

A Comparison of Pupils' Motivation in Integrated English and Conventional ELT in China^{1*}

Dr. Jianfang Xiao¹ and Mingyu Li^{2*}

¹School of English Education, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China.

²Correspondence author, Graduate student, School of English Education, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China.

(^{1*}The writing of this paper is financially supported by the project 'Characteristic Construction of Bilingual Courses Based on Key Competence in Foreign Language School Affiliated to Guangdong University of Foreign Studies' (JCJYB2018006), approved by Fundamental Education Research Center, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies.)

*Corresponding author email id: xiao3296888@163.com

Date of publication (dd/mm/yyyy): 08/10/2019

Abstract – This article investigated and compared the influence of different types of instruction (Integrated English as a localized content and language integrated learning model and conventional ELT) on pupils' motivation for EFL learning. Although participants' perspective in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has recently received increasing attention, little research has explored learners' perceptions, especially CLIL learners' motivation. And given that there are contradictions between the findings of existing relevant studies, the purpose of this paper is to enrich the evidence of the impact of the type of English teaching on primary school pupils' motivation for EFL learning. 300 pupils from four mixed-gender primary schools in China were invited to complete the LLOS-IEA scale. The findings revealed that CLIL pupils are more intrinsically motivated to learn English than conventional ELT pupils while the extrinsic motivation of conventional ELT pupils is equally high with that of CLIL pupils.

Keywords – Content and Language Integrated Learning, Conventional ELT, Integrated English, Motivation, LLOS-IEA.

I. INTRODUCTION

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL), originated from European institutions in 1990s and supported by the European Commission declarations (1995, 2003, 2008) for development of multilingualism. The concept was initiated by David Marsh in 1994 and explained as follows: "CLIL refers to situations where subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with dual-focused aims, namely the learning of content and the simultaneous learning of a foreign language" and a CLIL activity can be "any activity in which foreign language is used as a tool in the learning of a non-language subject in which both language and subject have a joint role" (Marsh, 2002:58). And in the process of its theoretical development and implementation, its essence of additional language as medium of instruction and dual-focus of learning and teaching both content and language has been undoubtedly acknowledged among scholars (Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols, 2008; Coyle, 2007; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010). Also, as English has been a world language, it is widely chosen as the instruction language in many CLIL programs. For the similar situations and purposes in foreign language teaching, CLIL has been borrowed and adapted from Europe to the whole world by many bilingual language teaching programs especially in non-English speaking countries (e.g. Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008; Suksawas and Wannaprapha, 2016; Xiong & Feng, 2018) and has been put into practice from primary education through vocational education to tertiary education (e.g. Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010; Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra, 2013; Knapp and Aguado, 2015; Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore, 2010; Pladevall-Ballester and Vallbona, 2016). Different CLIL models generated in this process could be seen as a continuum in which language-content integration varies (Banegas, 2011), being adjusted in various specific contexts. For example, Integrated English (IE) program in

Guangdong province, China, integrates English learning with subject learning and it is a new development model of European CLIL in China (Xiao, 2016).

And the positive effect of CLIL on foreign language competence has been endorsed by many researchers with their sufficient studies, including speaking (e.g. Admiraal, Westhoff, and de Bot, 2006; Lasagabaster, 2008, 2011; Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore, 2010; San Isidro, 2010; Wiesemes, 2009) and reading comprehension (e.g. Admiraal, Westhoff, and de Bot, 2006; Hellekjær, 2008; Lasagabaster, 2008; Loranc-Paszylk, 2009), as well as writing ability (e.g. Lasagabaster, 2008; Järvinen, 2010; Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore, 2010; Naves, 2011), although it still remains unclear in terms of listening because whereas some studies reveal better results on the part of CLIL students (Lasagabaster, 2008, 2011; Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore, 2010; San Isidro, 2010; Serra, 2007), other studies have found no significant differences (Naves, 2011; Roquet, 2011). Recently, research on CLIL has moved away from the interest in its effects on learners' foreign language competence to a multidimensional interpretation and understanding of it. Therefore, a focus on participants becomes one of the three key foci together with curriculum and pedagogy planning, and classroom practices (Nikula et al. 2016). Most studies which have investigated participants' perspectives in CLIL have focused on teachers' perceptions, especially CLIL teacher identity (e.g.; Dafouz, Huttner, and Smit, 2016; Skinnari and Bovellan, 2016). In contrast, far less research on learners' perceptions is conducted, like CLIL learners' attitudes or/and motivation towards foreign language learning. Since motivation has been widely regarded by researchers and teachers as one of the most significant factors that influence learners' rate and success of second/foreign language (L2) learning and "being motivated or not can present a quite different picture in people's willingness and success of learning other languages later in life, although it is not an issue when infants acquire their mother tongues" (Ushioda, 2013:5), research on CLIL learner's motivation is an undoubted must. However, regret to say, it is still at its very beginning with a few studies done and inconsistent results.

