



# **Students' Motivation and English Proficiency in CLIL AND EFL Contexts**

Maitane Guembe Azqueta

Master's Dissertation

Supervised by Amparo Lázaro Ibarrola

MA in Secondary Teaching

2020-2021

## **Abstract**

Motivation is a multi-faceted concept which is widely recognized to be a determinant factor in foreign language (FL) learning (e.g., Lasagabaster, 2011; Doiz et. al, 2014). As well as many other factors, motivation seems to have a huge impact on learners' linguistic proficiency. The rapid implementation of CLIL programs was aimed to increase motivation and improve linguistic competence. Most studies conducted in this context affirm that CLIL students are more motivated than non-CLIL ones towards the learning of a FL. Some studies investigating such effects have been conducted (e.g., Vandergrift, 2005; Lasagabaster, 2011; Pladevall-Ballester, 2018) but there is still a need to deeply analyze the effect of motivation in contexts where different CLIL programs are implemented. Following the L2 Motivational Self System theory (Dörnyei, 2005), the present work examines the motivation towards the FL in 42 fourth-year secondary education students in a state-funded secondary school in Spain. The students were divided into three groups that differed in the amount and type of exposure to English they received in school weekly: (i) the non-CLIL group (3 hours); (ii) the CLIL1 group (8 hours); and (iii) the CLIL2 group (17 hours). A questionnaire consisting of 15 items based on the one used by Pladevall-Ballester (2018) and Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martínez (2021) was employed. Results revealed that the three groups showed positive motivation towards the FL, yet the CLIL2 group was more motivated in the two factors related to the learning setting as compared to the non-CLIL and CLIL1 groups. Students' grades were also analyzed within each group in order to determine a possible relation between students' motivation and linguistic achievement. Nevertheless, only a tendency in the CLIL2 group could be found suggesting that students with higher grades were more motivated than students with lower grades. These results should be cautiously reported as no standard test was used to measure linguistic proficiency and students' grades were not comparable among groups. In light of these results some pedagogical implications will be discussed.

**Keywords:** L2 motivation, language proficiency, EFL, CLIL, secondary education

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	4
2. Literature Review .....	5
2.1. L2 Motivational Self-System theory .....	5
2.2. CLIL and Motivation.....	6
2.3. CLIL and Linguistic Competence .....	7
3. Research Questions .....	8
4. Method .....	8
4.1. Context and Participants.....	8
4.2. Instruments, Procedure and Data Collection .....	10
5. Results .....	12
5.1. Motivation results .....	12
5.2. English achievement and motivation.....	15
6. Discussion and conclusions.....	18
7. Acknowledgements .....	21
8. References .....	22

## **1. Introduction**

Motivation is regarded as one of the fundamental factors in second language acquisition (SLA) (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Dörnyei, 2005; Lasagabaster, 2011; Doiz et al., 2014). Motivation includes many different variables which play a role in learning such as the classroom setting or students' individual differences (Doiz et al., 2014). With regard to L2 motivation, a higher exposure to the language has been claimed to increase students' motivation towards the learning of a foreign language (FL) (Bradford, 2007; Pae, 2008). This belief supported content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes, which were rapidly implemented in schools all over Europe around the 1990s (Marsh, 2002).

According to Vandergrift (2005), the language learning process is closely related to the classroom setting. Depending on students' learning experiences, the knowledge and competence in the L2 as well as the attitudes and motivation towards learning the L2 may vary. Similarly, individual differences arise as the process of learning evolves. Thus, the concept of motivation is a complex multifaceted term which gathers different variables.

Despite the difficulty in isolating the motivational factor, a clear correlation between motivation and linguistic achievement has been found in several studies. Moreover, motivation may affect the learning of an L2 differently depending on the skills being analyzed. In this regard, Vandergrift (2005) found no correlation between (intrinsic and extrinsic) motivation and L2 listening proficiency among 13-14-year-old Canadian students learning French. Therefore, more studies investigating the correlations between motivation and other linguistic skills are needed (Lasagabaster, 2011).

In short, motivation is generally related to students' linguistic competence meaning that more motivated students have a higher command of the foreign language (Lasagabaster, 2011). Nevertheless, other factors such as age, time of exposure or the learning context seem to modulate that relationship between motivation and linguistic achievement. Recently, many studies comparing language learning outcomes in EFL and CLIL programs in Secondary Education schools have been conducted but there is still a need to investigate how motivation and linguistic achievement can be interrelated. Bearing all this in mind, the aim of this study is to investigate whether 15-16-years-old secondary school students' motivation varies among learners exposed to different quantities of English as a foreign language through foreign language lessons and CLIL lessons, and if students' linguistic competence has an impact on their motivation.

