



UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA

**Facultad de Filosofía, Letras y Ciencias de la Educación**

**Carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros**

**Internal and External Motivational Factors in CLIL Second and Foreign**

**Language Classrooms**

Trabajo de titulación  
previo a la obtención del  
título de Licenciado en  
Pedagogía de los Idiomas  
Nacionales y Extranjeros

**Autora:**

Julissa Maribel Iñiguez Añazco

C.I: 0750531527

Correo electrónico: [julissamar2599@gmail.com](mailto:julissamar2599@gmail.com)

**Directora:**

Juanita Catalina Argudo Serrano

C.I: 0102810249

**Cuenca – Ecuador**

**27-enero-2022**



## Resumen

La presente síntesis de investigación analiza y discute la relación entre clases a través del aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua extranjera (AICLE) y motivación estudiantil. Con el objetivo de determinar los factores motivacionales internos y externos más prominentes en clases AICLE de inglés como lengua extranjera e inglés como segunda lengua; y su impacto en el desempeño del idioma. Para esta síntesis de investigación, el procedimiento utilizado para la selección de los 18 artículos analizados fue una búsqueda exhaustiva en revistas académicas y bases de datos digitales para encontrar los estudios más adecuados sobre el tema a discutir. El análisis se dividió en categorías que demostraron que pueden existir varios factores, externos e internos, que influyen en la motivación. La mayoría de los estudios coincidieron en que la instrucción AICLE tuvo una influencia positiva en la motivación de los estudiantes. El resto encontró resultados inesperadamente decepcionantes sobre AICLE y motivación. De acuerdo con los resultados encontrados, se puede concluir que el número de factores que inciden en la motivación, ya sea de forma positiva o negativa, es tan grande y variado que es imposible analizarlos bajo los mismos criterios y que los alumnos AICLE se desempeñaron mejor debido a mayor motivación. Sobre esta base, se recomienda que en futuras investigaciones se haga más énfasis en la relación AICLE-motivación y los factores involucrados en ese fenómeno con el fin de mejorar su aplicación para tener alumnos más motivados en las aulas; por tanto, ayudarles a lograr el éxito académico.

Palabras clave: motivación, AICLE, factores motivacionales, motivación intrínseca, motivación extrínseca.



## **Abstract**

This research synthesis analyzes and discusses the relationship between Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classes and student motivation; it aims to determine the most prominent internal and external motivational factors found in CLIL second and foreign language classrooms and their impact on language performance. For this research synthesis, the procedure used for the selection of the 18 analyzed articles was thorough research in academic journals and digital databases for the most appropriate articles concerning the topic to be discussed. The analysis was divided into categories which demonstrated that there can be various factors, external and internal, that influence motivation. Most of the studies agreed that CLIL instruction had a positive influence on students' motivation. The rest found unexpectedly disappointing results about CLIL and motivation. The research conducted has important implications in the educational field. According to the results found, it can be concluded that the number of factors that affect motivation, whether positively or negatively, is so great and varied that it is impossible to analyze them under the same criteria and that CLIL students performed better because of higher motivation. On this basis, it is recommended that further research should make more emphasis on the CLIL-motivation relationship and the factors involved in that phenomenon to improve its application in the future to have more motivated students in the classrooms; therefore, to help them achieve academic success.

**Keywords:** motivation, CLIL, motivational factors, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation.



## Table of Contents

Resumen .....	2
Abstract.....	3
Table of Contents.....	4
Cláusula de licencia y autorización para publicación en el Repositorio Institucional .....	6
Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual.....	7
Acknowledgments .....	8
Dedication.....	9
CHAPTER I.....	10
Background .....	10
Problem Statement .....	11
Rationale.....	12
Research Questions .....	14
Objectives .....	14
Methodology.....	14
CHAPTER II.....	16
Theoretical Framework .....	16
<i>Theories and Models on Motivation and Language Learning</i> .....	20
Literature Review .....	22
CHAPTER III.....	30
Data Analysis.....	30
<i>a. Year of publication of the studies</i> .....	30
<i>b. Geographical Area</i> .....	32
<i>c. Factors that influence motivation/Types of motivation</i> .....	34
<i>d. Educational Level</i> .....	37
<i>e. Perceptions of CLIL from learners and teachers</i> .....	38
<i>f. Effects on motivation from the implementation of CLIL in the classroom in contrast with a traditional language teaching approach.</i> .....	41
<i>g. Impact of motivational/affective factors and CLIL classes on students' performance</i> .....	44
CHAPTER IV .....	47
Conclusions .....	47



Recommendations .....	50
References.....	52



## Cláusula de licencia y autorización para publicación en el Repositorio Institucional

---

Julissa Maribel Iñiguez Añezco, en calidad de autora y titular de los derechos morales y patrimoniales del trabajo de titulación “Internal and External Motivational Factors in CLIL Second and Foreign Language Classrooms”, de conformidad con el Art. 114 del CÓDIGO ORGÁNICO DE LA ECONOMÍA SOCIAL DE LOS CONOCIMIENTOS, CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACIÓN reconozco a favor de la Universidad de Cuenca una licencia gratuita, intransferible y no exclusiva para el uso no comercial de la obra, con fines estrictamente académicos.

Asimismo, autorizo a la Universidad de Cuenca para que realice la publicación de este trabajo de titulación en el repositorio institucional, de conformidad a lo dispuesto en el Art. 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Cuenca, 27 de enero de 2022

*Julissa Iñiguez*

---

Julissa Maribel Iñiguez Añezco

C.I: 0750531527



## Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual

---

Julissa Maribel Iñiguez Añazco, autora del trabajo de titulación "Internal and External Motivational Factors in CLIL Second and Foreign Language Classrooms", certifico que todas las ideas, opiniones y contenidos expuestos en la presente investigación son de exclusiva responsabilidad de su autora.

Cuenca, 27 de enero de 2022

Julissa Iñiguez

Julissa Maribel Iñiguez Añazco

C.I: 0750531527



## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank, first and foremost, my thesis director, teacher Juanita Argudo. Thank you for your patience, dedication, and attention to every little detail that I may have overlooked. Your guidance and attitude throughout this whole journey, especially during these difficult times have made this process a whole lot more bearable. I would also like to extend my gratitude to every professor from the major whose teachings have inspired me to dig deeper into such an interesting topic and who have helped me become the student I am today. Last but not least, I would like to thank the people who have always supported me unconditionally and to whom I own everything I get to accomplish, my parents.

*“It's the oldest story in the world. One day you're seventeen and planning for someday, and then quietly, without you ever really noticing, someday is today, and that someday is yesterday and this is your life.” – One Tree Hill.*





## **Dedication**

I would like to dedicate this work to my little sister, María Belén. She has been my person my entire life. She is the one who has dealt with me at my best and my worst. During this past year, there have been times where I just wanted to give up but she was there to prevent me from losing it completely. She was there to comfort and push me to keep going. So naturally, she gets the credit for me not throwing everything away and managing to complete this.



## CHAPTER I

### Background

The currently quite popular CLIL approach was born in Europe as a result of the continent's socio-economic growth and globalization during the 1990s. In some European countries, it was introduced as a necessity to find a new and innovative foreign or second language tool and the best option at the time seemed to be a methodology that used the foreign language as a medium for teaching and learning other subjects (Hunt, 2011). It was quite the upgrade, since students would not only have a more authentic experience when learning the language but they would also learn about different subjects in their target language.

In 1995, the European Commission established that, in addition to their native language, everyone should have the opportunity to communicate in at least two other European languages (Lasagabaster & López, 2015). Therefore, in 1996, the term CLIL was finally introduced (Hunt, 2011). A type of approach that exposed students to the language inside the classroom. Because of the novelty and hype about CLIL, the common belief that it highly motivated students to learn languages was born, which has been and still is the subject of studies and referent for future research given that "the effect of CLIL on students' motivational patterns is a fairly new topic..." (Lasagabaster & López, 2015, p. 42). Research on the topic is needed in order to establish if that common belief can be considered a general truth or if it varies widely depending on different external and internal factors that might affect the learning environment where it develops.

A key factor to remember is that CLIL was born to facilitate the job of language learners and provide them with a tool that would not only help them with the formal part of their learning, but also to discover new and different cultures through language and to



essentially enjoy the whole learning process. That is where the different types of motivation play an important role. For example, Lasagabaster and Doiz (2015) mentioned that

Intrinsic motivation is a crucial motivational factor that refers to the enjoyment of the activity itself. High levels of enjoyment of learning English will lead to more motivated students and as a result, language learning is enhanced.

