

Bilingual Physical Education in English. Opinion and Qualification of PE Teachers of Primary Education

Educación Física Bilingüe en Inglés. Opinión y Formación de los Maestros de Educación Física

Guillermo Felipe López Sánchez^{1*}, Joaquín Gris Roca², Sofía Sánchez Mompeán³, Roksana Zauder⁴ y Lee Smith⁵

1 Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Murcia (Spain).

2 Department of English Studies, University of Murcia (Spain).

3 Department of Translation and Interpretation, University of Murcia (Spain).

4 Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz (Poland).

5 Cambridge Centre for Sport and Exercise Science, Anglia Ruskin University (UK).

Abstract: The purpose of this research was to survey the opinions of Primary Education PE Teachers about bilingual PE and to find out if they felt confident to teach PE in English. The study sample consisted of 30 individuals, all with a Teaching Diploma in Primary Education (specialty PE). The instrument used was the 'Questionnaire on Bilingual Qualification of Physical Education Teachers'. Statistical analyses were performed through SPSS-22: descriptive statistics, Shapiro-Wilk test, Mann-Whitney U test, and Kruskal-Wallis H test. Most PE teachers surveyed had positive opinions about bilingual PE, but did not have much experience in bilingual teaching and were not sufficiently prepared to deliver classes in English. It would be recommendable to design and carry out educational programs in order to improve the qualification of PE teachers to teach bilingually, checking the effectiveness of these programs.

Keywords: Bilingualism, Physical Activity, Sport, Foreign Language, Second Language.

Resumen: El objetivo de esta investigación fue conocer las opiniones de los maestros de Educación Física (EF) acerca de la EF bilingüe y saber si se sentían cualificados para impartir EF en inglés. Participaron 30 individuos con la titulación de Maestro de Educación Primaria (especialidad EF). Se utilizó el 'Cuestionario sobre la formación bilingüe del profesorado de Educación Física'. Se llevó a cabo un análisis estadístico mediante SPSS-22: estadísticos descriptivos, test de Shapiro-Wilk, prueba U de Mann-Whitney, y prueba de Kruskal-Wallis. La mayoría de los maestros de la muestra presentaban opiniones positivas hacia la EF bilingüe, aunque no tenían mucha experiencia enseñando de forma bilingüe y no estaban suficientemente preparados para impartir enseñanza bilingüe. Sería recomendable diseñar y llevar a cabo programas educativos para mejorar la cualificación de los maestros de educación física para impartir enseñanza bilingüe, verificando la efectividad de estos programas.

Palabras clave: Bilingüismo, Actividad Física, Deporte, Lengua Extranjera, Segunda lengua.

1. Introduction

1.1. Theoretical framework

1.1.1. Why learn a foreign language in PE?

Physical Education (PE) is an ideal vehicle to facilitate language learning through movement, due to its functions of knowledge, communication and relationship (Rodríguez-Abreu, 2010a). Essentially, the acquisition of a second language involves learning the language in common situations, and PE is one of the areas that allows learning and putting into practice a second language in such situations, especially because in the sport ambit children are already familiar with many English words (Zagalaz-Sánchez et al, 2012). In the same vein, Torres-Outón (2010) highlighted that sports practice is a valid strategy to encourage the oral use of the foreign

language (communicative expression) and, thereby, to stimulate its learning (knowledge fixation).

Baena-Extremuera and Granero-Gallegos (2015) indicate that it is essential that the teaching of the L2 begins as soon as possible through bilingualism in subjects such as PE, and this learning should be controlled by the teacher and institutions. One of the ways to establish this control is measuring the degree of students satisfaction in the learning of a foreign language (FL). To measure students' satisfaction in Bilingual PE, these authors propose the Sport Satisfaction Instrument (SSI) Adapted to Bilingual Learning in English PE. They administered this survey to 328 high school students (12-16 years old) from Andalusia, and the results suggested that, overall, students were satisfied with PE in English and they tended to consider it more fun.

A new interesting perspective is given by Bothman (2013): Bilingual PE in Spanish for schoolchildren from United States. The point of view is different but the concept is the same: learning PE and FL at the same time. This author de-

Dirección para correspondencia [Correspondence address]: Guillermo Felipe López Sánchez. Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Murcia (Spain). E-mail: gfls@um.es

fends an interdisciplinary approach and indicates that the PE class is an excellent opportunity to acquire knowledge from other content areas. At the same time, L2 learning takes place while physiological and neurological mechanisms such as neurogenesis -the development of new cells- occurs in the body. Bothman advocates the combination of foreign language and PE in order to create a dynamic environment for the learning and application of both second language and motor skills.

1.1.2. Teaching methodology in bilingual PE

CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning)

Authors like Faya-Cerqueiro (2012) point out the ease of CLIL in PE compared to other subjects due to the practical and oral component of PE, as well as to the support in physical and visual skills. Molero-Clavellinas (2011b) analyzes bilingual PE from the methodological point of view. He explains that bilingual education involves methodological changes but it cannot be said that there is a unique and specific methodology for bilingual education, but a combination of teaching practices, and CLIL seems to be one of the most implemented methodological approaches by educational administrations, because it allows both the FL and the course contents to be taught simultaneously. In order to achieve this, teachers should be qualified and know basic vocabulary, communication strategies, etc.

Additionally, CLIL may prove very effective in helping foreign language learners attain proficiency (Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2010). A very important factor in L2 instruction is students' attitudes toward the FL. In this regard, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) studied Language Attitudes in CLIL and Traditional EFL Classes. The participants in the study were 287 secondary education students (14-16 years old) from Basque Country (Spain). The participants filled out a questionnaire with a view to measuring their attitudes toward Learning English as a FL and the results obtained seem to confirm that CLIL programmes help to foster positive attitudes toward language learning in general. The students enrolled in the CLIL classes held significantly more positive attitudes toward learning English than those in EFL classes. Therefore, the results of these authors reveal that language environment and methodology as represented by CLIL programs are important factors in determining positive attitudes toward the FL.

Total Physical Response

Rodríguez-Abreu (2010a) states that the interrelationship between the areas of PE and foreign languages requires the use of a teaching methodology that allows the learning of

contents of both disciplines together and through movement. He believes that the best method for this is the Total Physical Response. Fernández-Barrionuevo (2009) explains that in PE a specific content is associated with a particular type of methodology or activities. For example, body expression is associated with more open activities and socializing or creative teaching styles, while physical fitness is associated with more traditional instruction styles. Each of these styles is also associated with a different use of L2. For example, socializing styles are more related to communicative activities. However, traditional styles are more related to the learning of specific aspects, for instance, through the Total Physical Response, where the teacher presents aspects of language in the form of instructions. The children then have to do what the teacher says, for example: 'Run one lap', 'Stand up'...