Some research on motivation in the context of CLIL has shown it to be beneficial in promoting learners' motivation while some reach totally contradictory results. Lasagabaster (2011) found CLIL students to be more motivated than EFL students with regards to the degree of interest, instrumental motivation, attitudes towards learning English at school and effort made in a cross-sectional study at secondary level carried out in the Basque Country. Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra (2014) later on attested the former study that the students in the CLIL groups were more motivated than the non-CLIL students, revealing the importance of the teaching approach. What's more, Lasagabaster and Beloqui (2015) analyzed the differential effects of CLIL and EFL on different types of L2 motivation at primary level, and consistently found that CLIL had a positive effect on students' intrinsic motivation. However, another study conducted by Lasagabaster and Heras (2015) on the effect of CLIL and ELT on motivation and self-esteem of 4th year students in Navarre, Spain reached a puzzling result of no significant differences between the CLIL and FEL groups in terms of the affective factors. Furtherly Lasagabaster with Doiz (2017) again conducted a research considering motivation in CLIL and EFL settings from a longitudinal perspective and the outcome showed that CLIL students' motivation eventually converged with those of the EFL students after CLIL losing its novelty and becoming "normal practice", and that both groups were in fact equally highly instrumentally motivated because of students' widespread awareness of the important role of English in their future careers, independent of the approach (CLIL versus non-CLIL). Lasagabaster should be an expert on CLIL and pioneer in studying learners' motivation in CLIL context, but the effect of CLIL on learners' motivation in his research remains confusing, let alone that some completely contradictory results have also been reported (S

-eikkula-Leino, 2007; Apsel, 2012; Fontecha and Alonso, 2014; Otwinowska and Forsy, 2017; Sylven, 2017).

Thus, obviously the effect of CLIL on learner's motivation has been ill-defined and further studies are still urgently needed.

This paper as one of the achievement reports of the teaching and learning conducted in Integrated English (IE) program, a CLIL model in Chinese EFL teaching and learning context, is to enrich the evidence of the influence of the type of instruction (CLIL versus conventional ELT) on primary school pupils' motivation for EFL learning according to the research conducted by the author based on the IE program, by answering the following research questions: (1) Are the CLIL students more motivated to learn English than the conventional ELT students? (2) What are the differences (if existed) of students' motivational types between the CLIL students and the conventional ELT students? The author also hopes this paper can offer the readers a clearer understanding about CLIL in China and can offer CLIL bilingual teachers some reference in their teaching practice.

II. INTEGRATED ENGLISH: AN 19-YEAR PRACTICE OF CLIL MODEL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING IN CHINA

Asia has the largest number of EFL learners in the world, where in most cases English is the additional language. And it is indeed as Lasagabaster & Sierra (2010) has pointed out that the sustainability of bilingual education in this region may shed light on the development of this potentially 'very effective' ELT approach in EFL context. Mainland China is among many places, in which the development of bilingual or multiple language proficiency is regarded as favorable and desirable by policy makers, educators and parents. Bilingual education varies in Mainland China. There are different models, one of which is IE.

The full title of IE program is International Collaboration for Integrated English Program. It is an international program conducted collaboratively by educators of mainland China, the United States, Finland and Hong Kong. The founders of this program at the very beginning piloted this bilingual language teaching experiment in 6 kindergartens by importing the complete model of Canadian immersion bilingual education but the results later proved it to be a failure. Thus, those educators investigated around the world and finally targeted their example of CLIL originated from Europe but widely adopted in many non-English speaking countries where the circumstance of EFL education share many similarities with that in mainland China. Holding the educational idea that the development of children's language competence should start at a very early age, IE program is conducted mainly in elementary schools and some kindergartens.

Since IE program started in 2000, it has been going through 19 years. Over the past 19 years, more than 100 experimental schools (including kindergartens) in different provinces of China have adopted the IE approach, most of which have been awarded "reputable schools" (or kindergartens) with characteristics of bilingual teaching by the provincial or local educational bureaus. Many teachers in these schools (or kindergartens) became experienced and won prizes in teaching competitions run by educational bureaus, and thousands of pupils in IE experimental schools have evidently improved their English proficiency, cross cultural awareness, thinking ability and English learning competence. IE Symposium and IE teacher training are held every year in different cities around China. Classroom observation and deep discussion are carried out in each experimental school twice or three times a semester. A set of referential textbooks was published and put into use.