The same authors have also mentioned that the teaching itself is another important factor, external in this case, in CLIL classrooms. As they included in their study “motivated teachers ‘breed’ motivated learners, and motivated learners ‘breed’ motivated teachers in return” (p.2).

### **Problem Statement**

A well-known fact is that motivation is one of the key factors that determine the attitude towards success in second language learning (Koike, 2014). In his Affective Filter Hypothesis, Stephen Krashen illustrates that there are several variables that play an important role in second language learning (Krashen, 1988). One of those variables is ‘motivation’. He claims that highly motivated students are “better equipped” to succeed in second language learning. Navarro and García (2018) mentioned that motivation is responsible for ‘why people decide to do something’, ‘how long they are willing to sustain the activity’, and ‘how they are going to pursue it’; therefore, it is important to learn about and analyze the different sub-factors that affect students’ motivation to effectively help them learn a language. The CLIL approach has a dual-focused aim and it originated as a means to “describe and further design good practice as achieved in different types of school environments where teaching and learning take place in an additional language” (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). Since the approach arose in Europe, it was viewed as



particularly European. However, it has spread globally since its beginning to the present time (Marsh & Frigols, 2012). Furthermore, it has been a functional tool to prepare students in using the language in different contexts, which they can find more interesting and highly motivational than traditional language learning.

Lasagabaster and López (2015) stated that even though it is generally believed that CLIL increases learners' motivation due to its authenticity and novelty, there is little research about specific intrinsic and extrinsic factors that affect CLIL students' motivation. As a result, some issues may arise due to the lack of research tackling those factors. As Mearns, de Graff, and Coyle (2017) suggested, "future research in the area" should apply different types of instruments and approaches to "determine more directly the relationship between CLIL practices and learner motivations" (p.11). However, it is possible to arrive to a conclusion regarding the topic with the information available. This research synthesis pretends to investigate those different factors that play a part in students' motivation, and determine their impact on their language performance with the purpose of finding out some advantages and challenges to be solved in the future of this type of approach.

## **Rationale**

Admittedly, intrinsic motivation is the most prominent in CLIL students as mentioned in a couple of studies, such as the ones conducted by Borba (1989, 1994) about 'self-esteem', Burns (1979, 1982) about 'self-concept' and their impact on motivation, and Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976). A study conducted by Mearns et al., (2017) highlighted the importance of the use of CLIL and consequently how intrinsic motivation plays an important role when the authors mention that



The use of the target language for an applied purpose and real-life communication within the CLIL classroom can provide learners with a degree of relevance and authenticity, as well as proximal learning goals that can further contribute to positive attitudes and motivation

Regarding motivation, it is said that it may be a trait of CLIL learners rather than a state evoked by the CLIL experience which would lead to suggest that intrinsically motivated students choose to follow the CLIL experience. Still, some students can suffer for example from anxiety, which Lasagabaster and Doiz (2015) mentioned is correlated with intrinsic motivation and in turn, can constitute as an obstacle in language learning. This anxiety can be triggered by some external factors such as peer evaluation, stage fright, the fear of being laughed at, teaching styles, etc. On the other hand, a major external factor that could affect motivation is the way a certain subject is taught by the teachers, whose own motivation is a key factor in the success of their classes, as mentioned earlier.

It is rather important to learn about the different factors that affect students' motivation as a reference point for future teachers who may aspire to implement this kind of approach in their classrooms. Given that if they know about such factors and how they might affect students, they could have the tools to improve the application of this approach in the future; they can have the tools to create a better environment for the students thanks to the studies that have been conducted regarding CLIL education (Alejo & Piquer-Píriz, 2016; Fernández, 2014; Lasagabaster & López, 2015). Of course, up to this day, research on CLIL is relatively young and not entirely focused on internal and external factors affecting motivation. The focus of the existent research is more directed to motivation in general, which could make the search slightly more difficult. However, an important



study in this field has been conducted (Seikkula-Leino, 2007) which proves quite useful to the purpose of this study.

### **Research Questions**

After analyzing the relevant literature in the chosen field for this synthesis, the following questions have arisen.

- What are the most prominent internal and external factors that influence students' motivation when studying with the CLIL approach?
- What is the impact of internal and external motivational factors and CLIL instruction on students' language performance?

### **Objectives**

- To identify the most prominent internal and external motivational factors that influence learners during their CLIL classes.
- To determine the impact of internal and external motivational factors on and CLIL instruction on students' language performance.

### **Methodology**

In order to obtain adequate sources for the following exploratory bibliographic research synthesis, a thorough search will be performed. Research synthesis is a type of research that constructs new knowledge by making connections between various studies on a similar topic, involving a purposeful selection of material to review and synthesize it (Suri, 2011). Different research papers focusing on the factors affecting students' motivation in CLIL classrooms will be analyzed. The articles to analyze will be selected



according to two main criteria. They must be published journal articles that have used a variety of instruments to analyze selected groups of participants and with empirical results. Secondly, the articles will have to be pieces published during the last fifteen years to analyze CLIL and motivation in a more current context. The selected articles will be quantitative as well as qualitative given that they will mention factors such as influence, impact, just like perceptions and feelings.

The resources considered to discern the different factors that affect CLIL students' motivation for this synthesis will include different case and longitudinal studies that considered various levels of education and social contexts of the participants. Furthermore, the most appropriate articles for the investigation will be selected from a list of academic research studies. A total of 18 articles will be chosen to analyze, which will be selected from various reliable search engines such as 'Google Academic', 'EBSCO', published journals such as: 'International CLIL Research Journal', 'International Journal of English Studies', and 'International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism'.



## CHAPTER II

### Theoretical Framework

Marsh and Frigols (2012) describe CLIL as “a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language” (p.1). They make emphasis on the term “dual-focused” because this type of approach has two functions, to teach the target language itself and the content of the subject used. Dalton-Puffer (2011) makes an interesting remark by pointing out that “although the first ‘L’ in CLIL is meant to stand for any language, it would be an extreme case of denial to claim that this is also the case in reality” (p.183). That remark was made in reference to the domain of English as a Second and Foreign Language target and the author often referred to CLIL as “CEIL” or “Content and English Integrated Learning”.

Throughout Europe during the 1990s, the continent was suffering a great expansion and modernization, and with that came a lot of pressure to meet new standards when it came to education (Marsh & Frigols, 2012). The European Commission realized that there were some barriers in the achievement of their desired ‘multilingualism’ thus, educational experts set forth to come up with a new way of teaching a language that would contribute to the innovation of European countries (Marsh & Frigols, 2012).

Darn (2006) mentions that one of the main advantages or positive aspects of applying CLIL in the classrooms is the preparation it gives students for future studies or their professional lives since CLIL “provides opportunities to study content through different perspectives, access subject-specific target language terminology and hence prepare for future studies and/or working life” (p.2). Gergiou (2012) remarks that another important factor for the success of CLIL is that it is an approach in which students have





the chance to use the language they learn in a meaningful context (with whatever subject they are studying). Gergiou (2012) also points out that often in traditional English learning, students practically memorize vocabulary and grammar rules; however, they do not always have the opportunity to apply in a natural context the language they have learned. On the other hand, with CLIL's meaningful learning "students can engage in exploring and finding out the world while using a foreign language to do so" (p.496).

Despite the mentioned factors of CLIL success, this approach also presents some challenges and negative aspects. Pérez (2016) mentioned that an aspect that has negative outcomes for the application of CLIL could be the scarce preparation of teachers for this specific approach, considering it involves the teaching of an entire subject in the target language; teachers' preparation should be focused on language and content teaching altogether and it will require considerable initiative and effort from them. Moreover, Gergiou (2012) makes an important point to take into consideration, the popularity of CLIL nowadays. The author says that "it seems that the CLIL umbrella might be stretching too much and that CLIL might be on the verge of becoming a victim of its own success" (p.497). She mentions this because some dangers could potentially lead to the failure of CLIL, such as the approach being misapplied and losing the features that made it interesting in the first place. Another key observation she makes is that CLIL should not be seen as an approach that only provides some help for language learning; the actual name of the approach emphasizes that it is about 'content' learning, thus when applied it should focus on both aspects. However, she mentions that currently, content specialists, who are needed for CLIL to succeed in the long run, are absent.