Methodological considerations

Due to the fact that vocabulary and grammar have to be taught in the subject of PE, teachers tend to resort to theoretical explanations, sometimes in excess (Molero-Clavellinas, 2011b). According to Molero-Clavellinas (2011a), there are some aspects to consider when integrating linguistic contents and PE contents. The author advocates for an interdisciplinary coordination between departments in order to develop a bilingual project.

García-Jiménez et al (2012a) remarked that the teaching of PE in English should consider the individual differences of the students, as L2 development will be largely determined by the type of activities implemented and their level of complexity. They explain that teachers of bilingual PE should combine basic vocabulary and specific lexicon related to the Teaching Units. For this reason it is essential that the linguistic contents in bilingual PE are coordinated with the course curriculum of EFL.

Fernández-Barrionuevo (2011) defends the value of realism in bilingual PE tasks, indicating that realism is one of the key characteristics that L2 communicative tasks should accomplish. This author explains that this authenticity has to apply not only to general tasks but more specifically to PE when taught through a foreign language. The author recommends that the priority of PE should always imply exercising the body, so it's not convenient to resort excessively to written assignments. In addition, Barrionuevo states that PE teachers should moderate the amount of language feedback given to students, since PE teachers are not language teachers. Thus, the L2 should simply be a tool for students to access the contents of PE. Additionally, integrating content knowledge of different areas in the L2 should be done naturally, i.e., students should develop language skills at the same time they practice the games or tasks aimed at achieving the objectives of the PE curriculum. The author defends the ben-

efits of realistic PE instruction in L2, integrating physical activity and English in a realistic way, without emphasizing written assignments. In this manner, students will learn the L2 naturally and comfortably, while real communication is facilitated. At the same time, a more meaningful learning is achieved, since the lexicon is associated with concrete and real situations, so there is better memorization and generalization of learning.

1.1.3. Proposals for teaching in bilingual PE

In academic literature, most of the authors examining bilingual PE focus on making proposals for teaching bilingual PE. For instance, Alonso-Rueda et al (2015) present a bilingual proposal for teaching PE in elementary education through traditional English games. They implemented a Teaching Unit with the title 'Grandparents, shall we play?', aimed at teaching rules and combining physical activity, games and English language (L2). Its objective was to facilitate the learning of the L2 through the contents of PE and was designed for fifth-level students of Primary Education in Spain, eventually being carried out in a school in Martos (Jaén), with 54 students. The experimental development of the TU was very positive, achieving high enthusiasm and involvement among schoolchildren. Moreover, the use of L2 improved significantly due to the uninhibited behavior of schoolchildren in PE lessons. These authors concluded that it is necessary to design and apply more TUs about traditional and popular English games in which vocabulary related to physical activity, sports and English songs is used in order to improve the acquisition of the L2.

Another example is found in Cepero-González et al (2013). They designed a bilingual intervention program for the area of PE based on the Digital Skills, in order to develop students' language command. Twenty-three schoolchildren in primary education from Jaén (10-11 years old) were participants in this study during a school year. The results confirmed that the intervention program was effective for improving language and digital skills, and, also, the level of motivation of the students increased.

Fernández-Baena (2008) describes an experience of bilingual PE in a group of 9- to 10-year-old schoolchildren for one year. The author translated Spanish popular traditional games to English and also compiled English games of all kinds: warm-up games, circle games, hand-clapping games, jump rope rhymes and games to choose a person. He also proposed the repetition of specific vocabulary during the lesson, such as instructions, ending your lesson, giving regards and greetings. Furthermore, he used cupboard labels to teach the names of the different materials of PE in English and it was compulsory to name the materials in English. After one year, the schoolchildren that participated improved their

English and achieved better pronunciation, more vocabulary and more fluency. In addition there was an improvement in the willingness of the children to learn the L2 and the culture underlying it.

Montávez-Martín et al (2002) proposed an interdisciplinary teaching unit that integrated elements of the areas of PE and EFL. With the TU, the students improved their communicative and expressive skills in English, and the ease for learning languages through body expression was confirmed. López-Mercader (2011) dealt with bilingual PE in French and made a proposal to work the content of the warm-up in French with 12- and 13-year-old schoolchildren. The author recommended that the teacher gives students vocabulary lists and worksheets, and also highlighted the importance of the collaboration and continual contact between the PE teacher and the French teacher.

Ortiz-Calvo (2013) deals with Bilingual PE in Primary Education, interconnecting English, Science and PE contents. He proposes more than 300 games and activities, among which are warm-up and cool-down activities, popular games from English speaking countries, native songs and dances. Ramos and Ruiz-Omeñaca (2011) describe a proposal for the instruction of English through Physical Education in bilingual elementary schools. The proposal of these authors helps students improve their command of English via the use of movement and the resolution of "problem situations" while working in groups.

García-Jiménez et al (2012a) show a sample session of bilingual PE in English to work with body expression in primary education (6- and 7-year-old children) with the title, 'Let's Talk With Our Body!'. The same authors, García-Jiménez et al (2012b) say that the PE area has become an ideal subject to foster the learning of English through games and movement. They also make a proposal to practice postural hygiene in bilingual PE in English, presenting a set of activities to enhance postural hygiene in Primary Education. Finally, Rodríguez-Abreu (2010a) makes a proposal for bilingual PE in English in Secondary Education (12- and 13-year-old students), through a teaching unit of football, a sport of English origin. Rodríguez-Abreu (2010b) makes another proposal through a bilingual teaching unit of tennis also for Secondary Education students (15- and 16-year-old students), entitled 'Do You Play Tennis?'

1.1.4. Opinion and qualification of teachers

It is clear that bilingual PE is a good option to facilitate language learning. Moreover, over the last few years several authors have contributed findings about the teaching methodology in bilingual PE and have provided a significant number of resources for teaching in bilingual PE.

However, the opinions and qualifications of bilingual PE

teachers are of utmost importance (Zagalaz-Sánchez et al, 2012). These authors designed and validated an instrument for PE teachers of Primary Education to measure their opinion about bilingual PE in English and to find out if they felt qualified to teach PE in English.

1.2. Research purpose

The purpose of this research is to survey the opinions of Primary Education PE Teachers concerning bilingual PE and to find out if they feel qualified to teach PE in English.

