Language learning motivation in multilingual CLIL

Leah Gheoghegan
Universidad de La Rioja

ABSTRACT: Motivation has long been acknowledged as an undeniably important factor in language learning, and recent research indicates that it may play an even more significant role in CLIL than non-CLIL settings (Navarro Pablo & García Jiménez, 2018). However, given the lack of research into CLIL in languages other than English, Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit (2010) have called for a comparison across additional languages, so as to determine the strengths and weaknesses of CLIL language-independently. This comparison is particularly necessary with respect to L2 motivation, given that the spread of English as a global language has led to qualitative differences between learning English compared with other languages (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013). The current study thus investigates the language learning motivation of students taking both English and French CLIL classes to determine if there are quantitative differences between the participants' English and French language learning motivation. Results indicate that the participants exhibited a higher level of language learning motivation towards English than French. The findings highlight the need to better prepare CLIL methodologies when languages such as French are taught alongside English.
Keywords: Content Language Integrated learning (CLIL), Motivation, English as a foreign language (EFL), French as a foreign language (FLE)

La motivación en el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras en AICLE multilingüe

RESUMEN: La motivación es un factor imprescindible en el aprendizaje de un idioma extranjero, y se ha demostrado que desempeña un papel más significativo en un contexto AICLE que no-AICLE (Navarro Pablo y García Jiménez, 2018). Sin embargo, dado la falta de investigación sobre el AICLE en idiomas distintos del inglés, Dalton-Puffer, Nikula y Smit (2010) han hecho un llamamiento a la investigación comparativa de diferentes lenguas meta, para comprender las fortalezas y debilidades de AICLE independientemente de la lengua del programa. Esta comparación es particularmente necesario con respecto a la motivación, dado que hay una diferencia fundamental entre la motivación para aprender el inglés frente a otras lenguas (Dörnyei y Ushioda, 2013). Este estudio investiga la motivación de alumnos que cursan a la vez asignaturas de instrucción AICLE en inglés y francés para comparar las diferencias cuantitativas entre la motivación hacia cada idioma. Los resultados demuestran que hay una diferencia evidente entre el inglés y el francés, ya que en todos los casos los participantes indicaron un nivel más alto de motivación hacia el inglés. Los hallazgos destacan la necesidad de preparar de manera más eficaz la metodología AICLE cuando se enseña el francés junto con el inglés.
Palabras clave: Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenidos y Lenguas Extranjeras (AICLE), Motivación, inglés como lengua extranjera, francés como lengua extranjera

1. INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has become widespread throughout Spain over the last two decades, largely due to the need to overcome language learning deficits (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010). However, the overwhelming enthusiasm for the approach has meant that its implementation has taken precedence over empirical research which supports its effectiveness (Pérez-Cañado, 2012). In addition, given the clear focus on English language learning, the majority of CLIL programmes in Spain have chosen this language as the medium of instruction, overlooking other important target languages (TLs), such as French, which are also implemented but to a much smaller degree (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010). This has led Dalton-Puffer (2011) to remark that it may make more sense to simply use the term CEIL (content-and-English integrated learning). This predominance of CEIL evidently also effects CLIL research, which understandably has primarily dealt with English programmes, prompting Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit (2010) to call for comparative research across Languages Other Than English (LOTEs), so as to provide insight into the strengths and weaknesses of CLIL language-independently.

One key factor in a CLIL context is language learning motivation, which as Navarro Pablo and García Jiménez (2018) highlight, may play an even more crucial role in CLIL than non-CLIL settings. However, there may be a major difference between motivation towards English as compared with other TLs, given the fact that English is often regarded as a basic educational skill, imperative to professional advancement (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013). In addition, as in the case of CLIL, English has taken centre stage in language learning motivation research. On the one hand, its vital role has greatly influenced modern conceptualisations of L2 motivation and the concepts of self and identity. On the other hand, its status has led to a consequent neglect of LOTEs, which remain "a largely uncharted area of language learning motivation" (Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2017, p. 451). To remedy this clear imbalance, *The Modern Language Journal* recently published a special issue addressing the motivation to learn LOTEs in an era of globalization and multilingualism (Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2017). It aimed, firstly, to determine whether current theoretical perspectives were appropriate when analyzing motivation towards LOTEs and, secondly, how the spread of English as a global language is affecting motivation towards other TLs. While this issue takes some preliminary steps toward addressing this very clear need, there remains an evident scarcity of studies exploring the motivation of multiple TLs in a CLIL context. It is thus imperative that research addresses these differences, in order to determine whether the suggested benefits of CLIL for English hold true for LOTEs.

