



**Universidad**  
Zaragoza



Facultad de Educación  
**Universidad** Zaragoza

# **TRABAJO FIN DE GRADO**

**MAGISTERIO EN EDUCACIÓN PRIMARIA**

**MENCIÓN LENGUA INGLESA**

## **A MIXED-METHODS RESEARCH STUDY OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO MOTIVATION IN A PRIMARY EFL CLASSROOM**

Autora

**SOFÍA LUNA COSTA**

Director

**ENRIQUE LAFUENTE MILLÁN**

**FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN**

**2022/2023**

## Abstract

The increasing need to train bilingual students has brought about a shift in English teaching methodology, bringing students' motivation to the forefront. This paper presents a multiple case study conducted with a group of students in year 6 of Primary Education in Spain, who have been identified as highly motivated towards learning a second language (L2 motivation). The purpose of this research is to examine which factors most significantly impact students' L2 motivation, as well as how those factors are cultivated in the classroom context. Despite the limitations of our study, it is noted that there are several factors in the classroom context that substantially influence some constituents of learners' motivation. From the conclusions drawn, I make specific didactic suggestions may be useful for Primary Education English teachers and which may be applicable to similar contexts.

**Key words:** Language learning motivation, Instrumentality, Satisfaction, Self-confidence, Autonomy, Relevance, Learning situation, Teacher-specific motivational components.

## Resumen

La creciente necesidad de formar estudiantes bilingües ha traído consigo un cambio en la metodología de enseñanza del inglés, en la que la motivación de los estudiantes ha pasado a un primer plano. Este artículo presenta un estudio de caso múltiple realizado con un grupo de estudiantes de 6º de Educación Primaria en España, en los que se ha identificado una alta motivación hacia el segundo idioma. El propósito de esta investigación es examinar qué factores tienen un impacto más significativo en la motivación hacia el segundo idioma de los estudiantes y cómo se impulsan en el contexto del aula. A pesar de las limitaciones de nuestro estudio, observamos que hay varios factores en el contexto del aula que influyen significativamente otros componentes de la motivación de los estudiantes. A partir de las conclusiones extraídas, se hacen sugerencias didácticas específicas que se espera que sean útiles para los profesores de inglés de Educación Primaria y que puedan ser aplicables a contextos similares.

**Palabras clave:** Motivación en el aprendizaje de idiomas, Instrumentalidad, Satisfacción, Autoconfianza, Autonomía, Relevancia, Situación de aprendizaje, Componentes de la motivación específicos del profesor.

## INDEX

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Theoretical framework.....	3
2.1.	AN OVERVIEW OF THE TERM “MOTIVATION” .....	3
2.2.	LANGUAGE LEARNING MOTIVATION .....	4
2.2.1.	Language level motivation.....	5
2.2.2.	Learner level motivation. ....	6
2.2.3.	Learning situation level motivation.....	8
2.3.	STATUTORY FRAMEWORK .....	13
3.	Methodological framework.....	15
3.1.	Types of study .....	16
4.	Methodology.....	19
4.1.	CONTEXT AND PARTICIPANTS.....	19
4.2.	PROCEDURES.....	19
4.3.	INSTRUMENTS.....	21
4.3.1.	Field notes .....	21
4.3.2.	Questionnaire .....	21
4.3.3.	Focus groups and individual interview .....	23
5.	Results and analysis.....	24
5.1.	FIELD NOTES AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION.....	24
5.1.1.	Language level .....	24

5.1.2.	Learner level.....	24
5.1.3.	Learning situation level.....	25
5.2.	QUESTIONNAIRE.....	27
5.2.1.	Language level .....	27
5.2.2.	Learner level.....	28
5.2.3.	Learning situation level.....	31
5.3.	FOCUS GROUPS.....	33
5.3.1.	Language level .....	34
5.3.2.	Learner level.....	34
5.3.3.	Learning situation level.....	35
5.4.	INTERVIEW WITH THE TEACHER. ....	37
5.4.1.	Learner level.....	37
5.4.2.	Learning situation level.....	38
6.	Discussion.....	40
7.	Conclusions.....	45
8.	Annexes.....	52
8.1.	ANNEX 1. FIELD NOTES .....	52
8.1.1.	First observation.....	52
8.1.2.	Second observation .....	55
8.1.3.	Third observation .....	61
8.1.4.	Fourth observation.....	65

8.2.	ANNEX 2. FOCUS-GROUPS .....	70
8.2.1.	Focus group 1 .....	70
8.2.2.	Focus group 2 .....	75
8.3.	ANNEX 3. TEACHER INTERVIEW .....	82
8.4.	ANNEX 4. QUESTIONNAIRE .....	85

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1. Relation between questions and LLM components in the questionnaire. ....	22
Table 2. Students' orientations towards the L2. ....	28
Table 3. Students' perceptions on their Ideal L2-Self. ....	28
Table 4. Students' responses in relation to learner-level motivation. ....	29
Table 5. Students' causal attributions to their successes and failures. ....	30
Table 6. Students' reasons for receiving private English lessons. ....	30
Table 7. Students' views about literacy lessons at school. ....	31
Table 8. Students' perceptions on Teacher-specific motivational components. ....	32
Table 9. Students' perceptions on Group-specific motivational components. ....	33
Table 10. Students' preferences for groupings when doing the activities. ....	33

## **1. Introduction**

Concern is often expressed by teachers about the lack of motivation in English language learning. This, together with increasing demand to prepare students to be bilingual, has generated the need for innovative teaching methodologies that place the focus on students' motivation and, which are more efficient.

Motivation has been largely defined as the force that drives our behaviours, thus, when an individual is actively engaged in the development of an activity, it could be claimed that he or she is motivated (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Similarly, Cook and Artino (2016) stated that motivation is a process which deals with both the initiation and the sustainability of the behaviour that is directed at achieving a specific goal. In this way, in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) there has been extensive research to investigate the factors that impact on the learners' second language motivation (L2 motivation), given that this would be the ultimate cause for success or failure on the second language learning process (Dörnyei, 2014). However, the multi-faceted, evolving nature of motivation explains the complexity of defining the construct of motivation and, more importantly, of explaining how its different components interact with social, cognitive and classroom factors.

Accordingly, the main purpose of this multiple case study is to shed light on how a high second language learning motivation is achieved in a Primary Education classroom, identifying the key teaching practices that are responsible for this heightened motivation. In so doing, the study aims to ultimately yield practical implications and didactic suggestions that can apply to contexts whose features are similar to those of this case study.