1.3. Research questions

- 1) What is the opinion of Primary Education PE Teachers about bilingual PE?
- 2) Do Primary Education PE Teachers feel qualified to teach PE in English?
- 3) Will there be differences in the first two questions by sex, age, years of experience, employment status or membership in a bilingual school?

1.4. Research hypotheses

- 1) Most of the teachers will have a positive opinion about bilingual PE.
- 2) Most of the teachers will feel that they need more training.
- 3) There will be some differences according to sex, age, years of experience, employment status or membership in a bilingual school.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The study sample consisted of 30 individuals, all with the Teacher Diploma in Primary Education (specialty PE), of which 19 (63.3%) were men and 11 (36.7%) women. The average age was 38.6 (standard deviation 11.71) and the age range 23-65 years. The average years of experience were 13 (standard deviation 12.14), with a minimum of 0 years and a maximum of 40 years.

Regarding employment status, 15 teachers (50%) were civil servants, 6 teachers (20%) were interims, 3 of them (10%) worked in semi-private schools, 5 of them (16.7%) were enrolled in higher studies (2 Bachelor in Sports Sciences, 2 Ph.D. in Sports Sciences and 1 preparing competitive examinations), and the last one was retired (3.3%). Regarding the place of work, 14 teachers (46.7%) were teaching in bilingual schools.

2.2. Instrument

The questionnaire on bilingual qualification of PE teachers (Zagalaz-Sánchez et al. 2012) was used. This questionnaire for PE teachers of Primary Education measures their opinion about bilingual PE in English and assesses if they feel qualified to teach PE in English. The questionnaire is composed of 30 items, and the teachers valued each item through a quantitative Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1=Very little, 2=Little, 3=Some, 4=Quite, 5=A lot). The questionnaire was validated in Spanish and presents a Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.83 for the whole questionnaire (Zagalaz-Sánchez et al. 2012).

2.3. Design and Procedures

The study was conducted with a quantitative, non-experimental, transversal and descriptive design, through surveys to determine the opinion about bilingual PE in English of PE teachers of Primary Education and assess if they felt qualified to teach PE in English. Research staff was in charge of contacting teachers and distributing the questionnaires. With regard to ethical principles, questionnaires were filled in anonymously by the teachers, in the years 2015 and 2016.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

A statistical analysis was performed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 22 (SPSS-22). Descriptive statistics techniques have been applied: frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation. In addition, the Shapiro-Wilk test was applied to check the normality of the sample. After that, nonparametric tests were applied: Mann-Whitney U test to analyze the differences between sex and membership in bilingual schools; and the Kruskal-Wallis H test to analyze the differences according to age, years of experience and employment status.

3. Results

The results are presented in two tables. Table 1 describes the frequencies (F) and percentages (%) of answers for each item. Table 2 describes the mean, standard deviation and statistical significance for each item, according to sex, age, years of experience, employment status and school.

In Table 1 there are several results to remark upon. First of all, all the teachers agree that English is quite or very important for the global education of schoolchildren, and also they all think that it is important that schoolchildren finish Primary Education with an adequate English level according to the objectives pursued. Additionally, 90% of the teachers think that English is quite or very important in compulsory

education. Regarding the importance of bilingual instruction in primary education, 70% of the teachers believe that is quite or very important. With regard to the importance of PE in bilingual education, 60% of the teachers think that it is quite or very important. Moreover, 70% of the teachers agree that bilingual teaching may improve the English level of learners.

More than half of teachers (53.3%) agree that English teaching can be quite or very related to PE (objectives, content and methodology), and that current instruction in PE can be clearly adapted in a bilingual manner. However, only 43.3% of them believe that PE has quite or many advantages with respect to other subjects to be implemented bilingually. Besides this, only 20% of the teachers think that PE is quite or very related to foreign language teaching. It is also interesting that most of the teachers believe that schoolchildren are not well prepared to receive PE lessons in English (76.7%), especially because they do not have enough experience receiving bilingual instruction (66.7%). Nevertheless, 56.6% of teachers agree that learners will acquire more motivation for learning a foreign language if this is used also in PE.

Regarding the experience of teachers in teaching bilingually, all the participants in the study say that they do not have much experience teaching bilingually. In the same vein, 70% affirm that they are little or very little prepared to

impart bilingual teaching, while only 13.4% say that they are quite or very prepared to teach bilingually. Additionally, 60% of them answer that they have little or very little knowledge about bilingual methodologies and their implementation. Most of them also think that the other teachers of PE (73.4%) and the teachers of other subjects apart from foreign language (76.7%) have little or very little level to teach bilingually. Likewise, 66.7% consider that English and PE teachers have not the same qualification to teach bilingually. In addition, 80% of the teachers answer that universities are preparing students of PE little or very little to teach bilingually, and so 90% of the teachers surveyed also think that the preparation of recent graduates to teach bilingually is not quite or very high.

Finally, more than half of teachers (56.6%) believe that it should be necessary to pass level tests to teach bilingually and 60% would do courses to improve their qualifications for bilingual instruction. However, only 13.3% think that teachers would have more motivation teaching PE bilingually. Moreover, only 13.3% think that the English course is well-structured in Primary Education, and only 6.6% consider that educational centers have adequate tools and materials for bilingual education. Furthermore, 43.4% have very clear that is necessary to modify the educational laws to implement a bilingual model in PE lessons.

Table 1. Frequencies and Percentages for each item. (1=Very little, 2=Little, 3=Some, 4=Quite, 5=A lot).

