbach's alpha result of .792 (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 112), showing an adequate level of homogeneity in the survey items. The survey was completed anonymously and online after the 2-month intervention.

The tool was a survey with 20 items organised in 3 sections (10 scaled items for the first two sections and 10 dichotomic items for the third section): The first section was devoted to subtitling, where teachers were asked about their perception on the suitability of using subtitling in CLIL in Primary Education, their willingness to use it as a teaching resource in class, the main benefits of subtitling videoclips in relation to CLIL, the main difficulties when implementing activities, and the tasks their students liked most. The second section focused on dubbing, using the same items as in the previous section (adapted to this AVT modality). The third section examined teachers' preference between subtitling and dubbing, and asked respondents which AVT modality was more suitable in the particular context of CLIL, was easier to use in the classroom, was more difficult for students of Primary Education, more amusing, more useful to promote language competence, better facilitated working with content-subjects in CLIL, encouraged more participation, was more motivating, and better enhanced project-based learning.

Participants completed the first two sections of the questionnaire using a Likert Scale (1 to 5), while the third section included dichotomic answers (participants had to choose between subtitling or dubbing). Participating teachers also provided general information such as their age, gender, teaching time in CLIL sections, overall teaching experience in Primary Education, qualifications, previous knowledge on AVT, and their expertise with ICTs.

The focus groups were organised in December 2019 with teachers organised into two groups: The first included practitioners from the 4 urban schools (16 participants) and the second was composed of teachers from semi-urban and rural establishments (15 participants). The focus groups aimed at collecting teachers' perceptions of the possible benefits and drawbacks of using AVT in the classroom, which could not be gathered through the survey. The procedure was similar with both groups: Teachers were invited to share their thoughts on the didactic intervention with their groups, and the main issues raised were the challenges for the students and the teachers, the main advantages for the pupils, and the suitability of dubbing and subtitling in CLIL. The duration was 1 hour.

4. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The main results of the survey and focus groups are presented below. Descriptive statistics were used to explore tendencies in teachers' perceptions. Grounded Theory was used for the focus groups, so categories and topics were inducted from participants' discourse. SPSS v. 21 was used for descriptive statistics, while NVivo was utilised for the qualitative data.

4.1. Subtitling

Teachers consider active subtitling to be a suitable tool in the particular context of CLIL in Primary Education, as shown in Figure 1:




Figure 1. Teachers' perception of the suitability of subtitling in CLIL.

There were no negative answers given on the didactic possibilities of subtitling in the classroom as 96.3% of teachers responded "A lot" or "Quite" to the suitability of subtitling.

When asked if they would be willing to use subtitling in their own classes, 71.4% of teachers confirmed they would use it in Science and Social Science, with 23.8% of respondents choosing "maybe" and only 4.8% acknowledging they would not use it as a teaching resource.

Regarding how subtitling may contribute to learners' progress in CLIL, participants were asked to list 10 statements by order of preference. The following order was established, according to the teachers' answers: 1) It improves content-specific vocabulary; 2) it promotes code-switching (using the L1 and the L2); 3) it facilitates collaborative work; 4) it

increases motivation; 5) it allows working with ICTs; 6) it fosters creativity; 7) it reinforces specific subject-contents; 8) it allows working with Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP); 9) it promotes Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) and Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS), and 10) it fosters language and content integration.

As for the type of activity more appreciated by students, the teachers answered: creative subtitling (40%), followed by standard subtitling –English into Spanish– (20%), reverse subtitling –Spanish into English– (18%), and intralingual subtitling – from English into English – (12%).

Concerning the main difficulties students faced when subtitling videos in the classroom, the main issues raised by the teachers were lack of vocabulary (40%), synchronising subtitles and dialogues (30%), creating the script (15%) – when generating alternative subtitles – and using the software (15%).

The teachers' focus groups provided additional data to determine a better understanding of the advantages and challenges of using subtitling as a teaching resource in CLIL. One of the most commented benefits is that teachers consider subtitling videos to be engaging as well as increase students' motivation in the classroom:

T1: "Children are engaged, and their motivation seems to be enhanced. I noticed they could work independently without the need of having continuous guidelines and instructions by the teacher".

Several participants noted the motivational aspect of subtitling videos in the classroom, which is also linked to the use of ICTs, and that pupils perceive this activity as a "game", which is of paramount importance in Primary Education.

T7: "Subtitling allow using real language in the context of cooperative learning. Also, as students are using ICTs, it is very engaging for them. Subtitling videos was a kind of game in the classroom, and they learned with it".

