

English Foreign Language vs. English as a Lingua Franca: An Exploration of Student Motivation Towards Two Approaches to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language^{*}

Inglés como lengua extranjera versus inglés como lengua franca: una exploración de la motivación de los estudiantes hacia dos enfoques para la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera

Brian Wasik

Universidad de Alcalá: Instituto Franklin

Bwasik95@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6919-4495>

DOI: 10.17398/209/1988-8430.38.261

Esta obra está publicada bajo una licencia Creative Commons



Fecha de recepción: 15/09/2022
Fecha de aceptación: 01/03/2023

OPEN ACCESS

Wasik, B. (2023). English Foreign Language vs. English as a Lingua Franca: An Exploration of Student Motivation Towards Two Approaches to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. *Tejuelo*, 38, 261-308.

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.17398/1988-8430.38.261>

^{*} Este trabajo se ha realizado en el marco del Proyecto de Investigación *LinPePrensa, Ideas lingüísticas y pedagógicas en la prensa española del siglo XIX* (ref. PGC2018-098509-B-I00. Periodo de ejecución: 2018-2022)..

Resumen: El inglés y el aprendizaje del idioma inglés se están volviendo cada vez más importantes en la sociedad moderna y tanto los estudiantes como los educadores ven una mayor importancia en el uso del idioma en el escenario global. A medida que el inglés reclama cada vez más su derecho a ser el idioma global predeterminado, desde entonces han surgido preguntas sobre si la enseñanza del idioma debería cambiar y cómo: ¿debería la educación del idioma inglés centrarse en un enfoque más tradicional en el que se enfatice la comunicación estricta con el hablante nativo y la gramática y la mecánica se encuentra a la vanguardia (es decir, inglés como lengua extranjera o EFL) o debería centrarse en un enfoque global en el que la comunicación dentro y entre hablantes no nativos sea el foco y la comunicabilidad y la comprensibilidad tengan prioridad (es decir, el inglés como lengua Franca o ELF)? Este estudio proporciona información sobre las actitudes de los estudiantes (que representan varios niveles de grado, tipos de vías y niveles de esfuerzo) en torno a la motivación hacia estos dos enfoques de educación del idioma inglés. Los resultados mostraron que los estudiantes secundarios como un colectivo tienden a preferir ELF. Las implicaciones de esta investigación sugerirían un nuevo examen del plan de estudios actual del idioma inglés, especialmente entre los niveles de grado más altos, para determinar cómo adaptar el aprendizaje del idioma inglés tanto al interés de los estudiantes como a una sociedad cada vez más global de habla inglesa.

Palabras clave: inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL); inglés como lingua franca (ELF); motivación; inglés global.

Abstract: English and English language learning are becoming increasingly important in modern day society and students and educators alike are seeing greater importance in the use of the language on the global stage. As English increasingly stakes its claim as the default global language, questions have since emerged around if and how the teaching of it should shift: should English language education focus on a more traditional approach wherein strict communication with the native-speaker is emphasized and grammar and mechanics lie at the forefront (i.e., English Foreign Language or EFL) or should it focus on a more global approach wherein communication within and among non-native speakers is the focus and communicability and comprehensibility take precedence (i.e., English as a Lingua Franca or ELF)? This study provides insight into the attitudes of students (representing various grade levels, pathway types, and levels of effort) around motivation towards these two competing English language education approaches. The results showed that secondary students as a whole tend to favor the latter, with a particular preference among groups of older students and those that put forth greater effort. The implications of this research would suggest a re-examination of the current English language curriculum, especially among higher grade levels, in order to determine how best to tailor English language learning both to student interest and to a forever more global English-speaking society.

Keywords: english as a foreign language (EFL); english as a lingua franca (ELF); motivation; global english.

I ntroduction

English as a global language is becoming a fact of life. Because of the prevalence of English, more schools are recognizing the importance of incorporating English language classes into their curriculum. Currently, English is the foreign language most widely taught—in over 100 countries worldwide (Crystal, 2003). In fact, as of 2023, 142 countries mandate English language as a part of their public education curriculum and in an additional 41 countries English is either offered in most schools or as a possible elective (“Countries in which English language is a mandatory or optional subject (interactive)”). While schools across the globe acknowledge the growing necessity to include English language curriculum, do students see it as equally as important? What truly motivates students to learn the language that is arguably becoming the most global? Is student motivation most impacted by the fact that English is becoming more global or is it a bit more complicated than that?

The following paper will first examine the history of English as a global language, understand how its status as a global language has impacted foreign language classrooms around the world, and provide context for two competing approaches to the teaching of English as a foreign language: English Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a

Lingua Franca (ELF). Next, this paper will cite previous research regarding key determinants in motivation (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, valence, expectancy, and ability) towards second language acquisition (SLA) in the English language classroom and how that research has demonstrated the extent to which students want to learn English. Lastly, this study will build off of previous research to examine the inter-relatedness of these determinants of motivation towards the EFL and ELF approaches of English language instruction by different groups of students at a specific secondary education institution in Madrid, Spain.

The fundamental questions that this study addresses are: 1) to what extent are the determinants of a learners' motivation to acquire English as a foreign language related to the EFL approach? How does grade level, pathway type, and level of effort play a role in that relationship? And 2) to what extent are the determinants of a learners' motivation to acquire English as a foreign language related to the ELF approach? How does grade level, pathway type, and level of effort play a role in that relationship?

A survey given to students representing different grade levels, pathway types, and levels of effort will be administered and analyzed to determine the answers to these questions. Special commentary will be made on the groups that yield a statistically significant difference in affinity towards a specific approach of English language instruction. A discussion of the findings, their implications, any limitations, and the need for future research will then be provided.

1. Theoretical overview

1.1. *The landscape of English foreign language education*

English is everywhere. It is the most spoken language in the world with a whopping 1.35 billion users and has even been granted special status in more than 70 countries (Crystal, 2003). Because of the growing prevalence of English, more and more schools across the globe have begun recognizing the importance of incorporating English

language classes into their curriculum. In fact, English is currently the foreign language most widely taught across the globe, finding its way inside classrooms in over 100 countries worldwide (Crystal, 2003). While there is a common consensus on the increasing significance of teaching English, is there equal agreement on exactly how it should be executed?

The answer is complicated, because over the past few decades, the main approach to English language teaching has revolved around the field of English Foreign Language (EFL) (Kiczkowiak, 2017). The EFL classroom is one in which the main objective is for students – all of whom are presumably non-native – to communicate proficiently and effectively with native speakers (Davies & Patsko, 2013). Due in part to the idea that the ideal speaker-listener in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is the native-non-native, respectively, the EFL curriculum has almost entirely focused on a student's ability to understand and be understood by a native speaker (Kiczkowiak, 2017). The EFL approach, however, is not the only one to consider, as there exists another emerging camp within the English teaching world called English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). A lingua franca is a common language people from different linguistic communities use to communicate (Crystal, 2003). Historically, lingua francas have been used to foster easier communication among communities that trade with each other. Within the past century, however, the idea of English as a global lingua franca has emerged (Crystal, 2003). In terms of teaching methodology, the ELF approach, though far less common and largely under-researched, positions the speaker-listener in SLA as non-native-non-native interactors. Though at first seemingly counterintuitive, the ELF approach considers the fact that among the 1.35 billion English users in the world, non-native English speakers outnumber native speakers three to one (Alptekin, 2005). The idea is that if non-native English speakers dominate the English speaking world, they should also take center stage within English foreign language classrooms.

The ELF approach targets three principal objectives: first, it strips away conformity to a standard model of the native speaker – a term largely disputed in modern-day linguistics on the grounds of

hegemonic, western-centric ideologies, but for the sake of ease of understanding, will continue to be referenced in this paper (and will later be discussed in greater detail); second, it represents more closely the English interactions that happen in the real world (which, as previously stated, occur predominantly among non-native speakers); and third, it redirects the focus from the culture of strictly inner circle countries (where English is and has always been the primary language: US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, and New Zealand) to that of outer circle (where English has played a significant role in a nation's history such as through colonization: Singapore, India, Malawi, etc.) and expanding circle (where English is recognized as increasingly significant among a nation's institutions: China, Japan, Greece, Poland, etc.) countries, as well as that of the local community (Nagy, 2016; Crystal, 2003).