ITEMS	1. F(%)	2. F(%)	3. F(%)	4. F(%)	5. F(%)
1. Importance of English in compulsory education.	0(0)	0(0)	3(10)	12(40)	15(50)
2. Importance of English for global education of schoolchildren.	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	10(33.3)	20(66.7)
3. English teaching can be related to PE (objectives, content and methodology)	3(10)	1(3.3)	10(33.3)	10(33.3)	6(20)
4. Importance of bilingual instruction in primary education.	3(10)	0(0)	6(20)	10(33.3)	11(36.7)
5. Bilingual education may improve the English level of students	2(6.7)	1(3.3)	8(26.7)	9(30.0)	10(33.3)
6. English course is well-structured in Primary Education.	6(20)	10(33.3)	10(33.3)	3(10.0)	1(3.3)
7. Importance of PE in bilingual education.	3(10)	2(6.7)	7(23.3)	13(43.3)	5(16.7)
8. PE has advantages with respect to other subjects to be implemented bilingually.	3(10)	4(13.3)	10(33.3)	4(13.3)	9(30)
9. PE has disadvantages with respect to other subjects to be implemented bilingually.	10(33.3)	12(40.0)	3(10)	2(6.7)	3(10)
10. Current teaching in PE can be adapted in a bilingual manner.	4(13.3)	1(3.3)	9(30)	9(30)	7(23.3)
11. Foreign language teaching is related to PE.	5(16.7)	4(13.3)	15(50)	3(10)	3(10)
12. Experience that learners obtain receiving bilingual PE.	4(13.3)	2(6.7)	7(23.3)	12(40)	5(16.7)
13. It is important that schoolchildren finish Primary Education with adequate English level according to the objectives pursued.	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	11(36.7)	19(63.3)
14. Children are ready and able to receive PE lessons in English.	5(16.7)	7(23.3)	11(36.7)	4(13.3)	3(10)
15. Bilingual instruction may improve the English level of learners.	4(13.3)	3(10)	2(6.7)	13(43.3)	8(26.7)
16. Learners will acquire more motivation for learning a foreign language if this is used also in PE.	5(16.7)	4(13.3)	4(13.3)	10(33.3)	7(23.3)
17. Experience that learners have receiving bilingual teaching.	4(13.3)	8(26.7)	8(26.7)	7(23.3)	3(10)
18. Personal preparation to impart bilingual teaching.	16(53.3)	5(16.7)	5(16.7)	2(6.7)	2(6.7)
19. PE teachers should pass level tests to teach bilingually.	5(16.7)	4(13.3)	4(13.3)	7(23.3)	10(33.3)

ITEMS	1. F(%)	2. F(%)	3. F(%)	4. F(%)	5. F(%)
20. Personal experience teaching bilingual PE.	24(80)	5(16.7)	1(3.3)	0(0)	0(0)
21. Teachers will have more motivation teaching PE bilingually.	14(46.7)	7(23.3)	5(16.7)	3(10)	1(3.3)
22. Level of the rest of specialist teachers, regarding bilingual instruction in PE.	11(36.7)	11(36.7)	7(23.3)	1(3.3)	0(0)
23. Personal readiness to do courses and apply them to improve qualification for bilingual teaching.	4(13.3)	1(3.3)	7(23.3)	8(26.7)	10(33.3)
24. English and PE teachers have the same qualifications to teach bilingually.	11(36.7)	9(30)	3(10)	3(10)	4(13.3)
25. Level of the teachers of other subjects (apart from foreign language) to teach bilingually.	9(30)	14(46.7)	6(20)	1(3.3)	0(0)
26. Preparation of recent graduates to teach bilingually.	8(26.7)	8(26.7)	11(36.7)	3(10)	0(0)
27. Universities are preparing students of PE to teach bilingually.	14(46.7)	10(33.3)	5(16.7)	1(3.3)	0(0)
28. Education centers have adequate tools and materials for bilingual education.	10(33.3)	11(36.7)	7(23.3)	1(3.3)	1(3.3)
29. Personal knowledge of bilingual methodologies and their implementation.	9(30)	9(30)	8(26.7)	0(0)	4(13.3)
30. Need to modify the education laws to implement a bilingual model in PE lessons.	7(23.3)	4(13.3)	6(20)	8(26.7)	5(16.7)

In Table 2, means, standard deviations and statistical significances for each item are presented, studying the significant differences according to sex, age, years of experience, employment status and school.

In the first place, by sex there are no significant differences in any of the items.

By age, there are significant differences in 5 items:

10. Current teaching in PE can be adapted in a bilingual manner. Teachers 20 to 30 and over 50 are more in agreement with this item than the teachers 30-50 year-old.
16. Learners will acquire more motivation for learning a foreign language if this is used also in PE. Again teachers 20 to 30 and over 50 are more in agreement with this item than the teachers 30 to 50.
21. Teachers will have more motivation teaching PE bilingually. Teachers over 50 are more in agreement with this item than the other three groups.
23. Personal readiness to do courses and apply them to improve qualification for bilingual instruction. Teachers 20 to 30 have a better disposition to do courses, followed by the over 50 group, and later the other two groups.
30. Need to modify the education laws to implement a bilingual model in PE lessons. Again teachers 20 to 30 and over 50 are more in agreement with this item than teachers 30 to 50.

By years of experience, there are significant differences in 7 items:

3. English teaching can be related to PE (objectives, content and methodology). The teachers with less experience are more in line with this item.
4. Importance of bilingual teaching in primary education. Also here the teachers with less than 5 years of experi-

ence are more in agreement with this item, followed by the group with more than 20 years of experience.

7. Importance of PE in bilingual education. The teachers with 5-10 years of experience give less importance to PE in bilingual education.
12. Experience that learners obtain receiving bilingual PE. Again the teachers with 5-10 years are less in agreement with this item, so they think that learners do not obtain much experience receiving bilingual PE.
14. Children are ready and able to receive PE lessons in English. The group with more experience (more than 20 years) agrees more this statement.
26. Preparation of recent graduates to teach bilingually. The group with more experience gives more value to the preparation of recent graduates to teach bilingually, while the other three groups give lower values to this statement.
30. Need to modify the education laws to implement a bilingual model in PE lessons. The group with less experience is more in line with this statement, while the group with 5-10 years of experience thinks that is not necessary to modify the laws.

According to employment status, there are significant differences in 2 items:

4. Importance of bilingual instruction in primary education. The group more in consonance with this item is the group enrolled in higher studies, and the teachers less in agreement with this item are those who work in semi-private schools.
16. Learners will acquire more motivation for learning a foreign language if this is used also in PE. The higher studies group and retired group agree more with this statement than the groups of civil servants, interims and semi-private schools.

Regarding the type of school, there are significant differences in 10 items:

2. Importance of English for global education of schoolchildren. Paradoxically, teachers that work in bilingual schools give less importance to this item.
3. English teaching can be related to PE (objectives, content and methodology). Again teachers that work in bilingual schools agree less with this item than the other teachers.
7. Importance of PE in bilingual education. Also here teachers that do not work in bilingual schools think that PE is more important in bilingual education than the teachers that work in bilingual schools.
8. PE has advantages with respect to other subjects to be implemented bilingually. Also in this instance teachers who do not work in bilingual schools believe more in the advantages of PE to be implemented bilingually.
9. PE has disadvantages with respect to other subjects to be implemented bilingually. From the other perspective the same result is found, teachers in bilingual schools think that PE has more disadvantages to be implemented bilingually than the teachers who do not work in bilingual schools.