Gilankjani, Leong, and Sabouri (2012) pointed out that as the term motivation itself indicates, this is something that stimulates some kind of action, it is a "motive force" (p.9). An interesting depiction of the importance of motivation in language learning is



given by Anjomshoa and Sadighi (2015) as they call it the essence of language teaching. They highlight that if students are not motivated, there is no life in a class, which is why teachers should work on the improvement of motivation. Their study mentions the importance of various types of motivation, such as intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative which will be discussed later on.

Considering that it has been established that motivation is the essence of language learning and CLIL is an engaging approach for students, many researchers have studied the relationship between the two of them. Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2014) mention that advocates of the CLIL approach state that students are more motivated as a result of participating in CLIL instruction.

As mentioned above, four types of motivation are the most prominent when researchers analyze motivation and language learning. Anjomshoa and Sadighi (2015) have mentioned them in their study. First of all, there is intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, which the authors define in their paper as “whether the motivation is more inside a person or outside of him/her” (p.126). It can be inferred that intrinsic motivation refers to the type of motivation that originates inside a person with no external influence to fuel it, and extrinsic motivation is the type in which learners find themselves influenced by some external rewards. Still, motivation is a spectrum, and it is not ruled out that a person may find himself/herself motivated by both internal and external factors (Anjomshoa & Sadigui, 2015). The other two types of motivation often mentioned are instrumental and integrative motivation. Anjomshoa and Sadigui (2015) said that instrumental motivation refers to people wanting to learn a language with a specific academic or professional purpose, perhaps to follow a specific career path or to get a job that makes use of that language. On the other hand, integrative motivation refers to the motivation that affects



people who want to become part of a community (immigrants, for example), which is their reason for learning a new language.

In this research synthesis, the theoretical area to be focused on will be the different theories and models that analyze types of motivation in language learning, with a particular focus on the four types of motivation already mentioned. The ones that are relevant to this synthesis will be analyzed.

### ***Importance of Emotional Factors in Language Learning***

Hui and Lin (2008) state that The Affective Filter Hypothesis is one key point in Stephen Krashen's hypothesis of Second Language Achievement from 1982, in which he suggests that emotional factors play a crucial role in the language learning process. Another interesting depiction of this theory is the one given by Abukhattala (2013) where he states that in order to acquire the target language, it is not enough to just understand what is taught but to assimilate it; that is where the affective filter comes into play. The information goes through a process to be correctly acquired and in that process, it is filtered. This affective filter "opens" or "closes" depending on the mood of the learner; in a relaxed environment, the filter is mostly closed, whereas, in a tense environment, the filter opens up (Abukhattala, 2013).

Masciantonio (1988) adds that according to that theory, affective factors such as motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety influence the language acquisition process. He says that learners with attitudes that are not optimal will have a high affective filter, and in order for the acquisition to be successful, learners must have a low affective filter. Krashen (1988) maintains that affective variables can act either as facilitators or impediments of a smooth acquirement of input provided. He suggests that teachers and educators should go beyond the task of providing students with the needed input; they



should create environments that ensure a low affective filter allowing the input provided to result in language acquisition.

### ***Theories and Models on Motivation and Language Learning***

Following after, there is the Socio-Psychological Model by Gardner and Lambert (1972). Fernández and Canga (2014) state that this model covers two types of motivation, integrative and instrumental. Khalid (2016) points out that the attitude of the learners towards the target language is what determines their motivation or lack thereof to learn and later acquire the language. Khalid (2016) says that Gardner and Lambert (1972) made an important emphasis on the fact that language aptitude is not everything; it is important for language acquisition; nonetheless, motivational factors can override the effectiveness of aptitudes; therefore, they should not be overlooked. Moreover, Guerrero (2015) points out that Gardner and Lambert's model creates an important relationship between motivation and the goal to achieve proficiency in the language, using the following types of motivation. Integrative motivation, the disposition to learn about the culture of the target language and be part of the community. Instrumental motivation, the desire to learn a language for practical motives, as part of someone's studies or to secure a better paying job.

Another important theory to take into account is the Self-Determination Theory by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan (1985). These authors sustain that as the concept entails, Self-Determination refers to a person's own ability to have their own choices be what determines their actions. Krettenauer and Curren (2020) gather from that theory that it is in the nature of human beings to be intrinsically motivated to explore their environment. Self-Determination theory revolves around the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is referred to as autonomous since it comes



from inside a person; extrinsic motivation is referred to as controlled since there are external variables that influence it (Krettenauer & Curren, 2020). Deci and Ryan (1985) also point out that Self-Determination is of considerable importance since it is related to intrinsic motivation because it relates to the positive emotions of enjoyment and interest.

Subsequently, another important theory that prioritizes intrinsic motivation is the L2 Motivational Self System Theory by Dörnyei (2005). Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) mention that the theory proposes an interesting approach to understand what L2 motivation entails. This system integrates three 'self' dimensions to analyze. First of all, there is the notion of the 'ideal L2 self' which encompasses all of the traits a person aspires to possess, their hopes, desires, and aspirations in terms of language proficiency. Second, there is the 'ought to L2 self' which refers to more extrinsic instrumental motives, the traits a person believes ought to possess influenced by some external factors such as, obligations, responsibilities, or duties. Of course, those factors may or may not be related to one's own desires. The third one is the notion of the 'L2 learning experience' which relates to the learning environment and experience of the learners (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005).

The concluding theory to be discussed is the notion of Possible Selves by Markus and Nurius (1986). They say that the conception of Possible Selves is closely related to intrinsic motivation and the 'ideal self' that Dörnyei (2005) mentions. The theory of Possible Selves represents ideas of individuals about what they would like to become and what they fear from themselves in the future. Possible Selves are utterly important because they function as incentives for future attitudes, it depends on the person to decide if it is the 'self' to approach or to avoid. These authors point out that they have not found theories on motivation that are specific about what shapes the relationship between 'self' and motivation, which is what they intend to provide with the mentioned theory. Possible



Selves can be seen as cognitive bridges between the present and future, showing how individuals may change over time (Markus & Nurius, 1986).

## **Literature Review**

Motivation plays a predominant role in education in general. As a matter of fact, in Foreign and Second Language Learning, motivation can be a determinant factor in the success of students. The importance of that factor and the sub-factors that surround it is a subject of great interest. Specifically, when the approach of Content and Language Integrated Learning is involved, in this case. The focus of this research synthesis is to study and analyze the motivational factors involved in Second Language and Foreign Language Learning with the CLIL approach and the impact those factors have on the students' language performance. For this literature review, case and longitudinal studies from different journals have been analyzed. The syntheses analyzed are studies from 2007 to 2018 therefore; the information is mostly up to date and relevant to this time.

The research articles that help to support this project have been divided into three categories to deeply understand the significance of the topic at hand. First, papers that focus on comparing the motivation increase on students under the CLIL setting and the traditional way of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL). Studies that fuel the belief that CLIL does increase motivation will be included in this section; second, the articles that mention some of the factors (internal, external, integrative, instrumental) that seem to influence students in the CLIL setting, whether that influence is negative or positive. Some of those papers also mention the interest of the students to learn a new language which is linked to motivation; third, the articles that challenge the belief that CLIL automatically (or exponentially) increases students' motivation. Some articles that evidence that the decrease in motivation over



time is a possibility will be included. Some authors in this section do not entirely rule out the belief that CLIL motivates students but they maintain that future research is needed to come to that conclusion, Fernández (2014); Hunt (2011); Lasagabaster and López (2015).

### ***The contrast between motivation and achievement in CLIL and traditional EFL/ESL settings***

The first section of this synthesis will focus on the comparison the following authors (Doiz et al., 2014; Koike, 2014; Lasagabaster, 2011; Lasagabaster, 2017; Mearns et al., 2017; Navarro and García, 2018; Seikkula-Leino, 2007; Sylvén and Thompson, 2015) made between CLIL and non-CLIL classes and how each setting affected students' motivation and language performance. The articles in this segment are the ones that agree about CLIL playing an important part in students' motivation.

Seikkula-Leino (2007) wrote an article that shows the contrast between pupils who have learned a new language through immersion rather than in their native language and pupils who have learned a new language instructed in their mother tongue. The study makes an interesting comparison between the attitudes of CLIL and non-CLIL students towards language learning and it was found that CLIL students were, in fact, more motivated to learn the language. Similar results were found in the study conducted by Doiz et al. (2014) where CLIL students were more motivated than non-CLIL ones, even though results in both groups were not drastically different as both groups faced similar levels of anxiety about public speaking.