1. 2. *Native speakerism*

The idea that the native speaker serves as the ultimate arbiter for all knowledge related to the target language and culture has pervaded – and continues to pervade – the realm of English language education. In fact, despite increasing research on the importance of ELF and non-native English speaker scholarship, 75% of all global English language teaching jobs in the private sector are advertised for native English speakers only (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016). In addition, in certain places, particularly in private educational settings, teacher evaluation practices do not exist, implying that simply holding native speaker status qualifies a person to teach their first-learned language (Clouet, 2006). Indeed, the native speaker can offer incredible insight into the nuances of language, but the non-native speaker carries with them a wealth of knowledge in SLA otherwise not afforded to the native speaker. The non-native speaker can, for instance, draw comparisons between the grammar of English and the grammar of their mother tongue, which can aid in helping students overcome difficulties and produce new structures (Clouet, 2006). Furthermore, the language analysis capabilities of the non-native speaker tend to far exceed those of the native speaker (Clouet, 2006). Despite the tremendous evidence

suggesting that non-native speakers possess incredibly important language teaching abilities, the working world still tends to favor the native over the non-native speaker.

Employers, however, are not the only ones heralding native speakers as those with superior knowledge and higher capabilities in the English language classroom, as non-native speakers largely share the same sentiments. In fact, many non-native English teachers see native English speakers as the sole authority on the target language and the teaching of it. In some cases, non-native teachers of English have even been excessively ‘critical and dismissive’ of their fellow non-native English speaking colleagues’ professional skills (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016). In fact, in recent years, a paradox in language dynamics has arisen in which situations of non-native-non-native interactors experience a subtle yet palpable ideological undertone of idealized English, inadvertently imposing a constraint on linguistic freedom and yet again situating the linguistic competence of native English speakers at the very top, as if to suggest intra-language linguistic diversity operates strictly in a hierarchical fashion (Jenkins, 2003). There has even been growing evidence to suggest that native and non-native English speakers alike view ELF varieties not as equals but as distinct proficiencies positioned above or below one another on a hierarchy of competence, as if one version is inherently superior to another (Jenkins, 2003).

The notion that the native English speaker is “the embodiment of the values and ideals of English language teaching pedagogy and knowledge” is referred to as native speakerism, and, as previously mentioned, holds firm as a value among native speakers and non-native speakers alike (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016). According to growing research, however, the idea of a “native English speaker” has less to do with language proficiency and more to do with the “white Anglo-Saxon” image of people from the English-speaking West (Kiczkowiak, 2017). To therefore achieve “native speaker” status, one must likely be white, Western-presenting and come from one of the seven aforementioned inner circle countries (Kiczkowiak, 2017). Moreover, further research shows that the terms “native” and “non-native” are

largely “ideologically charged, ambiguous, problematic, subjective, and frequently used as a tool for marginalizing and stereotyping teachers and students” (Kiczkowiak, 2017).

When discussing native speakerism and the corresponding implications for non-native people, it is important to bring in ideas of dominance and power, as all too often the native English speaker hails from countries occupying positions of global hegemony. Historically, dominant powers – such as some of the inner circle countries previously mentioned – have been able to demonstrate authority in invisible or otherwise indirect ways (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016). This particular power dynamic trickles down to the English language classroom, where oftentimes an anglocentric and monolingual approach to teaching is favored, one in which curriculum and materials center the native English speaker model of communication, extending to the native English speaker sole ownership of the language (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016). As a consequence of this power imbalance comes the dismissal and loss of local pedagogy and culture, first by way of stigmatization and second by feelings of inferiority and incompetence by the non-native English language teacher. So not only do the native English speakers’ linguistic practices take precedence in the classroom, but so too do the native English speakers’ teaching styles and pedagogy, making it that much more difficult to implement culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) in the specific context in which local students learn best (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016).

So long as native speakerism remains inextricably linked to power, it is likely that a trend of linguistic hegemony will stand firm in the English foreign language classroom. Linguistic hegemony refers to “the ways in which linguistic minorities, or speakers of a variety of English other than the standard one, believe in and participate in the subjugation of non-standard varieties of English or minority languages to the dominant, to the point where just the dominant language remains” (Clark, 2013). As previously noted, the presence of linguistic hegemony in the English foreign language classroom can have tremendously adverse effects on the learner. When the learner associates their version of English as a “non-standard variety”, they begin to practice a –

perhaps subconscious – form of self-doubt. Moreover, students often equate “non-standard varieties” with a lower value version of English.

1. 3. *Intelligibility*

The problem with non-native English speakers attempting to adjust their language to mimic that of the native speaker serves to reinforce the idea that the native English speaker embodies the most superior version of the language. If a superior version of a language is defined as one that is most intelligible to the most speakers of that language, however, then native English speakers hold no such position of superiority. In fact, research has shown that by no means are native English speakers’ accents more universally intelligible than their non-native speaker counterparts (Jenkins, 2003). Therefore, this idea of universal intelligibility may relate less to true comprehensibility of language and more to the socio-cultural and political factors that underpin it, wherein the language of the group viewed as more powerful is deemed more intelligible by the group viewed as less powerful (Jenkins, 2003). Additionally, according to years of sociolinguistic research, linguistic diversity does not signify intellectual deficit, as attitudes (by natives and non-natives alike) towards those with “non-standard varieties” might suggest (Clark, 2013). So though many native and non-native speakers of English still hold firm in their belief that the native English accent is the most desirable, research shows that in terms of intelligibility, the native accent holds no such greater value.

1. 4. *Motivation*

While it is important to understand how native speakerism and its implications play out in the EFL and ELF classroom, it is equally if not more important to understand the perspective of students on why learning English is important in the first place. Motivation and SLA have been the subject of much research for quite some time. Most research shows that motivation plays a significant role in the success or failure in learning a language (Nguyen, 2019). In general, motivated

students from the primary to the secondary level are far more likely to learn a language more quickly than students who are less motivated (Nguyen, 2019). These students are also more likely to actively participate and pay more attention to a specific learning task. Less motivated primary- and secondary-aged students, conversely, are more likely to lose attention, misbehave, cause discipline problems, and participate less frequently.

Some studies of motivation in learning English as a foreign language have determined that only certain factors such as school year and parental ability positively correlate with a students' motivation (Nguyen, 2019). Others have concluded that the students of lower years are more motivated. Gardner and Lambert (1972) determined that learners are more motivated by a sort of identification with the target language culture. This sense of identification is referred to as integrative motivation and resurfaces time and time again in SLA scholarship. Kruidenier and Clement (1986) suggest that another type of motivation called instrumental motivation – wherein the learner sees learning the language as a means to fulfill a practical objective – presents itself far more prominently than integrative motivation in the English foreign language classroom. Despite debate over which type of motivation boasts greater validity, both integrative and instrumental motivation have been paramount in understanding what motivates a student to learn English. Moreover, as these two determinants of motivation serve as the foundation of this study, essential understanding of these terms is imperative.

Aside from an identification with a particular culture, integrative motivation also consists of the following three defining characteristics: 1) an interest in foreign languages, cultures, and people, 2) a desire to broaden their view and avoid provincialism, and 3) a desire for new stimuli and challenges (Shaaban & Ghazi, 2000). It is also important to understand, however, that while integrative motivation applies most commonly to the specific culture of the target language, in the context of English, it is growing ever more complicated, as the language is quickly losing a national cultural foundation and is instead beginning to identify more with a 'global culture' (Jenkins, 2003). This trend makes

it more and more difficult to carry out research in ‘integrative motivation’ because the lack of a well-defined language and cultural community diminishes the ability to credibly measure a student’s sense of identification with said singular culture. For the sake of this study, the term ‘integrative motivation’ will continue to be used to compare the EFL vs. ELF approaches, with the supposition that the former refers to integration into the culture of an inner circle country and the latter to integration into the global English-speaking community at large.

Alternatively, instrumental motivation points to the extent to which the learner hopes to make practical use of the language insofar as it serves them personally or professionally (Shaaban & Ghazi, 2000). Oftentimes instrumental motivation translates to how likely learning a language will result in better job attainment or greater preparation for university. In a study carried out in a secondary school in Granada, Spain with the objective of determining what motivates students to learn English, Romera and Ruiz-Cecilia (2019) determined that motivation to learn English derived largely from instrumental purposes, with only a few students citing an interest in either communicating with others in English or living in the UK or the USA, which are both integrative motivational factors. Instrumental motivation, despite being linked more closely to a higher interest in learning English as evidenced by the aforementioned study, has revealed – to a slightly lesser extent than that of integrative motivation – a rather inconsistent association to language learning outcomes. In other words, different studies have demonstrated different levels of correlation among instrumental motivation and language learning outcomes. Consequently, it has been difficult to pinpoint a particular type of relationship between motivation and language learning, resulting in the conclusion that this process is “unstable, non-linear, and varies greatly across individuals, contexts, and learning tasks” (Shaaban & Ghazi, 2000).