## **2. Literature Review**

Motivation has been widely recognized to be a core factor in FL learning. Early studies (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner & Smythe, 1975) stated that motivation was directly linked to (1) the learner's interests to learn the language and (2) to the learner's attitudes towards the language, the culture or the community who speaks that language. In this regard, two types of motivational orientations were distinguished: integrative and instrumental. The former is related to learners' desire to learn the language and become their L2 whereas the latter is related to the practical implications for learning the languages, that is, learning is influenced by external factors. Nowadays, the learning environment such as the teacher or the type of activities done in the classroom, is also considered a crucial factor which determines learners' motivation (Pladevall-Ballester, 2018).

### ***2.1. L2 Motivational Self-System theory***

The L2 Motivational Self-System (L2MSS) theory by Dörnyei (2005) focuses on the learner and the concept of the 'self'. This theory makes a distinction between the 'possible selves' and the 'ought-to selves' as an extension of previous theories on L2 learning motivation. 'The possible selves include what we would like to become, what we can become and what we are afraid of becoming' (Pladevall-Ballester, 2018: 3). In this regard, the L2MSS theory can be connected to previous research by Higgins (1987), who developed a theory, namely theory of self-discrepancy, by which two different selves were distinguished: the 'ideal self' or the linguistic features you would like to achieve as an L2 learner and the 'ought self' or the features that one should have achieved.

Based on these previous distinctions, the L2MSS theory comprises three dimensions. First, the 'ideal L2-self' which refers to who the learner wants to become regarding language learning; second, the 'ought-to L2 self' which is related to the learner's expectations towards learning an L2 required by external factors; and third, the L2 learning experience which concerns students' learning environment which have an impact on their motivation. Thus, the third dimension, which was not considered in previous theories of motivation, offers a more comprehensive approach. Indeed, the three factors shape learners' motivation towards learning a foreign or second language (Pladevall-Ballester, 2018). Therefore, the present research will analyze motivation taking into account the three factors: Factor 1 (F1) will be the 'ideal L2-self'; Factor 2 (F2) will be the 'ought-to L2 self'; and Factor 3 (F3) will be the L2 learning experience. Students' learning experience will be analyzed in a twofold way: (i) the learning

setting related to EFL lessons and (ii) the learning setting related to CLIL subjects. The former will be labelled as F3 and the latter as F4.

## ***2.2. CLIL and Motivation***

In this study I intend to investigate how two different learning approaches to FL learning, namely EFL and CLIL, affect students' degree of motivation and linguistic proficiency. Specifically, two different CLIL programmes have been tested; one of them with a higher amount of English exposure than the other.

CLIL is considered to be a practical and productive teaching method which was born in Europe and gained importance rapidly in the 1990s. In fact, the aim of this approach was to 'improve capacity and achieve requisite and sustainable outcomes' (Marsh, 2002, p. 10) through the study of a non-language subject in a foreign language. Indeed, CLIL is a lifelong concept that includes all periods of education and all kinds of methodologies. It is a flexible and dynamic view of learning in which the foreign language is an added value to the teaching of other subjects (Coyle, 2008). According to Coyle (2008), CLIL raises students' linguistic competence and confidence, it expands their expectations, it helps to develop a wide range of skills such as communication or problem-solving, and it also raises students' cultural awareness and the feeling of belonging to a global world.

Among other benefits, CLIL seems to have an impact on students' and teachers' motivation. As it is said by Darn (2006) in CLIL contexts language is an instrument, not the ultimate aim of study. Thus, when students are interested in a topic they will be motivated to learn the language so that they are able to communicate efficiently. The vast majority of studies conducted in secondary education settings suggest that motivation is higher in CLIL contexts. Studies such as Lasagabaster & Sierra (2009) conducted a study in which 393 students participated; some of them were students from the first-year and other from the third-year of secondary school. Both groups were divided between CLIL and non-CLIL students. They also analyzed the sociocultural background of the students. Therefore, they were analyzing individual variables (gender and age) and contextual variables that may affect students' motivation. In fact, their study was part of a three-year longitudinal project aimed to investigate the role of CLIL on motivation and students' attitudes towards English. They concluded that CLIL students showed significantly more positive attitudes towards English as a FL than their non-CLIL counterparts.

However, CLIL learners acknowledge the difficulties that studying in such a program entails (Doiz et al., 2014) and, as a consequence, this could affect students' motivation and/or self-esteem (Cenoz & Gorter, 2014; Seikkula-Leino, 2007). As well as other research conducted in CLIL programs, the present research has been conducted in a context where CLIL is optional. According to Mearns et al. (2020), this optionality makes it unclear whether higher scores in motivation came out of CLIL or motivation already existed among the students who selected this linguistic program. In fact, it is not possible to isolate CLIL from the other factors which may account for the differences found between non-CLIL and CLIL students. Most authors acknowledge that there are many variables interfering in these results (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009; Lasagabaster, 2011; Doiz et al., 2014; Pladevall-Ballester, 2018).