2. THE L2 MOTIVATIONAL SELF SYSTEM IN DIFFERENT TLs

In recent years, L2 motivation research has eagerly turned to what has been called the socio-dynamic period of motivation, with the aim of resolving numerous perplexing language learning issues (Dörnyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2014). Offering a more holistic approach, this trend moved "from a linear view of motivation to a more complex set of interrelated learning and contextual variables" (Woodrow, 2017, p. 239). In this vein, researchers aimed to understand why input in language teaching at times made a significant impact, but at others

made little to no differences at all. One particularly crucial theory in this period has been Dörnyei's (2005, 2009) L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS), which aimed in particular to overcome issues in previous theories regarding the concept of integrativeness. This was prompted by the similarity in results concerning the notion of integrativeness in Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh's (2006) large-scale motivation research in Hungary and Gardner's original motivation research in Canada, despite the dissimilar contexts in which the research was carried out (Csizér, 2019). This led Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) to postulate an alternative explanation by means of a broader sense of integrativeness.

Dörnyei's L2MSS offered a major reformation to previous L2 motivation research by adopting psychological theories of the self (Dörnyei, 2009). Uniting theories from two important psychological concepts by Markus and Nurius (1986) and Higgins (1987), the L2MSS formed the idea that a language learner's motivation involves three key elements:

1. The *ideal L2 self*
2. The *ought to L2 self*
3. The *L2 learning experience*

Firstly, the *ideal L2 self* is the image that we have of our future self as an L2 user according to our own wishes, which generally fosters integrative and internalised motives. For example, a learner may wish to learn the TL as they can see themselves being surrounded by friends who speak it, or simply because the language really appeals to them. The *ought to L2 self* is how we see our future L2 self according to external expectations and reflects more extrinsic types of external motivation. For example, a learner may feel obliged to study a language so as to not disappoint their parents. Finally, the *L2 learning experience* includes executive motives in the learning context such as the teacher, peer group and experience of success or failure. For example, a student whose teacher is not particularly pleasant may consequently not wish to study the TL.

Since its elaboration, the L2MSS has been used in numerous studies which aimed to provide empirical evidence for its central constructs. The first Motivational Factors Questionnaire (MFQ) using scales to investigate the ideal and ought-to Selves was developed by Ryan (2008) and has since been tested in an array of contexts (e.g., MacIntyre, MacKinnon & Clément, 2009; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi, Magid & Papi, 2009), with the items used in the MFQ being continuously revalidated for each new context (Csizér, 2019). For example, in a Spanish context, Brady (2019) investigated the L2MSS in over 500 Spanish learners of English, drawing from Ryan's (2009) work in Japan and Taguchi et al.'s (2009) work in Asia. This research resulted in a validated Spanish version of the MFQ consisting of 67 items across 13 scales.

While there is a clear dearth of research using the L2MSS with LOTEs, some researchers have recently begun to address this gap. Oakes and Howard (2019) investigated the applicability of the L2MSS in LOTEs, specifically in French, using a quantitative approach. The study included a total of 522 university learners of English ($n = 296$) and French ($n = 226$) in Sweden and Poland and analysed seven motivational constructs: the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, strong integrative orientation, weak integrative orientation, instrumental (promotion) orientation, intrinsic motivation and desire for proficiency. Results revealed statistically significant differences between French and English learners in four of the seven

constructs. While French learners had a higher mean in desire for proficiency and weak integrative orientation, English learners had a higher mean in instrumental orientation and the ought-to L2 self. The authors highlight how these constructs are dependent on factors such as the language at hand, level of study, learning environment and length of study. Calafato and Tang (2019) explored the motivational self-concepts of 73 Arab teenagers in English-medium schools, who also studied an additional foreign language (French, Spanish, German, Japanese, Dutch, Italian, Russian, Turkish or Korean). Focusing in particular on gender differences, they used a 54-item questionnaire to assess background and learning experience, motivation to be multilingual, ideal L3 self, ought-to L3 self, ideal English self and ought-to English self. Upon comparing English and the students' L3, results found statistically significant correlations only between the ought to-L3 and English selves in female learners. Finally, Geoghegan (2018) adopted the L2MSS to explore motivation towards English and LOTEs in a study abroad context. Participants included 68 first- and second-year undergraduate Spanish-Catalan bilinguals learning English as well as either German or French. The students took part or would take part in a compulsory study abroad period in their second year, choosing either to go to an English-speaking country, or a French-/German-speaking country. Comparing students who sojourned in an English-speaking country with those in a German- or French-speaking country, results revealed a statistically significant difference between the two groups with regards to the ideal L2 self. In this regard, the English group reported a higher overall mean, suggesting that they could better visualise themselves as the L2 user they wished to be than those in the French/German group.

