Motivational Potential of Bilingual and Non-bilingual Programmes in Secondary and Tertiary Education

Daniel Madrid
ORCID: 0000-0002-2198-7647
University of Granada

ABSTRACT: The aim of this research is to examine the overall degree of motivation among secondary school students and university students earning a bachelor's degree in primary education in bilingual and non-bilingual programmes, and the motivational potential of ten dimensions, broken down into 60 variables, which interact in these programmes. To this end, a sample of 485 secondary school students (310 in bilingual programmes and 175 in non-bilingual programmes) and 332 bachelor's degree students in primary education (160 in the bilingual degree programme and 172 in the non-bilingual programme) participated in the study. The findings indicate that secondary school students in non-bilingual programmes are overall more highly motivated than those in bilingual programmes, assigning a higher score than bilinguals to 21 out the 60 variables examined. While there are no significant differences in terms of overall motivation between the two groups compared in teaching degree programmes, EMI (English as a Medium of Instruction) students assigned a higher motivational value than non-EMI students to 32 variables. Finally, the study presents the resulting motivational potential of the 60 variables included in the ten dimensions analysed.
Key words: motivation, bilingual education, bilingual bachelor's degree, AICLE, CLIL, EMI programmes.

Potencial motivador de los programas bilingües y no bilingües en educación secundaria y universitaria.

RESUMEN: En este trabajo se ha investigado el grado de motivación global del alumnado de secundaria y de los estudiantes del Grado de Educación Primaria que cursan programas bilingües y no bilingües y el potencial motivador de diez dimensiones desglosadas en 60 variables que interaccionan en dichos programas. Para ello, se ha utilizado una muestra de 485 alumnos de secundaria (310 de programas bilingües y 175 de programas no bilingües) y de 332 alumnos del Grado de Educación Primaria (160 del grupo bilingüe y 172 del grado no bilingüe). Los resultados nos muestran que el alumnado de secundaria de programas no bilingües siente una motivación global más alta que el de programas bilingües y le asigna una puntuación más alta que los bilingües a 21 de las 60 variables estudiadas. En el Grado de Magisterio, aunque no existen diferencias significativas entre los dos colectivos comparados respecto a su motivación global, los estudiantes EMI (de Inglés como medio de instrucción) asignan un potencial motivador más alto que los demás a 32 variables. Por otra parte, el estudio da a conocer el potencial motivador de las 60 variables que integran las diez dimensiones estudiadas.
Palabras clave: motivación, educación bilingüe, grado bilingüe, AICLE , CLIL, programas EMI.

1. Introduction

It is complex and difficult to observe and define what motivates subjects in educational settings since this is internal to each individual, despite the reciprocity with the environment. Moreover, it is a condition that fluctuates in intensity, and for this reason the term "degrees of motivation" is often used.

In the past, research on motivation has been linked to internal processes: needs, interests and goals. The *choice* of a certain action in a series of possibilities is one indicator of motivation, and *consistency* in the performance of certain activities is another example of conduct that reflects the degree of motivation. Even changes in academic performance have often been attributed to differing degrees of motivation and to their influence on the degree of persistence, effort and dedication put forth by students in educational settings (Lasagabaster, 2011; Coyle, 2014; Navarro and García Jiménez, 2018).

Although they are gaining momentum at all educational levels, from primary school to university, the implementation of bilingual programmes in educational settings is still new and short on experience, which makes it essential to study the degree of motivation among the students participating in them. Thus, it will be possible to detect the potential strengths and the weaknesses of these programmes, and to gradually improve their quality, which is sometimes bitterly criticized in certain sectors (Marías, 2015; de Prada, 2015; Bruton, 2013).

While there are numerous methodological options when it comes to examining student motivation, this study focuses on the perceptions of participants in secondary education and teaching degrees, given that their beliefs reflect their inner world and their imagined identity, influencing the kind of motivation they feel and their motivational states (Lorenzo Bergillos, 1997; Navarro Biescas, 1998; Madrid, 1999; Uribe, 2000; Madrid & Pérez Cañado, 2001; Madrid, 2002; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009).

With this methodological approach, the main objective of this research was to examine the motivational potential of bilingual education programmes (content and language integrated learning (CLIL) and English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) programmes) and non-bilingual programmes (EFL programmes) as well as the overall degree of motivation among secondary school and teaching degree students. To this end, the research was based on the students' perceptions of how variables in family and educational settings, the personal features of teachers and students, and the teaching and learning processes exerted influence on their motivational states.

2. Theoretical framework and review of the literature on motivation

Motivation can be understood as an internal state in individuals which is influenced by certain needs or beliefs that generate favourable attitudes and interests towards a goal, and a desire that moves them to achieve it through dedication and continued effort because they enjoy it and feel satisfied when they achieve positive results (Madrid and Pérez Cañado, 2001; Madrid, 2002).

2.1. Review of the concept of motivation and its influence on learning

Diverse theories have attempted to define motivation and explain it from different perspectives over the years. In *psychoanalysis* (Freud, 1915), drives and instinctive needs play a fundamental role in subjects' behaviour and motivation, in addition to *hedonism*, or the inclination to search for pleasure and happiness.

The *drive theory* (Hull, 1951) explains individuals' behaviour through stimuli and incentives that create *habits*. Subjects can be motivated by encouraging the behaviours prompted by these incentives or stimuli.

In the *achievement theory* (Atkinson, 1964), learners' expectations of success and their perceptions of their competence and self-efficacy for L2 learning influence their motivation, increasing or decreasing it depending on the success of their experiences during the teaching and learning process (Stipek, 1984; Atkinson, 1964; Nicholls, 1984; Ames and Ames, 1984 & 1985; Weiner, 1989).

For proponents of the *social learning theory* (Rotter, 1954), the first source of motivation is our thoughts and our inner world. In educational settings, the image that individual teachers create of their students and how they externalize this is vitally important: if their achievements and skills are highlighted, students feel motivated and perform better, but if their weaknesses and mistakes are emphasized, this leads to discouragement and poor performance (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968). In this regard, teachers' expectations often end up being something of a self-fulfilling prophecy (Brophy, 1983).