### ***2.3. CLIL and Linguistic Competence***

CLIL seems also to have a linguistic outcome which means that students' enrolled in these kinds of programs have a higher linguistic competence. Indeed, previous studies claim that there is a correlation between motivation and linguistic achievement. However, the correlation between both variables is complex and is still difficult to determine if this relationship has equal influence among all the linguistic skills, namely use of English, listening, reading, writing and speaking (Lasagabaster, 2011). For instance, Vandergrift (2005) concluded that there was no correlation between motivation and language proficiency regarding the listening skill among Canadian students learning French. Lasagabaster (2011), however, found that students enrolled in CLIL programs were more motivated towards learning the L2 but also found that those students scored higher grades on the grammar tests.

In 2008, Coyle argued that CLIL raises students' linguistic competence and confidence. However, this could also be attributed to the amount of hours of exposure to the language. In fact, students enrolled in CLIL programs have a higher number of English lessons per week. Therefore, the amount of exposure to a language might modulate motivation levels. This research was conducted with three different groups of students whose exposure to English differs considerably and, thus, students' linguistic competence is higher or lower depending on the group.

Considering both motivation and linguistic competence, Eurydice, which is the information network on education in Europe, established a clear objective of CLIL programs that sums up the focus of this investigation: "To enable pupils to develop language skills which emphasize effective communication, motivating pupils to learn languages by using them for

real practical purposes' (2006; p. 22). The present study aims to investigate whether this objective is being fulfilled or not in different L2 learning settings.

### **3. Research Questions**

The aim of this study is to compare EFL and CLIL students' motivation. In addition, language proficiency, measured by school-internal tests, will be considered in order to examine whether having higher marks is transferred to being more motivated towards learning English. Accordingly, this research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the motivation pattern in CLIL1, CLIL2 and non-CLIL secondary school students?
2. Is the motivation similar in the three groups?
3. Is there a correlation between motivation and the proficiency level within each group?

### **4. Method**

#### ***4.1. Context and participants***

This study was carried out in a state-funded secondary school in Pamplona with approximately 700 students. In Navarre, the term *linguistic programme* is used to refer to the different linguistic approaches used in schools. As it is a bilingual territory, traditionally schools have offered Spanish or Basque as the vehicular language and English as a second language. Today, English has become more powerful and new linguistic options are available in education. In this high school, there were three linguistic programs available: (i) the CLIL programme, which is labeled as "British" in the community. In this programme the vehicular language for the teaching process is English. (ii) The second linguistic program is the Model A / Spanish in which the vehicular language is Spanish. (iii) The third one is the Bilingual / Plurilingual programme in which two subjects are taught in English. In the British program, students have 5 lessons of English per week, while the other two groups have only 3 hours. Therefore, students attend the English subject separately depending on the programme they are enrolled in.

This research was conducted with three groups studying fourth-year compulsory secondary education: (i) one group from the Spanish programme (16 students), (ii) one from the Plurilingual programme (13 students) and (iii) the third from the British programme (13

students). These groups will be referred to in the current paper as non-CLIL, CLIL1 and CLIL2, respectively. In total, 42 students took part in this investigation (25 boys and 17 girls). The mean age of the students in the CLIL2 group was 15.5 years of age, the mean age of those in the CLIL1 group was 15.4 and the mean age of those in the non-CLIL group was 15.7.

Table 1. Amount of exposure to English among fourth-year secondary education students per week.

	<b>Hours of EFL lessons</b>	<b>Hours of CLIL lessons</b>	<b>Total amount of exposure to English</b>
<b>non-CLIL</b>	3	0	3
<b>CLIL1</b>	3	5	8
<b>CLIL2</b>	5	12	17

As it can be observed in Table 1, non-CLIL students attend the ordinary lessons of English as a Foreign Language three hours a week. As for the CLIL1 group, apart from the regular 3 hours of EFL, they attend two subjects in English: *History and Geography* and *PE*. These students spend their Compulsory Education period varying the number of CLIL lessons and the subjects. For instance, in 1st and 2nd of Compulsory Education they attend four subjects in English which sums a total of 9 hours of CLIL lessons per week. The first year subjects are *Biology and Geology*, *PE*, *Music* and *Technology* while the second year subjects are *Geography and History*, *PE*, *Plastic and Visual Arts* and *Technology*. Thus, the number of hours of English exposure decreased from the first years to the last one.

Finally, CLIL2 students have a higher number of EFL lessons per week as well as more CLIL lessons. Similar to CLIL1 students, CLIL2 students attend this programme from first-year to fourth-year of secondary education but the number of hours declines from the first cycle to the second. To illustrate, first, second and third-year secondary education students attend 7 subjects in English apart from the 5 lessons of EFL (23 hours per week) while fourth-year secondary education students attend 5 CLIL subjects (17 hours per week in total).

Due to this difference in language exposure, fourth-year secondary education students' level of English differs among the three linguistic programmes: at this grade, non-CLIL students acquire an A2+, CLIL1 students a B1+ and CLIL2 students a B2+ according to the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (CEFR).