Also, on account of its 19 - year practice, IE program established its own series of educational ideas based on

CLIL. IE stresses taking English as a communication tool, and integrating the target language with content and culture. As a typical language-driven program, IE advocates teaching contents in English to enrich or reinforce instruction in the learner's native language, but not substituting for it. In fact, the responsibility for content learning also lies with other content subject teachers. English teachers may, but unnecessarily, consult with colleagues in other disciplines to determine which, when and how content will be integrated with language. Topics and tasks for language practice may be drawn from many disciplines in a single lesson or unit. English classes in IE program is not only linguistic classes but more of encyclopedic classes in which all kinds of knowledge of are taught, including knowledge of language, math, geography, history, literary, civic virtues, music, art, science, society, culture, etc. guided by three rationales: the rationale of children's development of cognition, the logic of children's development of language competence, and the principle of foreign language teaching, IE program follows seven teaching principles: the principle of theme and activity-based learning, the principle of listening and speaking first, supplemented by reading and writing, the principle of operant reinforcement, the principle of direct learning and spontaneous acquisition, the principle of interest orientation and active participation, the principle of focusing on practical use of English and the principle of quick pace and high intensity in classroom teaching (Yuan, 2005).

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The participants of this study were 300 primary school pupils of grade three and five ranged in age from 8 to 11. They were randomly selected from four mixed-gender schools located in Guangzhou city, Guangdong province in China with similar source of students so that the participants had similar sociocultural and economic background. Two of those schools were IE program experimental schools where students received CLIL model language instruction and the other two were normal schools whose students received conventional EFL teaching. The participants were divided into two groups according to the kind of instruction they received at school. The CLIL group was formed by 150 learners (75 girls and 75 boys) from the two IE program experimental schools, whereas the non-CLIL group involved 150 learners (75 girls and 75 boys) from the Foreign Language School Affiliated to Guangdong University of Foreign Studies and another conventional ELT school in Tianhe district in Guangzhou City.

B. Instruments and Procedures

This study adopted a method of quantitative analysis whereafter a large-scale cross-sectional survey was conducted to measure students' EFL motivation, thus a reliable questionnaire was used. In this study, a questionnaire based on the Language Learning Orientations Scale-Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation and Amotivation Subscales (LLOS-IEA) (Noels, Pelletier, Clement and Vallerand, 2000) was employed as the instrument. The LLOS-IEA scale (see Appendix 1) contains three sub-scales designed to assess Amotivation, the three levels of Extrinsic Motivation including External, Introjected, and Identified regulation and three categories of Intrinsic Motivation, including Knowledge, Mastery, and Stimulation, following the framework of Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory. Seven of each category has three items. The items used in this scale are partly adapted from the Academic Motivation Scale produced by Vallerand et al. (1992, 1993), and partly generated and repeatedly selected with exploratory factor analysis on SPSS. And according to the results of exploratory factor analyses in Noels, Pelletier, Clément and Vallerand's (2000) study, the scale consisted of seven

factors in accord with self-determination framework, accounting for 67.2% of the variance ($\chi^2 = 75.16$; $df = 84$; $p = .74$) and the Cronbach alpha index of internal consistency was acceptable for all subscales, varying between .67 and .88. This scale has been widely used in research on second/foreign language motivation (e.g. Ardasheva, Tong & Tretter, 2012; Gomari & Lucas, 2013; Park, 2015; Chu, 2008; Ngo, Spooner-Lane, & Mergler, 2017; Khalilzadeh & Khodi, 2018). To have the scale match the cognition of primary students and the learning context of Chinese primary students, the author adapted some words and translated it into Chinese.

The questionnaire (see Appendix 2) used in this study based on the LLOS-IEA scale, consisted of two sections. The first section dealt with personal information such as gender, age, and grade (items 1–3). The second section (items 4–23) representing the main body of the questionnaire focused on the three scales of amotivation, extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation. The items were followed by a traditional four-point Likert scale taking the neutral choice out and ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree and were randomly ordered throughout the second section. Considering getting accurate understanding, the questionnaire was in Chinese, translated by a senior English-Chinese translator.

The students were asked to rate how much they agree on the items. A high score suggests a high degree of correspondence between the proposed reason and the students’ reason for studying English. The questionnaires were filled out at the end of the semester. The statistical analysis of the questionnaire was carried out by means of the SPSS (IBM SPSS Statistics 24).