The idea of conducting this research emanated from the prior observations in the group C of the year six of Primary Education, during the placement period in the state school Catalina de Aragón. During this stay, a high motivation towards English language was perceived in this group of learners, and it was primarily ascribed to factors related to the learning situation. This led me to investigate the extent to which the rest of the components also have an impact on students' motivation, and how the components from the learning situation have an impact on both the language level and learner level components.

For the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the initial hypothesis is truthful, some questions are posed at the beginning of this case study:

1. To what extent do students value the potential pragmatic gains of L2 proficiency or the interaction with the L2 community?
2. Does the learning situation have an impact on students' orientations and attitudes towards the language?
3. Is students' need for achievement a relevant factor affecting a group of eleven-year-old students' L2 motivation?
4. To what extent does self-confidence affect the language learning motivation of this group of learners? Are there any factors in the learning situation that boost or deter students' self-confidence?
5. What factors of the learning situation have a more significant effect on learners' L2 motivation?

The present study is not meant to contribute to the theoretical basis, but it tries to examine what components, among the ones that have already been proposed in the academic literature, have a more significant impact on learners' L2 motivation, and how they are promoted in the Primary Education English classroom.

To this effect, in the first instance, the most relevant motivational theories will be reviewed, with a special focus on the field of second language learning motivation, examining how these theoretical foundations have been considered in curricula development. Subsequently, the methodological underpinnings will be presented, revising the main research paradigms and their features, and ultimately justifying the methodological design selected for this study. Afterwards, the context and participants involved in this multiple case study will be described, together with the produces and materials used for its implementation. In the next chapter the results will be organized and analysed focusing in turn on each of the instruments used to collect the data. the next chapter will be devoted to the analysis of each of the subcomponents, synthesizing and validating the findings obtained from the different instruments. To conclude, the last section of this paper aims at answering the questions raised in this introduction as well as at offering possible didactic suggestions to tackle the factors identified. The final part of this section will draw attention to the limitations of this research.



## 2. Theoretical framework.

Motivation has been found to be one of the most important individual learner differences affecting Second Language Acquisition (hereinafter SLA). The role of motivation in SLA was first highlighted by Gardner and Lambert (1959), who suggested that other variables apart from language aptitude played an important role in SLA and who proved that motivational factors was directly related to second language achievement (1959), thus initiating the study of motivation in Social Psychology and in the field of SLA. However, motivation is undoubtedly a multi-faceted and complex construct and numerous authors have contributed to its definition drawing attention to its different subcomponents.

Educational authorities have also acknowledged the importance of motivation in language learning by incorporating it in the different legislative texts. To this effect, the Aragonese curriculum (ORDEN ECD/1112/2022) states that the English language classroom should ensure students' motivation.

The purpose of this section is to define the construct of motivation, identifying the motivational components that would be most relevant to the context in which the study will be conducted; and briefly reviewing how these theoretical implications have been taken into consideration in the current curricula.

### 2.1. *AN OVERVIEW OF THE TERM "MOTIVATION"*

In order to understand the concept of motivation it is necessary to look at the different theories that have tried to explain it providing a complete definition of the construct.

In early studies of motivation, psychologists such as Skinner or Watson, tried to explain the concept of motivation in terms of conduct, suggesting that human behaviour could be modified by rewards (and punishments) that would reinforce or reduce certain behaviours (Brown, 2001). This behaviourist view placed the emphasis on external factors as motivating forces (Williams & Burden, 1997).

In contrast to this, the *Hierarchy of Needs Theory* elaborated by Maslow (1970) claimed that intrinsic motivation was more powerful in determining effort than extrinsic motivation (Brown, 2001). In his theory, Maslow identified different types of needs, which would be gradually organized in terms power and precedence (Maslow, 1943), and in such

way recognizes the need for personal growth, fulfilment and achieving one's potential as the more powerful motives that drive our behaviour.

The intrinsic/extrinsic motivation debate was further studied by Deci and Ryan (1985), who developed *Self-Determination Theory* (2000) in which they explored different social-contextual events that can sustain the innate motivational tendencies. According to Deci and Ryan's theory, intrinsic motivation can be undermined by extrinsic rewards.

Like Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, in their theory Deci and Ryan recognised the importance of *competence*, *autonomy* and *relatedness* as supporting factors that foster a greater internalization (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In this sense, positive feedback on performance would foster the feeling of competence and therefore would facilitate intrinsic motivation. However, positive reinforcement alone would not be sufficient to generate intrinsic motivation. It should be accompanied by a sense of autonomy where people perceive their behaviour as self-determined. Finally, they also acknowledged the sense of security and relatedness as a facilitative condition for intrinsic motivation.

Self-Determination theory may have significant implications for the Second Language Learning Classroom. Following this theory, the teacher should provide immediate contextual support to students for enhancing their intrinsic motivation for L2 learning, for instance by providing positive performance feedback, providing opportunities for self-direction, and ensuring social environments in which students feel safe.

Once some of the broader motivational theories have been reviewed, I will now proceed to examine the construct of motivation specific to the field of Language Learning, and the different theories that have contributed to its development.

## 2.2. *LANGUAGE LEARNING MOTIVATION*

Taking into account that motivation is what drives our behaviour and that language learning, is, as any kind of learning, a conduct, different scholars have studied the role of motivation in L2 learning process. In order to describe language learning motivation, Dörnyei (1994) established a tripartite L2 model of motivation that tried to bring together factors from the different psychological fields reviewed as well as to include others that were not previously taken into consideration such as Cognitivism or Social Psychology. In his model, Dörnyei

distinguished three levels which coincide with the three basic constituents of the L2 learning process: the Language level, the Learner level and the Learning Situation level.

### 2.2.1. Language level motivation.

In this first level, Dörnyei makes reference to students' attitudes and orientations towards L2 learning. This central issue was first established by Gardner in his motivation theory (1959), in which he made a distinction between *integrative* and *instrumental orientation*. The former refers to a particular desire on learning more about the L2 culture and community; while the second one would be driven by more utilitarian reasons of linguistic achievement, that is by the potential benefits the learner can obtain from successfully learning a second language (Dörnyei, 1994).

However, Dörnyei and Csizér (2002) demonstrated that integrativeness was not a particularly good predictor of intended effort, which led Dörnyei to propose an alternative subconstruct, i.e., *L2 Motivational Self System*. This was further supported by a later study, in which Dörnyei (2010) contended that in educational settings in which the students were not part of the L2 group, it was not relevant to consider integrativeness as it would not have a significant impact on student's motivation.

