Sheffield Hallam University

Explaining motivation in language learning: a framework for evaluation and research

BOWER, Kim <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7259-8118>

Citation:

Copyright and re-use policy

Explaining Motivation in Language Learning: a Framework for Evaluation and Research

Kim Bower

Sheffield Institute of Education, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK

Kim Bower, Floor 4 Arundel Building, Sheffield Institute of Education, Sheffield

Hallam University S11WB. Email: k.bower@shu.ac.uk

Biographical notes:

Kim Bower is Principal Lecturer in Education, teacher educator and former language teacher. Drawing from social constructivist perspectives, her research focusses on Content and Language Integrated Learning and learner motivation.

Explaining Motivation in Language Learning: a Framework for Evaluation and Research

Abstract

Researching motivation in language learning is complex and multi-faceted. Various models of learner motivation have been proposed in the literature, but no one model supplies a complex and coherent framework for investigating a range of motivational characteristics. Building on previous models I propose such a methodological framework, based on a complex dynamic systems perspective, which re-conceptualises the investigation of motivation in SLA in qualitative and mixed method approaches by offering one flexible tool for case study approaches. This new framework has been tried and tested in three locations in England and reported as case studies. The study aimed to address the following research questions: (1) in what ways does CLIL impact on learner motivation? (2) what are the main elements of CLIL that enhance motivation? Overall analysis of the results found that where expectations of success were high and where the teaching was effective, CLIL had a positive impact on motivation and progress. The framework is designed to be flexible enough to be used to investigate language learning in a range of national contexts. It is hoped that the proposed framework, reported here together with exemplification and commentary from the English study, will enable researchers in a wide range of language learning contexts to investigate learner motivation in a systematic and in-depth manner.

Key words: learner motivation framework; language-learning; complex dynamic systems; CLIL

Explaining Motivation in Language Learning: a Framework for Evaluation and Research

In recent years there has been a call in the second language acquisition (SLA) motivation literature e.g. (Dörnyei, 2009) for qualitative and mixed method research that allows for the exploration of individual differences, as well as reflecting patterns from a group of learners. Such methods enable research to focus on the *change* with time that occurs within the SLA social dynamic systems approach. This contrasts with the predominantly variable-centred approach characteristic of quantitative studies that are associated with dynamic systems theory, a branch of complexity theory within the field of natural sciences. Not all of the many variables in the dynamically-changing situated social contexts of SLA and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) can be measured precisely, thereby limiting reliable analysis in quantitative study (Dörnyei, 2009). This is particularly problematic in the context of CLIL given that it is 'a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language' (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010:1).

Looking broadly across researchers working in SLA and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) fields, flexible frameworks that take account of prior research and provide an in-depth approach to investigating situated language learning pedagogical approaches are needed - frameworks able to support investigations that seek to understand the complex interrelationships of factors contributing to learner motivation.   This paper proposes such a coherent framework that draws on prior research models in these areas (Coyle, 2011; Dörnyei, 1994; Williams and Burden, 1997) ; this is supplemented with more recent work in the field. Previous models for

research have either provided a conceptualisation of general aspects of motivation

without systematic consideration of characteristics, e.g. (Dörnyei, 1994), or focused on

specific internal and external factors that made an individual want to learn, e.g.

(Williams and Burden, 1997). This proposed new framework is referred to as The

Process Motivation Model for Investigating Language Learning Pedagogical

Approaches (abridged in this paper to Process Motivation Model, PMM). It identifies

and exemplifies a range of motivational characteristics for aspects of motivation in the

language learning context, and proposes some potential investigation methods to

address these aspects. Thus, it provides a framework for the evaluation and research of

motivation in language learning within mixed method studies that can be used to

support the kinds of studies needed to research motivation in second language learning.

This PMM is offered as one potential tool to support '*dynamically informed research*

designs' (Dörnyei, MacIntyre and Henry, 2014b:5) that enable researchers, practitioners

and learners to gain a deeper understanding of the reasons for individual learner

behaviour, as well as patterns from groups, in specific settings across a wide range of

language learning disciplines and national contexts.

While recognising that motivation has been studied from a variety of perspectives using

diverse methodologies such as metaphor analysis (e.g. Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008),

autobiography and narrative (e.g. Coffey and Street, 2008) and emotion and

embodiment (e.g. Trinick and Dale, 2015), in this article I focus specifically on research

from the dominant perspective of the social psychology tradition.

The paper begins with a review of the conceptualisation of L2 motivation in the

relevant literature before a discussion of previous models in the field. The proposed

new framework is then outlined and justified. Exemplification of how the PMM can be used to illuminate motivation in second language learning then follows.

Motivation in Language Learning

The theorisation of motivation in language learning emerged as a field of socio-educational research during the period 1960-1990. Gardner's work on integrative motivation, was particularly influential on the early understanding of motivation within the area of SLA. Gardner's (1985) *integrative motive* included three variables: integrativeness, attitudes towards the learning situation, and motivation. He argued that a motivated learner will display 'effort, desire and affect' (Gardner, 2001:13); affect being used here to refer to a positive emotional outcome, for example interest, pleasure or enjoyment. Intrinsic motivation is driven by such positive attributes and is considered to be more impactful in sustaining effort than extrinsic motivation, which is created by external, instrumental rewards such as the need to pass an examination. Gardner proposed that to learn a second language, the learner needs to be attracted to the culture and the people groups who speak the language (Gardner, 2001; Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Early L2 motivation theory had a focus on these distinctive elements and this conceptualisation of motivation distinguished L2 language learning from those associated with learning in other areas of the curriculum.