III. FINDINGS

In order to explore the research questions, the author optimistically held three research hypotheses that (1) the general motivation of CLIL group can be significantly superior to that of conventional ELT group, (2) the intrinsic motivation of CLIL group can be significantly higher than that of conventional ELT group, and (3) the extrinsic motivation of CLIL group may be equally high with that of conventional ELT group, and accordingly distinguished and compared three types of scores: (1) mean score in general motivation without defining types of motivation, (2) mean score in intrinsic motivation, and (3) mean score in extrinsic motivation.

To answer the first research question: Are the CLIL students more motivated to learn English than the conventional ELT students? The researcher verified the first hypothesis that the general motivation of CLIL group can be significantly superior to that of conventional ELT group by comparing mean scores of those two groups in general motivation without distinguishing types of motivation, and the findings of the independent samples t-test shows that this hypothesis is rejected since there is no statistically significant difference in the two group’s general level of motivation ($t = -1.689$, $p = .092 > .05$; see Table 4.2). That is to say that the conventional ELT group is as highly motivated as the CLIL group in general.

Table 4.1. Descriptive statistics: The General Motivation of CLIL & Conventional ELT.

	Type of instruction	N	Mean	S.D.	Std. Error Mean
General Motivation	non-CLIL	150	62.9600	7.97217	.65092
	CLIL	150	64.6000	8.82720	.72074

Table 4.2 Independent Samples *t*-test: The General Motivation of CLIL vs. Conventional ELT.

General Motivation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
	Equal variance assumed	2.157	.143	-1.689	298	.092	-1.640	.971
Equal variance not assumed			-1.689	294.959	.092	-1.640	.971	

And in order to answer the second research question: What are the differences (if existed) between CLIL and conventional ELT students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation levels? The researcher verified the hypotheses that (2) the intrinsic motivation of CLIL group can be significantly higher than that of conventional ELT group, and (3) the extrinsic motivation of CLIL group may be equally high with that of conventional ELT group by means of comparing the mean scores of those two groups in intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. The hypothesis that the intrinsic motivation of CLIL group can be significantly higher than that of conventional ELT group is evidenced by the *t*-test ($t = -3.226, p = .001 < .05, \eta^2 = .034$; see Table 4.4) which suggests that the CLIL type of instruction helps students to develop intrinsic motivation better than the conventional ELT instruction. And the result of independent samples *t*-test demonstrates that CLIL group has no statistically significant difference in terms of ELT group ($t = -1.437, p = .152 > .05$; see Table 4.4) which attests that the extrinsic motivation of CLIL students is equally high with that of conventional ELT students.

Table 4.3. Descriptive statistics: Intrinsic/Extrinsic motivation of CLIL & conventional ELT.

Type of motivation	Type of instruction	N	Mean	S.D.	Std. Error Mean
Intrinsic Motivation	non-CLIL	150	28.6267	4.26087	.34790
	CLIL	150	30.2733	4.57583	.37361
Extrinsic Motivation	Non-CLIL	150	28.8267	4.07439	.33267
	CLIL	150	29.5867	5.03836	.41138

Table 4.4. Independent Samples *t*-test: Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation of CLIL vs. Conventional ELT.

Type of Motivation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Intrinsic Motivation	Equal variance assumed	1.708	.192	-3.226	298	.001***	-1.647	.511
	Equal variance not assumed			-3.226	296.497	.001	-1.647	.511
Extrinsic Motivation	Equal variance assumed	7.834	.005	-1.437	298	.152	-.76000	.52906
	Equal variance not assumed			-1.437	285.502	.152	-.76000	.52906

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

As for the aspect of amotivation, the items of amotivation are reversed and the researcher has inverted them over so that the higher the scores in this aspect the more motivated are the students. And the *t*-test results shows

that the CLIL group's score in amotivation is statistically lower than the ELT's ($t = 3.281, p = .001 < .05, \eta^2 = .035$; see Table 4.6) which suggests that the CLIL students are more likely to see no relation between their learning and the consequences of their learning.

Table 4.5. Descriptive statistics: Amotivation of CLIL & conventional ELT.

Amotivation	Type of instruction	N	Mean	S.D.	Std. Error Mean
	non-CLIL	150	5.5067	2.02914	.16568
	CLIL	150	4.7400	2.01814	.16478

Table 4.6. Independent Samples t-test: Amotivation of CLIL vs. Conventional ELT.