The *attribution theory* proposed by Weiner **(**1972, 1989) suggests that motivation is based on three dimensions: the place of the causes or attributions of the subjects, their regularity and consistency, and the responsibility or degree of control over the events. Pinpointing the internal and external causal attributes leads to the concept of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Ryan, Connell & Deci, 1985; Corno and Rohrkemper, 1985). Particularly relevant to this theory is the student's self-concept, self-esteem and perceptions on their ability to learn the FL (Bandura, 1997; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2008).

Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) and Dörnyei (2000) have highlighted the dynamic, cyclical and process-oriented nature of motivation. This conceptualization endeavours to integrate three phases of the motivational process: the initial or pre-action motivation, the action (or *actional*) motivation, and final (or post-action) motivation, which reflects the individuals' emotional reaction when they have attained the goal more or less successfully (Madrid & Pérez Cañado, 2001; Madrid, 2002;).

In the late nineties, Schumann (1998, 1999) studied *the neurology of L2 motivation* (Dörnyei, 2003). This research led to the *stimulation evaluation theory* which is based on five dimensions: novelty, pleasantness, goal significance, coping potential and social image.

In recent years, the *imaginary identity theory*, or self-system theory (Norton, 2000), which takes into account the students' ideas, world and life views, their dreams for the future and their imaginary world, has become widely accepted (Markus & Nurius, 1986). The aim here is to bear in mind what Lave and Wenger (1991) dubbed the imagined communities of L2 speakers, because these are what guide the students' learning process and afford them an imagined identity. The most important types of identities for motivation are: 1) The *Ideal Self*, which refers to the ideal image they would like to have in the future, 2) the *Ought-to L2 Self*, which represents an image with the traits and qualities they believe they should

have, and 3) the *L2 Learning Experience*, which refers to specific situational reasons related to the immediate learning environment (Dörnyei 2005 & 2009; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; Dörnyei, Muir & Ibrahim, 2014).

Another innovative concept proposed by Dörnyei, Muir and Ibrahim (2014) is something they call *directed motivational current*. This is a drive capable of stimulating and supporting long-term motivational behaviour with regard to L2 learning. This process involves the individuals' *views* and their imagined reality, the perception of control over behaviour and progress, and the satisfaction of accomplishing a goal, which nourishes the students' motivational state.

The concept of motivation has also been enriched by Coyle's process model (2011, 2014) and learning-oriented critical incident technique (LOCIT). The process model consists of the learning environment, which must be stimulating, collaborative and supportive, and the students' degree of commitment. The LOCIT process engages teachers and students in a collaborative, dialogic process (Mercer, 2000; Wells, 1999).

Several theories on L2 learning have acknowledged the importance of motivation and the role it plays in learning. For example, Krashen's *monitor theory* (1982, 1985) features the *affective filter,* which is based on the importance of emotional factors and the motivation of the subjects, as essential elements regulating the learning processes.

Both Lambert's *pyscho-social model* (1974) and Clément's *social context model* (1980) show that motivation is a key factor in L2 learning, which depends on the subjects' attitudes toward learning and their degree of motivation.

Finally, in Gardner's *socio-educational model* (1985), the subjects' individual differences, including their degree of motivation, partially explain the final outcomes of learning. This author has also shown that there is a strong positive correlation between motivation and the desire to learn the L2 and the desire to live and become integrated into the country where the L2 is spoken (Uribe, Gutiérrez-Pérez and Madrid (2013).

2.2. Studies on motivation in EFL contexts

As several studies have shown (Skinner & Belmont, 1993; Lorenzo Bergillos, 1997; García Sánchez, 1999; Uribe, 2000), the classroom as a microsystem can modify students' motivational thinking. In this educational setting, Skehan distinguishes four essential sources of motivation (1989, p. 49-50): learning and teaching activities, learning outcomes, punishment and rewards, and their effect on students' extrinsic motivation (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Madrid, 2002).

Numerous studies have discussed the most relevant sources of motivation for secondary school students in English class (Madrid, 1996; Manzaneda and Madrid, 1997, Madrid & Pérez Cañado, 2001; Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2014; Navarro & García Jiménez, 2018). Madrid (1999, p. 56) emphasizes that overall motivation among secondary school students in English class is quite high (m=4.1, on a scale of 1 to 5 points). Girls (m=4.3) tend to display a greater degree of motivation than boys (m=3.8), although in certain cases these differences are not significant. This same study also reveals that the main sources of motivation in the classroom are, in order of importance: the instrumental value of English in today's society (m=4.5), the personal and didactic features of the English teachers (m=4.18), the type of tasks done in class and the teaching method used (m=4.1).

In the studies conducted on the teacher as a source of motivation (Madrid, Robinson et al. 1993 & Madrid, 1996), secondary school students indicated that what motivated them the most was when the teacher gave clear explanations, was pleasant and kind, had good knowledge of English and good pronunciation. However, strictness and severity, unpleasantness and frequent scolding, and setting homework and exams had a discouraging effect. The two environmental factors that have the strongest influence on student motivation are the school and teachers (m=4.3) and parents (m=4.1) (Madrid, 1996, p. 146). The main personal reasons that lead students to be motivated to study English include: benefiting from a fuller education and training (m=4.45), having better options of finding a good job in Europe (m=4.4), an interest in becoming acquainted with a foreign language and culture (m=4.35), the ability to expand their knowledge at university (m=4.2), and understanding TV and cinema in English (m=4.1) (Madrid, 1999, p.58).

Madrid (2002) analysed the motivational potential of eighteen classroom motivation strategies in a sample of 89 compulsory secondary school students and 114 post-compulsory secondary students. The results showed that the strategies and resources with the greatest potential to motivate in the classroom are (p. 412): the use of new technologies, group work, responding to and meeting students' needs and interests, student participation in class, getting good grades, meeting student's expectations, and praise and rewards for work well done. On the other hand, the aspects that motivate them the least are: passive listening without participating in class and, surprisingly, frequent use of the L2 in class (Rubio Gómez, 1997; Lorenzo Bergillos, 1997, Navarro Biescas, 1998; Coyle, 2014 & Kubanyiova, 2014).