These results suggest that there are some clear differences between the L2MSS in different TLs. There is, however, a notable lack of research into this construct in a CLIL context.

3. MOTIVATION IN DIFFERENT TARGET LANGUAGES IN CLIL

Despite the fact that one of the main objectives behind CLIL was to promote multilingualism, there has been an evident predominance of English throughout CLIL programmes (San Isidro, 2018). As a result of this, research has largely focused on CEIL rather than CLIL in other TLs. Cenoz, Genesee and Gorter (2014, p. 257), for example, remark how "much, if not most, research on CLIL has been conducted by ESL/EFL scholars", while Pérez, Lorenzo and Pavón (2016, p. 485) highlight the "empirical vacuum" in the field, emphasizing the absence of research into CLIL in LOTEs. Numerous calls have been made to remedy this. Dalton Puffer et al. (2010), as mentioned above, called for comparative research in different TLs in CLIL, so as to better understand whether results found so far are true only for English or also for other languages. The same call was made by Cenoz et al. in 2014, highlighting the need for more empirical research on other TLs. Yet this need has yet to be addressed, with Merino and Lasagabaster (2018) more recently highlighting the dearth of studies dealing with the effects of three languages in CLIL.

Following these calls, there are two key studies which have been carried out in a Belgian context, which seek to better understand motivation towards different TLs in CLIL. De Smet et al. (2018) and De Smet et al. (2019) investigated primary and secondary CLIL contexts, comparing 896 French-native Belgian students studying either English or Dutch by means of self-report questionnaires. Participants were divided into a total of eight groups according to

grade (5th or 11th grade), learning context (CLIL or non-CLIL), and TL (English or Dutch). De Smet et al. (2018) focused on learner anxiety and enjoyment, while De Smet et al. (2019) investigated language attitudes (perceived easiness and attractiveness of the TL) and motivation (expectancy for success, task value and cost). Results of the former showed that CLIL students reported statistically significant less anxiety than non-CLIL students overall, and that students in English CLIL reported statistically significant less anxiety and more enjoyment than those in Dutch CLIL. Similarly, in the latter, CLIL students reported more positive attitudes and higher motivation than non-CLIL students, while students in English CLIL reported more positive attitudes and higher motivation than those in Dutch CLIL. In addition, effect sizes revealed that the TL at hand, English or Dutch, plays a greater role in language attitudes and motivation than CLIL instruction does.

While this research offers some very interesting insights into the topic at hand, there is clearly a need to provide further evidence to support these findings, as well as to investigate this issue using the L2MSS. This would allow us to better compare the findings with other motivation research on LOTEs, as discussed in the previous section.

4. Methodology

This section outlines the approach used to conduct the current study. It outlines the research question and design, the participants, the instruments and finally the data analysis procedure.

4.1. Research question and design

This study set out to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a quantitative difference between secondary school CLIL and non-CLIL students' language learning motivation towards English as compared to French?
2. Is there a quantitative difference between secondary school CLIL and non-CLIL students' language learning motivation in English and French across time when measured cross-sectionally and pseudo-longitudinally?

In order to address the research questions, two data collections were carried out, separated by one full year, in order to collect both cross-sectional and pseudo-longitudinal data (Table 1).

Table 1. *Cross-Sectional and Pseudo-Longitudinal Approach of the Study*

	Pseudo-Longitudinal	
	Data Collection 1	Data Collection 2
9th grade (CLIL)	10th grade (CLIL) → 11th grade (Non-CLIL)*	
Cross-sectional		
Data Collection 2		

Note: *Students in 11th grade generally no longer took CLIL classes, with the exception of a small subset of economics students (*n* = 10).

As shown, data could be evaluated cross-sectionally, comparing CLIL students in 9th grade with students with an extra year's CLIL experience in 10th grade, and pseudo-longitudinally, comparing the same 10th grade CLIL students at the first data collection and at the second collection when they were in 11th grade and generally no longer took CLIL classes. In the case of the latter, the data was considered to be pseudo-longitudinal given the fact that some students took part only in one data collection. There was thus a total of twelve data collections, six in English and six in French, including participants across three grades, from schools for boys and girls. Prior to each data collection, consent forms were signed by the directors of each school as well as each individual participant.