A couple of years later, Lasagabaster (2011) conducted a study to establish if CLIL had a more positive impact on the students than the traditional EFL approach. The results were favorable and provided evidence that CLIL students were more motivated.



It was found that the traditional way of teaching could be responsible for having a negative effect on students' motivation due to its lack of authenticity, not having a real communicative function, and not offering enough input for the students. That claim is disputed by Lasagabaster (2017) in his study, where the results showed that the relationship between English and motivation in non-CLIL settings was not as negative as the study of Lasagabaster (2011) suggested.

Koike (2014) conducted a study in Japan in a traditional EFL class where she decided to apply some CLIL activities to conduct the study. According to the researcher, the implementation of those activities in her classroom was an imminent success because students felt more comfortable using the language to communicate with their classmates. The author said that CLIL programs should be directed to students at university level because when they choose to study something they like; they could feel more motivated towards learning. Doiz et al. (2014) agree in the aspect that CLIL could be a better tool for older students, given that they already have a perspective of the world and what the future holds for them, so with the help of CLIL they could become more interested in exploring new cultures, new points of view of different people, and they could reflect about the need for a second language that would help them in their academic and professional lives.

The research conducted by Sylvén and Thompson (2015) compares CLIL and non-CLIL students using a different rationale. This is one of the studies that fill a specific gap in the literature given that it was a longitudinal study that evaluated the levels of motivation of students before they would receive CLIL classes. This is an interesting take because it aims to determine if students who study with CLIL are already motivated or if that approach is what motivates them to learn. A similar approach was chosen by Mearns et al. (2017) in their study in which they explored an interesting question: Are learners





motivated for or from bilingual education? The results reveal that it can be possible that motivation already existed independently on the bilingual education experience.

To conclude with this section, it is important to highlight one more study relevant to this section. The study conducted by Navarro and García (2018) established that motivation is a really important factor in second language learning and it plays a more important role in CLIL than in non-CLIL settings. Their results were rather favorable because they positively answered the question of whether CLIL students are more motivated to learn English than non-CLIL ones.

### *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in younger and older learners*

In this next section, literature has been reviewed in terms of the different factors that play a role in affecting students' motivation and how those factors affect differently younger and older students. The following are the most relevant aspects encountered.

Fernández (2014) conducted an investigation that builds an interesting comparison between younger and older students and how their motivation or lack thereof of is illustrated. Older participants were found to be more extrinsically than intrinsically motivated, and the younger participants seemed to be more intrinsically motivated. The latter results agree with another study conducted by Lasagabaster and López (2015) in which they found that intrinsic motivation was the most prominent one in younger learners.

Lasagabaster and López (2015) found that intrinsic motivation decreases when students advance in their academic lives and that if intrinsic motivation was high, extrinsic motivation tended to be low and vice versa. They also discussed that CLIL helped students improve integrative motivation, which is the one that inspires them to



learn beyond their target language; it makes them interested in learning about the community and culture of speakers of their target language. In the study, extrinsic motivation was less prominent; nevertheless, it still played an important role. The results showed that students did seem influenced by their parents' opinions about the importance of learning English. An interesting suggestion made by Mearns et al. (2017) in their analysis is that paying close attention to the type of motivation students better respond to can be a determinant factor that encourages future research with the goal of adapting CLIL programs to the specific needs of learners to continue fueling that type of motivation.

To sum up this section, an investigation conducted by Alejo and Piquer-Píriz (2016) focused on the differences in exposure to English input between CLIL learners in the urban context vs. the rural school context and how the students' motivation level is affected by their social background. The results showed that learners from both contexts had a similar motivational profile and that they equally valued the motivational input from their teachers and other external sources. Concluding that the difference in social backgrounds was not a determinant factor in the presence of students' motivation.

### ***Students' perspectives about CLIL and a decrease in motivation***

The last segment of this literature review is focused on articles that take into account students' perspectives about the CLIL approach and also, those papers that conducted similar studies to the previous ones except with less favorable and even negative results about the relationship between CLIL and motivation.

Hunt (2011) conducted an exploratory case study that showed the actual perceptions of students about learning content through a foreign language and the impact of the CLIL approach on their motivation. The results showed that learners responded



particularly well to CLIL instruction; notwithstanding, they did not exactly feel motivated by it.

Employing an alternative approach, Heras and Lasagabaster (2014) focused on the implementation of CLIL on a specific subject (Physical Education) and the results were favorable, yet not to the extent that was expected as there were no significant differences in the motivation of the CLIL group and the non-CLIL one. They suggested that more research in this area should be conducted in the future focusing on the impact different subjects have on students' motivation.

An interesting research paper that challenges the belief that CLIL increases students' motivation is the one conducted by Fernández and Canga (2014) where they found that non-CLIL learners seemed to be more motivated than the CLIL ones. A possible explanation for these results could be that the workload for CLIL may be too heavy and could result in the demotivation of students over time, given that it involves learning content of a subject entirely in the foreign language. They also point out that it is not a good idea to introduce very young learners to the CLIL approach because they do not comprehend the importance of learning a different language yet, and some of them might even struggle with that type of instruction. Therefore, providing learners with the burden that CLIL demands would be too difficult for them at that age, causing their motivation to decrease and consequently, affect their performance.

Arribas (2016) analyzed the implementation of CLIL in an entire school in Spain. The researcher included students' and teachers' perspectives on the study. A high percentage of students did not consider CLIL as a useful experience for the future, and they thought that the approach had not helped them improve any of their skills. On the other hand, the teachers expressed high levels of motivation at the prospect of working



with that approach; nevertheless, a setback was that they did not have as much time as they would want to prepare material to conduct an effective class. In conclusion, CLIL did have some positive effects on motivation; nonetheless, it was not significant and the teachers believed that the implementation of the approach required some improvements in the future given the pessimistic results of little to no improvement of the learning of the students.

Lasagabaster and Doiz (2015) focused on CLIL and the affective factors it may influence. It was expected that the CLIL approach would help sustain students' motivation; however, that was not the case. Contrary to expectations, CLIL did not help to maintain motivation and there was even a motivational decline of some sort. Results show that motivation decreased over time because students showed higher motivation in the first year than in the rest of them. It seems that the initial high motivation starts to fade once CLIL is not a novelty anymore and becomes a normal (even monotonous) practice (Dalton-Puffer and Smit, 2013). One surprising result found was that motivation through the years did not decrease for non-CLIL students. As for CLIL students, it was expected that the program would increase or at least maintain students' motivation which was not the case; what was not expected was that there would even be a decrease in motivation for CLIL students. A hypothesis for those results had to do with the difficulty and demand of the subjects used as students advanced in their academic journey.

A common aspect, mentioned by the authors, in most of the analyzed articles is the fact that it is essential to conduct more research focused on this topic in general; especially for longitudinal studies because they illustrate the changes seen over time in the participants observed. This type of study is quite useful in this area because of the constant evolution of the world and the aspects surrounding education, such as the process of standardizing the CLIL approach (Arribas, 2016). Arribas (2016) also criticized that



many research studies focus on one single aspect of CLIL teaching; therefore, a suggestion was that it was necessary to conduct research with a wider view of every aspect involved in the approach to determine some overlooked details about the attitudes of the participants. Furthermore, Arribas (2016); Fernández and Canga (2014); Seikkula-Leino (2007) stress the importance of the teacher's role in the increase or decrease of motivation in the classroom. They agree that that aspect should also be further investigated.

This synthesis set out to analyze the relevant studies about motivational factors involved in Second and Foreign Language Learning with the CLIL approach and the impact those factors have on the target language performance. Three different categories were analyzed to have a deeper look into the context where this approach has been applied. What is important to highlight from most of the studies is that their authors pointed out excellent themes, questions, and concerns (such as the different academic subjects taught with the CLIL approach, bigger sample sizes, the need for more longitudinal studies) to be taken into account for future research, Fernández (2014); Fernández and Canga (2014); Koike (2014); Lasagabaster and López (2015).