As regards language and content learning, most participants commented on the fact that subtitling facilitates vocabulary acquisition. Participants also suggested that subtitling is a useful resource to promote students' oral skills:

T4: "I think they can develop their linguistic and phonological awareness more actively than with standard listening comprehension. I believe they can associate the words with their pronunciation, and the visual support helps them to recall concepts, vocabulary, and even improve their grammar".

Moreover, teachers agreed that subtitling might be beneficial in the integration of contents and language:

T3: “It was easier for me as a teacher to work with the 4Cs³, because the video will provide you with the context, and there were cultural contents in the film (Coco). As we were working with traditions in Social Science, they reviewed some basic notions, and we introduced new topics. They were also speaking in small groups, and they had to think when creating the subtitles, so they work with the 4Cs, and there is an integration of contents and language”.

As for the main difficulties the teachers faced when introducing these activities in the classroom, the most problematic was that subtitling is a time-consuming task. Most teachers agreed that they required plenty of time to prepare their students and explain the activities. Moreover, pupils needed much time to subtitle the videos, while the teachers had to slow down the rhythm of their classes to give students sufficient time to complete the activities.

T8: “It is very time-consuming; my students needed much time to subtitle the videos, and I could not complete all the activities with some of the lower courses (3rd year)”.

Secondly, several participants acknowledged that it was difficult to use the software (Aegisub), and they were not confident interacting with this tool in the classroom. Most participants also identified this as one of the most challenging aspects for their students.

T6: “Using the software was a challenge for them, especially in the first courses of Primary Education, where they needed extra time. The most difficult part was adjusting the duration of subtitles. Of course, I was flexible with that, because it was not the main objective, but they wanted to do it right, and they needed time for that”.

Additionally, the participants in both groups acknowledged that it would not be possible to do these activities in all schools. Specifically, a teacher from the rural area commented:

T9 “Not all the schools have enough computers to do the activities, or they will not be updated. Also, we cannot expect that students work independently at home, as some pupils might not have access to a computer. We do have computers here, but some schools in this area are not using ICTs, they are not equipped for this kind of projects”.

Finally, it is worth noting that most teachers concur that the last cycle of Primary Education (5th and 6th years) is most suitable to introduce this AVT modality, as students at this stage have higher language competence in English and have also progressed with the content subjects; moreover, several teachers also underlined that they cope with ICTs more efficiently. However, some teachers observed that subtitling videos is also possible in 3rd and 4th years (two participants even suggested it is appropriate for the first cycle).

³ Content, cognition, communication, and culture integrate the “4Cs framework” (Coyle, 2007).

4.2. Dubbing

Teachers found that dubbing activities are a relevant resource in CLIL classes, with no negative or neutral replies to the question “Do you find dubbing suitable for CLIL?” as shown in Figure 2:




Figure 2. Teachers' perception of the suitability of dubbing in CLIL.

When asked if they would use dubbing in their classes, teachers also endorsed the use of this AVT modality in Primary Education: 85.7% of participants indicated that they would use it in their classes, while 14.3% acknowledged they “may” use it, with no negative or neutral replies.

As for the possible benefits of dubbing in CLIL, teachers ranked the main advantages as follows: 1) It triggers students' motivation; 2) it enhances oral communicative skills; 3) it encourages creativity; 4) it promotes code-switching; 5) it facilitates collaborative work; 6) it allows working with BICS and CALP; 7) it fosters HOTS and LOTS; 8) it supports using ICTs; 9) it enables language and content integration; 10) it reinforces working with specific contents.

The type of activity that was more successful with the students – according to the teachers – was creative dubbing (60%), followed by dubbing from English into Spanish (23%) and then dubbing from Spanish into English (17%).

Regarding the greatest difficulties for students when dubbing videos, teachers stated synchronising the audio with the video (60%), overcoming initial shyness for some students who do not like to participate (20%), using the software (11%), and pronunciation and language-related issues (9%).

As with subtitling, the two focus groups were very insightful to determine the pros and cons of dubbing videos in the classroom. Teachers reported that dubbing is more engaging for students, and somehow promotes the participation of pupils less willing to communicate in the L2:

“T9: Dubbing allows students to use real language and develop their communicative skills using films; it is very compelling for them. They enjoy dubbing videos, and they were not directly exposed to the audience, as it happens in other activities we do. Some of my students participated much more than when I ask them in class, or they have to report on the results of a project”.