Later research suggests that a number of other orientations, e.g. travel, friendship, knowledge and instrumental orientations may be shared by all learner groups and that these are more significant for motivation than any desire for contact and identification with speakers of the TL (Noels, Pelletier and Vallerand 2003). Furthermore, according to more recent studies, the need to use English to interact on the global scene has overridden the need to be attracted to the culture or people group of English speakers

for many users (Lamb, 2004; 2013). It could therefore be argued that Gardner's integrativeness is no longer applicable in the same way.

Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) developed Gardner's theory in the field further, reflecting a shift towards the need for a situated approach that could take account of time and context. Their process-orientated approach incorporated a temporal perspective that is able to adapt to the frequent variations in motivation within a lesson and over time in changing contexts. It recognises that learners' motivation and the learning context and environment impact upon and shape each other. This shift also aligned L2 motivation research with mainstream cognitive and educational psychology (Boo, Dörnyei and Ryan, 2015). Nevertheless, Dörnyei (2003) acknowledges that despite requiring the explicit teaching of skills and linguistic knowledge in common with other curriculum subjects, language learning is distinct in that it is a deeply social and cultural activity (Dörnyei, 2003). This is reflected in Dörnyei's (2005) L2 Motivational Self-System, which as Ryan and Dörnyei (2013:91) suggest, may be the 'most current influential model of L2 motivation'. This model incorporates both affect and cognition, but focusses on the contextual and dynamic aspects of learner motivation. Significant notions introduced in this model are those of the Ideal L2 Self and Ought-to L2 Self, (compared with the current perceived L2 Self) and that of the L2 Learning Experience. The L2 Learning Experience is influenced by the perceptions of previous L2 learning experiences as well as the current learning environment. From this perspective teachers have an important role in generating the L2 learning vision, central to the ideal self (Dörnyei, 2008).

Two further developments in motivation research which influenced Dörnyei's thinking in addition to views of the self, and which are relevant in this context, are the

move towards a relational view of learning (Ushioda, 2009) and Noels, Pelletier,

Clement and Vallerand's (2000) work within the self-determination theory (SDT).

Ushioda (2009: 215) defines the former view as 'emergent from relations between real

persons, with particular social identities, and the unfolding cultural context of activities'.

Developed in the field of social psychology, self-determination theory (SDT) is

described by Deci and Ryan (2011:416) as 'an empirically derived theory of

human motivation and personality in social contexts that differentiates motivation in

terms of being autonomous and controlled'. It suggests that the most self-determined

form of motivation, intrinsic motivation, is more likely to thrive in contexts

characterized by a sense of security and relatedness (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Noels (2001) developed thinking further by identifying a correlation between

intrinsic motivation and identified regulation, which is a self-determined form of

extrinsic motivation. Here the goal is created by external demands on the learner, but at

the same time is of personal importance to them and reflects their values. This is

important for the teacher, as it highlights the merit of helping learners identify how the

learning is personally important to them. Furthermore, Noels, Pelletier and Vallerand

(2000) suggested the potential need to *persuade* learners of this personal importance,

since intrinsic factors such as pleasure or interest may be insufficient motivation to

sustain study of the language.

Reflecting the further development of theoretical perspectives such as attribution

theory (Weiner, 1992), self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985) and autonomy

theory (Ushioda, 1996) , Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) recognised that the process

orientated phase of L2 motivation theory was developing into a *socio dynamic* period.

This current period is characterised by a consideration of motivation from a complex

dynamic systems perspective, based especially on dynamics systems theory, one strand of complexity theory.

This is necessary because within the situated process-orientated paradigm, individual differences tend to vary in different contexts and at different times and can therefore no longer be viewed as generalizable, stable factors. In addition, elements such as cognitive or emotional factors may modify the general characteristic that is being observed. Dörnyei and Ushioda refer to these elements as 'cross-attributional cooperation' (ibid.:89). The broad distinctions between motivation, cognition and affect phenomena remain valid but 'should be viewed as dynamic subsystems that have continuous and complex interaction with each other' (ibid.: 91). Within this socio dynamic period, the most recent development has been the identification of *Directed Motivational Currents* (DMCs) described by Henry, Davydenko and Dörnyei (2015) as periods of intense and enduring motivation in pursuit of a highly desired personal goal or vision, for example that of migrant learners keen to master the language of their host nation. New research methods to the field, such as retrodictive qualitative modelling (RDM) (Chan et al., 2015) and multilevel nested systems approaches (Mercer, 2015) are being developed to better capture the nature of motivation in language learning from a complex dynamics systems perspective.

As can be seen, motivation in language learning is a complex area underpinned by a range of salient theoretical dimensions including the integrative motive, the Ideal and Ought to L2 selves, intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, individual differences and DMCs. These are all consistent with a situated process orientated paradigm interpreted through a complex socio dynamic systems lens. However, as the next section explores, the majority of early L2 motivation research has been

predominantly quantitative, so it would seem more qualitative research and mixed

methods studies are needed to explore this complexity.

The nature of research in L2 motivation

Originating in the field of social psychology, L2 motivation research has been

historically dominated by quantitative methods such as the Attitude/Motivation Test

Battery (AMTB), (e.g. Gardner and MacIntyre 1992; Gardner and Tremblay 1994).