Integrative and instrumental motivation, while significant in understanding language learning outcomes, do not fully illustrate the complexity of the relationship between motivation and language learning. Other determinants, specifically within the domain of the expectancy-value theories primarily investigated by Wen (1997) and

Shaaban & Ghaith (2008), are also important to consider. The principal theory states that “any effort exerted toward any action is determined by the valence, expectancy, and ability that the action would lead to the desired outcome (Shaaban & Ghazi, 2000). ‘Valence’, in this context, refers to the perception of the level of attractiveness of the goals set forth by the learner. ‘Expectancy’ refers to the perception of the probability of achieving those goals, irrespective of how capable they think they are of achieving them. Finally, ‘ability’ refers to an estimation of their ability to achieve those goals, irrespective of how probable it is they think they will successfully achieve them.

These determinants can be used collectively to gauge student motivation towards learning English and can shed light on the efficacy of certain methodologies to elicit greater affect towards the English language learning process. One such methodology that has arisen in Europe and, in particular, Spain is Content and Language Integrated Learning, also known as CLIL. CLIL emerged in the 1990s as a “pragmatic and pro-active approach to foreign language learning [...] thereby improving capacity and achieving requisite and sustainable outcomes” (Marsh, 2002, p. 10). Within the framework of CLIL, students engage in the target language by way of content related to another discipline. Consequently, it provides greater, more authentic, and more relevant input and exposure to the target language (Pérez Cañado, 2013). It also gives way to a more social-constructivist, interactive, and student-led learning process wherein teachers serve as facilitators rather than lecturers (Pérez Cañado, 2013). The merits of CLIL within a cultural domain have also been noted, wherein there exists an emphasis on intercultural knowledge and understanding as well as a greater concern for intercultural communication and competence (Pérez Cañado, 2013). According to one study carried out in several secondary schools in the Basque Country in Spain, the use of CLIL resulted in a more positive attitude towards English as a foreign language among students than did the more traditional EFL approach, perhaps due to the fact that CLIL provides more exposure and meaningful ways to use the language than does EFL (Lasagabaster, 2009).

In consideration of the fact that both the CLIL and ELF approach incorporate a more global and intercultural perspective into the English language classroom, and in consideration of the fact that the CLIL approach yields greater affect towards learning English among secondary students, the present study seeks to determine whether ELF will also yield such an affect towards learning English among secondary students at one particular bilingual school in Madrid, Spain.

2. Methods

The focus of this study will utilize the five aforementioned determinants of motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, and ability) to compare how students feel motivated by both the EFL and ELF approach to the teaching of English as a foreign language. Several variables will be considered to make a more holistic comparison between these two approaches and how they may be mediated by these different determinants. Grade level (1st ESO, 2nd ESO, 3rd ESO, 4th ESO, 1 Bachillerato, and 2 Bachillerato), educational pathway (Programa vs. Sección), and level of effort (Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High) will all be compared against the five determinants of motivation within each category of English foreign language teaching approach (EFL vs. ELF). For 1 and 2 Bachillerato, the educational pathway (Programa vs. Sección) does not vary and thus will not be used for analysis. Analyses of all these variables will serve to answer the following fundamental research questions grounding this study:

1. To what extent are the determinants of a learner's motivation to acquire a foreign language (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, ability) a factor in determining preference for one methodology over the other (EFL vs. ELF)?
2. To what extent are the determinants of a learner's motivation to acquire a foreign language (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, ability) related to the EFL approach in English language learning?

- a. Is there a difference in this relationship among learners of different grade levels?
 - b. Is there a difference in this relationship among learners among Programa vs. Sección?
 - c. Is there a difference in this relationship among learners that exert different levels of effort?
3. To what extent are the determinants of a learner's motivation to acquire a foreign language (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, ability) related to the ELF approach in English language learning?
- a. Is there a difference in this relationship among learners of different grade levels?
 - b. Is there a difference in this relationship among learners among Programa vs. Sección?
 - c. Is there a difference in this relationship among learners that exert different levels of effort?

While the literature has shown varying results on the relationship between and among these particular determinants of motivation, no study currently exists to compare these levels of motivation towards EFL and ELF as distinct approaches in English foreign language education. Ultimately, this study hopes to highlight the difference in the extent to which each determinant shows preference for EFL vs. ELF, and how these differences relate, if at all, to factors of grade level, pathway type, and effort. As such, the following null hypotheses shall be considered:

1. There is no significant difference in total average motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL among all students.
2. There is no significant difference in total average motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL among students of different grade levels.
3. There is no significant difference in total average motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL between Programa and Sección students.

4. There is no significant difference in total average motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL among students demonstrating different levels of effort.
- 5.

2. 1. Participants

Fifty-three students (n=53) enrolled at IES Antonio Fraguas Forges participated in this study. IES Antonio Fraguas Forges is a bilingual secondary education institution located in Madrid, Spain. The school offers two main pathways for students: Programa and Sección, wherein the former provides English instruction in Music, Physical Education, and English classes (totaling 5 hours of instruction in English per week) and the latter provides English instruction in Music, Physical Education, Geography & History, Biology, and English classes (totaling 15 hours of instruction in English per week). In other words, Sección students experience the CLIL approach, while Programa students experience a more traditional EFL approach. Students are placed into a particular pathway upon school matriculation during their first year of obligatory secondary education (ESO) according to the type of primary education institution attended. Most commonly, students from bilingual primary education institutions filter into the Sección pathway for ESO and students from non-bilingual primary education institutions filter into the Programa pathway. The Programa and Sección pathways span from 1 ESO to 4 ESO, meaning the students at the 1 Bachillerato and 2 Bachillerato levels – which take place optionally after ESO – are no longer divided into these two pathways (“Bilingual Program of the Community of Madrid”).

All of the participants were native speakers of Spanish. Of these participants, 21 students (39.6%) were enrolled in the Programa pathway and 18 (33.9%) were enrolled in the Sección pathway, with the remaining students enrolled in either 1 Bachillerato (8 students - 15.1%) or 2 Bachillerato (5 students - 9.4%). Of those enrolled in either the Programa or Sección pathways, 8 students (16.3%) were in 1 ESO, 8 students were in 2 ESO (16.3%), 11 students were in 3 ESO (20.7%),

and 13 students were in 4 ESO (24.5%). Though not considered as a variable in this study, participant gender was observed with 22 students identifying as male (41.5%), 30 students identifying as female (56.6%) and one student identifying as non-binary (1.8%).

2. 2. Instruments

Each participant's level of motivation to study English as a foreign language either through an EFL or ELF approach was measured using a modified version of the Wen (1997) scale in conjunction with specific determinants developed and utilized by (Shaaban, K. A., & Ghazi G. (2000) (see Annex A). This study's version consisted of 79 items divided into five sections and had an overall internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) of .79 based on average calculations from each section (A Cronbach's Alpha score approaching 1.0 suggests high internal consistency). Part one included a series of demographic questions such as the participant's name, gender, age, pathway, native language, and language assistant origin. Part two consisted of two subscales gauging English teaching approach (EFL vs. ELF) utilized in their English class and by their language assistant, respectively. Part three consisted of one of the three major independent variables in this study: overall effort. This section contained 6 multiple-choice items (later converted to a likert-type scale using numbers 1 - 4, wherein 1 signifies little to no effort exhibited and 4 signifies a high amount of effort exhibited) with an internal consistency of 0.73.

Part four of the survey consisted of subscales of integrative and instrumental motivation towards both EFL and ELF. The integrative motivation subscale consisted of 8 likert-type, 7-point items, in which four items gauged level of integrative motivation towards the EFL approach and four items gauged level of integrative motivation towards the ELF approach. As this study followed a single-blind methodology, the items designed to gauge attitude towards EFL vs. ELF intentionally withheld direct labelling of either approach in order to prevent priming and confirmation bias. The difference among items designed for the EFL approach and ELF approach lie primarily in the association with

native vs. non-native speakers representing inner circle vs. outer and expanding circle countries, respectively. This association holds true for all subscales of this survey. However, as integrative motivation relates to an appreciation of and interest in integrating into a language's culture, media, literature, art, etc., it is important to operationalize integrative motivation towards the ELF approach in particular as one in which students hope to relate to and integrate themselves into cultures reflected by the global English speaking community (with no consideration of a specific country representing the English language). The internal consistencies for items related to integrative motivation towards the EFL and ELF approaches were 0.74 and 0.81, respectively.