## CHAPTER III

### Data Analysis

In order to develop this research synthesis, 18 studies were thoroughly selected and reviewed to perform their respective analysis and eventually, aim to answer the proposed research questions and meet the established objectives. In the process of analyzing the selected studies, they were classified into different categories which are the following: (a) Year of publication of the studies, (b) Geographical Area, (c) Factors that influence motivation/Types of motivation, (d) Educational level, (e) Perceptions of CLIL from learners and teachers, (f) Effects on motivation from the implementation of CLIL in the classroom in contrast to a traditional language teaching approach, and (g) Impact of motivational/affective factors and CLIL classes on students' performance. Furthermore, the data collected was organized in tables with their respective description and discussion.

#### *a. Year of publication of the studies*

The era in which different studies were conducted is important to highlight because of the imminent evolution of the educational field and the changes and improvements one methodology has gone through as the years went by. It is important to know about the journey of the CLIL methodology since it first became an option in language teaching to its popularization and global application nowadays.

Table 1

#### *Publication Year of the Studies*



<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Year of Publication</i>	<i>N°</i>
<i>Seikkula-Leino (2007).</i>	2007-2010	1 (5,55%)
<i>Doiz, Lasagabaster, &amp; Sierra (2014); Fernández (2014); Fernández &amp; Canga (2014); Heras &amp; Lasagabaster (2014); Hunt (2011); Koike (2014); Lasagabaster (2011); Lasagabaster &amp; Doiz (2015); Lasagabaster &amp; López (2015); Otwinowska (2013); Sylvén &amp; Thompson (2015).</i>	2011-2015	11 (61,11%)
<i>Alejo &amp; Piquer-Píriz (2016); Arribas (2016); Martínez (2020); Mearns, de Graaff, &amp; Coyle (2017); Navarro &amp; García (2018); Pladevall-Ballester (2018).</i>	2016-2020	6 (33,33%)

*Total: 18 studies*

Table 1 shows the number of studies according to their year of publication. All of the studies, except for one, belong to the last ten years of research. A study from 2007 (Seikkula-Leino, 2007) was included to take notice of the evolution of the method from a decade to another. Seikkula-Leino (2007) mentioned that even though CLIL had its roots in the 1990s, there was not much research about it in general, much less about its relationship with motivation. She also brought up that the widespread use of the CLIL method started to raise some questions for researchers, which led them to immerse themselves in the topic the following years. One of the main reasons for the increase in



varied language teaching methods, among them CLIL, is the continued globalization of the world, as Keiko (2014) mentions “with the expansion of globalization and increased contact between countries, being able to use English is essential” (p.147).

Even with the increase of research on the implementation of CLIL, Lasagabaster and Doiz (2015) make a very important remark to reflect about, they mention that “it is striking to see that little attention has been paid so far to the evolution of student motivation in CLIL programs over time even though motivation may fluctuate over time” (p.4). The need for further research focused on the relationship between motivation and language attainment in CLIL classrooms is an idea maintained by Martínez (2020), which is a gap that should be filled in the future.

### ***b. Geographical Area***

The second important factor to take into consideration and proceed to the respective analysis is the Geographical Area in which the studies took place. It is pertinent to have some knowledge about the parts of the globe where the approach is often applied. Where is it that researchers have found it works best? In what scenery? Is CLIL popular in countries with a specific first language? Is it more popular in countries where English is regarded as a foreign rather than a second language?

Table 2

#### *Geographical Area*

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Continent</i>	<i>N°</i>
<i>Koike (2014)</i>	Asia	1 (5,55%)





	Africa	0
	America	0
<i>Alejo &amp; Piquer-Píriz (2016); Arribas (2016); Doiz, Lasagabaster, &amp; Sierra (2014); Fernández (2014); Fernández &amp; Canga (2014); Heras &amp; Lasagabaster (2014); Hunt (2011); Koike (2014); Lasagabaster (2011); Lasagabaster &amp; Doiz (2015); Lasagabaster &amp; López (2015); Martínez (2020); Mearns, de Graaff, &amp; Coyle (2017); Navarro &amp; García (2018); Otwinowska (2013); Pladevall-Ballester (2018); Seikkula-Leino (2007); Sylvén &amp; Thompson (2015).</i>	Europe	17 (94.44%)
	Australia	0

*Total: 18 studies*

Table 2 represents the different locations around the world where the analyzed studies referent to CLIL and motivation took place. As Arribas (2016) mentions, CLIL is referred to as “one of the trendiest terms in the European educational scenarios” (p.270) which is evidenced on the table given that all of the studies except one took place in European countries. Out of all of the European studies, the great majority took place in Spain. Doiz et al. (2014) point out that “Spain is one of the leading countries in Europe in the implementation of CLIL programmes” (p.220). Within the Spanish territory, it is important to highlight the fact that a good number of studies were applied in some of the autonomous communities belonging to Spain, such as the Basque Country, Navarre, and Extremadura (Alejo & Piquer-Píriz, 2016; Doiz et al., 2014; Heras & Lasagabaster, 2015; Lasagabaster, 2011; Lasagabaster & López, 2015; Martínez, 2020). It is rather curious



and intriguing how CLIL has gained plenty of popularity in a Spanish-speaking country within some autonomous communities rather than in the biggest and most cosmopolitan cities in the country.

As for the remaining study, even if it was conducted in a different continent, the one study conducted in Japan has many common points with the ones conducted in Europe. One point is that English is taught as a foreign and not as a second language. The researcher in charge of the study in Japan, Koike (2014) mentions that “CLIL methodology holds great potential and could open a new door for promoting and developing the curriculum for bilingual education in Japan” (p.154). The data provided demonstrates that CLIL is quite popular in countries where English is regarded as a foreign language rather than a second one. The reason for that could be that CLIL is useful to provide students with a more natural and communicative way of learning the language within the classroom since their opportunities for practicing the language outside of it could be limited.

### *c. Factors that influence motivation/Types of motivation*

There is a wide spectrum of factors that influence students’ motivation. There can be many internal and external factors that play a key role in the influence of motivation. Just like that, students can show signs of different types of motivation such as, intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative. The path to achieving higher motivation does not follow a specific pattern because not all students go through the same experiences, they do not have the same backgrounds or educational experiences. That is why motivation can come in different forms.

Table 3

*Factors that influence motivation/Types of motivation*

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Factors mentioned</i>	<i>N°</i>
<i>Alejo &amp; Piquer-Píriz (2016); Doiz, Lasagabaster, &amp; Sierra (2014); Fernández (2014); Fernández &amp; Canga (2014); Heras &amp; Lasagabaster (2014); Lasagabaster &amp; Doiz (2015); Navarro &amp; García (2018); Pladevall-Ballester (2018).</i>	Internal/Intrinsic & External/Extrinsic	8 (66,66%)
<i>Koike (2014); Mearns, de Graaff, &amp; Coyle (2017); Seikkula-Leino (2007); Sylvén &amp; Thompson (2015).</i>	Instrumental & Integrative	4 (33,33%)

*Total: 12 studies*

Table 3 highlights the presence of different factors that influence motivation as well as the most common types of motivation. An important factor mentioned that plays a role in motivation is the socioeconomic background of the students. In the study conducted by Alejo & Piquer-Píriz (2016) the difference between urban and rural learners when it comes to exposure to the English language is quite palpable, in favor of urban learners. Another factor that could contribute in some way to the students' motivation is the formal education their parents received. Arribas (2016) in his study mentioned that the majority of parents of students in the CLIL classroom had obtained a university degree contrary to the parents in the non-CLIL group. In the end, the results showed that CLIL students were far more motivated than their non-CLIL counterparts; therefore, it could be hypothesized that their home situation is of critical importance for the level of motivation of the students and their performance at school. However, Arribas (2016) also mentioned that learning English was considered of great importance both by the professional and



non-professional parents; both sets of parents had in common that they only wanted what was best for their children.

Another factor of great importance when it comes to motivation in CLIL classes is that of age and how motivation is more present in younger students, especially intrinsic motivation as mentioned by Fernández (2014). Lasagabaster & Doiz (2015) also make important emphasis on the fact that younger students are more motivated but through the years that motivation starts to disperse, they say that “CLIL students were more intrinsically motivated, more instrumentally oriented, and showed a higher motivational strength in the first year than in the subsequent academic years, but it seems that the initial high motivation starts to wane once CLIL is not a novelty anymore and becomes normal practice” (p.21). Seikkula-Leino (2007) mentions that an important factor to take into account that might affect students’ motivation is self-esteem, in that study “CLIL pupils felt that they had worse knowledge of foreign languages than pupils in non-CLIL classes” (p.335). In the results of the study, she found that despite their low self-esteem, CLIL learners showed great motivation to learn in a general sense. Sylven & Thompson (2015) investigated students’ level of motivation before their exposure to CLIL classes and it was found that “CLIL students have a greater interest in foreign languages, more positive attitudes towards learning English, a stronger ideal L2 self, more English self-confidence, and a higher willingness to communicate (WTC) in English” (p.35).