Dörnyei's (1994) L2 Motivational Self System is aligned with the notion of *possible selves*, provided by Markus and Nurius (1986), which referred to an individual's different perceptions and ideas about one's future selves, such as the self that one feels they should become (*ought to self*), the self that one would like to become (*ideal self*), or the self that one would be afraid of becoming (*feared selves*).

Dörnyei's ideas were also based on Higgins' *Self-Discrepancy Theory* (1987), which posited that we are motivated to reach a state in which our self-concept corresponds to our personally significant self-guides. Dörnyei tried to accommodate and apply these concepts in the field of Second Language Learning, therefore considering the *ideal L2 self* and the *ought to L2 self* as central components of his system (Dörnyei, 2010).

Following Dörnyei, the ideal L2 self refers to the person we would like to become as an L2 user, that is, if the person we would like to become speaks the L2, we would be motivated to learn the L2 in order to reduce the gap between our current self-concept and our

ideal L2 self. Meanwhile, the ought to self, refers to the attributes that someone thinks you should possess based on social or cultural norms and expectations.

Dörnyei and Csizér (2002), established the ideal L2 Self was a better predictor of intended effort than integrativeness, and therefore as a more relevant variable in language learning motivation.

These two terms are therefore relevant forces that might drive our students' motivation towards the L2 learning. For instance, if students want to satisfy their hopes and aspirations, as well as their feelings of growth, they would be moved to learn English by their ideal L2 self; but, if they want to meet their parent's expectations or to avoid failing an exam, they would be driven by their ought to self.

### 2.2.2. Learner level motivation.

Dörnyei (1994) emphasizes that L2 motivation is not a fixed trait, but rather a dynamic and context-dependent construct that can be influenced by a range of internal and external factors. However, in the learner level, the author identifies different relatively stable personality traits that learners would have developed over their L2 learning process. These traits fall into two main components, namely, *need for achievement* and *self-confidence*.

Need for achievement was a concept already considered by Atkinson and Raynor's *Theory of achievement motivation* (1974). These researchers claimed that individuals with a high need for achievement would initiate activities driven by the desire of achieving excellence for its own sake, rather than for the extrinsic rewards that the activity might bring. This idea is related to the previously mentioned Self-Determination theory, which focuses on those activities which are internalised by students and where they are sufficiently self-determined (Deci & Ryan, 2000), and at the same time, where the challenge generates a feeling of competence.

Dörnyei (2013) acknowledged the important role of need for achievement in situations in which academic attainment is very salient and claimed that learners with a high need for achievement would be more motivated and persistent in language learning as they are driven by the desire to accomplish their goals. However, he also recognized the negative effects that need for achievement can have on motivation if it becomes too intense or if

learners experience repeated failure or lack of progress, since it can lead to anxiety or attrition.

The recognition of the negative effects of anxiety and an excessive need for achievement led Dörnyei to place emphasis on self-confidence as a powerful motivational process. The author recognized the importance of aspects such as *self-efficacy*, *perceived L2 competence*, *causal attributions* and *language use anxiety*, as underlying factors that constitute self-confidence.

Clément (1980) was one of the first to pay attention to the concept of self-confidence, establishing two key aspects: an affective component, referring to language Use Anxiety, and a cognitive component, which alludes to the self-evaluation of L2 proficiency. These ideas would later be incorporated by Dörnyei in his motivational framework.

In terms of language acquisition, these components could be related to the *Affective Filter hypotheses* (Krashen, 1982), which states that affective states such as motivation, self-efficacy, and anxiety directly affect the rate of second language acquisition and suggests that for learners with optimal emotional conditions will have a low affective Filter which will be facilitative for language acquisition. This theory provides further support for the teachers' necessity of promoting low anxiety and motivating learning situations in order to support the acquisition of the L2.

Similarly, *Expectancy theory* (Brehm & Self, 1989) already anticipated that in order to feel motivated, individuals need to feel capable of achieving the outcome. Potential motivation, therefore, was generated by both the instrumental value of the outcome, and the perceived probability of success. In line with this, one's perception of self-efficacy determines the activities attempted by the individual, since the individual's behaviour is based on their judgements about their own capacity for completing the task (Bandura, 1989).

Dörnyei (2001) believed that attributional processes also play a vital role in the formation of people's expectancies of success. Dörnyei draws from Weiner's (1992) *Attribution theory*, which postulates that people try to understand the reasons for their past experiences and that the different causal attributions in which individuals base their successes and failures have a significant impact on motivation and levels of achievement. According to Graham (1994), the most common attributions in educational settings are ability, effort, task difficulty, or luck. Accordingly, educators will need to help students to ascribe their failures

to controllable internal factors (such as effort) instead of to external factors (such as task difficulty) thus reinforcing the idea that their L2 progress is caused by their effort and commitment and not by external circumstances beyond their control.

### 2.2.3. Learning situation level motivation.

Clément, Dörnyei and Noel (1994) set out to develop a construct that was consistent with the complexity of the classroom phenomena. To do this, they conducted a second study in Hungary in which they applied a group dynamics-based approach, including three aspects of students' perception of the classroom, namely, group cohesion, the evaluation of the L2 teacher, and the evaluation of the L2 course.

Dörnyei (1994) reformulated these terms and included them in his motivational construct, hence identifying three subsets of motivational components within the learning situation level: course-specific motivational components, teacher-specific motivational components and group-specific motivational components.

#### 2.2.3.1. *Course-specific motivational components.*

This first group includes components related to the syllabus, the teaching materials and methods, as well as the learning tasks. Following Keller (1983) and Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Dörnyei distinguishes four major motivational aspects or conditions: *interest*, *relevance*, *expectancy* and *outcome*.

According to Dörnyei (1994, p.277), “interest is related to intrinsic motivation”, to that inherent curiosity and desire that drives individuals to learn and know more about their environment, and which implies a high involvement in a behaviour which revolves around the stimuli that has caused that feeling of satisfaction (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). To generate interest, teachers should choose attractive teaching materials, activities, and topics that foster students' engagement in their learning process and ultimately their willingness to learn.

Relevance is considered as a prerequisite for motivation to persist in time (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991), and it refers to the extent to which the learner feels that both important personal needs or values and instrumental needs related to the language level, are met by the learning situation (Dörnyei, 1994). In this sense, the action-oriented approach proposed by

the Common European Framework of Reference (henceforth called CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2020) and which informs the current competency-based Aragonese curriculum (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2022), highlights the importance of orienting syllabuses and tasks around real-life communicative needs, and building them on the basis of purposefully selected notions and functions. This approach is expected to help students' see the real value of studying English language and, as a result, generate motivation.