The instrumental motivation subscale consisted of 14 likert-type, 7-point items, in which 7 items were devoted to instrumental motivation towards the EFL approach and 7 items to instrumental motivation towards the ELF approach. The instrumental motivation subscale focused on the importance of English for more practical purposes including, but not limited to, finding a job, needing it for university, understanding politics, and communicating with speakers of the language. The internal consistencies for items related to instrumental motivation towards the EFL and ELF approaches were 0.82 and 0.84, respectively.

Part five of the survey consisted of three subscales with 30 items in total measuring factors of valence, expectancy, and ability. The valence subscale consisted of 10 likert-type, 7-point items that related to the participant's views towards the level of attractiveness of goals towards learning English, wherein one set of 5 items concentrated on goals towards learning English with the EFL approach and the other set of 5 items concentrated on goals towards learning English with the ELF approach. The internal consistencies for items related to the valence towards the EFL and ELF approaches were 0.66 and 0.84, respectively. The expectancy subscale consisted of 10 likert-type, 7-point items that measured the participant's perceptions of the probability of achieving the goals towards learning English, wherein one set of 5 items concentrated on goals towards learning English with the EFL approach and the other set of 5 items concentrated on goals towards learning

English with the ELF approach. The internal consistencies for items related to the expectancy towards the EFL and ELF approaches were 0.75 and 0.79, respectively. Finally, the ability subscale consisted of 10 likert-type, 7-point items that measured the participant's perception of how capable they believed they were in achieving the goals towards learning English, wherein one set of 5 items concentrated on goals towards learning English with the EFL approach and the other set of 5 items concentrated on goals towards learning English with the ELF approach. The internal consistencies for items related to the expectancy towards the EFL and ELF approaches were 0.81 and 0.86, respectively.

2. 3. Instrument administration

The researcher was granted permission by the Bilingual Coordinator at IES Antonio Fraguas Forges in Madrid, Spain to administer this survey and carry out this research. The researcher was also granted permission by teachers to select students at random from each grade level and pathway. In order to be able to make a comparison on the basis of grade and pathway, at least two students from each grade and pathway were selected. In other words, no fewer than two students from each group of 1 ESO Programa, 1 ESO Sección, 2 ESO Programa, 2 ESO Sección, etc. were selected.

Students took time during their break to complete the online survey (ranging from 10 - 30 minutes) in Spanish (their native language) in a computer lab using Google forms. Three groups of students (including a random variety of grade levels and pathway types) took the survey over a three-day period (one group per day). The purpose of the survey in addition to estimated time to complete was shared with the students. The researcher requested that students be honest in how they responded to the survey items. To minimize response bias (i.e., any reporting on how students think they should feel instead versus how they actually feel), the researcher also emphasized that their teachers would not be seeing their individual responses, nor would the survey be reflected in any sort of grade for their classes.

2. 4. Data analysis

Eleven composite scores were computed for each student by adding the scores on the subscale items that measure the following variables: effort, integrative motivation towards EFL, integrative motivation towards ELF, instrumental motivation towards EFL, instrumental motivation towards ELF, valence towards EFL, valence towards ELF, expectancy towards EFL, expectancy towards ELF, ability towards EFL, and ability towards ELF. Three primary groups served as independent variables (grade level, pathway type, and effort) against ten dependent variables related to motivation and approach to English teaching (integrative EFL, integrative ELF, instrumental EFL, instrumental ELF, valence EFL, valence ELF, expectancy EFL, expectancy ELF, ability EFL, and ability ELF). The first two independent variables were self-reported and divided into groups based on grade level (1 ESO, 2 ESO, 3 ESO, 4 ESO, 1 Bachillerato, and 2 Bachillerato) and pathway type (Programa and Sección). The third independent variable was self-measured and was divided into five groups: low effort, medium-low effort, medium effort, medium-high effort, and high effort (effort levels on a 1-4 likert-type scale: 0-2, 2.0-2.5, 2.5-3.0, 3.0-3.5, 3.5-4.0).

A total motivation score was computed for each group within the above-mentioned categories for each dependent variable by averaging the scores from all five determinants of each respondent. Descriptive statistics were computed for all variables in order to determine the level of inter-relatedness among variables, namely how grade level, pathway type, and effort correspond with the ten aforementioned dependent variables (and how EFL compares to ELF within each category and as a whole). T-tests were run to determine statistical significance in the difference between EFL and ELF outcomes for each dependent variable across all groups within each independent variable (70 T-tests in total) and as a whole. In order to determine validity on the second and fourth null hypotheses, two univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were run to determine statistical significance in the difference between EFL vs. ELF outcomes

within each grade level and for each group of effort. In order to determine validity on the first and third null hypotheses, a T-test was run to compare collective student total average motivation to EFL and ELF as well as to compare pathway type to EFL and ELF because there were only two groups for each: EFL vs. ELF and Programa vs. Sección, respectively and an ANOVA requires three groups or more in order to yield valid results.

3. Findings

Every statistical test run to address the hypotheses presented in this study used 0.05 as the minimum alpha level to determine statistical significance. This section will outline the descriptive statistics by highlighting the observations that demonstrated statistical significance. Further reference of data can be seen in the tables representing each variable and detailing the descriptive statistics for relevant T-tests and ANOVAs.

3. 1. *Determinants of motivation towards EFL vs. ELF*

A series of T-tests were run by analyzing all students and their level of motivation among each determinant in addition to their total average motivation (a combination of the five determinants) towards EFL and ELF in order to pinpoint the relationships in which there exist statistically significant differences in affinity for one methodology over the other. Collectively, students demonstrated a preference for ELF over EFL via all determinants of motivation (including total average motivation) . The differences in averages computed for each determinant as well as for total average motivation ranged from 0.26 for expectancy to 0.36 for integrative. (see Table 1 for all descriptive statistics related to differences in affinity towards EFL vs. ELF for each determinant of motivation as well as Table 2 for total average motivation). This is to say that students collectively reported higher levels of motivation for ELF than EFL at a rate between 3.71% and 5.14%. As a result, the first null hypothesis (i.e., there is no significant

difference in total motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL) can be rejected ($p=0.0017$).

Table 1

T-Test summary of difference by determinant of motivation for each methodology (EFL vs. ELF)

Data Summary							
	Obs. (n)		Mean (M)			Standard deviation (SD)	
Determinant	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	% Diff.	EFL	ELF
Integrative	53	53	5.29**	5.65**	5.14%	1.26	1.07
Instrumental	53	53	5.72**	6.07**	5.00%	1.08	0.90
Valence	53	53	5.78**	6.08**	4.29%	0.95	0.92
Expectancy	53	53	5.70**	5.96**	3.71%	0.95	0.82
Ability	53	53	5.60**	5.95**	5.00%	0.99	0.93

Paired T-Test Summary					
Type of Test and P-Value	Integrative	Instrumental	Valence	Expectancy	Ability
Two-tailed (EFL = ELF)	p=0.056	p=0.013	p=0.037	p=0.003	p=0.001
One-tailed (EFL > ELF)	p=0.972	p=0.993	p=0.982	p=0.998	p=0.999
One-tailed (EFL < ELF)	p=0.028	p=0.007	p=0.018	p=0.001	p=0.001

Note.
 * ELF significantly greater than EFL at $p < 0.05$
 ** EFL significantly different than ELF at $p < 0.05$

Source: own elaboration

Table 2

T-Test summary of difference in total average motivation by methodology (EFL vs. ELF)

Data Summary			
Methodology	Number of obs. (n)	Means in total average motivation	Standard deviation (SD)
EFL	53	5.62**	0.88
ELF	53	5.94**	0.76

Paired T-Test Summary			
Type of Test	Effect Size	T-Value	P-Value
Two-tailed (EFL = ELF)	0.45	3.30	0.0017
One-tailed (EFL > ELF)	0.45	3.30	0.9991
One-tailed (EFL < ELF)	0.45	3.30	0.00087

Note.

* = ELF significantly greater than EFL at $p < 0.05$

** = EFL significantly different than ELF at $p < 0.05$

Source: own elaboration.