In the study conducted by Heras & Lasagabaster (2015) they concluded that “the motivation to learn a foreign language thus draws from three primary sources: the learner’s vision of oneself as a proficient and effective L2 speaker, the social pressure coming from his/her environment and positive learning experiences” (p.84). Those results allow us to believe that a great number of factors are involved in the achievement of greater motivation for the students. Finally, the results from the study conducted by



Mearns et al. (2017) pointed out that students were driven by instrumental motivation when they chose to enroll in bilingual education, with the rationale of the relevance of the language for their future as professionals and the challenge it represented for them.

#### *d. Educational Level*

The level of education of the participants of the analyzed studies is also an important factor to scrutinize since it can highlight the advantages and disadvantages of the CLIL methodology in different educational levels. There is no doubt that the methodology, in general, is quite useful; however, it may be more appropriate in certain grades when students already have some basic knowledge of the target language.

Table 4

#### *Education Level*

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Nº</i>
<i>Fernández &amp; Canga (2014); Lasagabaster &amp; López (2015); Otwinowska (2013); Pladevall-Ballester (2018); Seikkula-Leino (2007).</i>	Primary	5 (27,78%)
<i>Alejo &amp; Piquer-Píriz (2016); Arribas (2016); Doiz, Lasagabaster, &amp; Sierra (2014); Heras &amp; Lasagabaster (2014); Hunt (2011); Lasagabaster (2011); Lasagabaster &amp; Doiz (2015); Mearns, de Graaff, &amp; Coyle (2017); Sylvén &amp; Thompson (2015).</i>	Secondary	9 (50%)
<i>Koike (2014).</i>	University	1 (5,55%)



<i>Fernández (2014); Martínez (2020); Navarro &amp; García (2018).</i>	Primary & 3 Secondary (16,67%)
--	-----------------------------------

*Total: 18 studies*

Table 4 shows the educational level of the students who participated in each of the studies. Notably, half of the studies were carried out with secondary level students. A reason for that could be that their age and previous English instruction make them ideal candidates to implement the CLIL approach with.

Moreover, the one study aimed at University level students was the one conducted by Koike (2014) in which the researcher believes that students are ready for a new type of instruction given their experience learning English as an FL for more than six years and she mentions that “CLIL methodology requires students to understand the text in English, which also helps them to be able to think in English” (p.152).

Additionally, Fernández and Canga (2014) maintain that primary level students are too young to be working with the CLIL approach and to even understand the importance of learning a foreign language. It is only logical that the approach is not the most appropriate for students who are still in the early stages of learning a foreign language; introducing them to a methodology that uses the target language as a means to communicate in the classroom would be too much work for younger students.

#### *e. Perceptions of CLIL from learners and teachers*

To understand more about what CLIL entails it is important to go beyond the results obtained from every study. The perceptions and points of view of the participants

regarding CLIL instruction are important data to consider for the appropriate application of the approach in the future. In studies to obtain data about students' motivation, the opinions of the students and teachers are of great importance.

Table 5

*Perceptions of CLIL from learners and teachers*

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Perceptions N°</i>	
<i>Hunt (2011); Koike (2014); Lasagabaster (2011).</i>	Positive	3 (50%)
<i>Arribas (2016); Otwinowska (2013); Seikkula-Leino (2007).</i>	Negative	3 (50%)

*Total: 6 studies*

Table 5 shows the different perceptions of the CLIL approach implemented in different classes from learners and teachers. The study conducted by Arribas (2016) is highly focused on analyzing students' perceptions on CLIL because they believe that is the best approach to obtain reliable data to use in further research to improve the application of the method. They mention that their goal is to "give a description of its [CLIL] reality by means of asking learners themselves" (p.277). In that study, researchers gathered different responses from learners and teachers. The results from learners who participated in the study gathered that "according to more than 80% of the students, CLIL is not considered as a useful experience" (p.281). An important factor that could have led to those results is that the methodology may have been a bit too complicated for them. Otwinowska (2013) mentions that a recurring thought from students is that "CLIL classes are simply too challenging" (p.6). A result also shared by Seikkula-Leino (2007) is that the teachers agreed that "CLIL is very demanding for the pupils" (p.337). CLIL classes



being too challenging for students and teachers agreeing with that statement is an important point to take into consideration for further research; trying to find a balance between what students can handle and what CLIL demands from them is pertinent for a correct application of the method in the near future.

However, when it came down to teachers' perspectives in Arribas (2016), "CLIL teachers were highly motivated about the use of this methodology although they affirmed that they did not have as much time as they would like to devote to prepare classes and materials" (p.287). That statement from the teachers who participated in the study shows that even though there is motivation to teach with that methodology from the teachers, they still need some external incentive to make the best of it. Another investigation conducted by Hunt (2011) also focused on teachers' perceptions about the behavior of the students. Still, Hunt (2011) shed light on the fact that it is also important to gather trainee teachers' perceptions of the attitudes and changes of students in CLIL lessons. The results from the teachers indicated that "...pupils were more interested, more enthusiastic, more confident and showed greater enjoyment; pupils stayed on task more and weaker pupils were more engaged because the language was only a means to what they were really learning." (p.375).

As for teachers' perceptions mainly, the research conducted by Koike (2014) focused solely on the perceptions of the teacher. She believes that CLIL is a great tool for students to understand the material provided in the target language and even develop thinking skills in that language. She also mentions that CLIL could be best-taken advantage of during university since students choose what they want to study and already feel some interest towards that and also because they already have a somewhat advanced level of vocabulary and grammar. However, as a teacher she also mentions an important factor "It would be a challenging and time-consuming process to plan CLIL lessons and





create materials for it; however, it would definitely help teachers create more dynamic, engaging lessons, and improve English education in Japan” (p.154). Teachers agree when it comes to the importance of CLIL as a communicative method that can help improve the use of the target language. However, the differences in opinions arise when the level of challenge the students are faced with is mentioned. Once more, it is important to point out that further research should make more emphasis on finding a balance for the well-being of the students and the teachers who decide to implement the approach in their classrooms.

*f. Effects on motivation from the implementation of CLIL in the classroom in contrast with a traditional language teaching approach.*

This section discusses the actual results of the analyzed studies. It shows the effects on student motivation from the implementation of CLIL classes in contrast to student motivation under a more traditional language teaching approach. The analysis of the studies evidences this type of methodology does not always have the same results given the variety of factors involved.

Table 6

*Effects on motivation from the implementation of CLIL in the classroom in contrast to a traditional language teaching approach*

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Effect</i>	<i>Nº</i>
<i>Arribas (2016); Doiz, Lasagabaster, &amp; Sierra (2014); Koike (2014); Lasagabaster (2011); Lasagabaster &amp; López</i>	More motivated	9 (60%)



(2015); Navarro & García (2018); Otwinowska (2013);  
Seikkula-Leino (2007); Sylvén & Thompson (2015).

Fernández & Canga (2014).

Less motivated	1 (6.67%)
----------------	--------------

Alejo & Piquer-Píriz (2016); Hunt (2011); Lasagabaster &  
Doiz (2015); Mearns, de Graaff, & Coyle (2017); Pladevall-  
Ballester (2018).

Equally motivated	5 (33,33%)
-------------------	---------------

*Total: 15 studies*

Table 6 sheds light on the effects on motivation from the implementation of the CLIL methodology in classrooms in contrast to a traditional language teaching approach. There are many points of view of the matter, which are quite interesting and useful to understand the complexity of CLIL. Arribas (2016) mentions that “students receiving some kind of CLIL instruction show better attitudes towards English as compared to those students that are not involved in content teaching” (p.286). Koike (2014) highlights that “students were more motivated to speak English than at the beginning of the course” (p.151). In contrast to a traditional language teaching approach, Lasagabaster (2011) points out that “students enjoying a CLIL experience were significantly more enthusiastic than those in traditional EFL classrooms” (p.14). Otwinowska (2013) mentions that older students are “less reluctant towards CLIL and seem less determined to fight against the form and content of these classes” (p.9).