Expectancy was also identified as a factor affecting motivation and achievement. Dörnyei states that, at the learning situation level, expectancy is related to task difficulty, the effort the activity will require, or the resources and guidance the learner is provided with. This would be the reason why it is crucially important to give students enough ongoing guidance and assistance along their learning process by, for instance, informing students about the success criteria, or working on the strategies that will help them in completing the tasks.

Finally, Crookes and Schmidt (1989) used the term outcomes to refer to the extrinsic rewards and punishments that act as motivational forces. This concept was later reformulated by Dörnyei (1994) as satisfaction, which he used to refer to the combination of both extrinsic (being praised) and intrinsic rewards (feeling of growth). In this respect, we should not forget that intrinsic motivation has been identified as a central motivator of the educational process, and that extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation, since "they conduce toward an external perceived locus of causality" (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p.70).

#### *2.2.3.2. Teacher-specific motivational components.*

Several authors such as Wright (1987) and Brophy and Thomas (1984) stressed the importance of the role of the teacher in the language classroom. Dörnyei (1994) also acknowledges the teachers' impact on second language learning motivation, and he identifies three main motives within this subgroup of components: *authority type*, *affiliative drive*, and *direct socialization of motivation*.

The first motive is the affiliative drive, and it refers to learners' willingness to do well in school with the objective of pleasing their teacher, which stems from a special sympathy or appreciation for their teacher. Despite being an extrinsic motivational factor, affiliative drive can lead to intrinsic motivation for the student (Dörnyei, 1994).

The second component pertains to the authority type of the teacher, which can be autonomy promoting, supporting or controlling. Dörnyei (1998) elaborates on Ushioda's work (1996) and encourages teachers to promote learner autonomy.

Dörnyei (1994) stress the role of the teacher in direct socialization of students, referring to the extent to which the teacher stimulates students' motivation through three different processes: modelling, task presentation and feedback. For Dörnyei, motivation can be affected by the model offered by the teacher, which is defined by their orientation towards the L2 and the importance they attach to its learning. Besides, the teacher can also provide students with a model of the effort that will be required to succeed in classroom activities, which, at the same time, will help students with the attribution of their successes to their hard work and with the internalisation of extrinsic motives (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

The second channel for socialization would be through task presentation, which is directly linked to motivation since, if the teacher presents the tasks in a way that fosters students' interest and makes them aware of the tasks' practical value, it will increase students' expectancy of task fulfilment, and therefore it will positively contribute to students' motivation (Dörnyei, 1998).

Finally, the process of giving feedback is also seen as a form of socialization, and the method used to provide feedback will also affect students' motivation. Dörnyei believes that informational feedback, that is, feedback which informs about competence, should predominate at the expense of controlling feedback, which is focused on judging basing on external standards (Dörnyei, 1994). Accordingly, the teacher should try to provide students with motivational feedback, avoiding social comparison among them and emphasizing students' accomplishments over mistakes. In this regard, the Aragonese Curriculum (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2022) emphasizes the need to provide formative assessment, which seeks to guide and inform students along the learning process with the objective of providing learners with the necessary tools that will help them improve.

#### *2.2.3.3. Group-specific motivational components.*

This last group of components are related to group dynamics, which have been demonstrated to influence the students' attitudes, values and perceptions (Forsyth, 2014). In Dörnyei's framework, four different components within group dynamics that would affect L2



motivation are distinguished: *Goal-orientedness*, *Norm and reward system*, *Group Cohesion* and *Classroom goal structure*.

Goal-orientedness refers to the motivational strategy that would help students to understand and accept the group-goal, which, in this case, would be to learn the L2. This was further supported by Hadfield (1992), who claimed that having a common sense of direction and sharing a goal are necessary conditions for a group to succeed in its purpose.

Significant importance has been attached not only to sharing goals but also to sharing a norm system. Dörnyei (2001, p.112), defines group norms as standards that the majority of the group members agree to and hence, they will govern the group behaviour in general. These norms might be constructed by the learners themselves, or they might be set by the educational institution or teacher. Be that as it may, for the beneficial effects of having an established norm system to appear, in terms of both regulating students' conduct and enhancing their work morale, students need to internalize these norms (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1999). In this vein, one strategy that has been largely accepted in Primary classrooms is developing a set of classroom rules. To do this, all the students in the group along with the teacher develop the rules and accept them, showing their commitment by signing.

Both goal-orientedness and a well-developed norm and reward system would be crucial for group cohesion, which concerns the individuals' feeling of membership to the group and the interpersonal relationships among the members of the group (Dörnyei, 2001). It has been demonstrated that group cohesion fosters learners' L2 motivation (Clement, Dörnyei & Noels 1994) and that it also has a beneficial impact on group productivity (Dörnyei, 2001). Teachers should therefore promote positive peer relationships, which can be achieved by using cooperative learning techniques.

Finally, a classroom goal structure can be competitive, individualistic, or cooperative, which can significantly influence motivation. In competitive classrooms, only students with a high performance have proved to prosper, while these classrooms cause anxiety and low-self-esteem in individuals with lower levels of performance (Peterson et al., 1993). Conversely, even though individualistic classrooms seem to have beneficial effects in some individuals' personal progress and self-efficacy, it has been shown that cooperative structures promote motivation and self-efficacy among all the members of the group, since they share

responsibilities and the rewards (whether it is intrinsic or extrinsic) brought by the achievement of the outcome (Dörnyei, 2001).

In the light of the previous theories and claims, in the next section I will analyse how they have been taken into account in the realisation of educational legislation, focusing on Spanish education system.

### 2.3. *STATUTORY FRAMEWORK*

The methodological guidelines provided in the current Aragonese curriculum (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2022), in line with the guidelines provided by the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2022) stress the importance of students' motivation and advocate for a methodology which places students' motivation at its centre. More specifically, both instrumental and integrative orientation towards English language are emphasized in this document. In this regard, plurilingual competence is highly valued, given that it is facilitative for communication and interculturality. These factors are very significant, especially in our current pluricultural society (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2022, p.25936). Thus, the main objective should be the development of students' communicative competence and intercultural awareness.

The curriculum places a strong emphasis on promoting learners' self-confidence together with motivation towards the subject in the different stages of Primary Education. It also acknowledges the importance of students' affective states in both L2 motivation and acquisition and takes into account learner level motivational components.

This educational legislation also advocates a global, continuous and formative assessment. In so doing, it claims that positive feedback should be provided, focusing on students' achievements, thus fostering their self-efficacy, reducing their language use anxiety and creating a "philosophy of wellness" (2022, p.25). Thus, it recognises the teachers' role in promoting positive emotional conditions for L2 learning. It also suggests the use of different assessment tools and instruments adapted to each learning situation, which allow for an objective appraisal of students' learning progress.