Tests such as this one consist of self-report questionnaires, which use a battery of

questions to measure different aspects of motivation via 19 different subscales; items

are developed for each context (Gardner, 1985). Such methods provide useful

quantitative data, however they do not provide access to the reasons why individuals

think and behave as they do. There is therefore a need for qualitative research or mixed

methods approaches that can provide a thick description (Geertz, 1973) and lead to a

deeper understanding of learner and teacher perceptions. Researchers in SLA have

called for such a change, e.g. Mohan (1990) calls for qualitative, holistic research as

well as quantitative research and more recently researchers such as Dörnyei (2009)

have recognised that the preference of journal editors in the field is for quantitative

studies. More recent work has recognised case study to be well-suited to the

investigation of motivation within SLA (e.g. Shuman, 2014) . The more fluid nature of

qualitative approaches needed to investigate complex variation within individuals

requires robust investigative frameworks that are able to provide a coherent approach in

different contexts and for different pedagogical approaches.

The need for such methodologies becomes increasingly pressing when we

consider models which have attempted to synthesise the complex and multiple

perspectives on motivation outlined above. Such models are summarised in the next section.

Previous Models for Conceptualising Motivation in Language Learning

Dörnyei (1994), Williams and Burden (1997) and Coyle (2011) have all devised models for conceptualising motivation in language learning. Initially Dörnyei (1994:280) proposed a model entitled 'Components of Foreign Language Learning Motivation', which categorised different components involved in language learning motivation on three levels: language level, learner level and learning situation level. This model comprised course-specific, teacher-specific and group-specific motivational components. Significantly, this early situated model takes account of the potential impact of situational factors on aspects of motivation.

Building on this, in their model, Williams and Burden (1997) distinguished three interactive stages of motivation: i) reasons for doing something; ii) deciding to do it (initiating motivation); and iii) sustaining the effort, or persisting (sustaining motivation). In their exploration of what makes a person want to learn, they identified internal factors, which are subject to external factors. These are summarised in Table 1 (Williams and Burden, 1997:138-140) and are context-dependent. This range of factors has similarities with those previously identified in L2 research including intrinsic interest, sense of agency, self-concept, mastery, affective states, gender, age and developmental stage, but also specifies the learner's perceptions of the value of an activity. This identification of factors influencing an individual's decision to act are key for any framework that seeks to explain motivation.

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

A further salient notion, that of the teacher's role in initiating and maintaining motivation, was developed further by Dörnyei in his later models of the motivational L2 Teaching Practice (Dörnyei, 2001) and the L2 Motivational Self System, developed in 2005 and explored more fully in Ushioda (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System further developed thinking by focussing on the internal desires of the learner, the external pressures generated by significant others within the social context and the learner's experience of the learning process. Internal desires involve the notion of the Ideal L2 self (what the learner would like to become) and the Ought-to L2 self (driven by external requirements and drivers). Although each forms part of this model they are not exemplified here.

Whilst previous models focussed on the conceptualisation of L2 motivation, Coyle (2011:17) proposes an initial process model for the *investigation* of motivation specifically within CLIL settings, focussing on the 'learning environment', 'learner engagement' and 'learner identities/self' (Figure 1). This model draws on Dörnyei's framework of L2 motivation (Dörnyei, 1994; Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998) and his motivational teaching model (2001).

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

These three models have been highly influential in the development of L2 motivation theory. Dornyei's (1994) motivational teaching model provides examples of characteristics of the four stages that comprise motivational teaching practice, Williams and Burden (1997) identify internal and external motivational factors, and Coyle (2011) provides the first model for investigating motivation based around three aspects of

motivation. However, no one model systematically relates principal characteristics to aspects of motivation and exemplifies them for the purpose of investigation. Given that motivation is a complex, multi-faceted concept, we need a framework that acknowledges the complexity of motivation in the language learning context and one that provides a flexible, but robust research structure for supporting the selection of methods from a wide variety that are appropriate to researching particular phenomena in particular contexts (Dörnyei et al., 2014a). Such frameworks, that can support both qualitative and quantiative methods, are a useful addition to the field.

The Process Motivation Model

       The new framework proposed here, the PMM (see Figure 2) is based on current understanding of the socio dynamic process model (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011) along with salient aspects of previous models. This framework does not represent a re-conceptualisation of motivation, but rather a re-conceptualisation of the *investigation* of motivation and the development of a systematic method for investigating the range of motivational facets evident in language learning contexts for any pedagogical approach. It provides a new framework to support the investigation of motivation in language learning applicable to researching a pedagogical approach or evaluating an aspect of teaching or learning; it focuses specifically on key aspects of motivation by unpacking their principal characteristics, illustrating what these may look like in the classroom and offering some suggestions about how they might be investigated.

       If we are to develop the systematic approaches to qualitative and mixed methods research that are able to investigate motivation as a complex, multifaceted concept, then there is a need for research frameworks such as the one under consideration in this article.

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

The structure of this new framework integrates Coyle's three key aspects of motivation (Coyle, 2011): learning environment, learner engagement, and learner identities/self but also adds aspects drawn from other models as subsections. Coyle's model (2011) (see Figure 1), was designed to facilitate a particular study into learner gains and motivation in CLIL contexts and provides some useful characteristics. For example, as illustrated in the extract below, under the learner engagement aspect of motivation, Coyle includes three broad categories: 'enhancing learners' attitudes and successes', 'relevance of learning and learner involvement', and 'retrospective reflection on learning'.

[Insert Figure 3 about here]

These examples provide overarching themes indicating where to begin in the exploration of learner engagement as an aspect of motivation. However, these broad signposts are dependent on interpretation for their meaning. Therefore, for other studies, the range of intended principal characteristics indicative of learner engagement may be unclear. Exemplification of what these might look like in the learning context is also left to the reader. As pedagogical approaches and their contexts vary, over-prescription would be equally unhelpful. The PMM proposed in this article therefore is designed to complement previous models by providing greater clarity in identifying aspects of motivation. As such it provides a structure for identifying what their principal characteristics might look like and what might be looked for when investigating them in the learning context.