3. 2. Grade level and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF

There were a few cases in which there were statistically significant differences in motivation according to each specific determinant. For instrumental purposes, for example, the 2 Bachillerato group demonstrated a preference towards ELF over EFL with a p-value of 0.00874 (see Table 3 for all descriptive statistics in relation to grade level). In terms of valence (or overall attractiveness of goals), 1 ESO showed a significant affinity towards ELF with a p-value of 0.0547 (although p-value of difference – wherein the probability of rejection of null hypothesis is determined – is just above 0.05, suggesting the difference is insignificant, the p-value of the alternative hypothesis – wherein probability of valence towards ELF being greater than valence towards EFL is determined – is 0.03). In regards to expectancy (or overall likelihood to achieve the desired goals), 2 Bachillerato showed a preference towards ELF with a p-value of 0.0276. Finally, in terms of ability (or overall perception of ability to achieve desired goals), there was a marked preference exhibited by 1 Bachillerato ($p=0.09$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.048$, <0.05 for alternative hypothesis) and 2 Bachillerato ($p=0.069$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.034$, <0.05 for alternative hypothesis) towards the ELF approach.

Furthermore, statistically significant differences in total average motivation favoring ELF over EFL were established for 3 ESO ($p=0.052$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.026$ for alternative hypothesis) and 2 Bachillerato ($p=0.0163$ for null hypothesis and $p=0.0081$ for alternative hypothesis). A statistically significant difference was close to being established for total average motivation favoring ELF over EFL for 1 ESO ($p=0.055$ for alternative hypothesis).

An ANOVA was run to determine if there existed a statistically significant difference in the means of difference between motivation towards EFL and ELF among different grade levels. In order to attain the most accurate results, average scores for every student from each subscale representing EFL was subtracted from the same scores representing ELF. These average differences were then compared among each grade level to determine if the first null hypothesis (i.e.,

that there is no significant difference in total average motivation – integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability – to learn ELF over EFL among students from different grade levels) could be rejected. The ANOVA score revealed a significant difference among grade levels in their total motivation towards EFL vs. ELF ($F(5, 47)=8.39$; $p < 0.05$), thus confirming that the second null hypothesis can be rejected and that a difference in ELF and EFL as mediated by grade level can be confirmed (see Table 4).

Table 3

Descriptive statistics for ratings of motivation determinants by grade level

Variable	Stat.	1 ESO (n=8)		2 ESO (n=8)		3 ESO (n=11)		4 ESO (n=13)		1 Bach. (n=8)		2 Bach. (n=5)	
		EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF
Integrative	M	5.75	5.59	5.28	4.94	5.55	5.89	5.29	5.40	5.63	6.03	3.50**	6.40**
	SD	0.82	1.03	0.66	1.11	1.32	1.06	1.27	1.19	1.27	0.94	1.33	0.29
Instrumental	M	6.32	6.64	5.30	5.27	6.05	6.40	5.79	5.91	5.70	5.93	4.57*	6.31*
	SD	0.90	0.46	1.13	1.27	0.89	0.49	0.90	0.96	0.87	0.80	1.62	0.53
Valence	M	5.93*	6.25*	5.36	5.18	6.16*	6.67*	5.75	5.77	6.13	6.33	4.84	6.4
	SD	0.15	0.38	0.71	1.06	0.77	0.41	1.20	1.09	0.79	0.74	1.32	0.75
Expectancy	M	6.08	6.25	5.45	5.55	5.98*	6.42*	5.80	5.81	5.58	5.77	4.80**	5.86**
	SD	0.40	0.30	0.89	0.90	0.84	0.33	1.10	1.06	0.82	0.97	1.36	0.80
Ability	M	5.90**	6.26**	5.46	5.56	5.96	6.15	5.57	5.69	5.45*	5.93*	4.80**	6.36**
	SD	0.37	0.41	0.96	0.90	0.66	0.90	1.31	1.23	0.85	0.94	1.44	0.68
Total Avg. Motivation	M	5.99	6.20	5.38	5.30	5.94*	6.30*	5.64	5.72	5.69	6.00	4.50**	6.27**
	SD	0.33	0.27	0.75	0.99	0.78	0.45	0.93	0.91	0.79	0.75	1.26	0.40

Note.

* = ELF significantly greater than EFL at $p < 0.05$

** = EFL significantly different than ELF at $p < 0.05$

Source: own elaboration

Table 4

Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) summary of difference in total average motivation by grade level

Data Summary					
Grade level	Number of obs. (n)	Mean of differences in total average motivation (ELF - EFL)	Standard deviation (SD)		
1 ESO	8	0.21*	0.32		
2 ESO	8	-0.08*	0.39		
3 ESO	11	0.36*	0.55		
4 ESO	13	0.32*	0.29		
1 Bach.	8	0.34*	0.68		
2 Bach.	5	1.76*	0.99		

ANOVA Summary					
Source	Degrees of Freedom (DF)	Sum of Squares (SS)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Stat	P-Value
Between Groups	5	11.53	2.31	8.39	0.00**
Within Groups	47	12.92	0.27		
Total	52	24.45			

Note.

* = Statistically significant difference in means of difference of total avg. motivation

** = Proof of statistical significance

Source: own elaboration

3. 3. Pathway type and. motivation towards EFL vs. ELF

In consideration of all computations run for pathway type, the difference in level of motivation to learn English in the EFL context versus the ELF context did not vary significantly within each pathway

(see Table 5 for all descriptive statistics related to pathway type and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF). In other words, students of Sección showed no difference to students of Programa in terms of preference towards learning EFL over ELF. They did, however, demonstrate slightly more motivation to learn English regardless of English teaching approach, though this trend was not confirmed to be statistically different, as general motivation to learn English was not the focus of this study. The only statistically significant difference to be confirmed, however, occurred among Sección students and their perception of greater ability to achieve the goals for ELF over EFL ($p=0.02, <0.05$).

A t-test was run to determine statistical significance in the difference in means of difference between total average motivation for the EFL and ELF approach. As the p-value was greater than 0.05 ($p=0.4294$), the third null hypothesis (i.e., there is no significant difference in total average motivation – integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability – to learn ELF over EFL between Programa and Sección students) cannot be rejected, which is to say there is a strong possibility the differences were so subtle that they could have been attributed to mere chance (see Table 6).

Table 5

Descriptive statistics for ratings of motivation determinants by pathway type

Variable	Stat.	Programa (n=21)		Sección (n=18)	
		EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF
Integrative	M	5.20	5.29	5.69	5.64
	SD	1.27	1.14	0.80	1.08
Instrumental	M	5.70	5.95	6.02	6.16
	SD	0.96	1.06	0.98	0.85
Valence	M	5.58	5.85	6.06	6.17
	SD	0.99	1.09	0.65	0.83
Expectancy	M	5.65	5.87	6.02	6.16
	SD	1.01	0.91	0.68	0.67
Ability	M	5.50	5.67	5.97**	6.17**
	SD	1.16	1.19	0.52	0.55
Total Avg. Motivation	M	5.53	5.72	5.95	6.06
	SD	0.86	0.89	0.60	0.67

Note.

* = ELF significantly greater than EFL at $p < 0.05$

** = EFL significantly different than ELF at $p < 0.05$

Source: own elaboration

Table 6

T-Test summary of difference in total average motivation by pathway type

Data Summary			
Pathway type	Number of obs. (n)	Mean of differences in total average motivation (ELF - EFL)	Standard deviation (SD)
Programa	21	0.20	0.54
Sección	18	0.11	0.34

Unpaired T-Test Summary			
Type of Test	Effect Size	T-Value	P-Value
Two-tailed (Programa = Sección)	0.2	0.65	0.52
One-tailed (Programa > Sección)	0.2	0.65	0.26
One-tailed (Programa < Sección)	0.2	0.65	0.74

Source: own elaboration

3. 4. Level of effort and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF

There were a few instances in which statistically significant differences in motivation according to each determinant were identified. Students within the group of ‘medium-high’ effort showed significantly greater integrative motivation towards ELF over EFL ($p=0.0857$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.0428$ for alternative hypothesis) (see Table 7 for all descriptive statistics related to level of effort and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF). In terms of instrumental motivation, both the ‘medium-low’ and ‘medium-high’ groups reported a greater affinity towards ELF than EFL (medium-low: $p=0.0329$, and medium-high: $p=0.0404$). Overall affective orientation towards the goals of these

methods (i.e., valence) also yielded two groups with greater affinity towards ELF over EFL: medium-high effort ($p=0.0826$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.0413$ for alternative hypothesis) and high effort ($p=0.0185$ for null hypothesis). Likelihood to accomplish goals (i.e., expectancy) also held two groups with greater affinity towards ELF over EFL, namely, the medium effort group ($p=0.028$) and the medium-high effort group ($p=0.0514$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.0257$ for alternative hypothesis). Perception of ability to accomplish these goals resulted in the highest number of groups displaying greater affinity towards ELF over EFL: the medium effort group ($p=0.0089$), medium-high effort group ($p=0.0331$), and high effort group ($p=0.0876$ for null hypothesis, but $p=0.0438$ for alternative hypothesis).