4.2. Participants

The participants in this study were a total of 91 Spanish native speakers in 9th, 10th and 11th grade in two semi-private sister schools, one for boys and one for girls, which place a focus on plurilingual education and conduct content and language classes in Spanish, English, and French. From early childhood education and throughout primary education and obligatory secondary education (i.e., ages 3 to 16), the schools offer this linguistic immersion as part of their plurilingualism project. According to the project guidelines, each of the three languages is used as a vehicular language and takes up a third of the students' school day; however, subjects taken vary from grade to grade and there is at times a clear focus on classes in English as compared to French. In terms of language level, students are expected to have achieved a B2 or C1 level by the time they finish school; 9th and 10th grade students use B2 level textbooks for both languages while 11th grade students use C1 level textbooks. In some cases, students also take on an additional fourth language such as Latin or Greek. Participants were grouped according to grade and sex, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *Participants*

SAMPLE	N	CHARACTERISTICS
9th Grade	42	19 boys, 23 girls
10th Grade only	9	1 boy, 8 girls
10th + 11th Grade	32	14 boys, 18 girls
11th Grade only	8	5 boys, 3 girls

There were 42 participants in the 9th grade group, 41 participants in the 10th grade group and 40 participants in the 11th grade group. Students in 10th grade and 11th grade were largely the same ($n = 32$), however, there were a total of 17 students (6 boys and 11 girls) who took part only in one data collection. This occurred given that the transition from 10th to 11th grade also entails a changeover in school stage from obligatory secondary education to high school; as a result, a number of students no longer attended the school in 11th grade while other students enrolled in 11th grade. In other cases, this was due to absences on the day of one data collection. In addition, some boys took part in the tests for only one language: in 9th grade, all boys took part in the French tests ($n = 19$), while three students later opted not to participate in the English tests, in 11th grade, as French became an optional subject, four students no longer studied French and consequently did not participate in the French tests.

Regarding their CLIL classes, subjects taken included biology, physics and chemistry, economics, physical education and technology through English; and geography and history through French. The 9th grade participants took two science subjects (physics and chemistry, and biology), physical education and technology in English, and geography and history in French. The 10th grade participants studied either economics or a science subject (physics and chemistry for boys and biology for girls) and physical education in English; and geography and history through French. In 11th grade, students generally no longer took content classes through a foreign language, however, one exception was boys who chose to study economics (n = 10), which continued to be taught through English.

4.3. Instruments

The instruments in the study consisted of two questionnaires, written in Spanish, which were designed to investigate the participants' language learning motivation in English and in French. Both questionnaires had two parts: a first section consisting of eight questions dealing with personal information (age, sex, nationality and language learning background) and a second section consisting of an MFQ with 55 questions for the English questionnaire and 51 questions for the French questionnaire. The questions in the MFQ followed a five-level Likert scale format, with five choices for each item ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, represented by numbers one to five. This format allowed room for manoeuvre, while at the same time maintaining control over the possible responses (Bloomer, 2010).

The MFQ was adopted from Ryan's work, which has been replicated and used extensively by numerous researchers to investigate the L2MSS in a number of different contexts including Japan, China and Iran (Ryan, 2008; Ryan, 2009; Taguchi et al., 2009), Pakistan (Islam, Lamb & Chambers, 2013), Spain (Brady, 2015) and Saudi Arabia (Moskovsky, Assulaimani, Racheva & Harkins, 2016). The Spanish version of the questionnaire was adopted from Brady (2015), which had been thoroughly tested to ensure its validity.

The MFQs included a total of nine categories, which consisted of multi-item scales (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012) of between four to fourteen items:

Ideal L2 Self (5)
The "Ought to" Self (7)
Language Anxiety (5)
Interest in Foreign Languages (6)
L2 Self Confidence (4)
Instrumentality: Prevention (5)
Instrumentality: Promotion (6)
Attitude towards Learning (8-14)
Intended Learning Effort (5)

For the current study, Brady's (2015) translated MFQ was adapted in two main ways. Firstly, in Brady's study participants were in tertiary level education and so three questions in the category "Attitude to Learning: Past and Present" referred to their past experiences of learning English in secondary school. Given that participants in the current study were still in secondary school, these questions were rewritten in the present tense:

Me encantaban las clases de inglés en el instituto
[I loved English classes at school]
↓
Me encantan las clases de inglés en el instituto
[I love English classes at school]

Secondly, in order to tap into the participants' interest towards their CLIL subjects, additional questions were also added to this category (six to eight in the English MFQ and two in the French MFQ). Thus, in addition to the original questions "Learning English is very interesting" and "I enjoy English lessons", English was replaced with the relevant CLIL subjects, e.g., "Learning physics and chemistry in English is very interesting", "I enjoy physics and chemistry lessons".

In addition to these adaptations addressing students' specific CLIL classes, there were three other main differences between the English and French questionnaire. Firstly, part one asked for participants' final grade in their language and CLIL subjects, which evidently varied depending on the language at hand: the English questionnaire asked about classes taught through English and the French questionnaire asked about classes taught through French. Secondly, in the French version of the MFQ, the word "English" was replaced with "French":

English: Estudiar inglés es una pérdida de tiempo
[Studying English is a waste of time]
↓
French: Estudiar francés es una pérdida de tiempo
[Studying French is a waste of time]

Finally, the order of the questions in part two of the questionnaires was randomized, and therefore given in a different order in the MFQ of each language.