Importance is also attached to promoting a teacher's authority style that enhances students' autonomy. Related to this, it recognises the development of group work, which promotes cooperation among students and makes them responsible for their own learning process.

In addition, the curriculum recognises the necessity of fostering students' intrinsic motivation and satisfaction for English language, seeing it as an element for enjoyment. With this aim, it encourages the teaching body to create contextualised and relevant tasks, which should be connected to students' interests and emotions, as well as to their specific personal

circumstances. Similarly, it incentivizes the use of “authentic materials” that may be an invaluable source of motivation. In so doing, the curriculum acknowledges the importance of course specific motivational components. Other links to these same components may also be found in this curriculum. For example, it highlights the need to ground the syllabus on needs analysis and thus making it relevant to students and it recommends using resources that enhance students’ intrinsic satisfaction.

Finally, this statutory text is governed by a set of pedagogical principles that are aligned with the Universal Design for Learning Guidelines (Centre for Applied Special Technology, 2018). The implementation of this framework ensures the access and engagement of every student in meaningful, challenging and learning situations, as well as provides multiple ways of expression and action. Accordingly, the implementation of this approach would be facilitative for raising students’ self-confidence by adapting the learning experience to their individual needs, at the same time that it can enhance students’ feeling of competence by presenting learning challenges.

In sum, the Aragonese curriculum offers a methodological frame which places value on motivational components related to the language, the learning situation, and on learners’ individual needs and interests. Accordingly, this framework is consistent with the instructional implications of the motivational theories examined.

### **3. Methodological framework.**

This section is devoted to establishing the methodological basis in which this research is going to be founded, and the purpose and reasons for their use.

There are two main research paradigms that have been broadly recognized: the quantitative paradigm and the qualitative paradigm, which represent different approaches to conducting investigation and gathering knowledge.

On one hand, quantitative research deals with numerical data which is analysed by statistical methods, and which are usually obtained by taking a sufficiently large sample size in which the individual differences pass unnoticed due to the standardized commonalities perceived in the sample. Therefore, this paradigm is concerned with establishing relationships, patterns and generalizations through statistical analysis. Some of the most common instruments used in this paradigm are written questionnaires and surveys. In this sense, quantitative methods aim to contribute to positing wide-ranging laws by obtaining results generalizable beyond the particular (Dörnyei, 2007).

In contrast to this, qualitative research implies the use of data collection procedures that result in non-numerical data, which is analysed primarily by non-statistical methods. Despite the effort of making this data more rigorous by using different data analytical procedures, it usually remains open to the researchers' subjective sensitivity, training and experience (McKay, 2006). Some of the procedures that are most commonly used in qualitative research are ethnography, observation and field notes, interviews, introspective techniques or case studies (Dörnyei, 2007).

Unlike quantitative research, qualitative research aims at in-depth understanding of the "meaning in the particular", hence being able to examine certain aspects that would be disregarded in quantitative research (Dörnyei, 2007, p.28). Since language acquisition is significantly influenced by the social, cultural and situational factors of the context in which it occurs, qualitative methods in applied linguistics research have gained increasing acceptance (Duff, 2008). This methodology can provide a deeper understanding of those contextual circumstances that would affect the language acquisition process.

However, the conception that qualitative and quantitative methods are not mutually exclusive, and in consequence the combination of both paradigms, has resulted in a third

approach, called mixed methods research, which has contributed to bring the dichotomy between the first two methods to an end. According to Dörnyei (2007), this third paradigm involves the combination of different qualitative and quantitative research both in the data collection procedures used and in the analysis of the results.

Mixed methods have been found to have two major purposes, which are, in the first place, to look at the target phenomenon from different perspectives, hence providing/obtaining a deeper understanding thereof; and secondly, to triangulate the findings, which has been seen as a strategy to ensure research validity, by verifying an overall interpretation of the results through different data sources, instruments and methods.

The extent to which a study allows for generalization is explained by differentiation between idiographic and nomothetic perspectives. On one hand, nomothetic approaches seek to generate standardized descriptions and group norms, sometimes resulting in the loss of some meaningful individual findings but leading to valuable cross-individual comparisons (Cox & Klinger, 2023). Idiographic approaches, on the other hand, are based on a deep examination of a small sample. Idiographic results offer rich and individualized information about the participants' behaviours and experiences, thus making it difficult to establish comparisons among individuals (Cox & Klinger, 2023) but facilitating the analysis of idiosyncratic phenomena (Henry et al., 2023).

### *3.1. Types of study*

Case studies have been defined as a single situation or circumstance of an established system, whether it is a sole individual, a class, a school or a whole community (McKay, 2006). Moreover, Dörney (2007) states that case studies are a method of gathering and organizing data through qualitative and quantitative procedures in order to maximize the understanding the object of study.

In order to obtain a large amount of detailed information about the target entity, researchers usually spend an extended period of time exploring the context and its surroundings. This is in fact a key feature of an ethnographic approach. In this sense, one of the most characteristic features of ethnographic research is observation, which involves prolonged engagement in the community. In the same way as case studies, ethnographic methodology usually involves the use of multiple data sources (leading to conduct a mixed

methods study) which would be validated through triangulation of the findings (McKay, 2006).

The ethnographic approach has been widely used in classroom research, and it concerns any study whose purpose is to explore how the teaching and learning processes take place in the classroom context (Dörnyei, 2007). In the field of applied linguistics, there has been much classroom research which aims at investigating the impact of the second language instruction on the process of SLA, ultimately identifying those factors that promote or learning and acquisition. One of the main procedures employed in classroom research is ethnography, hence the use of observation, along with other instruments such as surveys, interviews, and diary studies (Dörnyei, 2007). Finally, as McKay (2006) claimed, when conducting classroom research, it is important to restrict the conclusions to the specific population that was examined.

In sum, the research undertaken here is a multiple case study which seeks to examine the causative factors of a high motivation in second language learning in a classroom of 6<sup>th</sup> year of Primary Education. It is expected that the findings of this paper will yield support to the motivational theories that have emphasized certain motivational components as central to second language motivation. In relation to this, this study will be undertaken from an idiographic perspective, taking into account the individual experiences of every student with the English language and trying to extract meaning from those singular individuals and build on the prediction of individual differences (Adams et al., 2018).