## ***4.2. Instruments, Procedure and Data Collection***

### ***Background questionnaire***

Before the motivation questionnaire, a background questionnaire consisting of 22 questions was done. This previous questionnaire had the aim of analyzing students' learning contexts, interests towards studying in general, etc. Moreover, the questionnaire included some questions related to students' parents in order to investigate their learning experience and their attitudes towards the learning of languages in general and English specifically.

In general, most students affirmed that their first language was Spanish and it was the language mainly used with family and friends. Almost all considered that they had a high level of Spanish although several students from the non-CLIL group believed they had a medium level. Among the CLIL1 and CLIL2 groups, students assessed their level of English as high or medium. However, non-CLIL students considered they had a medium or low level (6 medium - 7 low).

Most CLIL students studied another language out of school (72%) being French and German the most popular ones. By contrast, a smaller percentage of non-CLIL students stated that they studied a language outside school (38%). Almost all students started learning English in primary education with a few exceptions who said that they started in secondary education. Those exceptional cases were all from the Spanish group (3 in total). Similarly, the vast majority of CLIL students have travelled abroad while only three people from the non-CLIL groups experienced it.

As for their parents' educational level, CLIL1 and CLIL2 groups declared they had high qualifications; most of them had studied a degree at university. Opposite to this, the non-CLIL group presented a more heterogeneous situation, some parents studied a degree and others did not have even the basic education. Similarly, professionally speaking, CLIL students' parents had a well-paid job whereas non-CLIL parents depicted a diverse condition.

In short, it can be asserted that CLIL students regardless of the group (CLIL1 or CLIL2) are more homogeneous in terms of sociocultural background. On the other hand, the non-CLIL group presents more diversity among their students' backgrounds. This distinction might affect the results obtained in the motivation questionnaire.

### ***Motivation questionnaire***

A questionnaire consisting of 15 items based on the one used by Pladevall-Ballester (2018) and Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martínez (2021) was employed. The items were presented on a four-point Likert type scale going from 4 (strong agreement) to 1 (strong disagreement). The statements in the questionnaire were divided into four factors which included the specific types of motivation (namely, ‘ideal L2-self’ (F1) and ‘ought-to L2-self’ (F2) and the contextual variables (F3 -related to EFL lessons- and F4 -related to CLIL lessons-). For instance, a statement on the ‘ideal-self’ (F1) would be *‘I would like to speak and use English fluently and effortlessly’*; a statement on the ‘ought-to self’ (F2) would be *‘I think English will be useful for me when I grow up’*; a statement on the contextual variable related to EFL lessons (F3) would be *‘I find English lessons really boring’*; and, a statement on the contextual variable related to CLIL lessons (F4) would be *‘I find CLIL lessons in English very boring’*.

In this study, we are using raw data as statistical analysis could not be carried out. Thus, we are analyzing all the numbers descriptively.

Table 2. Factor analysis of items in the survey about motivation towards English.

	<b>FACTOR</b>
27. I would like to speak and use English fluently and effortlessly.	F1
28. I think English is a nice language.	F1
29. I like learning English.	F1
30. I would like to continue to learn English.	F1
31. I find EFL lessons really boring.	F1
36. I think EFL lessons are fun.	F1
34. Speaking/knowing English is essential for one to find a job.	F2
37. I think English will be useful for me when I grow up.	F2
33. I think I am good at English.	F3
38. It is difficult for me to learn languages.	F3
39. I think that my English is improving.	F3
40. Learning English is easy.	F3
41. I feel confident when using English.	F3
32. I think that CLIL subjects (for example, Mathematics or Science in English, etc.) are really boring.	F4
35. I think that CLIL subjects are fun (for example, Mathematics or Science in English, etc.)	F4

As it is stated by Pladevall-Ballester (2018; p. 9), ‘the questionnaire was designed to include a limited number of questions in an attempt to quickly and effectively gather

information'. In addition, two short answer questions were added in order to deeply examine students' attitudes towards English.

### ***English achievement***

Foreign language competence was measured by consulting the grades of students which have been facilitated by their teachers. Thus, a complete overview of students' linguistic competence will be provided but it won't be broken down between all the skills. The first idea was to create standardized tests assessing at list one linguistic skill to measure students' linguistic proficiency equally to the three groups but, due to time constraints, this procedure could not be followed.

Instead, students' final grades have been taken into consideration and analyzed within each group, aiming to investigate whether students with higher marks were more motivated than those with lower marks. The three groups were graded differently because of the disparities in their linguistic competence so those marks were not comparable (scoring a 7 in the non-CLIL program which has a A2+ level is not the same as scoring a 7 in the CLIL2 program where students are evaluated in a B2+ context). If a standard test -as it was thought at first- had been used, those grades would have been worthy of comparison.

## **5. Results**

This section will present the results in relation to the research questions meaning that each factor will be analyzed separately among the three groups and, then, those results will be compared. Similarly, students' grades and their motivation scores will be compared to see if there is any possible correlation.