Amotivation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	t	df
	Equal variance assumed	.245	.621	3.281	298	.001***	.76667	.23367
	Equal variance not assumed			3.281	297.991	.001	.76667	.23367

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

V. DISCUSSION

To sum up, the statistical analysis demonstrated that the CLIL group's intrinsic motivation is significantly higher than that of conventional ELT group while the extrinsic motivation of conventional ELT students is equally high with that of CLIL students; but the CLIL students are more likely to see no relation between their learning and the consequences of their learning; the levels of general motivation are equally high in both conventional ELT group and CLIL group.

The preliminary findings of the current study may indicate that the group of pupils experiencing CLIL instruction are significantly more intrinsically motivated. And it can further imply that CLIL students enjoy their learning activities more and are more willingly to explore ideas and develop knowledge, master tasks and achieve goals, driven by their inner pleasurable sensations. This finding is consistent with those in the studies of Lasagabaster (2011), Sierra (2011), and Doiz et al. (2014) and again reveals the pedagogical benefits of CLIL especially in such an EFL situation that learners have little contact with English and English culture outside the school and learners' language learning motivation is highly affected by "the environment in the class, the nature of the course and the curriculum, characteristics of the teacher and the very scholastic nature of the student" (Gardner 2010: 10). On the other hand, in IE program, English class does not substitute for any content subjects but functions as a complement and reinforcement of other content subjects. Therefore, the situation pointed out in Fontecha & Alonso' (2014) study is fortunately avoided, in which CLIL students receive much more instructional time and content in the foreign language than conventional ELT students thus the extra load involved with CLIL simply bores and demotivates very young learners.

Furthermore, the current study revealed that the extrinsic motivation of conventional ELT students is equally high with that of CLIL students as well. The high extrinsic motivation regardless of different instructional models (CLIL vs. Conventional ELT) can result from China's longing for foreign language talents, Chinese people's attitude towards foreign language and the status quo of Chinese basic education. In the Outline of the National Medium and Long-term Plan for Education Reform and Development (2010-2020) enacted by the Ministry of

Education of People's Republic of China (MEPRC), the government proposed that for the opening of national economy and society, sufficient talents who hold international views, master international rules and are competent to participate in international affairs and competitions must be cultivated (MEPRC, 2010). And the core of the cultivation of global competency must be bilingual or multilingually competent. Thus, although English is a foreign language in China, as a world language and bridge to the world, it is always one of the core subjects throughout the whole educational system in China. Besides national attention and social needs, Chinese parents have increasingly realized the importance of foreign language learning for their children's academic and future career achievements, especially in the context that examination-oriented education and testing have been the main characteristics of China's compulsory education since the National College Entrance Examination is the supreme target of China's basic education (Xiao, 2016).

The present study also showed that the CLIL students are more likely to see no relation between their learning and the consequences of their learning because they seem not know why they should learn English. This can be a new finding about CLIL instruction since similar results have not been seen in previous studies yet, as far as the author knows. But we may also find some possible reasons from previous studies besides those observed from IE program. Otwinowska & Forys (2017) found that a considerable portion of CLIL students' negative feelings are related to their sub-average English proficiency while linguistic problems can be a serious hindrance for content development, since language proficiency, academic achievement and overall success in CLIL learning are interdependent (Apsel 2012). Therefore, students who are perplexed by linguistic troubles may not able to keep up with teachers and their peers therefore feel not knowing what to do in class. This may support the decision of selecting students for CLIL instruction according to their English proficiency and allowing CLIL students to drop out from the CLIL program as some of the CLIL programs do. But on the other hand, this kind of amotivation can also pertain to the features of IE instruction. Following the principles of direct learning and spontaneous acquisition as well as quick pace and high intensity, IE classes are abounded with content-rich activities like storytelling, drama playing, dubbing even sports playing and handwork doing with teacher's guidance in English. The learning process under IE instruction happened naturally and subconsciously unlike those in conventional ELT instruction, which is paved with a steady flow of explicit linguistic knowledges such as lexical formation and grammar rules. So, students under conventional ELT instruction may have a clearer impression on what they have learnt in class. Another reason might be that students in IE programs are all primary school pupils, who are too young to have the insight to discover the cause and effect relation between the games they played in class and their increasing English language competency. But whether there are any other reasons or which one is the most dominant remains for further research.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the present study, the author has attempted to shed some light on motivational factors in two different instructional contexts: CLIL and conventional ELT in China. Two similar groups except for instructional method (CLIL VS. conventional ELT) of primary school pupils have been investigated on motivation of foreign language learning to explore the effect of CLIL on students' motivation compared with that of conventional ELT. And so far, the author has reached the preliminary conclusions that CLIL students are equally motivated with conventional ELT students and CLIL students are more intrinsically motivated than conventional ELT students while equally highly motivated by extrinsic factors. And CLIL students may be more likely to see no cause and effect relation