2.3. Studies on student motivation in CLIL contexts

For Coyle (2006), there are several factors that may activate motivation in CLIL type classes. For example, motivated teachers often foster the students' interest by making the content more relevant and the learning more fun, introducing activities in an attractive way, and bolstering students' self-esteem and self-confidence.

Cabezas Cabello (2010) and Lancaster (2016) have documented that bilingual programmes enhance the cognitive, cultural, social, affective and intellectual development of the participating students and considerably increase their motivation for L2 learning.

Perez Cañado (2018a) has concluded that bilingual programmes have a positive impact on students' confidence, motivation and participation in CLIL classes and, according to Dalton-Puffer (2008, 2009) and Ruiz de Zarobe (2011), CLIL programmes improve the understanding and use of the L2, students' overall communication skills, their oral comprehension and expression, and the vocabulary, creativity and motivation of the learners.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) conducted a study with 287 secondary school students and their findings showed that CLIL programmes helped create positive attitudes toward language learning in general and that students taking part in CLIL programmes showed more positive attitudes toward the English language used as a means of instruction than the EFL students.

Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2014) have studied the aspects of CLIL classes that motivate and discourage secondary school students, finding that, while the students acknowledge that studying the curriculum in another language (English) is more difficult and requires additional effort, they are highly motivated. However, they highlight the difficulty

of these programmes compared with those taught in the native language and the amount of work that must be done to progress (p. 124). Some of the aspects they like the most are their linguistic progress in English, the variety of activities performed, watching videos and films, and group activities (p. 126). The aspects they find most discouraging are exams, the difficulty of studying in English and the approach of certain activities (p. 128).

In another study, Lasagabaster and Doiz (2017) researched the influence of the CLIL approach on affective factors among secondary school students. Their findings revealed that motivation persists over time in non-CLIL programmes but they observed a considerable drop in the affective dimensions of the youngest CLIL students. They also found significant differences with regard to anxiety and, while the intrinsic, instrumental and integrative motivation of older students was high, as was their interest in languages, their interest and motivation dropped because of their anxiety levels.

Arribas (2016) has examined the attitudes, motivation and receptive vocabulary outcomes of CLIL and non-CLIL students. The findings indicate that CLIL students showed better receptive vocabulary outcomes due to their higher degree of motivation. However, the differences between CLIL and non-CLIL students were not significant.

Pérez Cañado (2018b) has also demonstrated, in several discriminant analyses with primary school subjects, that the differences between the groups were better explained in terms of motivation (particularly lack of interest) than in terms of other variables and, in secondary school motivation becomes an even more relevant factor.

One can conclude from the findings by Navarro and García Jiménez (2018) that CLIL students are more motivated to learn English than non-CLIL students and that motivation plays a more important role in CLIL programmes than in non-CLIL ones (Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2017; Arribas, 2016).

While all these studies have contributed to a better understanding of motivation in CLIL and non-CLIL (or EFL) secondary school students, there is still little research on motivation among these two types of students at university level enrolled in programmes using English as the language of instruction (EMI students). The study presented below aims to fill this gap somewhat by exploring the motivational power of today's bilingual programmes and comparing it with the effect of non-bilingual programmes on the students' degree of motivation at both secondary and university levels.

3. THE STUDY

This study is an example of applied, empirical-descriptive research, which aims to explore the degree of motivation among students in bilingual and non-bilingual programmes at the compulsory secondary school and university levels. The research is cross-sectional in nature, given that the data collection process took place at a specific time (halfway through the school year) and, as seen below, combines the quantitative and the qualitative approaches through a final open item.

3.1. Aims

As indicated in the introduction, the general objective of this paper is to examine the motivational potential of bilingual and non-bilingual programmes in secondary school and

university education, based on the students' perceptions of these teaching approaches. This overall aim has been broken down into several specific aims:

1) Understanding the overall degree of motivation of students in bilingual and non-bilingual programmes in secondary school and in primary education teaching degree programmes.
2) Examining the motivational potential of the variables involved in the dimensions studied: the family and educational/institutional settings, the personal features of the teachers and students, and the teaching and learning processes in the classroom.
3) Understanding the reasons why students feel less motivated by certain variables.

3.2. Sample

The characteristics of the sample used to conduct this study are detailed in Table 1:

Table 1. Characteristics of the sample

		Secondary education (N=485)		Education Degree (N=332)		
Type of programme	Bilingual (CLIL students)	310	63,9%	Bilingual (EMI students)	160	48,2%
	Non bilingual (EFL students)	175	36,1%	Non bilingual (Non EMI students)	172	51,8%
School year	Year 2	86	17,7%	Year 1	105	31,6%
	Year 3	106	21,9%	Year 2	94	28,3%
	Year 4	293	60,4%	Year 3	74	22,3%
				Year 4	59	17,8%
	Boys	234	48,2%	Boys	71	21,3%
Gender	Girls	251	51,8%	Girls	261	78,6%

The secondary school students are from the region of Andalusia and the education degree students attend the University of Granada.

3.3. Context: the bilingual and non-bilingual educational programmes examined

The non-bilingual secondary school students attended school under the system regulated by Decree 1105/2014 (Official Gazette of Spain No. 3, 3/1/2015), Decree 111/2016 (Official Gazette of the Regional Government of Andalusia No. 22, 28/6/2016), and the Order of the Regional Government of Andalusia dated 14 July 2016 (Official Gazette of the Regional Government of Andalusia, 28/7/2016), which develops the curriculum for compulsory secondary education in the Autonomous Region of Andalusia.

The secondary school students in bilingual programmes followed the system regulated under Order 28 June 2011 (Official Gazette of the Regional Government of Andalusia No. 135, dated 12/7/2011), which governs bilingual education in the schools of Andalusia. According to this regulation, at least 40%-50% of the curriculum was taught in L2 at all the schools (Jáimez & López Morillas, 2011).