### ***Motivation results***

In Table 3 we present the results regarding motivation in the three groups item by item. Each item value corresponds to the mean value of the whole group.

**Table 3.** Mean values on motivation.

	<b>MEAN VALUES</b>		
	<b>non-CLIL</b>	<b>CLIL1</b>	<b>CLIL2</b>
27. I would like to speak and use English fluently and effortlessly.	3,46	3,92	3,87

28. I think English is a nice language.	3,38	3,3	3,31
29. I like learning English.	3,23	3,23	3,18
30. I would like to continue to learn English.	3,15	3,53	3,56
31. I find EFL lessons really boring.	3,15	2,76	2,62
36. I think EFL lessons are fun.	3,07	2,84	2,81
34. Speaking/knowing English is essential for one to find a job.	3,3	3,3	3,37
37. I think English will be useful for me when I grow up.	3,53	3,61	3,68
33. I think I am good at English.	2,38	2,84	3,06
38. It is difficult for me to learn languages.	2,3	2,69	2,5
39. I think that my English is improving.	3,15	3,15	3,25
40. Learning English is easy.	2,53	2,76	2,93
41. I feel confident when using English.	1,92	2,61	3,06
32. I think that CLIL subjects (for example, Mathematics or Science in English, etc.) are really boring.	-	2	2,93
35. I think that CLIL subjects are fun (for example, Mathematics or Science in English, etc.)	-	2,07	3
Group mean	2,96	2,97	3,14

---

Values: 4: 'I fully agree', 3: 'I partly agree', 2: 'I partly disagree', 1: 'I fully disagree'.

As we can see in Table 3, motivation towards English was high in the three groups, with a group mean of 2.96 in the non-CLIL group, a group mean of 2.97 in the CLIL1 and a group mean of 3.14 in the CLIL2 (maximum score being 4 and minimum score being 1) (Table 3). Nevertheless, differences among the groups can be noted, especially regarding F3 and F4, measured under items 33, 38, 39, 40, 41, 32, 35.

Similarly, Table 4 shows the mean values of the three groups regarding each of the factors. That is, the mean values of the items belonging to each factor were calculated. Motivation results, then, will be analyzed taking into consideration both item and factor mean

results to have a more detailed picture of students' differences and similarities regarding the motivational variable.

Table 4. Mean values in relation to the factors.

	<b>F1 VALUES</b>	<b>F2 VALUES</b>	<b>F3 VALUES</b>	<b>F4 VALUES</b>
<b>Non-CLIL</b>	3.24	3.42	2.46	-
<b>CLIL1</b>	3.26	3.46	2.81	2.03
<b>CLIL2</b>	3.22	3.53	2.96	2.96

As for F1, that is, the 'ideal L2 self', which is related to learners' desire to learn a language, students showed positive attitudes. The mean score of non-CLIL students is 3.24, the mean score of low-exposure CLIL students is 3.26 and the mean score of high-exposure CLIL students is 3.22. Thus, it could be said that students were almost equally intrinsically motivated towards learning English (see Table 4). However, it is interesting the fact that non-CLIL students valued English more positively compared to their CLIL1 and CLIL2 counterparts. Further research could be devoted to interviewing these students to understand why this is happening. EFL students' mean value on item 36 (*'I think EFL lessons are fun'*) is 3.07 while CLIL1 and CLIL2 students' mean values are 2.84 and 2.81 respectively.

Regarding F2, which refers to the 'ought-to L2 self' or, in other words, to the instrumental value of learning a language, all the students showed positive attitudes. In fact, the highest values of the three groups are found in this factor. As it is exposed in Table 4, non-CLIL learners scored a mean of 3.42, CLIL1 learners obtained a mean of 3.46 and CLIL2 learners obtained a mean of 3.53. Therefore, there are minimum differences among the three groups regarding F1 and F2 meaning that independently of the linguistic program in which learners are enrolled, they recognize their interest for the language and its value as an educational/professional tool. However, it can be said that students' opinions were more varied among the non-CLIL students regarding F2. For instance, there were many students who obtained 2.5 as a mean score and others obtained a 4. By contrast, CLIL students' opinions were more homogeneous. Most of them obtained between 3 or 4 and just one student in each group obtained less than 3.

With respect to F3, that is, the learning contexts in EFL lessons, CLIL students valued this factor more positively than non-CLIL learners. CLIL1 learners' mean score is 2.81 and CLIL2 learners' mean score is 2.96 whereas non-CLIL learners obtained a mean score of 2.46.

If we acutely examine the items gathered by these factors, it can be noticed that non-CLIL students' scores are especially low in two items, namely item 38 (*'It is difficult for me to learn languages'*) and 41 (*'I feel confident when using English'*); they scored 2.3 and 1.92 respectively (Table 3). Besides, they obtained lower scores in the five items considered part of F3 compared to their CLIL counterparts. It is also worthy to mention that item 41 (*'I feel confident when using English'*) score was also the lowest for CLIL1 students but it was one of the highest for CLIL2 students. This finding suggests that English exposure might be modulating this reverse effect.