10. Current teaching in PE can be adapted in a bilingual manner. Also in this item the teachers who do not work in bilingual schools have more positive attitudes toward bilingual PE.
12. Experience that learners obtain receiving bilingual PE. In this item, the teachers who do not work in bilingual schools value more the experience that the learners obtain receiving bilingual PE.
13. It is important that schoolchildren finish Primary Education with adequate English level according to the objectives pursued. Also in this item teachers that do not work in bilingual schools are more in line with this statement.
16. Learners will acquire more motivation for learning a foreign language if this is used also in PE. Teachers that do not work in bilingual schools are more in accordance with this item than teachers who work in bilingual schools.
30. Need to modify the education laws to implement a bilingual model in PE lessons. Finally, the teachers who do not work in bilingual schools think that is more necessary to modify the education laws than the teachers that work in bilingual schools.

Table 2. Mean, Standard Deviation and Statistical Significance for each item. By sex, age, years of experience, employment status and school. *p<0.05 **p<0.01.

ITEMS	All (n=30)		SEX						AGE								YEARS OF EXPERIENCE										
			Males (n=19)		Females (n=11)		Sig.	20-30 y. (n=9)		30-40 y. (n=8)		40-50 y. (n=8)		>50 y. (n=5)		Sig.	< 5 y. (n=10)		5-10 y. (n=4)		10-20 y (n=7)		> 20 y (n=9)		Sig.		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
1	4,4	0,7	4,3	0,7	4,6	0,5	0,173	4,3	0,9	4,4	0,7	4,5	0,5	4,4	0,5	0,991	4,4	0,8	4,3	0,5	4,6	0,8	4,3	0,5	4,3	0,5	0,670
2	4,7	0,5	4,7	0,5	4,6	0,5	0,792	4,8	0,4	4,5	0,5	4,5	0,5	5,0	0,0	0,184	4,7	0,5	4,5	0,6	4,7	0,5	4,7	0,5	4,7	0,5	0,896
3	3,5	1,2	3,4	1,2	3,6	1,2	0,637	4,2	0,8	3,1	1,0	2,9	1,4	3,8	1,1	0,062	4,2	0,8	2,0	1,2	3,7	0,8	3,2	1,2	0,021*		
4	3,9	1,2	3,7	1,4	4,2	0,9	0,429	4,2	1,3	3,6	0,7	3,3	1,6	4,6	0,5	0,091	4,3	1,3	2,5	1,0	3,7	1,4	4,1	0,8	0,040*		
5	3,8	1,2	3,7	1,2	4,0	1,0	0,544	4,3	0,7	3,5	0,8	3,1	1,6	4,4	0,9	0,110	4,4	0,7	2,8	1,3	3,4	1,4	3,9	1,1	0,093		
6	2,4	1,0	2,5	1,0	2,3	1,2	0,381	2,0	1,3	2,5	0,8	2,4	1,1	3,2	0,4	0,101	2,0	1,2	3,0	1,2	2,3	0,8	2,8	0,8	0,145		
7	3,5	1,2	3,6	1,1	3,4	1,3	0,667	3,8	1,0	3,1	1,1	3,1	1,6	4,2	0,4	0,268	3,8	0,9	2,0	1,2	4,0	1,0	3,4	1,1	0,048*		
8	3,4	1,3	3,4	1,3	3,5	1,4	0,876	4,2	1,0	3,0	1,1	2,5	1,3	4,0	1,4	0,033	4,2	0,9	2,0	1,2	3,3	1,1	3,2	1,5	0,052		
9	2,2	1,3	2,4	1,3	1,9	1,2	0,276	1,6	0,5	2,6	1,4	2,6	1,6	2,0	1,2	0,295	1,6	0,5	3,8	1,9	1,9	0,9	2,4	1,3	0,158		
10	3,5	1,3	3,4	1,3	3,5	1,3	0,824	4,1	1,1	3,1	1,0	2,6	1,5	4,2	0,8	0,045*	4,1	1,0	2,0	1,2	3,4	1,3	3,4	1,2	0,058		
11	2,8	1,1	2,7	1,1	3,1	1,2	0,446	3,2	1,1	2,9	0,8	2,0	1,2	3,4	1,1	0,144	3,2	1,0	2,0	1,2	2,7	1,3	2,9	1,2	0,494		
12	3,4	1,2	3,3	1,2	3,6	1,3	0,381	4,1	0,8	2,9	1,1	2,8	1,6	4,0	0,7	0,067	4,1	0,7	1,8	1,0	3,3	1,4	3,4	1,1	0,028*		
13	4,6	0,5	4,6	0,5	4,6	0,5	0,979	4,8	0,4	4,4	0,5	4,6	0,5	4,8	0,4	0,310	4,7	0,5	4,3	0,5	4,7	0,5	4,7	0,5	0,413		
14	2,8	1,2	2,7	1,3	2,9	0,9	0,448	2,4	1,1	2,3	0,9	3,0	1,4	3,8	0,8	0,072	2,4	1,1	1,8	1,0	2,7	1,4	3,7	0,7	0,014*		
15	3,6	1,4	3,5	1,4	3,8	1,3	0,453	4,1	1,3	3,1	1,0	3,0	1,8	4,4	0,5	0,098	4,1	1,2	2,3	1,3	3,4	1,5	3,8	1,2	0,151		
16	3,3	1,4	3,2	1,5	3,5	1,4	0,535	3,9	1,3	2,6	1,1	2,6	1,6	4,6	0,5	0,017*	3,8	1,2	1,5	0,6	3,3	1,4	3,7	1,4	0,064		
17	2,9	1,2	2,8	1,1	3,0	1,4	0,757	3,2	1,4	2,8	1,0	2,5	1,4	3,2	0,8	0,572	3,1	1,4	2,5	1,3	2,9	1,3	2,9	1,1	0,898		
18	2,0	1,3	2,1	1,4	1,8	1,1	0,778	2,7	1,7	2,1	1,0	1,5	0,9	1,2	0,4	0,152	2,6	1,6	1,8	1,5	1,7	0,8	1,6	0,9	0,435		