Figure 4 illustrates the new framework's approach to the investigation of learner engagement. It identifies four principal characteristics of learner engagement: the perceived value of the activity, learner attitudes, learner perceptions of their learning and engagement in learning tasks.

[Insert Figure 4 about here]

The structure also identifies princpal characteristics of each of the three key aspects and potential sources of evidence in the classroom and learning process. For example, for the principal characteristic of 'perceived value of activity', suggested potential sources of evidence relate to personal relevance, anticipated value of outcomes, intrinsic value attributed to the activity, and identified regulation. Potential instruments include learner questionnaire and/or interview, focus group, teacher interview and lesson observation. However, this is not intended to be an exhaustive list. I used these methods in the study that exemplifies the framework here, but they are not prescriptive; it may be appropriate to use more innovative or different methods. Exemplifications of sources of evidence are provided as suggestions, where relevant to the context and the study. The intention is to facilitate consideration of appropriate research instrument(s) for one or more foci of aspects of motivation in the language learning context.

Indicators of motivation are identified in sufficient detail to enable the teacher, learner or researcher to consider in depth the aspects of motivation they may wish to focus on at any given time, whilst having an awareness of other aspects and characteristics that contribute to the multi-faceted nature of motivation. The focus is not on creating/initiating interest, but rather on how interest is sustained over time for the individual as well as groups within a lesson, a series of lessons or a longer period of

study. As in Coyle (2011) and Dörnyei's (1994) models, all aspects of motivation are interdependent: demotivation in any aspect may negate positive motivation elsewhere. In the next section I illustrate how the PMM framework may be applied through a discussion of how it was used to support the investigation of a series of case studies in schools in England. This research aimed to investigate the positive affects to learner motivation that the alternative pedagogical approach of CLIL might bring to the identified demotivation of language learners in secondary schools in England (Chambers 1999; Coleman, Galaczi, and Astruc 2007).

Exemplification of the Framework

Context for the study

The motivation of learners has been found to be key in the context of English learners learning a foreign language at secondary school. There is a tendency towards demotivation often due to a prevailing uninspiring diet that offers little challenge or interest for many secondary learners aged 11-16 (Chambers, 2000; Coleman, Galaczi, and Astruc, 2007; Coyle, 2000). The study from which I draw examples in this article sought to explore the extent to which CLIL might promote student motivation in three different contexts in schools in England. The PMM was used to frame the methodology for the study.

Contextual details of the settings in the study

The study focussed on one group of learners, aged 12-13 or 14-15 in three schools: referred to as schools A, B and C. The CLIL language was French. However, in School B, a further group of learners aged 11-12, studying German was included, to

represent the breadth of CLIL in this setting. Table 2 illustrates the contextual details of the three schools and the CLIL models in operation.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

As can be seen from Table 2, each school had operationalised different models of CLIL and each had differing class structures. However, the PMM provided a framework that supported the design and interpretive analysis of case studies in these three very different settings. It is important to note that although the sample size is small, it represents a relatively large proportion of learners engaged in the handful of known established CLIL contexts in state comprehensive schools in England involving at least one curriculum subject for at least one year.

The design of the study

The study addressed two research questions: (1) in what ways does CLIL impact on learner motivation? and (2) what are the main elements of CLIL that enhance motivation? The research took the following format. Following a half day visit to the school to discuss the research, I formulated a questionnaire in line with the framework, which was completed by the selected class of learners aged 12-13 or 13-14. Findings from this questionnaire provided a context and a steer for focus group questions and semi-structured interviews within each participating institution. A 3-day data collection visit followed, during which I held interviews with the head teacher, a deputy head, the head of the modern languages department, a CLIL teacher, and two learner focus groups of six-eight learners. Interviews and focus groups were recorded and transcribed verbatim. I triangulated data generated through this study to allow a comparison of perspectives via the range of selected instruments: a pre-visit questionnaire, qualitative

interviews and focus groups, all of which were designed and interpreted in accordance with the framework.

I employed a rigorous, transparent and systematic approach to data collection and analysis. For the questionnaire, pre-coded response categories were adjusted where necessary after piloting and consultation with each school. I coded other responses for brevity and clarity where appropriate using post-coding techniques (Bryman, 2004). For the analysis of quantitative aspects of the questionnaire, simple counting techniques (Silverman, 2002) were more appropriate than more complex software for reporting the results of this small sample. I drew on the PMM to devise a coding system for the collection and analysis of data from the interview and pupil focus group transcriptions (Bryman, 2004) and assigned empirical codes (Bryman, 2004) to additional themes that emerged during analysis of the data. Ethical regulations with the requisite safeguarding procedures were followed (British Educational Research Council, 2011)

This study investigated the extent to which a pedagogical approach promoted learner motivation. However, as the focus of this paper is on the development of a framework for explaining motivation in language learning in a broad sense, the following discussion section will explore how the framework provided sufficient breadth and depth of understanding for each aspect of learner motivation within the context of the chosen methodology for the CLIL study.

Discussion of the framework

The complex, dynamic nature of motivation means that any one particular facet can only be understood in relation to the others. The framework therefore, was needed to provide a systematic approach across models and year groups that took account of the

range of facets, those involved in interplay at any given moment as well as an acknowledgement of those lying fallow.

Operationalisation of the framework

In the planning stages, I formulated questions for the questionnaire, interview and focus groups from prompts in the PMM framework. I honed the questions following feedback from a pilot study. Results were subjected to an interpretive analysis by the themes derived from the framework in the Process Motivation Model, i.e. the learning environment, including teacher approaches to teaching, course and group dynamics; learner engagement and learner identities. Sub-themes, organised under the appropriate aspect of motivation, followed the principal characteristics and were exemplified where evidence was found. The themes emanating from the research questions were interwoven into this structure.