4.4. Data analysis

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS (Version 26). Numerical values were assigned to the five choices on the Likert scale: numerical value 1 was assigned to strongly agree, 2 to agree, 3 to somewhat agree/somewhat disagree, 4 to disagree, and 5 to strongly disagree. Before the analysis, data cleaning and manipulation were carried out, and negatively worded items were re-coded by being reversed before the analysis (Dörnyei, 2003). The cut-off point for determining that a result was statistically significant was for the p-value to be below $\alpha = .05$, as is typical is SLA (Larson-Hall, 2012).

To answer the first research question, Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to compare the participants' language learning motivation towards English as compared to French in each grade. This was due to the fact that the data at hand was ordinal so consequently could not be tested using parametric tests (Field, 2009). To answer the second research question, which compared the cross-sectional and pseudo-longitudinal differences between the participants' language learning motivation towards English and French, Mann-Whitney U tests and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, respectively, were carried out. In each case, this was done first for English and then for French.

5. Results and discussion

The research questions at hand addressed the quantitative differences between the participants' language learning motivation towards English as compared to French in 9th, 10th and 11th grade, as well as cross-sectionally from 9th to 10th grade and pseudo-longitudinally from 10th to 11th grade. Results indicated that there were clear differences in motivation depending on the TL (Table 3).

Table 3. *Language Learning Motivation in English and French*

| | | Languaje | | | | |
| | | English | | French | | |
Category	Grade	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD	p value
Ideal L2 Self	9th Grade	4.00	.85	2.80	.98	<.001
	10th Grade	4.00	.63	3.00	.88	<.001
	11th Grade	4.20	.69	3.00	.90	<.001
The "Ought to" Self	9th Grade	2.57	.58	2.57	.63	.066
	10th Grade	3.00	.46	2.71	.50	<.001
	11th Grade	3.00	.60	2.57	.60	.001
Language Anxiety	9th Grade	4.00	.92	3.80	1.11	.009
	10th Grade	3.80	.91	3.60	.95	.083
	11th Grade	4.10	.86	3.80	.96	.020
Interest in Foreign Languages	9th Grade	3.83	.73	3.17	.95	<.001
	10th Grade	3.83	.60	3.33	.64	.002
	11th Grade	3.83	.62	3.50	.69	.011
L2 Self Confidence	9th Grade	3.75	.69	3.25	.72	.002
	10th Grade	3.75	.81	3.25	.84	.080
	11th Grade	3.75	.81	3.25	.74	.113
Instrumentality: Prevention	9th Grade	4.00	.87	2.80	.86	<.001
	10th Grade	4.00	.67	3.00	.68	<.001
	11th Grade	4.00	.64	2.70	.92	<.001
Instrumentality: Promotion	9th Grade	4.17	.74	3.17	.96	<.001
	10th Grade	4.17	.48	3.50	.79	<.001
	11th Grade	4.00	.64	2.70	.92	<.001
Attitude towards Learning	9th Grade	3.36	.82	2.38	.81	<.001
	10th Grade	3.60	.53	3.00	.81	<.001
	11th Grade	3.37	.66	3.06	.63	.049
Intended Learning Effort	9th Grade	3.80	.62	3.00	.90	<.001
	10th Grade	3.80	.54	3.00	.79	<.001
	11th Grade	3.80	.64	3.00	.79	<.001
Mean Motivation	9th Grade	3.80	.62	3.00	.90	<.001
	10th Grade	3.77	.41	3.19	.56	<.001
	11th Grade	3.79	.41	3.11	.52	<.001

Note: 9th grade: English (*n* = 31), French (*n* = 40); 10th grade English (*n* = 41), French (*n* = 41); 11th grade English (*n* = 40), French (*n* = 36).

As outlined below, in each of the three grades there were statistically significant differences in the participants' overall language learning motivation, and almost all individual categories, with participants reporting higher levels of motivation towards English than to French in all cases. This is consistent with previous research on primary and secondary level students from De Smet et al. (2018), where participants reported lower anxiety and higher enjoyment in English CLIL compared to Dutch CLIL, and De Smet et al. (2019), where participants reported more positive attitudes and higher motivation in English CLIL compared to Dutch CLIL in terms of the categories attractiveness, easiness, expectancy for success, perceived task value and cost. While beyond of the scope of this paper, it should also be noted that these findings may also likely be related to the language level of the participants, which based on other data from the study appears to be higher in English than in French. This is despite the fact that, as noted in the methodology, language classes were catered towards similar levels in both English and French, i.e., a B2 level in 9th and 10th grade and a C1 level in 11th grade.