Concerning F4, i.e. the learning context regarding CLIL lessons, large differences could be perceived. Two different items were used to measure this factor, item 32 (*'I think that CLIL subjects (for example Mathematics or Science in English, etc.) are really boring'*) and item 35 (*'I think that CLIL subjects are fun (for example Mathematics or Science in English, etc.)'*), as observed in Table 2. F4 values are the following: 2.03 for the low-exposure CLIL group and 2.96 for the high-exposure CLIL group. Therefore, there is almost a point difference between the British and the Bilingual group so it seems that implementing English to more content subjects adds value to those subjects.

### ***English achievement and motivation***

Another factor highlighted in this research is linguistic achievement. In this case, no standardization has been done so we are going to focus on students' grades which have been provided by their teachers. In the school, Different assessment criteria and different CEFR levels of proficiency are employed in each of the groups and, therefore, the grades do not reflect comparable across group proficiency levels. The grade for each group will be considered to establish within group differences. Accordingly, students' grades and motivation scores will be compared in order to see if there is a correlation between these two factors. In other words, whether higher grades correspond to higher scores in the motivation questionnaire within each group. The tables will show the motivation scores in the first column and the grade for each student organized from the lowest to the highest in the right column.

Table 5 shows the results for the non-CLIL group. In this group, no clear correlation was found. In fact, there was a lot of variation in the group. For instance, the student with the highest score in motivation was number 13 with 3.35 and his/her grade was a 7, whereas the student with the highest mark was number 12 with an 8 and his/her motivation score was 3.04. Although it seems that students with higher marks were the most motivated ones, there were

some examples which do not correspond with this tendency. For example, student number 10 had an 8.25 in his/her English grade but his motivation score was 2.45, which is below 2.82, the motivation score of student number 9 who obtained a 4.75 in English.

Table 5. Motivation scores and final grades of non-CLIL students.

<b>non-CLIL</b>	<b>Mean score: motivation</b>	<b>Grades</b>
2	2,11	4
9	2,82	4,75
3	2,69	6
5	2,79	6
4	2,55	6,5
1	2,58	7
8	2,25	7
11	2,76	7
13	3,35	7
7	2,9	7,5
6	3,2	8
10	2,45	8,25
12	3,04	8,5

As we can see in Table 6, CLIL1 students presented a similar situation to the one found in non-CLIL students. In some cases, students with higher grades scored less in the motivation questionnaire. For example, student number 15 had a 6.8 in English -which was almost the highest grade in the classroom- but his/her motivation score was relatively low 2.75. By contrast, student number 24, whose English grade was 3, scored a 2.8 in the motivation questionnaire. Accordingly, there seem to be many individual differences among the students in this group.

Table 6. Motivation scores and final grades of CLIL1 students.

<b>CLIL1</b>	<b>Mean score: motivation</b>	<b>Grades</b>
24	2,8	3
20	2,46	3,9
22	3,07	5
25	2,97	5,5
17	2,74	5,7
14	2,78	5,9
18	3,25	5,9
26	2,65	5,9
16	3,34	6,35
21	2,54	6,75

15	2,75	6,8
19	2,8	6,8
23	3,45	7,3

Table 7 shows the motivation scores and the grades of CLIL2 students. With respect to this group, it can be said that students' grades and motivation scores were mainly high. In this case, the student with the lowest English grade, student 30 with a 6.25, scored a 2.7 on the motivation questionnaire which is the lowest score from the whole group. In general, students with an English grade above 8, obtained a motivation score above 3 (see students number 27, 28, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40 and 42) but, of course, there were some exceptions such as number 29 whose motivation score was quite low considering his/her English grade. Students with an English grade above 7 (only 3) obtained a motivation score around 3 which means that they were motivated towards learning English. Finally, there was one surprising case with student number 41. This student's English grade was 6.75 but the motivation score was 3.5 meaning that even though he/she did not achieve a high English mark, he/she was highly motivated to learn the language.

Table 7. Motivation scores and final grades of CLIL2 students.

CLIL2	Mean score: motivation	Grades
30	2,7	6,25
41	3,5	6,75
31	2,97	7
32	3,15	7,75
38	2,73	7,75
33	3,55	8
34	2,98	8
37	3,29	8
42	3,63	8
29	2,77	8,5
40	3,38	8,5
27	3,59	8,75
28	3,04	8,75
35	3,11	8,75
36	2,94	8,75
39	3,39	8,75

As a whole, it is terribly difficult to extract a definite idea on how motivation and linguistic proficiency are interrelated. Indeed, there may be several variables modulating the motivational effect towards L2 learning. A bigger sample of participants would have given a more realistic

view of this relation as well as a standardized test measuring students' proficiency in all the skills.