between their learning and the increasing competency. Several reasons have been pointed out to offer reasonable explanations for those findings. And the present study has verified the effectiveness of IE program on students' motivation not just from the theoretical perspective but also from empirical evidence. However, some limitations still exist and remain further studies are expected. First of all, the present study is just a cross-sectional survey of which the results may not be comprehensive enough thus a longitudinal study examining the preliminary findings from the present study will be required, as this could provide far more robust evidence to support those results. Secondly, the current study has only conducted a quantitative research thus some deeper understandings like the reasons why CLIL students have significantly higher feeling of amotivation are not accessible. Hence quantitative methods like interview and class conversations need to be taken into consideration in future studies.

APPENDIX I

Language Learning Orientations Scale - Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Amotivation Subscales (LLOS-IEA)

Amotivation

1. I cannot come to see why I study a second language.
2. Honestly, I don't know, I truly have the impression of wasting my time in studying a second language.
3. I don't know; I can't come to understand what I am doing in studying a second language.

External Regulation

1. Because I have the impression that it is expected of me.
2. In order to get a more prestigious job later on.
3. In order to have a better salary later on.

Introjected Regulation

1. To show myself that I am a good citizen because I can speak a second language.
2. Because I would feel ashamed if I couldn't speak to my friends from the second language community in their native tongue.
3. Because I would feel guilty if I didn't know a second language.

Identified Regulation

1. Because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak more than one language.
2. Because I think it is good for my personal development.
3. Because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak a second language.

Intrinsic Motivation-Knowledge

1. For the pleasure that I experience in knowing more about the literature of the second language group.
2. For the satisfied feeling I get in finding out new things.

3. Because I enjoy the feeling of acquiring knowledge about the second language community and their way of life.

Intrinsic Motivation-Accomplishment

1. For the pleasure I experience when surpassing myself in my second language studies.
2. For the enjoyment I experience when I grasp a difficult construct in the second language.
3. For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult exercises in the second language.

Intrinsic Motivation-Stimulation

1. For the “high” I feel when hearing foreign languages spoken.
2. For the “high” feeling that I experience while speaking in the second language.
3. For the pleasure I get from hearing the second language spoken by native second language speakers.

APPENDIX II

Questionnaire: Why Do You Learn English?

Dear kids: I am the messenger of Santa Claus. Santa Claus asked me to find out the reason why you learn English. As long as you help me to complete this task, you can receive presents from Santa Claus since Christmas is around the corner. Could you please help me? If yes, just tick out your real information and true thoughts.

1. Which school are you from?

_____ (filling-out)

2. Which grade are you in?

- The third grade.
- The fifth grade.

3. Are you a girl or a boy?

- Boy
- Girl

Why do you Learn English?

4. I learn English because my teacher/parents/others expect me to do so.
5. I learn English well to prove that I am able to be an excellent student.
6. I learn English because I hope that I can speak more than one language.
7. I cannot come to see why I study a second language, and frankly, I don't care.
8. I learn English because I like reading English literary stories.
9. I learn English because I like the feeling of surpassing myself in English study.
10. I learn English because it sounds cool.

11. Honestly, I don't know, and I feel learning English is a waste of time.
12. I learn English well because it's a must to enter a key middle school.
13. I learn English because I would feel embarrassed if I couldn't communicate with international friends when coming across them.
14. I learn English because it can make me more outstanding.
15. I learn English because I feel satisfied in finding out new things.
16. I learn English because I like the feeling of satisfaction when I grasp a difficult construct in English.
17. I learn English because I like the feeling of speaking English.
18. I don't know; I can't come to understand what I am doing studying English.
19. I learn English for a better grade in middle school entrance exam.
20. I learn English because I would feel ashamed if I cannot speak any foreign language.
21. I learn English because I hope to be a foreign language speaker.
22. I learn English because I want to know about English speaking countries and their life styles.
23. I learn English because I enjoy the process of accomplishing difficult exercises in English.
24. I learn English because of the pleasure I get from hearing English spoken by native speakers.