The studies of university students in the non-bilingual program earning a degree from the School of Education at the University of Granada are governed by the Resolution of the Secretary of State for Universities and Research dated 17 December 2007, which establishes the conditions that must be met in the curricula of primary education teaching programmes, and by Order ECI/3857/2007, of 27 December, which sets the requirements for verification of primary education teaching degrees (Madrid Manrique & Madrid, 2014). Students in the bilingual degree program earned the same degree but 50% of the courses were taught in English (Madrid and Julius, 2020b).

3.4. Data collection instruments

The data relating to the students' degree of motivation in the controlled variables were obtained from the items in the survey in Appendix 1, which covers the following dimensions:

1. Variables in family and educational/institutional settings (v1-v4).
2. Variables related to personal features of teachers and students: personality traits, capabilities, commitment to teaching, linguistic and didactic training (v5-v14).
3. Variables linked to the process of teaching and learning the curriculum contents and the L2 (v15-60): planning and coordination (v15-v18), linguistic and communicative skills (v19-v24), classroom activities and teaching techniques (v25-v45), materials and resources (v46-v49), students' grouping (v50-v52), evaluation techniques (53-v55), extra-curricular activities (v56-v58), results (v59-v60) and global motivation (v61).

For CLIL and EMI students, the items in Survey 1 referred to the bilingual program they were taking part in. For non-bilingual EFL students in both secondary school and university levels, the items referred to the non-bilingual program and to the subject of English as a second language.

At the end of the survey, the students were asked to explain in writing why they felt less motivated by the variables to which they had given a score of less than three points.

The survey implemented was validated in the studies by Madrid and Julius (2017) and Madrid and Roa (2018), and Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate the reliability of the scale. However, when the survey was conducted, it was necessary to explain the meaning of several items to the secondary school groups because the technical wording of some items was difficult for these students to understand.

3.5. Techniques used to analyse the data

The SPSS 20 statistics software was used for the data analysis and statistical calculations carried out. Basic descriptive statistics were calculated (mean and standard deviation), then

they were evaluated to see if there were any significant differences among the student groups. To do this, the Student's T-test or the Mann-Whitney U test were applied, depending on whether the score distributions were parametric or nonparametric, with a significance level of p ≤ 0.05, that is, 95%. To verify the degree of statistical significance, Cohen's *d* effect size was also calculated. The students' explanations about the low degree of motivation in certain variables were indicated based on the remarks deemed by the author to most clearly illustrate the students' opinions.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate the reliability of the scale used in the surveys conducted on the four cohorts, showing the following results:

Table 2. Reliability of the survey scale

TYPE OF PROGRAMME PROGRAMA	CRONBACH ALPHA	N
Secondary EFL students	0,93	175
Secondary CLIL students	0,94	310
EMI education students	0,95	160
EFL education students	0,96	172

As seen above, the scores are highly reliable, which indicates that there is a high degree of consistency and accuracy in the data supplied by the survey designed.

4.1. Secondary school students

Secondary school students in non-bilingual programmes, consisting of EFL students, showed higher motivation overall (m=4) than CLIL students (m=3.66). As seen below, these differences are significant in favour of EFL students. These students gave high scores to: v4. The importance of bilingualism in society (m=4,31), v6. Students' interests for the study program (m=4,18), and v1. Family support (m=3,96). However, the order of priority in CLIL students was: v4. The importance of bilingualism in society (m=4,20), v4. Family support (m=4,16), v6. Students interests for study program (m=3,85) and v13. Teachers subject preparation (m=3,84).

4.1.1. Differences between CLIL and EFL students

By applying the Mann-Whitney U test, it was verified that, in addition to higher overall motivation, non-CLIL secondary school students feel significantly more motivated than those

in CLIL programmes in relation to 21 variables (p≤0.05). The calculation of the effect size, using Cohen's *d*, indicates that the degree of statistical significance of these differences is small for all but three variables: v14. Involvement of native teachers in the program (d=-0,46), v35. Frequency of the use of the L2 in class (d=-0,52) and v55. Application of students´ self-evaluation (d=-0,47), where the degree of significance is average. The significance is not high in any of the cases.

However, just three significant (p≤0.05) differences were found in favour of CLIL students in v1. Family support (d=0.21), v13. Teachers' preparation in non-linguistic subject contents (d=0.52) and v2. School management support (d=0.27). Once again, calculation of the effect size shows that the degree of significance is low, except in v13, where it is average.

4.1.2. Variables with low motivational power in secondary school

The non-bilingual (EFL) cohort of students evidenced just two variables with low motivational potential: v27. Songs and games (m= 2.87) and v35. The students using the L2 in class (m=2.72), in the CLIL cohort the following eight were found.

Table 3. Variables with low motivational power in the CLIL cohort of secondary school

VARIABLES	MEAN	SD
V36. Project work	2,82	1,18
V56. Extracurricular activities	2,81	1,38
v34. The teacher using the L2	2,80	1,16
v27. Songs and games	2,76	1,39
v55. Students' self-evaluation	2,72	1,30
v57. Stays in English speaking countries	2,69	1,50
v43. Use of portfolio	2,58	1,23
v35. The students using the L2	2,11	1,14

Using the final qualitative item of the survey, information was requested about the reasons why these variables occasionally failed to motivate the students, and the students explained themselves in the terms indicated below (the students' actual remarks were made in their native language).

Sometimes, *using English in class* did not motivate the students because some students are shy, feel insecure about expressing themselves and are afraid of making mistakes. They indicate this in the following terms: "Some of us are shy and don't have the nerve to speak." "Most of us don't speak English well." "We don't pronounce or understand English well and we are embarrassed to use it because it takes more effort." "We can understand things we don't know better if they are explained in Spanish." "It's a lot of work to understand and keep up."

The use of the *portfolio* is not attractive to them because most of them are unfamiliar with it and have never used it. Some who are familiar with it indicate the following: "I wouldn't do well because I'm very disorganized and lose everything." "Using a notebook is tidier." "I used a portfolio in primary school and it was a waste of time."