Moreover, this study is framed as classroom research, since the purpose is to examine how learning and teaching takes place in the context of the classroom of 6<sup>th</sup> C. Besides, the ultimate goal is to identify the factors regarding the learning situation that promote a higher motivation towards the foreign language and that therefore have a beneficial impact on Second Language acquisition. The findings of this study will provide a deep understanding of the phenomenon, which means that they are bound to this context and may inform teaching practices and strategies that might be transferred to similar contexts.

As Dörnyei (2007) stated, classroom research, given the complexity of the classroom environment, lends itself to combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Accordingly, this study will be accomplished using mixed methods research, as a finding which is supported by tests from different methods, is seen as more valid than one that has

only been tested with one single method (Dörnyei, 2007). Thus, qualitative research methodology will be used, since, as discussed above, this research takes the form of a multiple case study. Besides, an ethnographic perspective will be used on a small scale, therefore there will be a prolonged engagement in the classroom to find out the learners' views about their own learning experiences. However, quantitative data procedures will be also used given that, as will be later discussed, a questionnaire will be created and implemented, and we may also want to identify certain tendencies.



## **4. Methodology.**

### **4.1. *CONTEXT AND PARTICIPANTS.***

This classroom research has been conducted in the Infant and Primary Education School Catalina de Aragón, which is a state school located in the city of Zaragoza.

The participants involved in this multiple-case study were 22 students from the sixth grade of Primary Education (between eleven and twelve years old) from group C. In this group, there is one girl (who has been named “Ana”) who is diagnosed with Attention-Deficit and Hyperactive Disorder, as well as with Autism Spectrum Disorder.

The teacher (who has been named “John”) is also an essential agent on this research, since he provided essential information to gain a richer understanding of the language learning process and methodologies used. He is a 51-year-old male of English nationality, who, after finishing a degree in French, arrived in Spain and decided to start working as an English teaching assistant. After several years, he decided to enrol at university and complete a Teacher Training degree, while he continued working. Years later he obtained a permanent position as a tutor in this school, which he has been performing for 12 years now. It is also important to mention that this is his second year teaching literacy to this group of students. It should be noted that both the teacher’s name (John) and the students’ names have been changed in order to maintain their privacy (see focus groups).

This group also attends weekly lessons with the English collaborator (“William”). This has not been taken into consideration as a factor affecting students’ motivation due to the small amount of time that students spend with him.

### **4.2. *PROCEDURES.***

The decision to undertake this study stemmed from my observation that students in this class exhibited remarkably high motivation towards the L2. Initially, classroom observation took place during my internship period, and it was rather unstructured. The aim of this observation was to identify some of the most significant features of the learning situation that could enhance or deteriorate learners’ L2 motivation, at the same time that special attention was placed on students’ behaviours.

After analysing the data from the observations, I created a questionnaire for all students. This survey allowed us to assess the programme outcomes in terms of students' motivation. It was delivered in Spanish in order to ensure students' understanding of the questions and consequently to obtain reliable answers.

Once the questionnaire was completed by students, their answers were exported directly from Google Forms to an Excel spreadsheet. For Likert Scale questions, I calculated the mean of the scores in order to find out the perceptions of the whole group, paying attention to whether it was expressed in affirmative or negative form. On the other hand, for checkbox questions, I analysed the frequency of each of the possible answers. However, in line with the idiographic perspective, I also paid attention to those isolated cases, since they could allow us to gain a deeper knowledge and understanding. In this way, I tried to extract meaning from the means, frequencies, and idiosyncratic answers, arranging them according to Dörnyei's (1994) L2 motivational framework.

The results obtained from the questionnaire served to develop the questions to be answered by students in the focus group interviews. Then, I specify the organisational aspects and I schedule it.

Once the responses given by the students in the focus groups were transcribed and analysed, an interview schedule for an individual semi-structured with the teacher was also developed. This tool was used to validate my findings and to deepen my understanding on those identified processes and features of the instructional programme that would promote that high motivation.

Focus groups with students preceded the interview with the teacher so as to focus first on students' perceptions about different aspects of the language learning situation. After that, the teacher's views and reasons for the methodological design of the literacy programme were explored in the teacher interview.

Data analysis of both the focus group and individual interview required transcribing the interviews and then I performed the process of data reduction. First, I read through them several times and started highlighting with different colours the participants' answers (both students and the teacher) making reference to each the three levels. Once I had them highlighted, I interpreted on the basis of the theories revised, and I identified each of the

subcomponents to which they made reference and their potential impact on students' motivation.

### 4.3. *INSTRUMENTS.*

#### 4.3.1. Field notes

Fourth lessons were observed, and field notes were recorded in an observation diary (see Annex 1). These were descriptive field notes, containing teacher-talk and some students' responses, which provided a realistic and objective account of the classroom situations. However, these objective descriptions were also interpreted and analysed on the basis of the motivational theories previously discussed.

#### 4.3.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 41 questions, since it was believed to be appropriate given the age of the participants and the probability of them answering randomly if they got tired.

To simplify the writing task, the survey only contained close-ended questions. Most of these questions were of the Likert-scale type, in which students were asked to evaluate different statements indicating from 1 to 5 the level of agreement with that utterance. To obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon there were also 5 multiple-choice questions, using checkboxes, in which students had to click any answers that applied to their situation. These different options (checkboxes) in these questions were developed on the basis of what had been observed in the classroom.

The content of these questions was established on the basis of the L2 motivational components identified in Dörnyei's L2 motivation framework (1994). Table 1 shows the different subcomponents measured and the specific questions designed to investigate each of those motivational subcomponents.

<i><b>Motivational level</b></i>	<i><b>Components</b></i>	<i><b>Questions (and subcomponents)</b></i>
<i>Learner level</i>	<i>Orientation towards the L2</i>	<i>1</i>
	<i>Possible selves</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Learner level</i>	<i>Need for achievement</i>	<i>3, 4</i>
	<i>Self-efficacy</i>	<i>5,6</i>
	<i>Language Use Anxiety</i>	<i>7,8</i>
	<i>Causal Attributions</i>	<i>9,10,11</i>
	<i>Perceived L2 Competence</i>	<i>12,13</i>
	<i>Intrinsic Satisfaction</i>	<i>14,15</i>
<i>Learning situation level</i>	<i>Course-specific motivational components</i>	<i>16,17 (Interest)</i>
		<i>18,19 (Relevance)</i>
		<i>20,21 (Expectancy)</i>
		<i>22,23 (Satisfaction)</i>
	<i>Teacher-specific motivational components</i>	<i>24,25 (Authority Type)</i>
		<i>26,27 (Affiliative Drive)</i>
		<i>28 (Modelling)</i>
		<i>39, 30 (Task Presentation)</i>
	<i>Group-specific motivational components</i>	<i>31, 32 (Feedback and assessment)</i>
		<i>33,34 (Goal-orientedness)</i>
		<i>35,36 (Norm and Reward System)</i>
		<i>37, 38 (Group Cohesion)</i>
		<i>39,40,41 (Classroom Goal structure)</i>

**Table 1. Relation between questions and LLM components in the questionnaire.**

In order to increase its validity, the questionnaire was given to 3 teachers that work in the school where the case study was conducted, and who had some previous experience in the field of research. The teachers were asked to read through it and suggest improvements. Once the survey had been validated, a pilot test was conducted, by asking 5 students from the fourth grade of the school to take the questionnaire. During the piloting, students did not experience any major difficulties. Only a few students reported some questions regarding the comprehension of question number 25, but because of the older age of the participants of this study, they were not expected to experience similar difficulties.