Findings from the questionnaire are reported elsewhere (Bower, 2014). However, it is useful to note that the quantitative data it generated demonstrated more positive learner perspectives, than might be found in the traditional language learning classroom in England (e.g. Jones and Jones 2001; Williams, Burden and Lanvers 2002). Categories identified included enjoyment, effort both in class and at home and progress across the four skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. There were some differences between schools and in one school between learners. These findings informed research questions during the data collection visits. The facility provided by the framework within this case study approach to tease out the reasons for these differences was essential to allow a deeper probing and thereby a more profound understanding beyond the superficial.

Exemplification from the study

      The discussion of the framework here will focus on examples that illustrate the kind of insights the framework can generate. These examples are taken from two principal characteristics of two different aspects of motivation. 1) how the learning environment provides interest and relevance from the course specific sub-section; and 2) from the learner engagement aspect of motivation: the principal characteristics of learner perceptions of their learning.   Below I exemplify how the PMM framework helped frame the study in relation to the learning environment and learner perceptions of their learning using a small amount of data from the study.

1. How the learning environment provides interest/relevance

      In order to investigate how course specific aspects of motivation interested learners and were perceived as relevant by them, the following potential sources were identified in the framework and investigated: stimulating course content, relevance to learners' needs and expectancy of success (see extract in Figure 5).

[Insert Figure 5 about here]

      Instruments used for collecting data relevant to these principal characteristics were: the review of resources and the setting's own documentation; questions posed on the learner questionnaire and explored during the focus groups; and responses from the semi-structured teacher interviews.

Stimulating, relevant content

      In the questionnaire respondents were asked what they liked and disliked about learning in this way, against pre-populated options including 'other'. In School A, 22 of

27 liked 'the way you learn French' and 22 of 27 'speaking French'. It was important, particularly in the context of demotivation in language learning in England, to probe more deeply with learners, teachers and managers in order to understand why this was the case. Learners reported how they enjoyed understanding more and more of what was being said in the target language and speaking the language. One learner, for example, suggested that the longer they were in the group, studying in this way, 'French actually comes more naturally to you…'. The focus groups provided the opportunity to probe deeper into why learners enjoyed learning French in this way. One student suggested:

> I don't necessarily want to learn about what's in people's pencil cases, but I like learning about world things that you can actually say and would be useful to you in French....

When asked what lesson content they most enjoyed, Y8 pupils in School B responded:

> P1   What we enjoy most, probably (.) challenge, it's a challenge for us to work something, do it different, do it in a different way.

> P2   Well, I quite like the, I sometimes get a bit stuck on the French and then don't learn the geography, but we're usually, like, given dictionaries and stuff, so I quite like working out what sentences say and that.

When placed in relation to comments from teachers and a head teacher, this provided deeper insights. Teachers viewed the content as more relevant, for example, the head of department of School C posited that the space module was relevant to learners because:

> you're using languages for real purposes because they're giving opinions about something they're bothered about, rather than how much pocket money they've got.

The head teacher at School C, linked making languages more relevant to motivation suggesting:

> for me, the really clear difference for the children is when they are doing something which clearly links to another subject, you don't need to spend any time whatsoever on the relevance. The relevance is there for all to see.

When analysed together with the other data, these views confirmed that where learners had a positive experience of CLIL, they usually found the subject content more relevant to them than the content of modern language lessons. Relevant content had a significant impact on the vast majority of learners in all three case study schools, who appreciated being able to use the language for real purposes and were proud of what they had achieved (Bower, 2014). This increased interest and relevance concurs with findings from other research (Coyle, 2000; 2011).

These examples illustrate that the PPM provided a structure for interviewing groups of learners and individual staff to probe further in a consistent manner, in order to ascertain why learners perceived this to be the case and whether teachers agreed and why. The formulation of questions in line with the framework ensured a similar approach, adapted to the particular attributes of each institution and their chosen approach to CLIL. Investigating the pedagogical approach in this way led to significant findings.

Expectancy of success

The short term nature of the project in School C (9 lessons), meant that it was not appropriate to apply the framework to measure success by achievement in the same way as the long term CLIL models in operation in Schools A and B. The framework however, allowed for discrimination in the application of appropriate aspects; not all are relevant to all contexts.

In School A, when asked what they liked about the 'immersion'[1] group, 20 of 28 questionnaire respondents noted accelerated learning and 21 of 28 future opportunities. 21 of 28 learners said in CLIL lessons they were usually making progress. 21 learners also noted that they liked the teacher. In contrast, in the Y8 group in School B, only 5 of 27 respondents noted accelerated learning when considering what they liked about French Geography and only 7 of 27 said they usually perceived themselves to be making progress. However, feedback from the Y7 focus group learners (aged 11-12) suggested high levels of attainment and success: they reported that they had made more progress in two terms of learning German, than they had in the four years of learning French at primary school (aged 7-11).

These contrasting results raised a number of questions to explore in the focus groups and teacher interviews. The range of aspects and principal characteristics of motivation in the framework were considered in drilling down into the reasons for these differences, not just those in the course specific category. Here teacher specific characteristics were found to be significant in cases of lower expectancy of success. In particular, an inappropriately high level of challenge set by one teacher was perceived by many Y8 learners to be too difficult. For example, one pupil from School B suggested:

> Well, it's hard and some people like a challenge, so it's good for people who like a challenge, but then if people don't really understand it's not really good for them.

Another explained:

---

[1] The term 'immersion' was used by School A in relation to their CLIL model

> I'm very happy about French geography and really enjoy the lessons, but some
> people don't and don't understand [and] therefore distracting (sic) people. I want
> to keep learning this way.