An ANOVA was also run to determine if there existed a statistically significant difference in the means of difference between motivation towards EFL and ELF among different levels of effort. In order to attain the most accurate results, average scores for every student from each subscale representing EFL was subtracted from the same scores representing ELF. These average differences were then compared across each level of effort to determine if the fourth null hypothesis (i.e., there is no significant difference in total motivation – integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability – to learn ELF over EFL among students representing different levels of effort) could be rejected. The ANOVA score failed to reveal a significant difference among all of the mean differences in total average motivation towards EFL vs. ELF and level of effort ($F(4, 48)=2.11$, $p=0.093$) thus preventing the null hypothesis from being rejected. However, with the exclusion of one particular outlier in the medium effort group, the ANOVA score demonstrates a statistically significant difference among the means of difference between EFL and ELF ($F(4, 47)=3.099$, $p=0.0241$), thus allowing – in this particular scenario – the null hypothesis to be rejected (see Table 8).

Table 7

Descriptive statistics for ratings of motivation determinants by level of effort

Variable	Stat.	Low (n=5)		Medium-Low (n=16)		Medium (n=15)		Medium-High (n=9)		High (n=8)	
		EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF	EFL	ELF
Integrative	M	4.8	4.85	5.47	5.52	4.70	5.32	5.19*	6.31*	6.47	6.31
	SD	1.24	1.34	1.02	0.94	1.25	1.10	1.52	0.77	0.51	0.88
Instrumental	M	5.03	5.00	5.82**	6.11**	5.48	5.75	5.49**	6.60**	6.68	6.64
	SD	1.10	1.16	0.92	0.69	1.24	0.96	1.05	0.61	0.36	0.36
Valence	M	4.92	5.48	5.94	6.04	5.45	5.63	6.02*	6.76*	6.32**	6.65**
	SD	1.69	1.40	0.61	0.68	0.96	1.04	0.92	0.40	0.47	0.40
Expectancy	M	4.76	4.77	6.00	6.08	5.32**	5.72**	5.84*	6.48*	6.23	6.34
	SD	1.01	1.26	0.75	0.72	1.02	0.70	0.95	0.34	0.59	0.45
Ability	M	4.48	4.56	5.94	5.88	5.05**	5.84**	6.00**	6.6**	6.18*	6.48*
	SD	1.33	1.53	0.70	0.82	1.00	0.74	0.79	0.40	0.43	0.35
Total Avg. Motivation	M	4.80	4.93	5.83	5.92	5.20	5.65	5.71**	6.55**	6.37	6.48
	SD	1.11	1.19	0.64	0.53	0.95	0.73	0.79	0.18	0.31	0.29

Note.

* = ELF significantly greater than EFL at $p < 0.05$

** = EFL significantly different than ELF at $p < 0.05$

Source: own elaboration

Table 8

Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) summary of difference in total average motivation by level of effort

Data Summary					
Level of Effort	Number of obs. (n)	Mean of Differences in Total Average Motivation (ELF - EFL)	Standard Deviation		
Low	5	0.13	0.37		
Med-Low	16	0.09	0.37		
Medium	15	0.45	1.02		
Med-High	9	0.84	0.83		
High	8	0.11	0.13		
ANOVA Summary					
Source	Degrees of Freedom (DF)	Sum of Squares (SS)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Stat	P-Value
Between Groups	4	4.04	1.01	2.1182	0.093
Within Groups	48	22.88	0.48		
Total	52	26.92			

Source: own elaboration

4. Discussion

This study set out to determine the interrelatedness of motivational factors previously identified in the literature and to explore the effects of grade level, pathway type, and effort level on a students' motivation to learn English by way of EFL and ELF. The principal questions set out to determine the extent to which five specific determinants (integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, effort, valence, expectancy, ability) of a learners' motivation to learn English related to the EFL vs. ELF approach and how this relationship varied across grade level, pathway type, and level of effort. There is little doubt that this study confirmed the importance of all these determinants in gauging student motivation to learn English, but the extent to which each determinant demonstrates motivation varies greatly across grade level, pathway type, and level of effort.

4. 1. *Determinants of motivation towards EFL vs. ELF*

In consideration of all determinants of motivation, students as a whole feel more motivated to learn English by the ELF methodology over the EFL. This trend aligns with the effects of the CLIL approach on student motivation to learn English insofar as they both yield more positive attitudes towards English as a foreign language (Lasagabaster, 2009). This trend is also observed individually among each determinant as it is collectively among all (as measured by total average motivation). Of the determinants with the greatest difference in affinity towards ELF lay integrative and instrumental (5.14% and 5.00%, respectively). Several potential factors might explain this trend. In terms of integrative motivation, students may want to associate with a vast array of English-speaking cultures, ones in which English may not even be the dominant language but may be used as the common intermediary. They perhaps recognize that knowledge of a more global English will help facilitate integration into more cultures around the globe. In terms of instrumental motivation, students may find greater applicability of global English to life after school, whether at university, in a future job, or for future travel purposes. It can also be observed that

both EFL and ELF yield higher rates of instrumental motivation than integrated motivation, a trend that runs consistent with the study by Romera and Ruiz-Cecilia (2019) in which motivation to learn English derived mainly from instrumental purposes.

Aside from integrative and instrumental purposes, students still report greater affinity towards ELF than EFL by way of valence, expectancy, and ability. Students may believe the goals of a more global English have greater appeal, are more likely to be accomplished, and are more attainable due to the very reasons listed above in addition to a perceived greater level of ease associated with the ELF approach. If the ELF approach provides students with more skills in line with their goals, they may, as a result, exhibit greater focus, investment, and energy into their studies and, by extension, find the material easier to learn. This case becomes stronger to make upon consideration of the collective student body's total average motivation towards ELF exceeding that of EFL, lending further credence to the idea that students want a more global English language education. The extent to which different groups of students demonstrate affinity towards this approach over the other, however, will be detailed below.

4. 2. Grade level and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF

When examining grade level and student motivation, several grades demonstrate greater affinity towards ELF over EFL by way of several determinants, indicating that they are more motivated by a curriculum that incorporates a more global perspective, highlighting the non-native speaker and de-centering inner circle country linguistic and cultural practices. Upon a closer analysis of the data, one group of students in particular feels more motivated by the ELF approach in just about every aspect: 2 Bachillerato. 2 Bachillerato scored higher on ELF on every single determinant of motivation except for valence. In terms of integrative motivation, 2 Bachillerato students want to better understand, appreciate, and relate to art, literature, TV, movies, and culture from speakers of English all around the world, not just from those from countries in the inner circle. For instrumental motivation,

they want to learn English to become more knowledgeable in global issues and be able to get a job with English speakers from all over the world, not just with native speakers. Moreover, they see themselves as more likely to and more capable of achieving these more globally-minded goals than they do for goals that strictly relate to EFL and/or the native speaker. This group's affinity towards ELF may be due to an increasing realization of the aspects that matter most in knowing English: practicality and an understanding of it more as a tool to integrate into the global community, not just into countries of the inner circle.

Though 2 Bachillerato is the group that experiences the greatest difference in motivation for ELF over EFL, they are not the only group. 1 ESO, for example, demonstrates a significant preference towards ELF over EFL, specifically in the areas of valence and ability. In other words, this group of students possess a greater affective orientation towards learning ELF, and view the corresponding goals as more attractive than those of EFL. In addition, they see themselves as having a greater ability to achieve these goals. As 1 ESO students are new to secondary education, and by extension to the secondary Content and Language Integrated Pedagogy (CLIL) curriculum (one in which they learn World Geography and History in English), they may see English's application to global issues as one of the language's most practical uses.

A statistically significant difference in a student's perception of their ability to achieve the goals for ELF over EFL can also be observed for 1 Bachillerato students. 1 Bachillerato students, along with 1 ESO and 2 Bachillerato students, share the belief that the goals outlined by the ELF approach, which predominantly emphasize the ability to communicate with and understand English speakers from all over the globe (not solely native speakers), are far more attainable and within the realm of their capabilities. One potential explanation may be proximity to graduation and entry into university or the labor force. Students may begin to reimagine the utility of English as a tool to communicate principally with non-natives and may therefore view the goals of comprehensibility by and for speakers just like them as far more attainable.