While a good number of students recognize the benefits of *stays* in English-speaking countries to improve their English, many others give this a low score because they have never done it and have no experience with the benefits: "I've never done this." "I've never left Spain." "They never took us." "I wouldn't understand anything and I'd have a terrible time."

Self-assessment by students is not practiced very often either, nor is it approached in a way that leads them to reflect on their progress. The students' remarks evidence this: "We've never done this." "It might be negative because, if students correct their own homework, they could change the answers and always get a 10 (a perfect grade) or pass without studying, and that would bother the ones who studied."

Songs and games also scored low because they are seldom used in class and the methodology used is not always appropriate. The students explain it in this way: "Sometimes we don't learn anything." "We've done very few activities of this kind." "I think this is a waste of time." "They don't motivate me much because they are very childish."

At this educational stage, several students do not feel motivated by the teacher's use of English in class, either because they often do not understand the teacher, or because it creates more stress and it is easier and more convenient to use Spanish. They explain this as follows: "It doesn't motivate me much because sometimes I don't understand what the teacher is saying." "I understand the teacher better when he explains in Spanish." "We feel frustrated when we don't understand." "I'm not very keen on it because I don't understand a thing."

As a general rule, the schools arrange very few *extra-curricular activities* and do not usually include *projects* in their programming, which leads these variables to have low motivational potential.

4.2. University students in bachelor's degree programmes in primary education

The results obtained from this cohort (see Appendix 1) show that overall motivation (v61) is high among students in both the bilingual degree (m=3.9) and those earning a non-bilingual degree (m=3.88) and, while the degree of difficulty and working methods are quite different in the two programmes, the students' degree of motivation regarding their study programme is quite similar, there being no significant differences. It is also interesting to note that the students' overall motivation is related to their degree of satisfaction with their study programme, which is also relatively high: EMI students (m=3.73) and non-EMI students (m=3.81) (see Madrid & Julius, 2020b).

Appendix 1 shows that the factors that most attract students in the bilingual degree are: v60. Attaining a good level of English (m=4.64), v4. The instrumental value of bilingualism in contemporary society (m=4.61), v59. Achieving good academic outcomes (motivation to achieve) (m=4.57), v57. Stays in English-speaking countries (m=4.47) and v58. Exchanges with native speakers (4.45). The motivation of university students was also significantly influenced by v1. Family support (m=4.44), v29. The fact that the professor speaks clearly in class (m=4.37), v46. The availability of resources (4.35), v47. Audio-visual material (4.32), v48. The use of ICTs (m=4.22) and v34. Constant use of the L2 in class (m=4.22).

The student's intrinsic motivation (v6) and the extrinsic motivation by the professors (v45) are also high (m=4.27 and m=4.3, respectively). In addition, students clearly prefer on-going assessments to summative assessments by means of testing, and they are attracted to activities done in groups or pairs. The highly motivating effect of v5. The student's self-concept and perceptions on their abilities (m=4.03) (Weiner, 1989 & Atkinson, 1964) is also observed.

Students in the non-bilingual degree programme only assign a high motivational potential to five variables: v1. Family support (m=4.37), v6. The student's personal interest and enthusiasm toward the study programme (m=4.24), v8. Their personality and personality traits (m=4.1), v52. Group work (m=4.01) and v4. The importance of bilingualism in today's society (m=4).

Moreover, it should be stressed that no lack of interest or motivation was detected in relation to any of the variables in either of these two cohorts, unlike the case with secondary school students, where scores of less than 3 points were found in eight variables (Table 2).

4.2.1. Differences between EMI and non-EMI students

While no significant differences were found between EMI and non-EMI students as regards the dependent variable of "overall motivation" (v61), there are differences in favour of EMI students in the motivating effect of 32 independent variables (p≤0.05). Through the calculation of Cohen's d, these significant differences were found to be particularly relevant (d ≥ 0.5) for ten variables. In other words, EMI students are significantly more motivated than non-EMI students in terms of attaining a good level of English (d=0.95), stays in English-speaking countries (d=0.86), linguistic exchanges with natives (d=0.82), high performance in non-linguistic subjects (d=0.77), the teacher's use of the L2 in class at least 50% of the time (d=0.75), the importance of bilingualism in today's society (d=0,72), attractive extra-curricular activities (d=0.62), the variety of audio-visual material (d=0.52), the students' use of the L2 (d=0.51), and having the material and human resources needed (d=0.50).

5. CONCLUSIONS

Twenty-five years after the initial studies by Madrid (1996 & 1999), secondary school students continue to display high rates of motivation (m=4) of an instrumental nature (Gardner, 1985). Also worth noting is the power of the achievement theory (Atkinson, 1964), assessed through item v59, especially for teaching degree students, and the importance of the students' imagined identity, which reflects their personal view of how important bilingualism is in contemporary society (v6) in finding a good job (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009).

Overall motivation of EFL (non-bilingual) secondary school students is significantly higher than that of the CLIL cohort, which explains why they ascribe greater motivational potential to 21 variables. However, in the bachelor's degree in primary school teaching, while there are no significant differences between the two cohorts, EMI students in the bilingual program feel significantly more motivated than EFL students with respect to 32 variables.

At secondary school level, both EFL and CLIL students coincide in assigning a very high motivational potential to the importance of bilingualism in contemporary society (m=4.31

and m=4.20, respectively) and to the students' interest in the study program they are taking part in (m=4.18 and m=3.85 respectively). However, family support motivates CLIL students more than it does EFL students, perhaps because the implementation of bilingualism requires greater collaboration from the parents.

Secondary school CLIL students are less motivated by the teacher's use of English in class than EFL students because the use of Spanish is less stressful and easier for them. The lack of exchanges and contact with native speakers and stays in English-speaking countries prompts them to underestimate this variable.

Although the sampling of students that participated in this research does not fully represent certain academic levels, the results presented here could be used as a good baseline for teachers to understand the motivational potential of the main variables that interact in bilingual and non-bilingual programmes, in order to enable them to implement improvements that encourage and increase the motivation of the students taking part in these programmes. Hopefully this research will contribute to this end.