ITEMS	All (n=30)		SEX					AGE								YEARS OF EXPERIENCE								Sig.	
			Males (n=19)		Females (n=11)			20-30 y. (n=9)		30-40 y. (n=8)		40-50 y. (n=8)		>50 y. (n=5)		< 5 y. (n=10)		5-10 y. (n=4)		10-20 y (n=7)		> 20 y (n=9)			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M		SD
19	3,4	1,5	3,7	1,5	3,0	1,5	0,198	3,9	1,4	3,3	1,5	2,4	1,5	4,6	0,5	0,057	3,7	1,4	3,0	1,8	3,6	1,4	3,2	1,7	0,879
20	1,2	,5	1,3	0,6	1,2	0,4	0,805	1,3	0,7	1,3	0,5	1,1	0,4	1,2	0,4	0,928	1,3	0,7	1,0	0,0	1,3	0,5	1,2	0,4	0,747
21	2,0	1,2	2,0	1,2	2,0	1,3	0,963	2,3	0,9	1,4	0,7	1,5	1,1	3,2	1,5	0,017*	2,2	0,9	1,0	0,0	1,9	1,2	2,3	1,5	0,156
22	1,9	0,9	1,9	0,9	2,0	0,8	0,632	1,8	0,7	2,0	1,1	2,0	0,9	2,0	1,0	0,964	1,8	0,6	1,0	0,0	2,4	1,0	2,1	0,9	0,052
23	3,6	1,4	3,6	1,6	3,6	0,9	0,577	4,4	0,7	3,5	1,6	2,6	1,3	4,0	1,0	0,040*	4,4	0,7	2,0	2,0	3,7	1,4	3,4	1,0	0,078
24	2,3	1,4	2,4	1,5	2,2	1,3	0,606	2,6	1,3	1,9	1,1	1,8	1,4	3,6	1,5	0,073	2,4	1,3	1,5	0,6	2,4	1,6	2,6	1,7	0,717
25	2,0	0,8	2,0	0,9	1,9	0,7	0,871	2,1	0,9	1,6	0,7	1,9	0,6	2,4	0,9	0,346	2,1	0,9	1,5	0,6	1,9	0,9	2,1	0,8	0,561
26	2,3	1,0	2,1	1,0	2,6	0,8	0,143	1,9	0,8	2,1	1,0	2,5	1,2	3,0	0,7	0,205	1,8	0,8	1,8	1,0	2,3	1,0	3,1	0,8	0,023*
27	1,8	0,9	1,6	0,8	2,0	0,9	0,227	1,6	0,7	1,8	0,9	1,9	1,1	2,0	0,7	0,756	1,5	0,7	1,3	0,5	1,9	0,9	2,2	1,0	0,182
28	2,1	1,0	1,9	0,9	2,4	1,2	0,277	1,9	0,6	1,9	0,8	1,8	0,9	3,2	1,5	0,181	1,9	0,6	1,5	1,0	1,9	0,9	2,7	1,3	0,260
29	2,4	1,3	2,4	1,3	2,4	1,4	0,788	2,6	1,2	1,9	0,8	2,5	1,6	2,6	1,7	0,707	2,5	1,2	1,3	0,5	2,6	1,3	2,6	1,6	0,216
30	3,0	1,4	2,9	1,5	3,1	1,4	0,775	3,9	1,1	2,4	1,5	2,1	1,4	3,8	0,8	0,029*	3,8	1,0	1,0	0,0	3,1	1,5	2,9	1,4	0,017*

ITEMS	All (n=30)		EMPLOYMENT STATUS										SCHOOL				Sig.	
			Civil servants (n=15)		Interims (n=6)		Semi-private schools (n=3)		Higher studies (n=5)		Retired (n=1)		Bil. School (n=14)		No Bil. School (n=16)			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
1	4,4	0,7	4,5	0,5	4,2	1,0	4,3	0,6	4,4	0,9	4,0	0,0	0,854	4,3	0,6	4,5	0,7	0,268
2	4,7	0,5	4,7	0,5	4,5	0,5	4,3	0,6	4,8	0,4	5,0	0,0	0,503	4,4	0,5	4,9	0,3	0,011 *
3	3,5	1,2	3,3	1,2	3,0	1,1	3,7	1,2	4,6	0,5	4,0	0,0	0,111	2,9	1,4	4,0	0,6	0,012 *
4	3,9	1,2	3,9	1,1	3,5	1,4	2,7	1,5	5,0	0,0	4,0	0,0	0,045*	3,6	1,1	4,1	1,3	0,060
5	3,8	1,2	3,7	1,2	3,7	1,5	3,3	0,6	4,6	0,5	3,0	0,0	0,312	3,5	1,2	4,1	1,1	0,134
6	2,4	1,0	2,5	0,8	2,8	1,5	3,0	1,0	1,4	0,5	3,0	0,0	0,115	2,6	0,9	2,3	1,1	0,362
7	3,5	1,2	3,5	1,3	3,2	1,2	3,3	0,6	4,0	1,2	4,0	0,0	0,648	3,0	1,4	3,9	0,8	0,034 *
8	3,4	1,3	3,1	1,4	3,3	1,4	3,3	0,6	4,6	0,9	3,0	0,0	0,252	2,8	1,4	3,9	1,1	0,021 *
9	2,2	1,3	2,1	1,2	3,0	1,5	2,7	1,2	1,2	0,4	2,0	0,0	0,110	2,9	1,5	1,6	0,6	0,019 *
10	3,5	1,3	3,3	1,4	3,0	1,1	3,7	0,6	4,4	1,3	3,0	0,0	0,271	3,0	1,3	3,9	1,1	0,041 *
11	2,8	1,1	2,7	1,3	2,7	0,8	3,0	0,0	3,4	1,5	3,0	0,0	0,933	2,5	1,2	3,1	1,1	0,147
12	3,4	1,2	3,2	1,4	3,2	1,2	2,7	0,6	4,6	0,5	4,0	0,0	0,069	2,7	1,2	4,0	1,0	0,002 **
13	4,6	0,5	4,7	0,5	4,5	0,5	4,3	0,6	4,8	0,4	4,0	0,0	0,350	4,4	0,5	4,8	0,4	0,032 *
14	2,8	1,2	3,1	1,3	2,2	0,8	2,0	1,0	2,8	1,3	3,0	0,0	0,299	3,0	1,2	2,6	1,2	0,228
15	3,6	1,4	3,5	1,4	3,3	1,2	2,3	1,5	4,8	0,4	4,0	0,0	0,066	3,2	1,4	3,9	1,2	0,141
16	3,3	1,4	3,3	1,5	2,8	1,2	2,0	1,0	4,6	0,5	5,0	0,0	0,037*	2,7	1,4	3,9	1,3	0,025 *
17	2,9	1,2	2,7	1,2	2,7	1,2	2,3	0,6	4,0	1,0	4,0	0,0	0,178	2,6	1,0	3,2	1,3	0,178
18	2,0	1,3	1,5	0,7	2,0	1,3	3,3	2,1	2,6	1,7	1,0	0,0	0,335	2,0	1,4	1,9	1,2	0,964
19	3,4	1,5	3,2	1,7	2,8	0,8	4,7	0,6	4,0	1,7	4,0	0,0	0,292	3,1	1,6	3,7	1,4	0,368
20	1,2	0,5	1,2	0,4	1,2	0,4	1,3	0,6	1,4	0,9	1,0	0,0	0,963	1,2	0,4	1,3	0,6	0,929
21	2,0	1,2	2,0	1,4	1,5	0,5	1,3	0,6	2,8	0,8	3,0	0,0	0,180	1,7	1,3	2,3	1,1	0,097
22	1,9	0,9	2,1	1,0	1,5	0,5	1,7	0,6	1,8	0,8	3,0	0,0	0,418	1,9	0,9	1,9	0,9	1,000
23	3,6	1,4	3,3	1,3	3,7	1,5	3,3	2,1	4,6	0,5	4,0	0,0	0,416	3,2	1,5	4,0	1,1	0,149
24	2,3	1,4	2,2	1,5	1,7	0,8	2,3	0,6	3,0	1,6	5,0	0,0	0,273	2,1	1,3	2,6	1,5	0,398