What perhaps serves as the most meaningful takeaway from the findings around grade level is the fact that two out of the six sampled grade levels demonstrated a greater affinity towards the ELF approach when considering total average motivation: 3 ESO and 2 Bachillerato. If students are reporting a feeling of greater motivation towards the ELF approach, and see themselves as more capable of achieving its goals, perhaps the school should consider adapting its curriculum to the needs and interests of its students in order to establish a level of buy-in that sustains itself to and through 2 Bachillerato and that better serves them for the real world.

4. 3. *Pathway type and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF*

The findings related to pathway type proved slightly less remarkable than those of grade level. While it can be observed generally that students of Sección appear to experience a greater affinity towards both EFL and ELF by way of each determinant when compared to students of Programa, students within each group (Programa and Sección) demonstrate similar attitudes towards each approach. That said, the only statistically significant data point observed lies in the difference in perception of ability to achieve goals within ELF over EFL for students of Sección.

Students of Sección may see themselves as more capable of achieving goals related to ELF than for EFL in part, at least, because of the CLIL curriculum. These students are enrolled in classes such as Geography and History in which English is the language of instruction, perhaps implicitly instilling an association between the English language and the global issues discussed in these courses. This association may consequently empower students to feel more confident about their abilities in achieving the goals required by a more global English.

Despite this one observation, however, the general trend in greater affinity towards ELF over EFL fails to apply to pathway type in

terms of total average motivation and therefore affirms that pathway type holds no true weight in determining affinity towards the EFL or ELF approach.

4. 4. *Level of effort and motivation towards EFL vs. ELF*

Level of effort, in contrast to its pathway type counterpart, yielded a number of interesting significant results related to motivation towards the EFL and ELF approaches. For instance, the vast majority of the statistically significant differences between each approach occur among the students who put forth the most effort. Medium effort students, for example, demonstrate a greater affinity towards ELF than EFL in the realms of expectancy and ability. Medium-high effort students take it a step further and demonstrate a greater affinity towards ELF than EFL among every single determinant of motivation.

The one exception to this trend lies among the high effort group of students, who only demonstrate a greater affinity towards ELF than EFL within the realm of valence and ability. The reason for this exception, however, can likely be attributed to the fact that high effort students already report such high affinity for both EFL and ELF in every category of motivation. It therefore comes as no surprise that statistical significance could not be established for every determinant of motivation within this group, as these students already possess a significant affective orientation towards learning English, regardless of the approach taken towards English language instruction.

One potential reason why students who exhibit greater effort generally prefer the ELF approach lies in the amount of time this group of students devotes to their studies. The more time they devote to their studies, the more likely they are to want to reap the benefits of that investment. As the literature suggests, the ELF approach offers a more practical approach to language learning, taking consideration of the international contexts in which students will likely make use of their English. If ELF is the most practical approach for international learners of English and students recognize that fact, then those very students will

likely develop a greater affinity towards the approach that allows them to see the greatest return (practical use of the language) on their investment (effort).

5. Conclusion

This study sought out to address fundamental questions around how different groups of students at the secondary level feel motivated by two distinct approaches to English language instruction and how that motivation changes based on grade level, pathway type, and level of effort. The following four null hypotheses were tested using several statistical methods including t-tests, and ANOVAs: 1) There is no significant difference in total average motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL among all students. 2) There is no significant difference in total motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL among students of different grade levels. 3) There is no significant difference in total motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL between Programa and Sección students. 4) There is no significant difference in total motivation (integrative, instrumental, valence, expectancy, ability) to learn ELF over EFL among students demonstrating different levels of effort.

The results of this study determined that the first and second null hypotheses could be rejected, while the third and fourth could not. These outcomes are significant because they demonstrate not only how secondary students are motivated to learn English in a specific way, but also how certain groups of secondary students are motivated to learn English in a specific way by way of certain determinants. The results of this study also underscore a noteworthy discrepancy in the system. According to preliminary data gathered in the first section of the survey used for this study, students overwhelmingly reported an English class that reflected the EFL approach and an Auxiliar de Conversación that reflected the same. If students perceive their current English learning environments as one inconsistent with what most motivates them, how

are they expected to remain optimally motivated throughout their English language education career?

This study, while demonstrative of significant outcomes in affinity towards approach in English language instruction, certainly carries with it several limitations that would invite future research to further explore this topic. First, the sample size was limited to the students willing and able to participate. While an exerted effort was made to recruit as many students as possible and from a variety of groups, no material incentive was provided thus making student participation entirely voluntary. Consequently, specific groups within each variable were less represented than others thereby reducing the external validity for those groups and rendering any statistical claim less complete, often resulting in a failure to reject null hypotheses that might otherwise be rejectable. Another limitation relates to the data collected but never statistically analyzed. Gender, for instance, was reported by participants but was never used as an independent variable. In addition, student perception of the current approach used in English class was reported, but proper statistical analyses were never run to determine any sort of relationship to student motivation. Finally, statistics around combinations of independent variables (grade & pathway vs. EFL/ELF, grade & effort vs. EFL/ELF, and pathway & effort vs. EFL/ELF) were prepared but never properly analyzed.

In consideration of the limitations of this study, future research related to the interconnectedness of gender, current student perceptions of English language instruction, and a combination of student group types could all be used as independent variables against the outlined determinants of motivation in analyzing the relationship between the EFL and ELF approaches. Moreover, an analysis of these variables covering a greater number of students from different backgrounds in a variety of English learning contexts could reveal linguistic, geographic, and cultural differences in level of affinity towards the EFL and ELF approaches to English language education. While the implications of this research indicate a need for further investigation into the English language curriculum at IES Antonio Fraguas Forges and its impact on student motivation, future research including a greater geographical

diversity of surveyed students coupled with a more complete statistical analysis of variables could suggest a global shift in the way English language instruction is carried out in both bilingual and non-bilingual institutions alike.

Bibliographical references

Alptekin, C. (2005). Dual language instruction: Multiculturalism through a lingua franca. TESOL Symposium on Dual Language Education: Teaching and Learning Two Languages in the EFL Setting. Boğaziçi University Istanbul, Turkey.

Bilingual Program of the Community of Madrid. Comunidad de Madrid. <https://www.comunidad.madrid/en/inversion/madrid/educacion-bilingue>

Countries in which English language is a mandatory or an optional subject (interactive).

<https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/global-english-education/countries-in-which-english-is-mandatory-or-optional-subject.html>

Clark, U. (2013). A sense of place: Variation, linguistic hegemony and the teaching of literacy in English. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 12(2), 58-75.

Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, K.S., Patsko, L. (2013, November 25). How to teach English as a lingua franca (ELF). British Council. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/how-teach-english-lingua-franca-elf>

Gardner, R. C., and Lambert, W. E.. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Newbury House.

Guo, Y., and Beckett, G. H. (2007). The hegemony of English as a global language: Reclaiming local knowledge and culture in China, 40(1)

Jenkins, J. (2003). ELF and identity. *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. (pp. 190-226). Oxford University Press.

Kiczkowiak, M. (2017). Confronting native speakerism in the ELT classroom: Practical awareness-raising activities. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*.

Kiczkowiak, M., Baines, D., and Krummenacher, K. (2016). Using awareness raising activities on initial teacher training courses to tackle 'native speakerism'. *Journal of English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 19(1), 45-53.

Kruidenier, B., and Clement, R. (1986). The effect of context on the composition and the role of orientations in second language acquisition. International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Lasagabaster, D. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional EFL classes. *International CLIL research journal*. 1(1), 4-17.

Marsh, D. (ed.). 2002. CLIL/EMILE. The European dimension. Actions, trends, and foresight potential. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä

Nagy, T. (2016). English as a lingua franca and its implications for teaching english as a foreign language. *Scientific Journal of Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania*. 12(1), 155-166.

Nguyen, H. H. C. (2019). Motivation in learning English language: A case study at Vietnam National University. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, EJE, 6(1), 49-65. doi: 10.19044/ejes.v6n01a4

Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2013). Introduction to the special issue: Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) and the teaching of languages for specific purposes. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*. 19(1), 12-27.