8. REFERENCES

Ames, C. & Ames, R. (1984). *Research on motivation in education, (vol 1) : Student motivation.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ames, C. & Ames, R. (1985). *Research on motivation in education, vol 2: The classroom milieu.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Arribas, M. (2016). Analysing a whole CLIL school: Students' attitudes, motivation, and receptive vocabulary outcomes. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 9, 2, 267-292.

Atkinson, J. (1964): *An introduction to motivation*. Van Nostrand.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Brophy, J. (1983): Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 631-661.*

Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some of the Reasons Why ..and Why Not. *System* 41, 587-597.

Cabezas Cabello, J.M. (2010) A SWOT analysis of the Andalusian plurilingualism promotion plan (APPP). In Pérez Cañado, M.L. (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 23rd GRETA convention (*pp. 83-91). Jaén: Joxman.

Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson & P.M. Smith, (Eds.), *Language: Social Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 147-154). Pergamon.

Corno, L. & Rohrkemper, M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation to learn in classrooms. In C. Ames, C. & R. Ames, R. (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education* (vol. 2), (pp. 53-85). Academic Press.

Coyle, D. (2006).Content and language integrated learning: Motivating learners and teachers". *Journal Scottish Languages Review*, Volume 13, 1 – 18

Coyle, D. (2011). *ITALIC Final research report: Investigating student gains: content and language integrated learning*, available at: http://www.abdn.ac.uk/italic

Coyle, D. (2014). Motivating teachers and learners as researchers. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: from theory to practice* (pp. 51-69). John Benjamins.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2008). Outcomes and processes in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Current research from Europe. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkmann (Eds.), *Future perspectives for English language teaching* (pp. 139-57). Carl Winter.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2009). Communicative competence and the CLIL lesson. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe and R.M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning. Evidence from research in Europe* (pp.197-214). Multilingual Matters.

De Prada, J. M. (2019). Asnos bilingües. *XL Semanal*. Available at: https://www.xlsemanal. com /firmas/20190304/asnos-bilingues-juan-manuel-prada.html

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2014). Giving voice to the students: What (de)motivates then in CLIL classes? In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: from theory to practice* (pp. 117-138). John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000): Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 70, 519-538.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations and motivations in language: advances in theory, research and applications. *Language Learning*, 53, 3-32. DOI 10.111/1467-9922.53222.

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

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

Dörnyei, Z & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* (Thames Valley University, London), 4, 43-69.

Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (Eds.) (2009). *Motivation language identity and L2 self*. Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., Muir, C. & Ibrahim, Z. (2014). Directed motivational currents: Energising language learning by creating intense motivational pathways. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: from theory to practice* (pp. 9-29). John Benjamins.

Freud, S. (1915): *A General introduction to psychoanalysis*. Washington Square Press.

García Sánchez, E. (1999): *Las creencias del profesor acerca de la motivación y su actuación en el aula de inglés*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Granada: English Department.

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning, the roles of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.

Hull, C. L. (1951): *Essential of behaviour*. Yale University Press.

Jáimez, S. & López Morillas, A. M. (2011). The Andalusian plurilingual programme. In D. Madrid y S. Hughes, (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingual Education* (pp. 77-103). Peter Lang.

Krashen, S. (1982): *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985): *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

Kubanyiova, M. (2014). Motivating language teachers: inspiring vision. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: from theory to practice* (pp. 71-89). John Benjamins.

Lambert, W. E. (1974). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud, & R. D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education* (pp. 91-122). (Bellingham, Washington: Fifth Western Washington Symposium on Learning).

Lancaster, N. (2016). Stakeholder perspectives on CLIL in a monolingual context. *English Language Teaching,* 9 (2), 148-177.

Lasagabaster, D, & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1,2, 4-17.

Lasagabaster, D. & Doiz, A. (2017). A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL affective factors. *Applied Linguistics*, 38, 5, 688-712.

Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3-18.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambrige University Press.

Lorenzo Bergillos, F. J. (1997). *Etiología y tipología de la Motivación hacia el inglés como L2*. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Seville, English Department.

Madrid Manrique, M. & Madrid, D. (2014). *La formación inicial del profesorado para la educación bilingüe*. Editorial Universidad de Granada.

Madrid, D. & Julius, S. (2017). Quality Factors in Bilingual Education at the University Level. *Porta Linguarum* 28, 49-66.

Madrid, D. & Julius, S. (2020a). Profiles of Students in Bilingual University Degree Programmes Using English as a Medium of Instruction in Spain. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development,* 22(2), 79–94. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile. v22n2. 80735.

Madrid, D. & Julius, S. (2020b). Academic Achievement of Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Education Degree Students. *Porta Linguarum* 34, 25-37.

Madrid, D. & Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2001). Exploring the student's motivation in the EFL class. In E. García Sánchez (Ed.), *Present and Future Trends in TEFL* (pp. 321-364). Editorial Universidad de Almería.

Madrid, D. & Roa, J. M. (2018). Qué variables ejercen mayor influencia en la calidad de los programas bilingües? *Revista de Educación*, 382, 81-106, DOI: 10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2018-382-393.

Madrid, D. (1996). The Foreign Language Classroom. In N. McLaren, N. and D. Madrid (Eds.), *A Handbook for TEFL* (pp. 129160). Marfil.

Madrid, D. (1999). *La investigación de los factores motivacionales en el aula de idiomas*. Grupo Editorial Universitario.

Madrid, D. (2002). The Power of the FL Teacher's Motivational Strategies. *Cauce*, 25, 369-422.

Madrid, D., Robinson, B., Hidalgo, E. Gomis, A. Verdejo, M. J., Ortega, J. L. (1993). The Teacher as a Source of Motivation in the EFL Classroom, *International Conference Of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 492-500). Universidad de Granada.

Manzaneda, F. & Madrid, D. (1997). Actitudes y motivación en la clase de inglés (1º de BUP). In E. A. Adams, A. Bueno & G. Tejada (Eds), *Francisco Manzaneda Oneto"In Memoriam", The Grove, 4, 153-171*. Universidad de Jaén: Servicio de Publicaciones.