## **6. Discussion and conclusions**

The present study aimed to investigate whether there were any differences between CLIL1, CLIL2 and non-CLIL secondary school students towards English in the four factors previously discussed. Also, we aimed to examine the relation between motivation and students' linguistic proficiency, that is, to investigate whether students with higher marks were more motivated or not. The results obtained through this investigation provide evidence which suggests that the CLIL approach affects positively in terms of learning motivation towards the foreign language, namely English.

With reference to the first and second research questions, it has been found that students scored the highest values in the F2, that is, the 'ought-to L2-self' or the instrumental value of the language. The three groups considered, therefore, that English is terribly useful to find a future job. This finding mirrors previous studies results such as Lasagabaster (2011) or Pladevall-Ballester (2018). However, the results obtained revealed that there was more variation among the non-CLIL students' answers than among the CLIL students' ones. The reason behind this finding might be students' individual differences such as their L2 learning experiences, their socioeconomic status or even their parents' preferences. In this regard, CLIL students are more homogeneous than non-CLIL students. Although the results in this factor suggest that the three groups developed a high level of instrumental inclination towards EFL and positive attitudes towards the 'ought-to L2-self', in order to have a deeper image of this finding, further investigations should be carried out. This homogeneity found in F1 and F2 can be linked to Ushioda's (2017) article where it is argued that English is a global language and worldwide considered as an essential tool to succeed both socially and economically. In fact, the instrumental value of the language is extremely promoted by the governments and, consequently, transferred to the educational setting.

Similarly, students showed positive attitudes in F1, the 'ideal L2-self', meaning that they would like to continue learning English and that they liked the English language. Contrary to Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martínez (2021) but in line with Pladevall-Ballester's (2018) results, who worked with primary education students, minimal differences could be found and, probably, a statistical analysis would not find significant differences between the three groups in F1. In Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martínez (2021), the fact that CLIL learners showed

more positive attitudes towards English could be attributed to the so-called ‘bunker attitude’ (Baker, 1992), that is, non-CLIL learners viewed English as a potential danger to the survival of the minority language, in this case, Basque. Regarding this factor, it is also worth it to point out that non-CLIL students in this study considered EFL lessons funnier than CLIL students. As aforementioned, non-CLIL students scored higher in item 36 (*‘I think EFL lessons are fun’*) which is part of F1. In consequence, further research should investigate this striking finding by interviewing the students.

F3 values, however, present more variation between the three groups meaning that the type of instruction seems to have an impact on students’ motivation. The CLIL2 group obtained the highest mean value (2.96), the CLIL1 group scored 2.81 and the non-CLIL group the lowest one (2.46). Consequently, the learning setting related to EFL lessons is evaluated more assertively by CLIL students than by its non-CLIL counterparts. From a descriptive analysis point of view, CLIL students’ EFL learning setting seems to be more motivating for those learners than the EFL learning environment for non-CLIL learners, whose mean value is lower.

Mean scores, nonetheless, were lower in F3 than in the previous factors in the three groups. As suggested by Pladevall-Ballester (2018), this finding might be linked to cognitive developmental issues, that is, when students mature cognitively they become aware of what learning a foreign language comprises. In fact, her participants were young learners (YLS) from primary education so cognitive flourishing could affect more notoriously to the present study participants who are older. It was also suggested that the repetition of EFL content in the non-CLIL group and the demanding content used in CLIL groups may affect students’ motivational levels. In general, classroom experience favors CLIL students regarding L2 learning motivation, especially shown in items 33 (*‘I think I am good at English’*) and 41 (*‘I feel confident when using English’*).

Considering F4, namely the learning context related to CLIL subjects, CLIL2 motivational level was higher than CLIL1. Indeed, there is almost one-point difference between both groups: 2.035 is the mean value of CLIL1 and 2.965 is the mean value of CLIL2. This finding could be linked to the number of hours of English exposure. It could also be related to the fact that choosing CLIL was optional in this high school so, as it has been argued in the literature review, learners could be previously motivated to learn those subjects in English (Mearns et al., 2020). Thus, as CLIL2 students have chosen the British programme, they were probably more motivated to attend more subjects in English. By contrast, CLIL1 students, who

had chosen the Bilingual programme in which they attend less subjects in English, were presumably less interested in learning those subjects in English.

In compliance with Pladevall-Ballester (2018), L2 motivation levels of CLIL1 and CLIL2 regarding F1, F2 and F3 no significant differences have been found. In some of the items the mean score of one group is slightly higher than in the other group and vice versa. However, she studied the difference between the type of CLIL in terms of subjects so the groups were divided as the CLIL science group and the CLIL arts and crafts group. The present study, however, has dealt with CLIL groups that vary on the amount of English exposure. This dissimilarity between studies could account for the difference found in F4 which has been added in the current dissertation.