This also illustrates how demotivation in one aspect can negate motivation in the others. In School A, the school presented compelling evidence from the first cohort to parents and learners prior to joining the school that the curriculum strand 'immersion' model raises learners' attainment and enables early entry GCSE in French. During focus groups learners' held this high expectancy of success for themselves. Paradoxically, many who perceived themselves to be living up to these expectations, also perceived external expectations from the school, the teacher and in some cases parents, as a negative pressure. The issue was raised in questionnaire responses as a dislike and probed further during focus groups and interviews. For example, one pupil from School A suggested:

> I find it a bit daunting … Because we're in French immersion, like it's also
> expected of us that we do better in the other subjects as well... on the introduction
> evening … they showed us the results tables for the French immersion groups and
> they got like higher than average levels/grades in all the other subjects as well…

This exploration of the notion of expectancy of success illustrates the complex interplay of facets of motivation and demonstrates how the structure of the framework provided the breadth and depth needed to investigate them.

In summary, the exemplification of these course specific findings pertaining to interest and relevance in the study demonstrate how the framework can be used to reveal the complexity of facets of motivation for this aspect of motivation within the learning environment.

2. Learner perceptions of their learning

       Similarly, the framework was used to provide structure when planning and investigating learner engagement aspects of motivation (Figure 2). The principal characteristic from this aspect selected to illustrate the framework here is learner perceptions of their learning (Figure 6).

Insert Figure 6 here

       The following potential sources were investigated in order to investigate how learners' perceived their effort, progress and the level of difficulty and challenge: the learner questionnaire, focus groups and teacher interviews. Three specific questions relating to learner perceptions produced data from the questionnaire for quantitative analysis. The analysis of this data provided a context for drawing up questions for the 3-day data collection visit in line with the framework. Respondents rated firstly how enjoyable they found this learning on a scale of 4-1, from very enjoyable to not enjoyable. Secondly, they rated their effort on a scale of 4-1, from maximum effort to poor effort, both in class and at home. Finally, they rated their progress in French since the beginning of the academic year in each of the four main skill areas.

       Compared to the prevailing demotivation in the context of secondary education in England (Chambers 1999; Coleman, Galaczi, and Astruc 2007), in School A, the quantitative analysis suggested that learners perceived themselves to make exceptional effort for a mixed ability Y8 group, aged 12-13 (Bower, 2014). Questions were again drawn up against the framework in order to probe the reasons why. It was surprising that in this mixed ability group only one boy and one girl perceived their effort to be less than good in class and only one learner less than satisfactory at home. Discussions

in the focus groups and teachers' perspectives from the semi-structured interviews substantiated these findings. In School B, although effort levels were perceived to be lower than in School A, levels were still high for a middle to lower ability group with 23 of 27 learners perceiving their effort in class to be at least good, and no learner describing their effort in class as poor. One boy from School A explained why learners did not find it boring:

> because it's always like a challenge, and you have to always work hard to
> understand it, and once you understand, you remember it, because you work hard.

These findings suggested that a measure of motivation and enthusiasm may be attributable to the nature of CLIL teaching, which may be extending learners' enthusiasm beyond where it might be expected to be. However, perceived effort can only be fully understood in relation to other aspects in the framework. Interestingly, discussion relating to other facets of motivation revealed that many of the learners in the Y8 focus group in School B reported trying hard but frequently found that levels of challenge were too high. As a result, at times they became demotivated, for example one learner reported:

> Just to do it (geography) in French is quite hard, so sometimes I'm sat next to my
> partner and we don't really understand it and we start talking, and we just … don't
> listen.

This may not have been revealed had this systematic and detailed framework not been employed.

In School C, deeper probing revealed issues that may have adversely influenced their effort such as many learners having already opted to drop French, the learners' dislike of the teaching style in the top set, and the concurrent study of the same topic in

a range of subjects. For example, referring to the cross-curricular history project, two

learners in a focus group explained:

> P1 Yeah we were doing the Holocaust thing so we had this … huge project
> throughout all of the lessons.
> P2 We done it in every single subject, we've done it in XXX, we've done it in like
> French and then after a while it just gets really boring, and we know like
> everything about the Holocaust

Learners however appreciated the increased cultural awareness that learning the topic in

French brought. One girl suggested:

> …they taught it from the way French people would see it. So it made us, made me
> see things like in a perspective of a different country.

Therefore, from these findings, it was again difficult to interpret the impact of this short

term model of CLIL on learners' effort in this setting.

The majority of learners in all schools perceived their progress in listening and

writing skills to be good or better.   Further questions to investigate these initial findings

were drawn up in line with the framework. Writing is a weaker skill area for some

learners across the secondary curriculum (ages 11-16), however in School A, 24 of 28,

in School B, 17 of 27 and in School C, 20 of 30 respondents, perceived their progress to

be good or better in writing. In School C, data from the teacher interviews demonstrated

a focus on improving writing skills in normal language lessons and therefore, the

progress in this skill was not necessarily attributable to CLIL. 27 of 28 of learners in

School A and 22 of 27 learners in School B perceived their progress in listening to be

good or better. This was substantiated during further discussions with learners and

teachers.

These results from a range of perspectives and sources illustrate how, by using the framework, it was possible to identify insights into individual learner motivation and also similarities, differences and nuances between settings. It was possible to compare these findings with previous research relating to motivation in traditional foreign language learning contexts in England, in order to inform practice.

Overall, key findings from the established projects in the study indicate greater motivation, engagement, progress and achievement by a large majority of learners in CLIL lessons. They perceive languages to be important; they work hard and have developed greater concentration and listening skills across the curriculum and greater intercultural awareness (Bower, 2014).