Romera, C., and Ruiz-Cecilia, R. (2019). A motivation case study of students learning English at a secondary school in Granada, Spain. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Studies*. 14(1), 31-45. doi: 10.18848/2327-011X/CGP/v14i01/31-45

Shaaban, K. A., and Ghazi G. (2000). Student motivation to learn English as a foreign language." *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(6), 632-644.

Clouet, R. (2006). Native vs. non-native speakers: A matter to think over. *Journal of Philology*, University of Las Palmas of Gran Canarias.

Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(1), 234-251.

Annex 1

Survey protocol

Part I. General Information

1. Indicate your grade level (1 ESO - 1 BACH) and pathway type (sección vs. programa)
2. Indicate your gender.
3. Indicate your native language.
4. Indicate the language assistant status regarding your English classes throughout secondary school:
 - a. I have only had language assistants from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand
I have had a language assistant from places other than the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.

Part II.

- a. Motivation and Class**
- b. Motivation and Language Assistant**

a. Motivation and Class

Indicate the level to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by selecting one of the following options:

1. strongly disagree
2. disagree
3. somewhat disagree
4. neutral
5. somewhat agree
6. agree
7. strongly agree

-
1. My class emphasizes communication (listening) with English native speakers.
 2. My class emphasizes communication (listening) with speakers of English from all over the world.
 3. My class incorporates culture from only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
 4. My class incorporates cultures from all over the world.
-

5. My class considers the accents of English natives only.
6. My class considers the accents of English speakers from all over the world.
7. My class brings in ideas, backgrounds, and perspectives from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
8. My class brings in ideas, backgrounds, and perspectives from all over the world.

b. Motivation and Language Assistant

1. The language assistants I have had have incorporated ideas, backgrounds, and perspectives from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
2. The language assistants I have had have incorporated ideas, backgrounds, and perspectives from all over the world.
3. Having English native speakers as language assistants has made me more knowledgeable about the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
4. Having English native speakers as language assistants has made me more knowledgeable about the world in general (not just about the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand).
5. The language assistants I have had have mainly focused on cultural and linguistic aspects from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
6. The language assistants I have had have mainly focused on cultural and linguistic aspects from all over the world.
7. I think having a language assistant from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand will help me speak and use English in a global context.
8. I think having a language assistant from anywhere in the world other than the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand will help me speak and use English in a global context.

Part III. Effort

1. When I learn a foreign language, I expect that: I will ...
 - a. pass on the basis of sheer luck and intelligence
 - b. do just enough work to get along
 - c. try hard to learn the language
 - d. enjoy doing all the work
 2. I will think about the words and ideas that I have learned in my classes...
 - a. hardly ever.
 - b. once or twice per week
 - c. several times during the week
 - d. daily
 3. I will spend about the following amount of time to practice the language after class:
 - a. zero hours
-

-
- b. one hour per week
 - c. four hours per week
 - d. more than six hours per week
4. I will...
- a. not necessarily be active in speaking the language in class
 - b. answer the questions when I am called upon
 - c. volunteer answers to the questions that are easy
 - d. volunteer answers as much as possible
5. After I get my English assignments back, I will...
- a. just throw them in my desk and forget them
 - b. look them over but won't bother correcting mistakes
 - c. correct mistakes when I have time
 - d. always rewrite them, correcting my mistakes
6. I will try to speak English after class:
- a. never
 - b. when I have to
 - c. when I am offered the opportunity to do so
 - d. in a wide variety of situations and as much as possible
-

Part IV.

- a. Integrative Determinant of Motivation**
 - b. Instrumental Determinant of Motivation**
-

Instructions. The following are statements with which some people will agree and others will disagree. There are no right or wrong answers, since many people have different opinions. Please give your immediate reactions to each of the items. On the other hand, please do not be careless, as it is important that we obtain your true feelings. Circle the number of the alternative below the statement that best indicates your feelings about that statement.

a. Integrative Determinant of Motivation

Studying English will help me...

- 1. ...better understand, appreciate, and relate to art, literature, movies, and TV produced by native English speakers from only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
 - 2. ...better understand and appreciate art, literature, movies, and TV produced in English by any culture and from any country.
 - 3. ...better understand, appreciate, and relate to the values, belief systems, and biases of native English speakers from only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
 - 4. ...better understand, appreciate, and relate to the values, belief systems, and biases of English speakers from all over the world.
-

5. ...meet and converse with English natives from only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
6. ...meet and converse with anyone who speaks English fluently anywhere in the world.
7. ...participate more freely in the activities (sports, cooking, dancing, singing, creative writing, etc.) of English native groups
8. ...participate more freely in the activities (sports, cooking, dancing, singing, creative writing, etc.) of groups from all over the world that speak English

b. Instrumental Determinant of Motivation

Studying English will help me...

1. ...by allowing me to better understand the world of news, politics, science, business, and technology only in the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
 2. ...by allowing me to better understand the world of news, politics, science, business, and technology in the whole world.
 3. ...because it will make me more knowledgeable in social issues (like gender inequality, socioeconomic inequality, racism, hunger, poverty, etc.) faced by people only in the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
 4. ...because it will make me more knowledgeable in social issues (like gender inequality, socioeconomic inequality, racism, hunger, poverty, etc.) faced by people from all over the world.
 5. ...because it will allow me to learn about all the people from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand who speak other languages but who use English as a hub language [a language nonnative speakers use to communicate in different contexts]
 6. ...because it will allow me to learn about people from all over the world who speak other languages but who use English as a hub language [a language nonnative speakers use to communicate in different contexts].
 7. ...in getting a job with exclusively native English speakers only from the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand.
 8. ...in getting a job with English speakers from all over the world.
 9. ...converse and communicate with English native speakers.
 10. ...converse and communicate with people from all over the world who speak English.
 11. ...communicate (in English) with the locals when I travel to English-speaking countries.
 12. ...communicate (in English) with the locals when I travel to any country in the world.
 13. ...because I will need it for university to be able to succeed at English-language classes.
 14. ...because I will need it for university to be able to succeed at any class given
-

in English.

Part V. Information on Learning Outcomes

- a. Valency
- b. Expectancy
- c. Ability

a. Valence

How important are these outcomes of your English class to you? Indicate the number that best represents your feelings about each statement.

- 1. Very significantly
- 2. Significantly
- 3. Somewhat significantly
- 4. Neutral
- 5. Somewhat insignificantly
- 6. Insignificantly
- 7. Very insignificantly

- 1. To speak English like a native.
- 2. To speak English well enough to communicate.
- 3. To be able to communicate with native English speakers from one of 7 inner circle countries.
- 4. To be able to communicate with any English speaker from anyone in the world.
- 5. To be able to read English documents/material in English the English speaking world
- 6. To be able to read English documents/material in English from all over the globe.
- 7. To better understand native English people and their way of thinking
- 8. To better understand people from all over the globe who speak English and their way of thinking
- 9. To learn about the culture and customs of only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand
- 10. To learn about the culture and customs of all countries where English is spoken as a main language OR hub language.

b. Expectancy

How probable is it that you will achieve the below outcomes based on previous and current circumstances? Indicate the expected probability for each outcome.

- 1. Very probable
- 2. Probable

3. Somewhat probable
4. Neutral
5. Somewhat improbable
6. Improbable
7. Very improbable

1. To speak English like a native.
2. To speak English well enough to communicate.
3. To be able to communicate with native English speakers from one of 7 inner circle countries.
4. To be able to communicate with any English speaker from anyone in the world.
5. To be able to read English documents/material in English the English speaking world
6. To be able to read English documents/material in English from all over the globe.
7. To better understand native English people and their way of thinking
8. To better understand people from all over the globe who speak English and their way of thinking
9. To learn about the culture and customs of only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand
10. To learn about the culture and customs of all countries where English is spoken as a main language OR hub language.

c. Ability

What do you think of your own ability to achieve the below outcomes? Indicate your estimated ability for each outcome.

1. Very capable
2. Capable
3. Somewhat capable
4. Neutral
5. Somewhat incapable
6. Incapable
7. Very incapable

1. To speak English like a native.
2. To speak English well enough to communicate.
3. To be able to communicate with native English speakers from one of 7 inner circle countries.
4. To be able to communicate with any English speaker from anyone in the world.
5. To be able to read English documents/material in English the English

- speaking world
6. To be able to read English documents/material in English from all over the globe.
 7. To better understand native English people and their way of thinking
 8. To better understand people from all over the globe who speak English and their way of thinking
 9. To learn about the culture and customs of only the US, UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand
 10. To learn about the culture and customs of all countries where English is spoken as a main language OR hub language.
-

Source: own elaboration