However, in the study conducted by Fernández and Canga (2014), it was surprisingly found that non-CLIL students seemed more motivated than their CLIL counterparts. An explanation for that could be that “the extra load involved with CLIL



simply bores and demotivates young learners” (p.31). Additionally, for not-so-expected results Lasagabaster and Doiz (2015) found that “contrary to expectations and what is stated in the literature, CLIL did not help to maintain motivation and there was a motivational decline over time” (p.21). In the study conducted by Pladevall-Ballester (2018), there was not a significant difference between the effect on motivation for CLIL and non-CLIL students, although CLIL students were slightly more motivated.

This lack of significant differences between groups could also result from the fact that the study was conducted in a very low-exposure CLIL setting, which might not have been enough to trigger, at least in the short term, more significant motivational differences between groups.

An important factor that affects motivation from CLIL and non-CLIL students is the type of motivation involved. In the study by Lasagabaster and López (2015), it was found that “EFL pupils were slightly, but not significantly, more extrinsically motivated than students in the CLIL program” (p.53), and as of intrinsic motivation “young learners from primary education maintained greater intrinsic motivation than extrinsic towards language learning (p.53).

Furthermore, Mearns et al. (2017) pose a really interesting point of view about CLIL and motivation. It sets out to answer the question “Are learners motivated for or from bilingual education?” (p.3). They hypothesize that students were already motivated before embarking on bilingual education and that motivation is what gave them the inspiration or courage to take on that challenge. Sylvén and Thompson (2015) found positive results that show that CLIL students were more motivated than non-CLIL ones. However, they also mention that the results were not attributed to the approach, instead they were an outcome of past experiences and personality attributes. Therefore, it is not



ideal no assume that CLIL automatically leads to increased motivation and better attitudes towards language learning. Still, they do not completely rule out the possibility of CLIL being a source of further motivation in the following academic years for students.

*g. Impact of motivational/affective factors and CLIL classes on students' performance*

The last part of the analysis focuses on the impact of the previously mentioned motivational or affective factors as well as CLIL classes on students' overall language performance. According to some studies, students saw some fruits from their CLIL classes and their performance in different skills went through an improvement. On the other hand, the factors that negatively affected students' motivation also took a toll on their performance; in some cases, their performance simply remained the same, yet in others, it worsened.

Table 7

*Impact of (motivational/affective factors or CLIL teaching) on students' performance*

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Nº</i>
<i>Arribas (2016); Koike (2014); Lasagabaster (2011); Mearns, de Graaff, &amp; Coyle (2017).</i>	Positive	4 (40%)
<i>Alejo &amp; Piquer-Píriz (2016); Lasagabaster &amp; Doiz (2015); Martínez (2020).</i>	Negative	3 (30%)
<i>Fernández (2014); Navarro &amp; García (2018); Seikkula-Leino (2007).</i>	No impact	3 (30%)



*Total: 10 studies*

Table 7 discusses the impact that CLIL classes and different motivational or affective factors have on students' overall performance in the target language. Arribas (2016) reports that students in the CLIL group performed better in vocabulary tests as a result of their higher motivation. Students did report some improvement in their linguistic skills. Arribas (2016) also mentions that "there is a strong link between motivation and achievement since the more motivated students are also the ones that obtained the highest scores regardless of their instruction" (p.286). Besides that, Arribas (2016) mentions that "attitudes towards languages have a significantly positive influence on students' achievement; therefore, teachers should really make an effort to enhance their pupils' motivation and attitudes" (p.289). In the case study by Koike (2014) she makes an interesting point in that students continued using the material and tools applied during the CLIL classroom since they found them immensely interesting and useful to the point of using it in the long run. She points out that "as they felt more comfortable using English for communication, they learned more vocabulary spontaneously on their own" (p.151). Lasagabaster (2011) also found positive results when it came down to CLIL's impact on students. He said that "CLIL seems to bear rich fruits in both the oral and written skills" (p.14).

Alejo and Piquer-Píriz (2016) found that student anxiety can become an important obstacle in students' language performance if not treated appropriately. They mention that "the CLIL experience brings anxiety to the front. The reason may be that general academic results and academic success are also dependent on this motivational factor [anxiety]" (p.13). Lasagabaster and Doiz (2015) found that the difficulty of certain subjects can be considered external factors that affect motivation. What they said about their results was that "these results may be closely linked to the difficulty of the subjects



delivered in CLIL, as subjects become more complex and cognitively demanding in later grades” (p.21). Navarro and García (2018) found that CLIL classes have a different impact on certain skills. They say that “CLIL seems to have a lower effect on receptive skills (listening and reading) than on productive skills (speaking and writing)” (p.87). Those results may be related to the communicative nature of the CLIL approach. Seikkula-Leino (2007) found that students feel more comfortable and at ease with their mother tongue, as pointed out with the lack of self-esteem for CLIL students who take classes in a foreign language “the results seem to indicate that pupils who are taught in their native language tend to overachieve more strongly than those in CLIL” (p.336).



## CHAPTER IV

### Conclusions

This research synthesis aimed to analyze some of the leading internal and external factors that influence CLIL students' motivation and the impact, if there is any, of that type of instruction on students' language performance. The 18 studies analyzed provided key information about motivational factors within CLIL instruction and the type of instruction's impact on students' performance. Additionally, other factors were analyzed as they were relevant for the results obtained in the synthesis, such as the year of publication of the studies, their geographical area, the types of motivation shown by the participants, their educational level, perceptions of CLIL from students and teachers, and effects on motivation from CLIL in contrast to a traditional language teaching approach.

Answering the first research question of this synthesis about the identification of the internal and external factors that affect CLIL students' motivation, it was found that there is a wide spectrum of those factors that play an important role in influencing students' motivation, whether it is a positive or negative influence. Essentially, the types of motivation often found in the articles were: intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative. Each of them influencing students in different ways depending on other factors (internal and external) such as student background, the influence of their parents and teachers, their desire to achieve great things in life, and so on (Sylvén & Thompson, 2015; Heras & Lasagabaster, 2015; Mearns, de Graaf, & Coyle, 2017). What is crucial to point out is that since not all students go through the same experiences in life, or have similar backgrounds and upbringings, it will not be accurate to have one straight, specific perception about what exactly affects motivation. As expected, the factors that positively influence students were analyzed to have a better comprehension of English instruction



using CLIL. Moreover, the factors that negatively affect motivation were analyzed as well to maintain a balance and read unbiased results about the influence of the approach. In the studies where student motivation was negatively affected by CLIL, it was mainly because of some external factors such as pressure to study an entire subject in a foreign language, a low-exposure CLIL setting, their socioeconomic background, low self-esteem (sometimes resulting in terrible cases of anxiety), or the social pressure common to their environment (Fernández & Canga, 2014; Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2015; Pladevall-Ballester, 2018).

On the other hand, some factors that positively influenced motivation were the following. The age of students (younger students seemed more intrinsically motivated in CLIL classes and that motivation seemed to decrease as they got older). Student's exposure to the foreign language through CLIL is evidenced in Koike (2014) where she used the CLIL method with college students who learned about different cultures around the world through that approach. That exposure could also imply that students would face a challenge with that new type of instruction, which is the case in the study conducted by Pladevall-Ballester (2018) where students thought CLIL would be a challenging experience, yet they seemed excited about the prospect of learning the language through a more authentic approach. Overall, it can be concluded that exposure improved their attitudes towards the language. Other important factors were their vision of oneself as a proficient L2 speaker, the "ideal L2 self" from the motivational self-system by Dörnyei (2005), positive previous learning experiences, and the importance they give to bilingual education for their future plans known as instrumental motivation (Arribas, 2016; Koike, 2014; Lasagabaster, 2011; Otwinowska, 2013). All in all, the study conducted by Mearns et al. (2017) hypothesized that students who choose CLIL are already intrinsically and instrumentally motivated because of previous experiences and that pushed them to choose





CLIL as a type of instruction. That hypothesis could be applicable to the studies where CLIL instruction was optional for students, such as the one conducted by Heras and Lasagabaster (2014) where students had the choice to pick CLIL or not. In other cases, for instance, Seikkula-Leino (2008) where CLIL students were selected through entrance examinations, that hypothesis could not be sustained.