Research question 3 dealt with the relation between motivation and proficiency level. As it has been explained in the methodology section, no standard tests have been carried out so this analysis has been done separately for each group. In general, no obvious correlation has been found between the two factors. By the way, it can be argued that within CLIL2 group there is a tendency indicating that students with higher marks are the ones with higher motivation scores. By contrast, non-CLIL and CLIL1 groups show an enormous variation between students. Even though we cannot compare grades and motivation between groups, English marks can be compared if we take into account their proficiency. In other words, CLIL2 learners enrolled in the British programme attend B2+ level English lessons while CLIL 1 and non-CLIL students attend B1+ and A2+ English lessons respectively. Consequently, British students' grades are higher even though the level required is more advanced. Along these lines, it can be argued that if a standard test was done, CLIL2 students would have scored higher marks and, probably, a correlation between motivation and language proficiency would have been found.

In summary, this study has shown that L2 motivation levels are high when taking into account the English language and the usefulness of it. However, this study also reveals that students enrolled in the CLIL programmes show higher motivational levels in respect to their learning settings. CLIL2 learners value positively both their EFL lessons and their CLIL lessons. Indeed, the amount of exposure seems to have an important effect in the learning contexts related to CLIL subjects. That is, CLIL students with a lower exposure to the language were less motivated towards CLIL lessons than CLIL students with a higher exposure to

English. Further studies could carry out this investigation with a higher sample of participants in order to obtain more reliable data.

Although this study has helped to have a general view of the effect of different approaches on students' motivation, several limitations can be acknowledged. As it has been mentioned, the sample number is very small so a higher number of participants would be advisable. In addition, standardized tests on the four skills should be done in future investigations so that data could be comparable among groups. Therefore, differences among groups depending on the linguistic skill we are analyzing could be examined. Similarly, it could have been interesting to carry out this investigation with all Secondary Education students to analyze the effect of age on motivation and linguistic proficiency. Furthermore, although we are investigating the effect of motivation, other individual or contextual variables such as the amount of exposure, age or students' social backgrounds could be interfering with the results obtained. Indeed, further study could focus on finding a possible correlation between motivation and linguistic proficiency taking some of the previous factors into consideration.

As a whole, I believe this study is valuable for the high school where it was conducted as it gives them information about their students' motivation towards learning English. In this regard, they could use this data to adjust their teaching methods to increase students' motivational levels. In this case, the least motivated students regarding the L2 learning setting were the non-CLIL group which means that some methodological adjustments should be done. In addition, they could deeply investigate this issue by carrying out interviews or other questionnaires.

### **Acknowledgements**

I truly would like to thank the school, school teachers and students for their kindness to participate in this research. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Amparo Lázaro Ibarrola, for helping me during the whole process.

## References

- Bradford, A. (2007). Motivational orientations in under-researched FLL contexts: Findings from Indonesia. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 302–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688207085849>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2014). Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp.239–254). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Coyle, D. 2008. Content and language integrated learning. Motivating learners and teachers. *University Nottingham*. <http://blocs.xtec.cat/clilpratiques1/files/2008/11/slrcoyle.pdf>
- Darn, S. 2006. CLIL: A European overview. *INGED News Online Issue 2*. [http://www.stevedarn.com/?Writings::CLIL%3A A European Overview](http://www.stevedarn.com/?Writings::CLIL%3A%20A%20European%20Overview)
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2014). CLIL and motivation: The effect of individual and contextual variables. *Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889508>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eurydice, & Europe, T. information network on education in. (2009). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe. In *Education* (Vol. 33, Issue Clil). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730685200121>
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning* (Vol. 786). Newbury: Rowley.
- Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). Motivation and second-language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(3), 218–233.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-Discrepancy: A Theory Relating Self and Affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2010.519030>

- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, M. J. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and international EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4–17. <http://www.icrj.eu/12/article1.html>
- Lázaro-Ibarrola, A. & Azpilicueta-Martinez, R. (2021). Motivation towards the foreign language (English) and regional language (Basque) in immersion schools: Does CLIL in the foreign language make a difference? *Language Teaching Research* (in press).
- Marsh, D. (ed). 2002. CLIL/EMILE – *The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential*. Public Services Contract DG EAC. European Commission.
- Mearns, T., de Graaff, R., & Coyle, D. (2020). Motivation for or from bilingual education? A comparative study of learner views in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(6), 724–737. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1405906>
- Pae, T. II. (2008). Second language orientation and self-determination theory. A structural analysis of the factors affecting second language achievement. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 27(1), 5-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X07309509>
- Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2018). A longitudinal study of primary school EFL learning motivation in CLIL and non-CLIL settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 765–786. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818765877>
- Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). CLIL learning: Achievement levels and affective factors. *Language and Education*, 21(4), 328–341. <https://doi.org/10.2167/le635.0>
- Ushioda, E. (2017). The impact of global English on motivation to learn other languages : towards an ideal multilingual self. *Modern Language Journal*, 101(3). pp. 469-482. <http://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12413>
- Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 70–89. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh039>