Regarding the individual motivation categories, statistically significant differences between the motivation for each language were found in six out of the nine categories across all three grades: *Ideal L2 Self, Interest in Foreign Languages, Instrumentality: Prevention, Instrumentality: Promotion, Attitude towards Learning* and *Intended Learning Effort*. This suggests that in English as compared to French, participants at all levels can better visualise themselves as the L2 user they wish to be; are more interested in the TL; are more instrumentality motivated, believing that lacking English would prevent their future success and that having English would promote it; have more positive attitudes towards learning English than French; and finally, report that they make more of an effort to learn English. On the other hand, though means were higher for English in all cases, no statistically significant differences were found for *The "Ought to" Self* in 9th grade, *Language Anxiety* and *L2 Self Confidence* in 10th grade and *L2 Self Confidence* in 11th grade. This indicates that the younger participants are similarly externally motivated towards both English and French, while for older students, affective factors such as self-confidence or anxiety may be similar regardless of the language at hand. In other words, although 10th and 11th grade students report a clear difference in their motivation towards English and French regarding instrumental value or their interest towards the language, it appears that this perception may not affect their own self-confidence and anxiety, as if they lack confidence in one TL they generally do so in the other as well. Regarding the former, previous research has suggested that *The "Ought to" Self* may be age-relevant, potentially becoming less significant as students get older. For example, it may play a greater role in secondary school students, who generally do not get to choose whether or not they study the language at hand, than university students, who usually choose to study the TL (Busse & Williams, 2010; Oakes, 2013). Furthermore, it has also been recently suggested that *The "Ought to" Self* may be less relevant for LOTE learners (Oakes & Howard, 2019). This could potentially be a factor here as although French was a compulsory school subject in 9th and 10th grade for all students, the 11th grade boys were able to choose whether or not to continue studying French in upper-secondary school. The latter finding suggests that if students in 10th and 11th grade lack confidence in one language, they generally also do for the other language. The same was also found in the case of *Language Anxiety* in 10th grade. This, however, is inconsistent with research by De Smet

et al. (2018) where participants enrolled in English CLIL reported less anxiety than those in Dutch CLIL. This could, however, be due to the fact that different groups of students were compared. Here, it appears that when the same cohort of students are compared, they may report similar levels of anxiety and/or self-confidence towards both TLs.   In terms of the cross-sectional differences in English and French (Table 4), results revealed very few differences between students in 9th and 10th grade. There were no statistically significant differences in overall motivation in either language, and only in the category *The "Ought to" Self* in English. This suggests that participants in 9th and 10th grade are equally motivated to learn English and French overall and in terms of most of the individual motivation categories. However, it appears that in English, 10th grade students are more motivated by external sources than their 9th grade peers. This finding may be explained by the fact that 10th grade students were in their final year of compulsory secondary education, and, as a result, may have been receiving greater pressure from teachers and parents to do well in English than the 9th grade students.

Table 4. *Cross-Sectional Analysis of English and French Language Learning Motivation*

	English					French				
	9th Grade		10th Grade			9th Grade		10th Grade		
Category	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD	p	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD	p
Ideal L2 Self	4.00	.85	4.00	.63	.919	2.80	.98	3.00	.88	.227
The "Ought to" Self	2.57	.58	3.00	.46	.004	2.57	.63	2.71	.50	.105
Language Anxiety	4.00	.92	3.80	.91	.612	3.80	1.11	3.60	.95	.842
Interest in Foreign Languages	3.83	.73	3.83	.60	.422	3.17	.95	3.33	.64	.103
L2 Self Confidence	3.75	.69	3.75	.81	.204	3.25	.72	3.25	.84	.758
Instrumentality: Prevention	4.00	.87	4.00	.67	.555	2.80	.86	3.00	.68	.116
Instrumentality: Promotion	4.17	.74	4.17	.48	.653	3.17	.96	3.50	.79	.123
Attitude towards Learning	3.36	.82	3.60	.53	.441	2.38	.81	3.00	.81	.332
Intended Learning Effort	3.80	.62	3.80	.54	.120	3.00	.90	3.00	.79	.583
Mean English Motivation	3.65	.47	3.77	.41	.821	2.92	.53	3.18	.56	.077

Note: English: 9th grade, *n* = 39; 10th grade, *n* = 41; French: 9th grade, *n* = 41; 10th grade, *n* = 41.