Advantages and limitations of the Framework

Building on previous models, the framework provided by the Process Motivation Model re-conceptualises the investigation of motivation in SLA in qualitative and mixed method approaches by offering one flexible tool for case study approaches. It is underpinned by current theoretical understanding of motivation in SLA from a complex dynamics systems perspective. The framework facilitates the exploration of individual differences as well as reflecting patterns of a group of learners in order to gain a deeper understanding of the reasons for learner behaviour. The examples provided here illustrate how it can provide a comprehensive, yet flexible framework that takes account of the multi-faceted complex dynamic nature of motivation including cognition and affect in the language learning context. Here it facilitated the scrutiny of a nuanced picture across different settings, in which contrasting models of one pedagogical approach (CLIL) were in operation. As a result, findings from the study could be utilised to better inform practice within and beyond the participating schools. It may be

relevant to the investigation of a wide range of non-CLIL language learning pedagogical approaches, but further research would be needed to support this proposition.

As demonstrated here, the PMM framework facilitates a systematic, approach to planning a focus for investigation, designing the research instruments, conducting the study and analysis of data; it brings coherence to these processes.   In the exemplar study, the detailed nature of the identification of principal characteristics and exemplification of potential sources of evidence in this framework enhanced the richness of the data and the ability to collect it in a systematic way. As a result, rich data leading to thick descriptions were generated in each context.

The detailed nature of the framework, though, leads to limitations in its use. For example, it is too complex for use as a tool for lesson observation. Whilst it is possible to use the framework to identify criteria for observation, it would not be possible to simply use the framework in its entirety as a tool within the context of observation of lessons. Additionally, the framework as presented in Figure 2 is not intended as an exhaustive compilation of aspects of motivation, characteristics, exemplification of sources of evidence and investigation methods.

However, the framework does provide a tool, which may be utilised to broaden the research base in the field of SLA by providing a comprehensive, coherent approach and may also be valuable in structuring evaluations of new pedagogical models where there is little published research, such as the emerging nature of CLIL in English schools (e.g. Hunt et al., 2009). It may also be useful in supporting individual school's evaluations.

Concluding remarks

This paper has argued that there is a need for a flexible research framework to use as one tool in the development of coherent approaches to qualitative and mixed methods research in the field of SLA. The Process Motivation Model for Investigating Language Learning Pedagogical Approaches, reported here together with exemplification and commentary, provides such a framework. The PMM framework proved to be an effective and coherent framework for planning the research, instrument design, data collection and interpretive analysis of data in three contrasting settings, in which different models of language learning were in place (Bower, 2014).

As demonstrated here, it enables research to focus on the range of facets of motivation underpinned by the SLA social dynamic systems approach. It is sufficiently detailed to facilitate the investigation of nuances whilst maintaining a cogent approach. Although used here to illustrate the exploration of examples of language learning in England, the framework is designed to be flexible and may be used to investigate other language learning pedagogical approaches in a range of settings. It is hoped that the proposed model will provide a tool to enable teachers and researchers in a wide range of language learning contexts to investigate learner motivation in a systematic and in-depth manner. The framework has the potential for much greater significance in the future by adaptation to a range of curriculum subjects beyond language learning.

References

Bower, K. (2014) To what extent does Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) as a language-based project approach promote pupil motivation in the teaching of MFL in three secondary schools in England? PhD., The University of Hull.

Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z. and Ryan, S. (2015) L2 motivation research 2005–2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape, *System*, 55: 147-157. doi:10.1016/j.system.2015.10.006

British Educational Research Council. (2011) Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research 2011, BERA, (ed.). London: BERA.

Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chambers, G. N. (1999) *Motivating Learners*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chambers, G. N. (2000) Motivation and the Learners of Modern Foreign Languages in S. Green, (ed.), *New Perspectives on Teaching and Learning Modern Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, Modern Languages in Practice 46-76.

Chan, L., Dörnyei, Z. and Henry, A. (2015) Learner archetypes and signature dynamics in the language classroom: A retrodictive qualitative modelling approach to studying L2 motivation, in M. Dörnyei. Z., P., & Henry, A., (ed.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 238-259.

Coffey, S. and Street, B. (2008) Narrative and identity in the "Language Learning Project", *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(3): 452-464. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00757.x

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education*, London: Routledge.

Coleman, J. A., Galaczi, A. and Astruc, L. (2007) Motivation of UK school pupils towards foreign languages: a large-scale survey at Key Stage 3, *The Language Learning Journal*, 35(2): 245-281. doi:10.1080/09571730701599252

Coyle, D. (2000) Meeting the Challenge: Developing the 3Cs Curriculum, in S. Green, (ed.), *New Perspectives on Teaching and Learning Modern Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: Modern Languages in Practice: 158-182.

Coyle, D. (2011) *ITALIC Research Report Investigating Student Gains: Content and Language Integrated Learning*, Edinburgh: University of Aberdeen, Esmée Fairbairn Foundation.

Coyle, D., Hood, H. and Marsh, D. (2010) *Content and Language Integrated Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deci, E. and Ryan, R. (1985) The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality, *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19: 109-134. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(85)90023-6

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2011) *Self-determination theory, London*: Sage.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994) Motivation and Motivating in the Foreign Language Classroom, *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3): 273-284. doi:10.2307/330107

Dörnyei, Z. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Motivation*, Harlow: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003) Attitudes, Orientations, and Motivations in Language Learning: Advances in Theory, Research, and Applications, *Language Learning*, 53(51): 3-32. doi:10.1111/1467-9922.53222

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2008) New ways of motivating foreign language learners: Generating vision, *Links*, 38(Winter): 3-4.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009) Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment, *Language Learning*, 59(s1): 230-248. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00542.x

Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D. and Henry, A. (2014a) Conclusion: Hot enough to be cool -the promise of dynaminc systems research, in Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, and A. Henry, (eds.), *Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., MacIntyre, P. D. and Henry, A. (2014b) Introduction: Applying Complex Dynamic Systems Principles to Empirical Research on L2 Motivation, in Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, and A. Henry, (eds.), *Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

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

Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (2011) *Teaching and Researching Motivation*, Harlow: Pearson Education.