Likewise, there was a general agreement that dubbing contributes to developing students oral communicative skills in a different way:

T4: “It was easier for me as a teacher to work with pronunciation and intonation with the videos and the dubbing activities. In general, I find students were using the language independently in the groups, and when they dubbed the videos, we could work their communicative skills in the classroom. I found they do not really perceive it as the typical speaking activity and they were somehow more relaxed”.

Most teachers also underlined the ludic nature of dubbing for the students and that they enjoyed creating their own dialogues:

T8: “Creating their own dialogues and using their voices was really fun for them. I think these activities promote their creativity, which should be a goal in CLIL and education in general. I think these particular activities (creative dubbing) promote the creative use of the language”.

In terms of the challenges of dubbing activities in the classroom, teachers suggested dubbing may be more demanding in terms of class management, as some students may start talking about the movies or other things.

T1: “I had to monitor my students more than with the subtitling activities, as I noticed some of them were losing track, and they were talking about other things. You have to remind them about the objective of the activities, so they do not divert from it”.

Furthermore, classroom noise is always an issue for teachers, especially those who work with 3rd and 4th years:

T2: “Class management was difficult sometimes because they were all speaking very loud, and it was difficult to record the voices while all the class is talking. You have to keep this in mind, as class management is important when students record the videos”.

Other difficulties noted by participants in the focus group coincide with the challenges already mentioned with subtitling: Teachers emphasise that dubbing is time consuming, and the materials and the classes have to be carefully prepared and timed. Furthermore, the use of ICTs may pose problems due to technical issues in the classroom. Additionally, students and schools from less privileged backgrounds may not have access to computers.

The range of courses for dubbing activities seems to be wider than in subtitling, as most teachers confirmed that they would plan these activities with 6th, 5th, and 4th courses, and several would also introduce dubbing in 3rd, 2nd and 1st years.

4.3. Subtitling vs dubbing

Finally, we wanted to assess the perception of teachers on the suitability of subtitling and dubbing in the context of CLIL in Primary Education and examine their preferences for one or the other modality. The quantitative analyses data on the comparison between subtitling and dubbing is shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Teachers' perception of subtitling and dubbing as a teaching resource.

Which modality is more suitable for CLIL in Primary Education?	23.9%	76.1%
Which modality is more difficult for you to introduce in the classroom (as a teacher)?	42.9%	57.1%
Which modality is more challenging for the students of Primary Education?	61.9%	38.1%
Which modality do you find more effective to improve students' language competence?	33.3%	66.7%
Which modality is more effective to work with subject-specific contents (Science, Social Science)?	42.8%	57.2%
Which modality did your students enjoyed the most?	28.6%	71.4%
Which modality is more effective to promote students' participation?	14.3%	85.7%
Which modality is more motivating for the students?	9.5%	90.5%
Which modality is more suitable for Project-Based Learning (PBL)?	23.8%	76.2%

The results of the questionnaire suggest that teachers consider dubbing more suitable and effective than subtitling to promote students' learning and language competence in CLIL sections in Primary Education. The findings of Table 1 are supported by the views provided by the focus groups, which indicated two main directions. First, participants regard dubbing activities as more appropriate since they promote oral skills in Primary Education:

T8: "I think both modalities work fine in CLIL. However, in Primary Education, oral skills prevail over written ones, so I think dubbing is more suitable here. Usually, students in Primary Education prefer talking than writing in English. I think it is easier for students than subtitling, and it promotes oral communicative skills, which is really important for students at this stage".

This is connected with the second main idea of the focus groups, which emphasises that dubbing activities are more motivating and engaging for students of Primary Education.

T1: “The liked both, but they enjoyed dubbing videos much more. They do not have to worry about writing, and they just communicate with their colleagues, they prefer talking at this stage. They loved dubbing videos and modulating their voices and practising with pronunciation and accents was very appealing”.

Teachers also supported students’ preference for dubbing, since some of the students already knew some apps and websites devoted to humorous versions of films and videos:

T5: “Some students already knew several apps for mobile phones or tablets that were used by their older siblings. They love things like Dubmash and mashups, and they want to create their own versions of videos and films”.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Concerning the first objective of the paper, our results stress the optimistic view of participating teachers on the didactic possibilities of AVT in Primary Education. Taken together, the data from the questionnaire and the focus groups suggest that teachers acknowledge the potential value of subtitling and dubbing in Primary Education. This finding tallies with the only previous paper published on the perception of teachers on the use of AVT (Alonso-Pérez & Sánchez-Requena, 2018) and confirms the suitability of subtitling and dubbing as a teaching resource at early stages. Our study accentuates the motivational effect of AVT, as it seems to boost students’ engagement in the classroom and their participation in the proposed activities. This result is somehow institutive, since the use of active subtitling and dubbing in formal settings has already been connected with pedagogic theories in language teaching that support the fact that students are more relaxed, in line with Krashen’s affective filter (see, for instance, Lertola, 2018; Talaván, 2013). Furthermore, it has to be stressed that learning by doing is a key strategy in CLIL – and language learning in general – so students’ motivation is boosted since “the practice of AVT implies being involved in an authentic task, situated in a meaningful context, whose outcome, unlike watching subtitles or using viewing techniques, is a tangible, shareable product: the subtitled or dubbed video” (Sokoli, 2018, p. 78).

As for the language impact on students’ learning, teachers perceive that vocabulary acquisition is favoured (in line with Lertola, 2012, 2013) and AVT contributes to boosting motivation and engagement in the classroom (as claimed by Navarrete, 2013; Alonso-Pérez & Sánchez-Requena, 2018; Talaván, 2019). Overall, our results allow us to confirm that the benefits of AVT identified in university settings and in Secondary Education also apply in Primary Education.

Regarding the second objective of the paper, dubbing is perceived by teachers as the most suitable modality based on its engaging potential in Primary Education. Although subtitling videos is effective in terms of vocabulary acquisition, the benefits of dubbing seem to outnumber subtitling, as it allows working with oral comprehension and production, and is more effective in promoting students’ participation (85.7% vs 14.3%), is more motivating (90.5% vs 9.5%), and facilitates Project-Based Learning (76.2% vs 23.8%). Moreover, from the teachers’ perspective, students enjoy dubbing more than subtitling (71.4% vs 28.6%),

where the creation of alternative dialogues is the most popular activity among students, in line with Talaván (2019). Interestingly, this option seems to stimulate students' creativity in the classroom, which is of paramount importance in Primary Education and CLIL. Notwithstanding the promising results provided by the questionnaire and the favourable perception of teachers in the focus groups, some challenges were also identified: First, participants noted that not all schools and students have access to the required resources to use AVT as a teaching strategy. Second, some practitioners also claimed that both modalities are time-consuming in the classroom (although teachers in the project received specific training before implementing the activities). Furthermore, teachers acknowledge that synchronising audio with an image is the most challenging aspect of dubbing, while matching subtitles to images is the main hurdle for subtitling, which is more difficult for students at this stage.

As for the third objective, our results confirm that subtitling and dubbing may be advantageous in the particular context of CLIL, as both modalities contribute to working with fundamental aspects such as code-switching (since students can use the L1 and the L2 in several activities), as well as HOTS and LOTS (as some of the activities require students use some more demanding cognitive skills). They also contribute to working with specific contents from the subject being taught (Science and Social Science, in this case), and may favour the acquisition of subject-specific lexicon, as reported by teachers. Moreover, participants in our study particularly noted that subtitling and dubbing facilitate working with 4Cs framework. However, it is worth noticing that the integration of content and language –which the keystone in CLIL– is placed at the bottom of the list by participants when approaching the benefits of subtitling (10th place) and dubbing (9th place). Since teachers do acknowledge the crucial importance of integration in CLIL and consider AVT contributes to the teaching of content and language in an integrated way (according to the responses in the focus group), this result can only be explained by the fact that participants perceived the gaining of subtitling and dubbing is greater in other dimensions, such as motivation or code-switching.

Overall, this investigation contributes to language teaching, CLIL, and AVT by confirming the didactic value of subtitling and dubbing in bilingual sections in Primary Education. To date, there is no empirical evidence of the educational use of AVT in CLIL, while there is a dearth of studies on the potential of subtitling and dubbing in Primary Education. Furthermore, the combined use of both modalities has received less attention, and the perspective of teachers has largely been ignored.

The primary finding of this paper is that teachers' perception is overwhelmingly positive, as they regard AVT to be engaging and triggers students' motivation. Moreover, both modalities seem to fit within CLIL, as they contribute to working with critical aspects in this approach, such as the 4Cs framework, code-switching, improving students' metalinguistic skills, collaborative work, and subject-specific contents and vocabulary. Although both modalities are welcome by the participants in our study, it should be noted that dubbing seems to be preferred by both teachers and students, as it fosters pupils' creativity and allows working with oral skills. Notwithstanding the positive results of the study, teachers also identified several challenges when using AVT in the classroom: Both modalities are time-consuming, and there might be technology-related issues. Furthermore, not all schools and students may have access to this type of approach due to socioeconomic reasons.