REFERENCES

- [1] Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G. & de Bot, K. 2006. "Evaluation of Bilingual Secondary Education in the Netherlands: Students' Language Proficiency in English". *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12 (1): 75–93.
- [2] Apsel, C. 2012. "Coping with CLIL: Dropouts from CLIL Streams in Germany". *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1 (4): p.47–56.
- [3] Ardasheva, Y. Tong, S.S. & Tretter, T. R. 2012. "Validating the English Language Learner Motivation Scale (ELLMS): Pre-college to measure language learning motivational orientations among young ELLs". *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(4): 473–483.
- [4] Banegas, L. D. 2011. "A Review of 'CLIL: content and language integrated learning'". *Language and Education*, 25(2): 182–185.
- [5] Chu, H. N. R. 2008. "Shyness and EFL Learning in Taiwan: A Study of Shy and Non-shy College Students' use of Strategies, Foreign Language Anxiety, Motivation, and Willingness to Communicate". Ph.D. Thesis. Austin: The University of Texas.
- [6] Coyle, D. 2007. "Content and Language Integrated Learning: Towards a Connected Research Agenda for CLIL Pedagogies". *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10 (5): 543–562.
- [7] Coyle, D., Hood, P. and Marsh, D. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Dafouz, E., Huttner, J. & Smit, U. 2016. "University Teachers' Beliefs of Language and Content Integration in English Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings". In *Conceptualizing Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*, edited by Nikula, T. Dafouz, E. Moore, P. and Smit, U. 123–144. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [9] Dalton-Puffer, C. 2011. "Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles?". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31: 182–204.
- [10] Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, New York: Plenum Publishing Co.
- [11] Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J. M. 2014. "CLIL and Motivation: The Effect of Individual and Contextual Variables". *The Language Learning Journal*, 42 (2): 209–224.
- [12] Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. and Sierra, J. M. (eds.) 2013. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [13] European Commission. 1995. "White Paper on Education and Training". *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society*. http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf.
- [14] European Commission. 2003. *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004–2006*: 1–29. http://ec.europa.eu/education/doc/official/keydoc/actlang/act_lang_en.pdf.
- [15] European Commission. 2008. *Multilingualism: An Asset for Europe and a Shared Commitment*. *Communication of the European Commission*: 1–15. http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/pdf/com/2008_0566_en.pdf.
- [16] Fontecha, A. and Alonso, 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.
- [17] Gomar, H. and Lucas, R. I. 2013. "Foreign Language Learning Motivation and Anxiety among Iranian Students in the Philippines". *Philippine ESL Journal*, 10: 148–178.
- [18] Hellekjær, G. 2008. "A Case for Improved Reading Instruction for Academic English Reading Proficiency". *Acta Didactica Norge* 2 (1): art. 3.
- [19] Heras, A. and Lasagabaster, D. 2015. "The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning". *Language Teaching Research*, 19(1): 70–88.
- [20] Järvinen, H. 2010. "Language as a Meaning Making Resource in Learning and Teaching Content". In *Language use and Language*