Gardner, R. C. (1985) *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*, Baltimore: MD: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. Integrative Motivation: Past, Present and Future, *Presented at Distinguished Lecturer Series*, Temple University Japan.

Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.

Geertz, C. (1973) Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture., *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York: Basic Books: 3-30.

Henry, A., Davydenko, S. and Dörnyei, Z. (2015) The anatomy of Directed Motivational Currents: Exploring intense and enduring periods of L2 motivation, *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(2): 329-345. doi:10.1111/modl.12214

Hunt, M., Neofitou, A. and Redford, J. (2009) Developing CLIL training for modern language teacher trainees, *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field, Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä.*

Jones, B. and Jones, G. (2001) *Boys' performance in Modern Foreign Languages. Listening to learners,* London: CILT.

Lamb, M. (2004) Integrative motivation in a globalizing world, *System*, 32(1): 3-19. doi:10.1016/j.system.2003.04.002

Lamb, M. (2013) 'Your mum and dad can't teach you!': constraints on agency among rural learners of English in the developing world, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(1): 14-29. doi:10.1080/01434632.2012.697467

Mercer, S. (2015) Dynamics of the self: A multilevel nested systems approach, in Z. Dörnyei, Henry, A., & MacIntyre, P. D, (ed.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 139-163.

Mohan, B. A. LEP Students and the Integration of Language and Content: Knowledge Structures and Tasks, *Presented at Proceedings of the first research symposium on limited English proficient student issues*, Washington, DC.

Nikitina, L. and Furuoka, F. (2008) A language teacher is like…: Examining Malaysian students' perceptions of language teachers through metaphor analysis, *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(2): 192-205.

Noels, K. A. (2001) Learning Spanish as a Second Language: Learner's Orientations and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Communication Style, *Language Learning* 51(1): 107-144. doi:10.1111/0023-8333.00149

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clement, R. and Vallerand, R. J. (2000) Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory, *Language Learning*, 50: 57-85. doi:10.1111/0023-8333.00111

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G. and Vallerand, R. J. (2003) Why Are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory, *Language Learning*, 53(S1): 33-64. doi:10.1111/1467-9922.53223

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000) Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being, *American psychologist*, 55(1): 68. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(85)90023-6

Ryan, S. and Dörnyei, Z. (2013) The long-term evolution of language motivation and the L2 self, in A. Berndt, (ed.), *Fremdsprachen in der Perspektive lebenslangen Lernens*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang: 89-100.

Shuman, J. H. (2014) Foreword, in Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, and A. Henry, (eds.), *Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning,* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Silverman, D. (2002) Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction, London: Sage Publications.

Trinick, R. and Dale, H. (2015) Hinengaro, Manawa me nga e Ringaringa/Head, heart, hand: embodying Maori language through song, *Australian Journal of Music Education*,(3): 84.

Ushioda, E. (1996) *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation*, Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.

Ushioda, E. (2009) A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity, in Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, (eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 215-28.

Weiner, B. (1992) *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories, and research,* London: Sage.

Williams, M., Burden, R. and Lanvers, U. (2002) 'French is the Language of love and Stuff': student perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language, *British Educational Research Journal*, 28(4): 503-528. doi:10.1080/0141192022000005805

Williams, M., Burden, R., Poulet, G. and Maun, I. (2004) Learners' perceptions of their success and failures in foreign language learning *The Language Learning Journal*, 30: 19-29. doi:10.1080/09571730485200191

Williams, M. and Burden, R. L. (1997) *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*, New York Cambridge University Press.

Table 1. Summary of internal and external context-dependent factors of motivation to learn based on Williams and Burden (1997)

Internal Factors	*subject to*	External Factors
1. Intrinsic interest of activity 2. Perceived value of activity 3. Sense of agency 4. Mastery 5. Self-concept 6. Attitudes 7. Other affective states 8. Developmental age and stage 9. Gender		1. Significant others 2. The nature of interaction with significant others 3. The learning environment 4. The broader context

Table 2. Summary of Case Study models for this study

School	Project type	Curriculum & Questionnaire respondents	Focus groups
School A 11-16 Inner city, high FSM, almost all EAL	Curriculum Strand	ICT, PSHE, Tutor group for three years in French Year 8 group of 28	2 groups: 8 x Year 8 learners drawn from questionnaire group
School B **11-18** **Leafy suburb, almost all white, few EAL**	**School-based project**	**Subject strand of Geography in French** **Year 8 group of 27**	**1 group: 10 x Year 8 learners: 5 from questionnaire group; 5 from high ability group** **1 group: 6 x Year 7 learners (German Geography)**
School C 11-18 Faith school c. 50% white, 50% Ethnic minority heritage, EAL above average	Language-based projects based on links with other curriculum areas	Subject module of History and Science in French: 9 lessons Y9 group of 30	1 group: 10 x Y9 top set drawn from questionnaire group 1 group: 8 x Y9 bottom set

Key
FSM: Free School Meals (deprivation indicator)
EAL: English as an Additional Language
ICT: Information Technology
PSHE: Personal Social Health Education (PSHE)