As for the limitations of the current paper, it should be noted that both the participating

teachers and schools volunteered to take part in the project, and thus the desirability effect may be present in the questionnaire and the focus groups. Furthermore, bigger sample sizes are required and, specifically, we need to scrutinise teachers with different profiles, as the group scrutinised in the current paper was relatively homogeneous in terms of age and background.

The educational potential of AVT deserves further attention in the early stages, as most papers have only examined university students. Prospective investigations may concentrate on longitudinal studies to assess the cumulative effect of using AVT in the classroom, and the impact that subtitling and dubbing may have on students' performance in CLIL (e.g., acquisition of subject-specific vocabulary).

We hope this investigation contributes to providing new insights and opportunities for researchers and teachers to assess the pedagogical value of subtitling and dubbing in CLIL sections and early educational stages.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been funded by (removed for peer review). The author is most grateful to the schools and the teachers participating in the project.

7. REFERENCES

- Alonso-Pérez, R., & Sánchez-Requena, A. (2018). Teaching foreign languages through audiovisual translation resources: Teachers' perspectives. *Applied Language Learning*, 28(2), 1–24. <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/18464/1/Alonso-Perez-TeachingForeignLanguagesThroughAVTranslation%28AM%29.pdf>
- Caimi, A. (2006). Audiovisual translation and language learning: The promotion of intralingual subtitles. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 6, 85–98. http://www.jostrans.org/issue06/art_caimi.pdf
- Calduch, C., & Talaván, N. (2017). Traducción audiovisual y aprendizaje del español como L2: el uso de la audiodescripción. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 4(2), 168–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2017.1407173>
- Chiu, Y. H. (2012). Can film dubbing projects facilitate EFL learners' acquisition of English pronunciation? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(1), 41–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01252.x>
- Cook, V. (2020). *Translation in language teaching: An argument for reassessment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 543–562.
- Danan, M. (2010). Dubbing projects for the language learner: A framework for integrating audiovisual translation into task-based instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(5), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.522528>

- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2012). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. London: Routledge.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (1995). El subtítulo como técnica docente. *Vida Hispánica*, 12(12), 10–14.
- Fernández-Costales, A. (2017). Subtitling in CLIL: Promoting Bilingual Methodologies through Audiovisual Translation. In M. E. Gómez Parra & R. Johnstone (Eds.), *Bilingual Education: Trends and Key Concepts* (pp. 185–196). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. <https://doi.org/10.4438/030-17-133-4>
- Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Arias Blanco, J. M., & Fernández-Costales, A. (2018). Assessing the influence of socio-economic status on students' performance in Content and Language Integrated Learning. *System*, 73(73), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.09.001>
- Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Fernández-Costales, A., & Blanco, J. M. A. (2019). Analysing students' content-learning in science in CLIL vs. non-CLIL programmes: Empirical evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(6), 661–674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1294142>
- Ghia, E. (2012). *Subtitling matters: New perspectives on subtitling and foreign language learning*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ibáñez Moreno, A., & Vermeulen, A. (2017). Audio description for all: A literature review of its pedagogical values in foreign language teaching and learning. *Encuentro*, 26, 52–68. https://ebuah.uah.es/dspace/bitstream/handle/10017/34980/audio_ibáñez_encuentro_2017_N26.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Incalcaterra McLoughlin, L., Lertola, J., & Talaván, N. (2018). Audiovisual translation in applied linguistics (Eds.). Special issue of *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 4(1), 1–8.
- Kumai, W. (1996). Karaoke movies: Dubbing movies for pronunciation. *The Language Teacher Online*, 20(9). <https://jalt-publications.org/tlt/departments/myshare/articles/2049-karaoke-movies-dubbing-movies-pronunciation>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Lertola, J. (2012). The effect of subtitling task on vocabulary learning. In A. Pym & D. Orrego-Carmona (Eds.), *Translation research projects 4* (pp. 61–70). Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.
- Lertola, J. (2013). *Subtitling new media: Audiovisual translation and second language vocabulary acquisition*. Doctoral thesis. Galway: National University of Ireland.
- Lertola, J. (2018). From translation to audiovisual translation in foreign language learning. *Trans Revista de Traductología*, 22(22), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.24310/TRANS.2018.v0i22.3217>
- Lertola, J., & Mariotti, C. (2017). Reverse dubbing and subtitling: Raising pragmatic awareness in Italian English as a second language learners. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 28, 103–121. https://jostrans.org/issue28/art_lertola.pdf
- Lertola, J. (2016). Subtitling in language teaching: Suggestions for language teachers. In Y. Gambier, A. Caimi, & C. Mariotti (Eds.), *Subtitles and language learning* (pp. 245–267). Bern: Peter Lang.
- López Cirugeda, I., & Sánchez Ruiz, R. (2013). Subtitling as a didactic tool. A teacher experience. *Porta Linguarum*, 20(20), 45–62. https://www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero20/3%20%20Isabel%20Lopez.pdf
- Lorenzo, F., Granados, A., & Rico, N. (2020). Equity in bilingual education: Socioeconomic status and content and language integrated learning in monolingual southern Europe. *Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaa037>