For its implementation, the questionnaire was transferred to Google Forms. The link to the questionnaire was sent to the teacher, who uploaded it to Google Classroom so that all students could have access to it. Students were given 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. All students completed the questionnaire at the same time during a literacy lesson. Before starting the questionnaire, the instructions were explained to the students and

all the questions were previously read aloud by the researcher. The teacher was asked to leave the classroom in order to promote a relaxed atmosphere and to encourage students to answer as honestly as possible.

#### 4.3.3. Focus groups and individual interview

For the focus group interviews with students, there was a set of prespecified questions to ask. I decided to conduct two focus groups with two homogeneous groups of four students, in order to have a wider range of information and minimize any singular finding (Dörnyei, 2007). The interviews were carried out in Spanish so that the language was not a hurdle. During its implementation, students' answers were recorded and later transcribed as shown in Annex 2.

Regarding the individual interview with the teacher, there were some pre-prepared guiding questions, but the format was open-ended in order to allow the teacher to respond in his own terms (McKay, 2006).

Finally, it is important to note that, both in the focus group interviews with the students and in the interview with the teacher, despite the guidance provided, there was also room for follow-up in case of unforeseen interesting developments by the participants (Dörnyei, 2007).

## **5. Results and analysis.**

In this chapter, the results obtained from the different instruments employed will be outlined and analysed according to the most relevant motivational literature, and for that, Dörnyei's tripartite framework of L2 motivation will be again taken as a basis for presenting them.

### **5.1. *FIELD NOTES AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION.***

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the field notes (hereinafter FN) registered in Annex 1, different motivational aspects have been identified. Although the three motivational levels will be mentioned, my main focus will be aspects related to the learner level and specially the learning situation level.

#### **5.1.1. Language level**

Regarding the language level, it has been observed that instrumental orientations towards the subject and ultimately towards the language are usually modelled by the teacher. This is done, for instance, by linking certain specific pieces of language with real life examples in which they would be used, as can be seen in FN 2.3 and 4.2. In contrast, no evidence of integrative orientation has been identified in any of the lessons witnessed. However, not many data could be extracted in this level, since from mere observation, it is not possible to further investigate students' learning goals that explain language orientations.

#### **5.1.2. Learner level**

In relation to the learner level, the first thing that calls our attention is the fact that all students, regardless of their L2 proficiency, are willing to participate and talk in the lessons (FN 1.1, FN 2.3, FN 4.1). This would mean that students' language use anxiety is low and therefore, it would be interesting to analyse the factors in the learning situation level which positively contribute to this. Besides, this could indicate a low intrinsic motivation in some students, since, as Gardner (1985) stated, lack of effort usually indicates low motivation.

Only on one occasion observed (FN 2.6), some students were working with relatively high intensity in the task being completed, and they were asking questions driven by their desire to know more words. In this instance, these students showed a relatively high need for achievement, but, otherwise, need for achievement was not clearly identified as a component

that drives students' motivation towards the language. Similarly, some students directly talk in English to John even when the lesson has already finished, and even though it could be linked with a high need of achievement, some might also think that, in so doing, students are being moved by their affiliative drive for the teacher, or even just by a high perceived L2 competence, or by mere intrinsic satisfaction. Be that as it may, this issue should be further examined in order to identify the underlying causes.

Finally, during cooperative work and PBL (FN 1.3) students' intrinsic satisfaction seems to arise from the feeling of competence and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

### 5.1.3. Learning situation level

Components regarding the learning situation level have been thoroughly examined in the classroom. In this sense, different aspects which are likely to promote learners' motivation have been identified within the lessons observed, with a special emphasis on teacher-specific motivational components to explain other types of motives.

Within course-specific motivational components, it can be noted that students' interest is fairly high in different activities conducted in the lessons. For instance, some students seemed to be interested in the topic "shopping", since when asking new words to the teacher, they showed curiosity for the topic (see FN 2.3 and 2.6). Furthermore, FN 4.4 shows how the teacher makes students engage in grammar explanation by using an example that appears to be interesting for students. However, there were also occasions in which some students did not seem to be interested at all in the activity that was being carried out, as in FN 4.4, situation which could mean that a traditional teaching might not be sufficiently interesting for those students who are not intrinsically motivating for the subject.

Students' expectancy in the achievement of tasks is enhanced by receiving a significant amount of guidance by the teacher, as noted in FN 1.4 and FN 2.5.

Concerning relevance, it has been previously mentioned in the language level that instruction helps students learning language that they will need in real-life contexts, by for instance, giving examples that relate to real life, or talking about their interests, experiences, and motivations. Therefore, instruction is connected to students' goal of learning English and it is relevant for them. However, FN 3.2 shows that some students, particularly those with low L2 proficiency, were not interested in the video displayed. Students might not be

interested in the video because, in failing to understand it, they do not see the relevance of the instruction and consequently they do not pay attention and they find it boring.

Finally, satisfaction has been generated on many occasions by enjoyment of the activities and conversations that took place in the classroom as stated in FN 1.2, where it was recognised that PBL and the use of digital resources produced satisfaction among the students; or in FN 4.1, in which the students enjoyed sharing their personal experiences with the teacher.

Moving on to teacher-specific motivational components, the teacher's use of strategies and his teaching approach would lead one to think that the teachers' authority profile is autonomy supporting (see FN 1.1, FN 2.4, or FN 3.4). His teaching approach implies the use of PBL methodology, raising students' voices in decision-making, encouraging students' participation as much as possible, designing open tasks in which there is not just one right answer, or by having students actively participate in corrections instead of being the teacher the one who tells them the correct answers.