    In terms of the pseudo-longitudinal differences in English and French (Table 5), results again indicated that there were similarities across grades: students' motivation towards English and French remained relatively constant from 10th to 11th grade. There were no statistically significant differences for overall motivation in either English or French or in majority of the individual categories. With regards to English, there were statistically significant differences only in the category *Attitude towards Learning*, where 11th grade participants reported less positive attitudes. This may be explained by the fact that, while 10th grade students took English CLIL classes, this was generally no longer the case in 11th grade. Thus, this change to their exposure to English may have resulted in a decrease in their English language learning motivation in this regard. In terms of French, results indicated that there

were statistically significant differences in two categories: *Instrumentality: Prevention* and *Instrumentality: Promotion*. In both cases, 11th grade students reported lower motivation in these two categories. This indicates that these students decreased the extent to which they saw not having French as an impediment to their future success and the extent to which they saw having it as a way to promote their future success. These findings may be explained by the fact that, on the one hand, CLIL classes were no longer offered in French in 11th grade and so as students received less exposure, it may have become less of a priority. On the other hand, French was no longer a compulsory school subject for boys in 11th grade. As a result, a large number of students may have viewed the language as having less instrumental value as they had in 10th grade.

Given the dearth of previous studies investigating motivation towards learning English and LOTEs at different points in time, these results provide an interesting insight into how motivation towards English and French develops cross-sectionally and pseudo-longitudinally. Moving forward, it would be very beneficial for future research to focus on the compulsory nature of learning the TLs at hand, and in particular to compare two TLs which are both compulsory or not compulsory in order to verify the role that this plays in language learning motivation.

Table 5. *Pseudo-Longitudinal Analysis of English and French Language Learning Motivation*

	English					French				
	10th Grade		11th Grade			10th Grade		11th Grade		
Category	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD	p	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD	p
Ideal L2 Self	4.00	.63	4.20	.69	.549	3.00	.88	3.00	.90	.400
The "Ought to" Self	3.00	.46	3.00	.60	.127	2.71	.50	2.57	.60	.350
Language Anxiety	3.80	.91	4.10	.86	.878	3.60	.95	3.80	.96	.684
Interest in Foreign Languages	3.83	.60	3.83	.62	.246	3.33	.64	3.50	.69	.508
L2 Self Confidence	3.75	.81	3.75	.81	.766	3.25	.84	3.25	.74	.617
Instrumentality: Prevention	4.00	.67	4.00	.64	.582	3.00	.68	2.70	.92	.011
Instrumentality: Promotion	4.17	.48	4.08	.57	.714	3.50	.79	3.25	.89	.023
Attitude towards Learning	3.60	.53	3.37	.66	.001	3.00	.81	3.06	.63	.905
Intended Learning Effort	3.80	.54	3.80	.64	.230	3.00	.79	3.00	.79	.058
Mean English Motivation	3.77	.41	3.79	.41	.092	3.19	.56	3.11	.52	.262

Note: English: 10th grade, *n* = 41; 11th grade, *n* = 40; French: 10th grade, *n* = 41; 11th grade, *n* = 36.

6. CONCLUSION

The results in this study show that there are clear differences between students' motivation towards English and French in 9th, 10th and 11th grade. Statistically significant differences were found in the participants' overall language learning motivation towards each language, and nearly all individual categories, with higher levels of motivation towards English than to French in all cases. Some exceptions included *The "Ought to" Self* in 9th grade, *Language Anxiety* and *L2 Self Confidence* in 10th grade, and *L2 Self Confidence* in 11th grade. The

cross-sectional analysis revealed few differences between participants in 9th and 10th grade, with statistically significant differences found only in *The "Ought to" Self* in English, where 10th grade students reported higher external motivation. The pseudo-longitudinal analysis similarly revealed few differences in participants from 10th to 11th grade, though statistically significant differences were observed in the category *Attitude towards Learning* in English, with 11th grade students reporting lower motivation, and in the categories *Instrumentality: Prevention* and *Instrumentality: Promotion* in French, with 11th grade students reporting lower motivation.

These results offer valuable insight into the role of motivation in CLIL in multiple foreign languages. Given the supposition that motivation plays a crucial role in this context, theoretically increasing students' interest towards the TL, it is imperative that policy makers and language educators are made aware of these differences in the language at hand. This would better allow those involved to make the most out of this multilingual learning environment, rather than have it become a disadvantage for TLs which may be viewed as having less importance.

7. References

Busse, V., & Williams, M. (2010). Why German? Motivation of students studying German at English universities. *Language Learning Journal*, *38*(1), 67-85.

Bloomer, A. (2010). Designing a questionnaire. In S. Hunston & D. Oakley (Eds.), *Introducing applied linguistics concepts and skills* (pp. 145–150). London: Routledge.