Marcus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954.

Marías, J. (2015). Ni bilingüe ni enseñanza. *XL Semanal*, 17 de mayo, p. 90.

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge.

Navarro Biescas, M. (1998): *La motivación del estudiante de inglés como lengua extranjera en la enseñanza secundaria. Un estudio de caso múltiple*. Doctoral dissertatioin. University of Seville: English Department.

Navarro M, & García Jiménez, E. (2018). Are CLIL students more motivated? An analysis of affective factors and their relation to language attainment. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 71-90.

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91, 328-346.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change.* Longman.

Pérez Cañado, M.L. (2018a). The evolution of bilingual education in monolingual settings: an Andalusian case study. In P. Ronanowski & M. Jedynak (Eds.), *Current research in bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 207-241). Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-9239-3-12

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2018b). The effects of CLIL on L1 and content learning: updated empirical evidence from monolingual contexts. *Learning and Instruction 57*, 18-33. DOI: 10.1016/j.learninstgruc.2017.12.002.

Rosenthal, R. Y. & Jacobson, L. (1968): *Pygmalion in the classroom.* Holt, Rinehart &Winston.

Rotter, J. B. (1954): *Social learning and clinical psych*ology. Prentice-Hall.

Rubio Gómez, A. J. (1997). La motivación una vez más. Análisis de aspectos motivadores. In A. Martínez, P. Barros, J. A. De Molina & J. M. Becerra (Eds.), *Enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras* (pp. 353-360). Universidad de Granada.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2011). Which language competencies benefit from CLIL? An insight into Applied Linguistics research. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J.M. Sierra, & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and foreign language integrated learning. Contributions to multilingualism in European contexts*, (pp. 129-53). Peter Lang.

Ryan, R. M., Connell, J.P. & Deci, E.L. (1985). A motivational analysis of self-determination and self-regulation in education. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, vol 2: The classroom milieu* (pp.13-47). Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Schumann, J. H. (1998). *The neurology of affect in language learning.* Blackwell.

Schumann, J. H. (1999). A neurobiological perspective on affect and methodology in second language learning. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 28-42). Cambridge University Press.

Schunk, D. H. & Zimmerman, B. I. (2008). *Motivation and self-regulating learning: Theory, research and application*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning.* Edward Arnold.

Skinner, E. A. & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: reciprocal effects of teacher behaviour and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 571-581.

Stipek, D. J. (1984). The development of achievement motivation. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, (vol 1)*: *Student motivation* (pp. 145-174). Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Uribe, D. (2000): *Actitudes de dos muestras de hispanohablantes de California y Andalucía hacia la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de la lengua inglesa.* Doctoral dissertation: University of Granada.

Uribe, D., Gutiérrez-Pérez, J. & Madrid, D. (2013). Attitudes of Mexican-American students towards learning English as a second language in a structured immersion program. *Porta Linguarum*, 20, 205-221.

Weiner, B. (1972): *Theories of Motivation: from Mechanism to Cognition.* Rand McNally.

Weiner, B. (1989): *Human Motivation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: towards a socio-cultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX 1
Motivational potential of bilingual and non-bilingual education

VARIABLES	SECONDARY EDUCATION (age: 15-16)				UNIVERSITY STUDENTS (EDUCATION DEGREE)			
	CLIL students		Non-CLIL students		EMI students		Non-EMI students	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. CONTEXT VARIABLES								
1. *Family support* and involvement in the bilingual programme.	4,16	,91	3,96	,96	4,44	,77	4,37	,90
2. *School management* support	3,33	1,07	3,03	1,14	3,01	1,09	3,10	1,09
3. Support from the *education authorities*	3,14	1,07	3,23	1,11	3,04	1,07	3,04	1,07
4. *Importance of bilingualism* in society for people's education and to find a good job.	4,20	1,02	4,31	,84	4,61	,64	3,99	1,03
1. TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS								
5. Students' general *capacity*, intelligence and abilities.	3,26	1,09	3,57	,95	4,03	,65	3,84	,77
6. Students' *interest and enthusiasm* for the study programme.	3,85	1,07	4,18	,93	4,27	,77	4,24	,83
7. The attention and interest that *teachers* pay to the *students' learning styles* and multiple intelligences.	3,35	1,05	3,26	1,12	3,39	1,08	3,43	1,09
8. *Students' personality traits*: extroversion, sociability, risk-taking, perseverance,…	3,54	1,07	3,67	1,00	4,04	,82	4,10	,80
9. *Teachers' motivation* and personal commitment to the programme.	3,39	,98	3,34	1,03	3,56	,97	3,58	1,08
10. *Teachers' personal qualities* and personality traits.	3,35	1,02	3,55	1,03	3,63	,88	3,60	,99
11. *Teachers' linguistic preparation* and second language level.	3,47	,94	3,60	1,10	3,81	,95	3,50	1,01
12. *Teachers' didactic training* in CLIL.	3,39	,99	3,49	,97	3,69	1,00	3,66	1,08
13. Teachers' *preparation* in non-linguistic subject *contents* to be taught.	3,84	1,00	3,25	1,23	4,11	,83	3,91	,928