- Madrid, D., & Barrios, E. (2018). A comparison of students' educational achievement across programmes and school types with and without CLIL provision. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 29–50. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6273209>
- Madrid, D., & Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2004). Teacher and student preferences of native and non-native foreign language teachers. *Porta Linguarum*, 2, 125–138. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=1129932>
- Navarrete, M. (2013). El doblaje como herramienta de aprendizaje en el aula de español y desde el entorno Clipflair. *MarcoELE*, 16, 75–87.
- Navarrete, M. (2018). The use of audio description in foreign language education: A preliminary approach. *Special Issue of Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 4(1), 129–150.
- Pavón, V. (2018). Learning outcomes in CLIL programmes: A comparison of results between urban and rural environments. *Porta Linguarum*, 2018(29), 9–28. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322487128>
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 315–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/013670050.2011.630064>
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2017). CLIL teacher education: Where do we stand and where do we need to go? In M. E. Gómez Parra & R. Johnstone (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Trends and key concepts* (pp. 129–144). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- San Isidro, X., & Lasagabaster, D. (2019). Code-switching in a CLIL multilingual setting: A longitudinal qualitative study. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(3), 336–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1477781>
- Sánchez-Requena, A. (2016). Audiovisual translation in teaching foreign languages: Contributions of dubbing to develop fluency and pronunciation in spontaneous conversations. *Porta Linguarum*, 26, 9–21. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5784926>
- Sánchez-Requena, A. (2018). Intralingual dubbing as a tool for developing speaking skills. *Special Issue of Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 4(1), 102–128. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tmc.00006.san>
- Sokoli, S. (2018). Exploring the possibilities of interactive audiovisual activities for language learning. *Special Issue of Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 4(1), 77–100. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/tmc.00005.sok>
- Talaván, N. (2011). A quasi-experimental research project on subtitling and foreign language acquisition. In L. Incalcaterra McLoughlin, M. Biscio, & M. Á. Ní Mhainnín (Eds.), *Subtitles and subtitling. Theory and practice* (pp. 197–218). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Talaván, N. (2013). *La subtitulación en el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras*. Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Talaván, N. (2019). Creative audiovisual translation applied to foreign language education: A preliminary approach. *Journal of Audiovisual Translation*, 2(1), in press. <https://doi.org/10.4438/i19cee>
- Talaván, N., & Ávila-Cabrera, J. J. (2015). First insights into the combination of dubbing and subtitling as L2 didactic tools. In Y. Gambier, A. Caimi, & C. Mariotti (Eds.), *Subtitles and language learning: Principles, strategies and practical experiences* (pp. 149–172). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Talaván, N., & Costal, T. (2017). iDub. The potential of intralingual dubbing in foreign language learning: How to assess the task. *Language Value*, 9(1), 62–88. <https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.6035/LanguageV.2017.9.4>

- Talaván, N., Ibáñez, A., & Bárcena, E. (2016). Exploring collaborative reverse subtitling for the enhancement of written production activities in English as a second language. *ReCALL*, 29(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344016000197>
- Talaván, N., Lertola, J., & Costal, T. (2016). iCap: Intralingual captioning for writing and vocabulary enhancement. *Alicante Journal of English Studies*, 29, 229–247.
- Talaván, N., & Rodríguez-Arancón, P. (2014). The use of interlingual subtitling to improve listening comprehension skills in advanced EFL students. In B. Garzelli & M. Baldo (Eds.), *Subtitling and intercultural communication. European languages and beyond* (pp. 273–288). Pisa: InterLinguistica ETS.
- Vanderplank, R. (1988). The value of teletext subtitles in language learning. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 272–281. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/42.4.272>
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (2008). The nature of the audiovisual text and its parameters. *International Journal of Learning in Higher Education*, 22, 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.77.05zab>