Moving on to the second question in the research synthesis, which aimed to answer the interrogative of the impact of those motivational and affective factors, as well as the actual CLIL classes on students' language performance, was analyzed. All of those variables can act either as facilitators or impediments of an effective acquisition of the knowledge provided, as mentioned by Krashen (1995). The findings show that in some cases, students' performance improved because of CLIL classes. When students were highly motivated, they performed better on different tests focusing on different skills (Arribas, 2016; Koike, 2014; Lasagabaster, 2011). On the other hand, the factors previously mentioned that negatively affected students' motivation consequently affected their performance, hypothesizing that unmotivated students do not perform well. Anxiety resulted as one of the key factors that proved to be an obstacle in the improvement of students' performance (Alejo & Piquer-Píriz, 2016). That anxiety arises as school subjects become more cognitively challenging through the academic years and students become fearful of participating in CLIL classes, therefore affecting their performance (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2015). However, the anxiety can diminish once students become accustomed to the use of English in content classes (Doiz et al., 2014). Additionally, there may be subjects that are already difficult and learning them through a foreign language could also result in poor performance (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2015). Subjects such as History or Geography can be easily adapted to teach in CLIL, even if instructors are language teachers, yet not content experts, such as the case of Koike (2014). On the other



hand, subjects that are more cognitively challenging, even in the first language, may not be good candidates to adapt to CLIL as evidenced by Pladevall-Ballester (2018) where more challenging subjects seemed to negatively affect learners' motivation.

## **Recommendations**

Throughout the analysis of the articles, it was noticeable the lack of research focused solely on the relationship between motivation and CLIL and some authors even pointed out the importance of future research focusing on that area in particular. The existence of that relationship is of great importance given that students' motivation gives life to a class, it is the essence of language teaching, as mentioned by Gilankjani et al. (2012). Another reason that evidences the importance of that relationship is mentioned by Khalid (2016) about the socio-psychological model by Gardner and Lambert (1972). Khalid (2016) points out that student aptitude to learn a language is not everything since motivational factors involved can override the effectiveness of aptitudes, for that reason they should not be put aside. Some of the most relevant recommendations for further research are about the applicability of the method itself considering the background of the students.

Moreover, there is a need for more longitudinal research performed in long periods of time to observe the development of motivation in the same students over the years. In addition to that, research focused on the preparation of CLIL instructors is needed, in order to understand the difficulties of the method from their point of view for future improvement, given that language teachers as well as content experts are necessary for the method since it is focused on content and language learning as mentioned by Gergiou (2012). Related to that, it is also recommended that future research focuses on



the compatibility between certain academic subjects and CLIL, given that not all subjects are appropriate to be successfully taught through a foreign language.

On a final note, perhaps one of the most relevant recommendations because of local context is the need to conduct more studies in Latin America and if possible, to get more researchers interested in studying the topic in the Ecuadorian territory. In this local context, future instructors ought to consider teaching students to think critically using the CLIL approach. That type of instruction is an incredible tool that could be applied in the classroom to discuss important matters such as poverty, racism, homophobia, and sexism. Students would learn the target language and also be critically aware of what goes on around the world. Moreover, they will be able to use English as an intercultural tool as citizens of the world to advocate for what they stand for and firmly believe in.



## References

- Abukhattala, I. (2013). Krashen's 5 Proposals on Language Learning: Are They Valid in Libyan EFL Classes. *English Language Teaching*. 6(1).
- Alejo, R & Piquer-Píriz, A. (2016). Urban vs. Rural CLIL: an analysis of input-related variables, motivation and language attainment. *Language, Culture & Curriculum*. 29(3), 245-262
- Anjomshoa, L & Sadighi, F. (2015). The Importance of Motivation in Second Language Acquisition. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*. 3(2), 126-137.
- Arribas, M. (2016). Analysing a whole CLIL school: Students' attitudes, motivation, and receptive vocabulary outcomes. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 9(2), 267–292.
- Borba, M. (1989). *Esteem Builders: A K-8 Self-esteem Curriculum for Improving Student Achievement, Behavior, and School Climate*. Fawnskin, CA: Jalmar Press Inc.
- Borba, M. (1994). *Home Esteem Builders: Activities Designed to Strengthen the Partnership between Home and School*. Fawnskin, CA: Jalmar Press Inc.
- Burns, R. B. (1979). *The self-concept: In theory, measurement, development and behaviour*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Burns, R. B. (1982). *Self-concept development and education*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.



- Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language Learners' Motivational Profiles and Their Motivated Learning Behavior. *Language Learning*, 55(4), 613–659.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. & Smit, U. (2013). 'Thinking allowed: Content and language integrated learning: a research agenda,' *Language Teaching* 46(4), 545–49.
- Darn, S. (2006). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): A European Overview. Online Submission.
- Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. (1985) Cognitive Evaluation Theory. In: Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior. *Perspectives in Social Psychology*. Springer, Boston, MA.
- Doiz, A; Lasagabaster, D & Sierra, J. (2014). CLIL and motivation: the effect of individual and contextual variables. *The Language Learning Journal*. 42(2), 209-224.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Fernández, A. (2014). Receptive vocabulary knowledge and motivation in CLIL and EFL. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*. 9(1), 23-32.
- Fernández, A & Canga, A. (2014). A preliminary study on motivation and gender in CLIL and non- CLIL types of instruction. *International Journal of English Studies*. 14(1), 21-36.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.



- Gergiou, S. (2012). Reviewing the puzzle of CLIL. *ELT Journal*, 6(4), 495-504.
- Gilakjani, A; Leong, L & Sabouri, N. (2012). A Study on the Role of Motivation in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. *I.J. Modern Education and Computer Science*, 7, 9-16
- Guerrero, M. (2015). Motivation in Second Language Learning: A Historical Overview and Its Relevance in a Public High School in Pasto, Colombia. *HOW*, 22(1), 95–106.
- Heras, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2014). The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(1), 70–88.
- Hui, G., & Lin, C. (2008). Pedagogies Proving Krashen’s Theory of Affective Filter. *Hwa Kang Journal of English Language & Literature*, 14, 113–131.
- Hunt, M. (2011). Learners’ perceptions of their experiences of learning subject content through a foreign language. *Educational Review*, 63(3), 365-378.
- Khalid, A. (2016). A Study of the Attitudes and Motivational Orientations of Pakistani Learners Toward the Learning of English as a Second Language. *SAGE Open*, 6(3), 1-19.
- Koike, A. (2014). A Case Study of CLIL Practices in the EFL Classroom. *Toyo University: Institute of Human Sciences Bulletin*, 16(1), 147-156.
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Prentice Hall.
- Krettenauer, T., & Curren, R. (2020). Self-determination theory, morality, and education: introduction to special issue. *Journal of Moral Education*, 49(3), 275–281.



- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3–18.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Integrating content and foreign language learning. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 5(1), 4–29.
- Lasagabaster, D & Doiz, A. (2015). A Longitudinal Study on the Impact of CLIL on Affective Factors. *Applied Linguistics*. 38(5), 1-26.
- Lasagabaster, D & López, R. (2015). The Impact of Type of Approach (CLIL Versus EFL) and Methodology (Book-Bases Versus Project Work) on Motivation. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*. 23, 41-57.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41(9), 954–969.
- Marsh, D., & Frigols M. J. (2012). Content and Language Integrated Learning. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
- Martínez, J. de D. (2020). To what extent do affective variables correlate with content learning achievement in CLIL programmes? *Language and Education*, 1–15.
- Masciantonio, R. (1988). Stephen Krashen and the Classical Languages. *The Classical Journal*, 84(1), 53–56.
- Mearns, T., de Graaff, R., & Coyle, D. (2017). 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.



- Navarro, M & García, 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.
- Otwinowska, A. (2013) CLIL lessons in the upper-primary: the interplay of affective factors and CALP. In: D Gabryś-Barker and J. Bielska, (eds.) *The Affective Dimension in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 211-225). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pérez, M. L. (2016). Are teachers ready for CLIL? Evidence from a European study. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 202–221.
- 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.
- Seikkula-Leino, J. (2007). CLIL Learning: Achievement Levels and Affective Factors. *Language and Education*, 21(4), 328–341.
- Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. (1976). Self-Concept: Validation of Construct Interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46(3), 407–441.
- Sylvén, L. K., & Thompson, A. S. (2015). Language learning motivation and CLIL. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3(1), 28–50.
- Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful Sampling in Qualitative Research Synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 11(2), 63–75.