14.	Involvement of *native teachers* in the programme.	3,11	1,22	3,64	1,05	3,74	1,37	3,31	1,13
	2. TEACHING PLANNING AND COORDINATION								
15.	Preparation and implementation of adequate *language projects* planned in cooperation by teachers.	3,03	1,04	3,34	1,00	3,61	1,04	3,47	,91
16.	*Integrated academic planning* of linguistic and non-linguistic content.	3,05	,99	3,34	,96	3,65	,92	3,47	,81
17.	*Coordination, monitoring and control* of the CLIL programme.	3,08	1,11	3,25	,99	3,51	,99	3,47	,96
18.	Balanced *integration of subject contents and linguistic* aspects of L2 in class.	3,15	1,00	3,34	,95	3,70	,93	3,35	,96
	3. LINGUISTIC COMPONENTS AND COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS								
19.	Emphasis on interactive and *oral communication* activities.	3,17	1,07	3,28	,99	3,94	,86	3,76	,94
20.	Emphasis on *reading activities* and the types of texts to be read.	3,13	1,05	3,17	1,02	3,66	,99	3,56	,94
21.	Emphasis on *written expression* and the types of texts to be written.	3,05	1,22	3,29	1,00	3,68	,93	3,67	,94
22.	Attention to *cultural* and *intercultural* aspects.	3,23	1,10	3,37	1,00	3,79	1,07	3,71	,95
23.	Emphasis on *linguistic components*: grammar, vocabulary, spelling, etc.	3,43	1,13	3,69	1,01	3,67	1,07	3,68	,94
24.	To care for *pronunciation* and oral expression in class.	3,28	1,06	3,43	1,02	3,69	1,16	3,64	1,09
	4. TEACHING ACTIVITIES AND TECHNIQUES								
25.	Attention dedicated to *practical activities* of both linguistic and non-linguistic content.	3,02	1,16	3,32	,91	3,96	1,00	3,76	,97
26.	Systematic *repetition* of instructions in class activities to facilitate learning.	3,44	1,03	3,61	1,11	3,94	,94	3,73	,99
27.	*Songs* and *game* like activities.	2,76	1,39	2,87	1,26	3,81	1,22	3,30	1,35
28.	Use of outlines, *graphics & charts* to facilitate learning	3,35	1,18	3,33	1,12	3,97	1,04	3,71	1,12

29.	Speaking clearly to students in class.	3,65	1,05	3,75	1,03	4,37	,77	3,88	1,17
30.	Use of gestures and non-verbal communication to facilitate learning.	3,51	1,08	3,51	1,02	4,20	,83	3,86	,93
31.	Adequate treatment of students' errors in class	3,22	1,04	3,34	1,13	3,99	1,01	3,74	1,01
32.	Providing feedback to students about their learning process.	3,18	1,06	3,38	1,09	4,21	1,00	3,78	1,07
33.	Use of L1 to clarify concepts when unclear in L2.	3,66	1,18	3,65	1,06	4,20	,98	3,49	1,03
34.	Use of L2 by teachers in at least 50% of the subjects.	2,80	1,16	3,06	1,18	4,22	,91	3,45	1,12
35.	Frequent use of the L2 by students in communicating with their classmates.	2,11	1,14	2,72	1,20	3,75	1,10	3,20	1,05
36.	Working with tasks and projects related to everyday life.	2,82	1,18	3,13	1,12	4,11	1,15	3,87	1,04
37.	Affective relationship among teachers and students (Rapport).	3,12	1,14	3,23	1,15	3,71	1,10	3,49	1,06
38.	Keeping discipline and classroom control	3,16	1,05	3,33	1,00	3,80	,88	3,66	,89
39.	Input adaptation for comprehension in class according to the students' diversity.	3,03	,99	3,23	,85	3,94	,97	3,60	,97
40.	Employing a diversity of approaches, activities, exercises and tasks.	3,12	1,07	3,29	1,11	4,00	1,04	3,85	,97
41.	Homework	3,24	1,23	3,44	1,20	2,96	1,12	3,19	1,19
42.	Incorporation of innovation projects to improve results.	3,08	1,12	3,36	1,10	3,97	,97	3,66	1,04
43.	Use of a portfolio as a learning and evaluation tool.	2,58	1,23	3,02	1,17	3,40	1,06	3,38	1,00
44.	Emphasis on and attention paid to subject contents.	3,14	1,05	3,44	1,03	3,80	,87	3,57	,90
45.	Motivating students in class by highlighting successes and downplaying mistakes.	2,92	1,28	3,23	1,26	4,23	1,07	3,79	1,14
	5. MATERIALS AND RESOURCES								
46.	Availability of academic materials and human resources.	3,59	1,10	3,65	1,04	4,35	,84	3,91	,91

47.	Variety of *audiovisual material* and "realia".	3,52	1,14	3,49	1,01	4,32	,75	3,87	,94
48.	Use of *ICTs* to facilitate learning activities	3,22	1,26	3,34	1,20	4,22	,87	3,83	,93
49.	Effective *tutorial system* for bilingual subjects.	3,07	1,24	3,25	1,23	4,34	,87	3,97	,82
6. STUDENTS GROUPING IN CLASS									
50.	Students' *individual work*	3,57	1,09	3,55	1,06	3,99	,91	3,76	,99
51.	*Pair work*	3,47	1,08	3,53	,935	4,04	,90	3,82	,94
52.	Student's and teachers' cooperative and *group work.*	3,45	1,12	3,53	1,12	4,06	1,09	4,01	
7. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES									
53.	Application of *ongoing evaluation* system.	3,49	1,11	3,42	1,13	4,07	,96	3,95	
54.	Periodic evaluation and control by *tests*.	3,27	1,29	3,32	1,15	3,66	1,02	3,48	
55.	Application of student *self-evaluation* in student marks.	2,72	1,30	3,30	1,16	3,89	1,19	3,72	1,13
8. EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES WHICH ENCOURAGE LEARNING									
56.	Participation in suitable *extra-curricular activities*.	2,81	1,38	3,20	1,39	4,20	1,08	3,46	1,27
57.	*Living* in English-speaking countries.	2,69	1,50	3,07	1,43	4,47	,99	3,47	1,31
58.	*Language exchanges* with native speakers.	3,13	1,43	3,10	1,45	4,45	,98	3,48	1,34
9. ACADEMIC RESULTS									
59.	Obtaining a good academic *achievement* in *non-linguistic subjects*.	3,44	1,08	3,71	1,10	4,57	,71	3,88	1,04
60.	Achieving a *good level of English* (A2 in Primary and B2 in Secondary).	3,11	1,31	3,46	1,28	4,64	,65	3,81	1,04
61.	**Your global motivation: degree of interest, and general motivation**	**3,66**	**,98**	**4,00**	**,73**	**3,90**	**,85**	**3,88**	**,89**

In case you have assigned a score of less than 3 points to some variables, explain your personal reasons why these aspects do not motivate you: …………………………….