Brady, I.K. (2015). *The ideal and ought-to L2 selves of Spanish learners of English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de Murcia, Spain.

Brady, I.K. (2019). Exploring the L2 Motivational Self System in Spain: Study design and preliminary findings. *Journal of English Studies*, *17*, 43-73. https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.3575

Calafato, R., & Tang, F. (2019). Multilingualism and gender in the UAE: A look at the motivational selves of Emirati teenagers. *System*, *84*, 133-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.06.006

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(3), 243-262. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011

Csizér, K. (2019). The L2 motivational self system. In M. Lamb, K. Csizér, A. Henry & S. Ryan (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Motivation for Language Learning* (pp. 71-93). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of applied linguistics*, *31*, 182-204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092

Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms: Current findings and contentious issues*. John Benjamins.

De Smet, A., Mettewie, L., Galand, B., Hiligsmann, P., & van Mensel, L. (2018). Classroom anxiety and enjoyment in CLIL and non-CLIL: Does the target language matter? *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8,* 47-72. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.3

De Smet, A., Mettewie, L., Hiligsmann, P., Galand, B., & van Mensel, L. (2019). Does CLIL shape language attitudes and motivation? Interactions with target languages and instruction levels. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1671308

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Questionnaires in second language research: Constructing, administering, and processing. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(4), 421-462. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.4.421

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2012). How to Design and Analyze Surveys in Second Language Acquisition. In A. Mackey & S.M. Gass (Eds.), *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Guide* (pp. 74–94). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Motivation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P.D., & Henry, A. (2014). Introduction: Applying Complex Dynamic Systems Principles to Empirical Research on L2 Motivation. In Z. Dörnyei, P.D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 1-7). Multilingual Matters.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: Sage publications.

Geoghegan, L. (2018). International posture, motivation and identity in SA. In C. Pérez-Vidal, S. López-Serrano, J. Ament and D. Thomas Wilhelm (Eds.), *Learning context effects: study abroad, formal instruction and international immersion classrooms* (pp. 215-253). Language Science Press.

Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*(3), 319. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319

https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2018.1484038

Islam, M., Lamb, M., & Chambers, G. (2013). The L2 motivational self system and national interest: A Pakistani perspective. *System, 41*(2), 231-244.

Larson-Hall, J. (2012). How to Run Statistical Analyses. In A. Mackey & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (pp. 245-274). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

MacIntyre, P D., MacKinnon, S.P., & Clément, R. (2009). Toward the development of a scale to assess possible selves as a source of language learning motivation. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 193-214). Multilingual Matters.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*(9), 954. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954

Merino, J., & Lasagabaster, D. (2018). CLIL as a way to multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(1), 79-92. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1128386

Moskovsky, C., Assulaimani, T., Racheva, S., & Harkins, J. (2016). The L2 motivational self system and L2 achievement: A study of Saudi EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(3), 641-654.

Navarro Pablo, M., & García Jiménez, E. (2018). Are CLIL students more motivated? An analysis of affective factors and their relation to language attainment. *Porta Linguarum: Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras, 29*, 71-90.

Oakes, L. (2013). Foreign language learning in a 'monoglot culture': Motivational variables amongst students of French and Spanish at an English university. *System*, *41*(1), 178-191.

Oakes, L., & Howard, M. (2019). Learning French as a foreign language in a globalised world: an empirical critique of the L2 Motivational Self System. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(1), 166-182. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1642847

Pavón Vázquez, V., & Rubio, F. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes. *Porta Linguarum: Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras*, *14*, 45-58.

Pérez, A., Lorenzo, F., & Pavón, V. (2016). European bilingual models beyond linguafranca: key findings from CLIL French programs. *Language Policy*, *15*(4), 485-504. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9386-7

Pérez-Cañado, M.L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 315-341. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.630064

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Lasagabaster, D. (2010). Introduction. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & D. Lasagabaster (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (pp. ix-xvii). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ryan, S. (2008). *The Ideal L2 Selves of Japanese learners of English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Nottingham, UK.

Ryan, S. (2009). Self and identity in L2 motivation in Japan: The ideal L2 self and Japanese learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 120-143). Multilingual Matters.

San Isidro, X. (2018). *Innovations and challenges in CLIL implementation in Europe. Theory into Practice*, *57*(3), 185-195. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2018.1484038

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 66-97). Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Beyond global English: Motivation to learn languages in a multicultural world: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(3), 451-454. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12407

Woodrow, L. (2017). Motivation in language learning. In R. Breeze & C.S. Guinda (Eds.), *Essential competencies for English-medium university teaching* (pp. 235-248). Springer.