ITEMS	EMPLOYMENT STATUS													SCHOOL				
	All (n=30)		Civil servants (n=15)		Interims (n=6)		Semi-private schools (n=3)		Higher studies (n=5)		Retired (n=1)		Sig.	Bil. School (n=14)		No Bil. School (n=16)		Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		M	SD			
25	2,0	0,8	1,8	0,8	2,0	0,6	1,3	0,6	2,6	0,9	3,0	0,0	0,144	2,0	0,8	1,9	0,9	0,721
26	2,3	1,0	2,6	1,1	1,8	1,0	1,7	1,2	2,2	0,4	3,0	0,0	0,356	2,6	1,1	2,0	0,8	0,078
27	1,8	0,9	1,9	1,0	1,8	1,0	1,3	0,6	1,4	0,5	2,0	0,0	0,699	2,1	1,0	1,5	0,6	0,101
28	2,1	1,0	2,2	1,3	2,0	0,6	1,3	0,6	2,0	0,7	3,0	0,0	0,530	2,1	1,2	2,0	0,9	0,844
29	2,4	1,3	2,5	1,5	2,5	1,4	2,3	1,2	2,0	1,0	1,0	0,0	0,744	2,4	1,3	2,4	1,3	0,914
30	3,0	1,4	2,9	1,5	2,5	1,4	2,0	1,0	4,4	0,9	3,0	0,0	0,126	2,1	1,2	3,8	1,2	0,003 **

4. Discussion

The results of this research can be compared with several studies that have focused on similar topics. For example, Faya-Cerqueiro (2012) studied the influence of a course of English for Specific Purposes on 35 students of Sports Science, who could be future teachers of PE in English. The author found that most students were aware of the usefulness of knowing a second language and thought that English had great importance for their prospects for employment. Also in the present study all the teachers were aware of the importance of English. In addition, Faya-Cerqueiro (2012) found that 59% of the students would like to teach the subject of PE in English in the future, although it is also noteworthy that 30% of them said that they would not like to teach PE in English as they did not consider themselves sufficiently prepared. However, in the present study 70% of the teachers thought that they were little or very little prepared to teach bilingually.

Fernández-Fernández et al (2005) studied the expectations of teachers in four public schools in the Community of Madrid about the implementation of bilingual education projects in English. The teachers were specialists in English, music education and PE. The opinion of teachers about bilingual education was very favorable, and they believed that it was necessary to educate the students in accordance with the demands of our society, in which the mastery of a foreign language is essential. This result is similar to the present study, where all the teachers recognized the importance of English in education. Fernández-Fernández et al (2005) also reported that, according to some teachers, the teaching of foreign language in primary education was suffering a serious crisis, and it was necessary to make a methodological change. Also in the present study most teachers thought that English course was not well-structured in Primary Education. Finally, Fernández-Fernández et al (2005) found that most of the teachers studied believed that they were prepared to teach bilingually. This last result is very different from the present study where 70% of the teachers declared that they were little or very little prepared to impart bilingual instruction.

In the same vein Travé-González (2013) studied the opinion of 60 Primary School teachers about bilingual teaching in Andalusia, and found that there seemed to be very little initial and ongoing training for teachers in the foreign language itself and how best to teach it. This result is very similar to the present study where most of the teachers were not sufficiently prepared. Travé-González (2013) also noted that bilingual school projects have to deal with government overregulation; this point is related to the opinion of 43.4% teachers of the present study that had very clear the necessity to modify the educational laws to implement a bilingual model in PE lessons.

Finally, Ramos (2007) stressed that having teachers with proper linguistic and methodological backgrounds is of special relevance for the success of a bilingual program, since this factor has a strong impact on language and content learning. Additionally, Martín-del-Pozo (2013) stressed the importance of teacher training programs and willingness for the success of a bilingual program.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Findings

1) Opinion of Primary Education PE Teachers about bilingual PE

Most PE teachers of the sample think that PE is quite or very important in bilingual education. They agree that English teaching can be quite or very related to PE (objectives, content and methodology), and think that PE can be adapted in a bilingual manner.

However, most of the teachers also believe that school-children are not well-prepared to receive PE lessons in English, especially because they do not have enough experience receiving bilingual instruction. Nevertheless, they generally think that learners will acquire more motivation for learning a foreign language if this is used also in PE.

2) Qualification of Primary Education PE Teachers to teach PE in English

The participants in the study do not have much experience teaching bilingually. Furthermore, a vast number of them are little or very little prepared to do bilingual teaching, and they have little or very little knowledge about bilingual methodologies and their implementation.

Most of them also think that the other teachers of PE have little or very little level to teach bilingually. In addition, they believe that universities are preparing students of PE little or very little to teach bilingually, and they also think that the preparation of recent graduates to teach bilingually is not quite or very high.

Finally, more than half of teachers believe that it should be necessary to pass level tests to teach bilingually and the majority would do courses to improve their qualification for bilingual teaching.

3) Differences in opinions and qualification by sex, age, years of experience, employment status and membership in bilingual schools

By sex there are no significant differences.