- Learning in CLIL Classrooms*, edited by Dalton Puffer, C., Nikula, T. and Smit, U. 145–168. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [21] Khalilzadeh, S. and Khodi, A. 2018. “Teachers’ personality traits and students’ motivation: A structural equation modeling analysis”. *Current Psychology*. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-0064-8>
- [22] Knapp, A., and K. Aguado. 2015. *Fremdsprachen in Studium und Lehre: Chancen und Herausforderungen für den Wissenserwerb / Foreign Languages in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges for the Acquisition of Knowledge*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- [23] Lasagabaster, D. and Doiz, A. 2017. “A Longitudinal Study on the Impact of CLIL on Affective Factors”. *Applied Linguistics*, 38 (5): 688–712.
- [24] Lasagabaster, D. and Beloqui, R. L. 2015. “The Impact of Type of Approach (CLIL Versus ELT) and Methodology (Book Based Versus Project Work) on Motivation”. *Porta Linguarum (language gateway)*, 23: 41–57.
- [25] Lasagabaster, D. 2008. “Foreign Language Competence in Content and Language Integrated Courses”. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 1: 30–41.
- [26] Lasagabaster, D. 2011. “English Achievement and Student Motivation in CLIL and ELT Settings”. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5: 3–18.
- [27] Loranc-Paszylk, B. 2009. “Integrating Reading and Writing into the Context of CLIL Classroom: Some Practical Solutions”. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1 (2): 47–53.
- [28] Lorenzo, S. Casal, S. and Moore, P. 2010. “The Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning in European Education: Key Findings from the Andalusian Bilingual Sections Evaluation Project”. *Applied Linguistics* 31 (3): 418–442.
- [29] Marsh, D. 2002. “The relevance and potential of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) for achieving MT+2 in Europe”. *European language Council Report*.
- [30] Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. and Frigols, M. J. 2008. *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford, UK: Macmillan.
- [31] Ministry of Education of People’s Republic of China. 2010. *Outline of the National Medium - and Long-term Plan for Education Reform and Development (2010-2020)*, http://old.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/info_list/201407/xxgk_17104.html.
- [32] Navés, T. 2011. “How Promising are the Results of Integrating Content and Language for ELT Writing and Overall ELT Proficiency?” In *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts*, edited by Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., Sierra, J. M. and Gallardo del Puerto, F. 155–186. Bern: Peter Lang.
- [33] Ngo, H., Spooner-Lane, R. and Mergler, A. 2017. “A Comparison of Motivation to Learn English between English Major and Non-English Major Students in a Vietnamese University”. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(2): 188-202.
- [34] Nikula, T., Dafouz, E. Moore, P., and Smit, U. (eds.). 2016. *Conceptualizing Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [35] Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L.G., Clément, R. and Vallerand, R. J. 2003. “Why are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory”. *Language Learning*, 53(S1): 33–64.
- [36] Otwinowska, A., and Forýš, M. 2017. “They Learn the CLIL Way, but do They Like it? Affectivity and Cognition in Upper Primary CLIL Classes”. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20: 457–480.
- [37] Park, J. 2015. “Insights into Korean EFL Students’ Reading Motivation, Proficiency, and Strategy Use”. *English Teaching*, 70(1): 57-74.
- [38] Pladevall-Ballester, E and Vallbona, A. 2016. “CLIL in minimal input contexts: A longitudinal study of primary school learners’ receptive skills”. *System*, 58: 37-48.
- [39] Roquet, H. 2011. “A Study of the Acquisition of English as a Foreign Language: Integrating Content and Language in Mainstream Education in Barcelona”. PhD thesis. Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Pompeu Fabra University), Barcelona.
- [40] Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. 2008. “CLIL and Foreign Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study in the Basque Country”. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1): 60-73.
- [41] San Isidro, X. 2010. “An Insight into Galician CLIL: Provision and Results”. In *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*, edited by Lasagabaster, D. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. 55–78. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- [42] Seikkula-Leino, J. 2007. “CLIL Learning: Achievement Levels and Affective Factors”. *Language and Education*, 21 (4): 328–341.
- [43] Skinnari, K., and Bovellan, E. 2016. “CLIL Teachers’ Beliefs about Integration and about their Professional Roles: Perspectives from a European Context”. In *Conceptualising Integration in CLIL and Multilingual Education*, edited by Nikula, T. Dafouz, E. Moore, P. and Smit, U. 145–169. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [44] Suksawas and Wannaprapha. 2016. “Investigating Language use in a Content and Language Integrated Learning Classroom: A Case Study of ELT Students in Thailand”. *Advanced Science Letters*, 22(12): 4095-4098.
- [45] Sylven, L. K. 2017. “Motivation, Second Language Learning and CLIL”. In *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL*, edited by Linares, A. and Morton, T. 51–66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [46] Ushioda, E. 2013. “Motivation and ELT: Global Issues and Local Concerns”. In: Ushioda, E. (eds) *International Perspectives on Motivation. International Perspectives on English Language Teaching*. 1-18. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- [47] Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senecal, C., and Vallières, E. F. 1992. “The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education”. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52: 1003–1017.
- [48] Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Briere, N. M., Senecal, C., and Vallières, E. F. 1993. “On the assessment of intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation in education: Evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the Academic Motivation Scale”. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53: 159–172.
- [49] Wiesemes, R. 2009. “Developing Theories of Practices in CLIL: CLIL as Post-Method Pedagogies?” In *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, edited by Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. and Jiménez Catalan, R. M. 41–59. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [50] Xiao, J. F. 2016. “Integrated English in China – An Effective CLIL Model of Foreign Languages and Cultures Learning”. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, 3(4): 234-242.
- [51] Xiong, T. and Feng, A. W. 2018. “Localizing immersion education: A case study of an international bilingual education program in south China”. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1435626>
- [52] Yuan, C. Y. 2005. *Teaching Methods of Integrated English*. Guangzhou: Sun Yat Sen University Press.

AUTHOR’S PROFILE



Dr. Jianfang Xiao is a Professor in the School of English Education in Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China. She has BA in English Language and Literature, M. Ed & Ph.D. in Education. She teaches English Language Pedagogy to both undergraduates and postgraduate students. She has published more than 55 articles in many recognized journals and eighteen monographs and textbooks. Her current research interests are world language education and bilingual education.