By age, teachers 20 to 30 and over 50 have more positive attitudes toward bilingual PE than teachers 30 to 50.

By years of experience, the teachers with less experience (less than 5 years) have more positive opinions about bilingual PE.

According to the employment status, the group of teachers that are enrolled in higher studies have more favorable attitudes toward bilingual PE.

Regarding the type of school, paradoxically, teachers that do not work in bilingual schools have more positive opinions toward bilingual PE than the teachers that work in bilingual schools.

5.2. Suggestions for further research

For future research, it would be interesting to study the opinions about bilingual education and qualification to teach bilingually of teachers of other educational stages: Secondary Education, Baccalaureate and University.

Additionally, it would be recommendable to design and carry out educational programs in order to improve the qualification of PE teachers to teach bilingually, checking the effectiveness of these programs. In this way, there would be more resources to improve the qualification of teachers and the effectiveness of these resources would be known.

6. References

- Alonso-Rueda, J. A., Cachón-Zagalaz, J., Castro-López, R. & Zagalaz-Sánchez, M. L. (2015). Bilingual proposal for teaching physical education in elementary education. Popular and traditional English games. *Retos: nuevas tendencias en educación física, deporte y recreación*, 28, 116-121.
- Baena-Extremera, A. & Granero-Gallegos, A. (2015). Versión española del Sport Satisfaction Instrument (SSI) adaptado al aprendizaje de la Educación Física bilingüe en Inglés. *Porta Linguarum*, 24, 63-76.
- Bothman, M. (2013). *Bilingual Physical Education*. (Honors Thesis). Western Oregon University.
- Cepero-González, M., García-Pérez, A. & López-López, M. (2013). Diseño de un Programa de intervención bilingüe para el área de Educación Física basado en la competencia digital. *Porta Linguarum*, 19, 257-273.
- Faya-Cerqueiro, F. (2012). Influencia de una asignatura de inglés para fines específicos en posibles profesores de AICLE. *Congreso Internacional de Propuestas docentes en AICLE*. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.
- Fernández-Baena, J. G. (2008). La Educación Física bilingüe en la etapa de primaria. Descripción de una experiencia. *EFDEPORTES: Lecturas, Educación Física y Deportes, Revista Digital*, 117, 1-7.
- Fernández-Barrionuevo, E. (2009). La secuenciación de contenidos lingüísticos dentro de la Educación Física Bilingüe. *Revista Digital Innovación y Experiencias Educativas*, 23, 1-9.
- Fernández-Barrionuevo, E. (2011). The value of realism in bilingual physical education tasks. *Revista Digital Educativa Wadi-red*, 1, 1, 27-32.
- Fernández-Fernández, R., Pena-Díaz, C., García Gómez, A. & Halbach, A. (2005). La implantación de proyectos educativos bilingües en la Comunidad de Madrid: las expectativas del profesorado antes de iniciar el proyecto. *Porta Linguarum*, 3, 161-173.
- García-Jiménez, J. V., García-Pellicer, J. J. & Yuste-Lucas, J. L. (2012a). Expresión corporal en inglés. Modelo de sesión para educación primaria. *EmásF: Revista Digital de Educación Física*, 3, 18, 7-17.
- García-Jiménez, J. V., García-Pellicer, J. J. & Yuste-Lucas, J. L. (2012b). Physical Education in English. A proposal for working postural hygiene in Primary Education. *Retos: nuevas tendencias en educación física, deporte y recreación*, 22, 70-75.
- Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language Attitudes in CLIL and Traditional EFL Classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1, 2, 4-17.
- Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: more differences than similarities. *ELT Journal*, 64, 4, 367-375.
- López-Mercader, M. P. (2011). Proyectos de innovación-secciones bilingües. Enseñanza de la educación física en francés. Materiales. *Revista Española de Educación Física y Deportes*, 393, 25-33.
- Martín-del-Pozo, M. A. (2013). Lecturer education for English Medium Instruction. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 11(3), 197-218.
- Molero-Clavellinas, J. J. (2011a). La planificación de la educación física bilingüe: aspectos a tener en cuenta en la integración de los contenidos lingüísticos. *EmásF: Revista Digital de Educación Física*, 2, 9, 6-15.
- Molero-Clavellinas, J. J. (2011b). De la educación física hacia la educación física bilingüe: un análisis desde el punto de vista metodológico. *EmásF: Revista Digital de Educación Física*, 2, 10, 7-16.
- Montávez-Martín, M., López-Díaz-De-Durana, I. & Mariscal Solís, A. (2002). Desdramaticemos el inglés. Propuesta interdisciplinar: Edu-

- cación Física (Expresión Corporal y Lengua Extranjera. *Retos: nuevas tendencias en educación física, deporte y recreación*, 1, 29-36.
19. Ortiz-Calvo, A. (2013). *Physical Education in Bilingual Projects. 1st, 2nd & 3rd Cycle*. Madrid: INDE.
 20. Ramos, F. (2007). Programas bilingües y formación de profesores en Andalucía. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 44, 133-146.
 21. Ramos, F. & Ruiz-Omeñaca, J. V. (2011). La educación física en centros bilingües de primaria inglés-español: de las singularidades propias del área a la elaboración de propuestas didácticas prácticas con AIBLE. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada (RESLA)*, 24, 153-170.
 22. Rodríguez-Abreu, M. (2010a). El área de Educación Física en la enseñanza secundaria bilingüe. *EFDEPORTES: Lecturas, Educación Física y Deportes, Revista Digital*, 143, 1-10.
 23. Rodríguez-Abreu, M. (2010b). Unidad didáctica bilingüe: Do you play tennis? *EmásF: Revista Digital de Educación Física*, 1, 5, 36-55.
 24. Torres-Outón, A. M. (2010). La práctica deportiva como instrumento para el aprendizaje de una lengua extranjera. *III Congreso Internacional de Ciencias del Deporte y Educación Física*. Pontevedra: Alto Rendimiento.
 25. Travé-González, G. (2013). A Study of Primary School Teachers' Representation Regarding Bilingual Teaching. *Revista de Educación*, 361, 379-402.
 26. Zagalaz-Sánchez, M. L., Molero-López-Barajas, D., Cachón-Zagalaz, J. & Gutiérrez-de-Castro, J. (2012). Diseño de un cuestionario para medir la formación bilingüe del profesorado de educación física (FB-PEF). *Sportk: Euroamerican Journal of Sports Sciences*, 1, 1, 7-12.