As mentioned above, the teacher models an integrative orientation towards the English language, making students aware of the relevance of learning English by contextualising activities, as seen in FN 4.2. In addition, he models effort and time expenditure by insisting on making a responsible and efficient use of their time (FN 1.5).

Broadly speaking, the teacher presents the activities in a way that is attractive for students, using different strategies such as linking it to students' experiences (FN 2.7) or by having students participate, as seen in FN 2.1, but it is also important to mention that the purpose of conducting the activity is not always stated by the teacher, such as in the case of this last observation mentioned. Therefore, from these observations, it is not clear whether task presentation is energizing or undermining students' motivation.

When providing feedback, the teacher tries to avoid addressing individual students. When he notices a mistake, he explains it to the whole group so that other students can benefit from that explanation. Corrective feedback given by the teacher is informative (FN 2.7, FN 4.3 and 4.6), which will be beneficial for students' self-confidence. In spite of this, there is no evidence of the use of positive feedback nor praise by the teacher.



Lastly, different aspects related to the group have been identified as potentially beneficial for students' motivation. FN 1.3 shows that most students disowned a small group of students who did not respect the teacher's command, leading us to think that there is a well-developed norm and reward system. Similarly, the efforts made by many of the students' for talking in English along the different lessons (FN 2.3 and 2.5, FN 3.1...) reflects the extent to which the group is attuned to learning the L2. Consequently, it could be contended that some students are driven by a shared goal-orientedness, albeit this might not be a motivational force for a reduced number of students who usually do not participate.

Concerning the classroom goal structure, the use of PBL seems to be helping students learn to cooperate, since they work together and share responsibilities. Nevertheless, there are some students who are not engaged in the group work (FN 1.3). Finally, group cohesion is most certainly strong, since all students (except for one student) prefer to work in pairs, as seen in FN 2.4, which indicates that there are positive relationships among students.

To conclude, attention must be drawn to Ana, who seems not to be integrated within the group, and who definitely does not have any close relationships with her classmates. Thus, it could be anticipated that this student does not share a common goal with them, and neither partakes in the norm and reward system identified.

## 5.2. *QUESTIONNAIRE.*

Students' answers to the questionnaire will be explored in this section. To do that, the questions will be organized and analysed according to the component of motivation they are designed to investigate). By clustering and interpreting the data obtained, we seek to identify the emerging trends and patterns in which the focus should be placed with the following tools.

### 5.2.1. Language level

Table 2 provides the questionnaire results on students' orientation towards L2 learning. The results show that there is a high instrumental orientation towards the L2 among students, as 20 students out of the 22 that completed the survey claimed that they study English because it would be useful for them to communicate with people who do not speak Spanish. Moreover,

13 students also noted that English is necessary for their future, and that they feel it is useful to study those subjects that are taught in English. This is further supported by the answers provided by the students themselves in the open-ended option (*Otros*) in which two students recognized that it was necessary for them to accomplish their goal of studying in the USA. Similarly, there is a high perceived intrinsic motivation, since 59.1% of the students asserted that they enjoy learning the English language.

It is worth noticing that three students are moved by the Ought to Self in the sense that they report studying English to please their parents. Conversely, some students (23.7%) show a high need for achievement, since they claim that they study English seeking to obtain good marks.

<i>Estudio inglés porque...</i>	<i>Frequency (%)</i>
<i>Me ayudará en un futuro para comunicarme con otras personas...</i>	20 (90.9%)
<i>Es necesario para mi futuro.</i>	13 (59.1%)
<i>Me sirve para entender otras asignaturas como science o...</i>	13 (59.1%)
<i>Me gusta el idioma.</i>	13 (59.1%)
<i>Me gustan las clases de literacy.</i>	13 (59.1%)
<i>Quiero sacar buena nota.</i>	6 (27.3%)
<i>Tengo que aprobar la asignatura.</i>	4 (18.2%)
<i>Para que mis padres estén orgullosos de mí.</i>	2 (9.2%)
<i>Me obligan mis padres.</i>	1 (4.5%)
<i>Otros.</i>	2 (9%)

**Table 2. Students' orientations towards the L2.**

Students' Ideal L2 Self is studied in Table 3, and the high mean obtained (4.4) points to the fact that this group of students has indeed a well-formed L2 speaking ideal self.

	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Mean</i>
<i>Para mí es muy importante aprender a hablar muy bien inglés.</i>	-	-	3	7	12	4.4

**Table 3. Students' perceptions on their Ideal L2-Self.**

### 5.2.2. Learner level

Table 4 sheds some light on students' perceptions about their own motivation regarding English language learning. Attention must be drawn to question 4, which makes reference to students' need for achievement, since from the high mean obtained and the number of

responses in scores 4 and 5, it could be inferred that students from 6th C are significantly moved to learn English by their desire of being as excellent as they could possibly be. In relation to this, questions 14 and 15 show an irregular intrinsic satisfaction among students. Some students reported not enjoying talking in English nor listening to it, thus they are definitely not motivated towards the language. However, there is another limited group of students who seem to have a high intrinsic satisfaction. Although there is no evidence of the origin of this motivation, if we consider Self-Determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) it could be posited that it is provoked by a feeling of competence; or, conversely, it could be driven by sheer enjoyment and pleasure derived from the activity.

Questions 5 and 6 show that students' self-efficacy is relatively high, which indicates that learners believe that they are capable of succeeding in the L2 learning. However, as an exception, it is worth noticing that, in question number 6 one student admitted to feeling lost in literacy lessons.

Despite this interpretation on students' self-efficacy, from students' answers to both questions 7 and 8, it seems that there is a small group of students who confessed being anxious when talking in English, thus showing a high language use anxiety, although there is also a considerably large group of students whose language use anxiety seems to be low. Closely related with this is students' perceived L2 competence. As shown in question 12, the vast majority of the students define themselves as being nor very good nor very bad in English Language. However, low perceived L2 competence was found in a small number of students (question 13) since four students recognized not being very good in speaking English.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Mean</b>
4. <i>Me esfuerzo por sacar la mejor nota posible en literacy.</i>	-	-	1	8	13	4.54
14. <i>Me gusta ver series...</i>	6	2	4	3	7	3.13
15. <i>Estaría todo el día hablando en inglés.</i>	6	3	6	3	4	2,81
6. <i>Me siento perdido/a en clase...</i>	17	1	3	-	1	1.5
5. <i>Creo que nunca voy a poder sacar buena nota...</i>	16	2	4	-	-	1.45
7. <i>Me pongo nervioso/a...</i>	8	5	5	1	2	2.23
8. <i>Me siento incómodo/a...</i>	14	3	-	1	4	2
13. <i>NO se me da bien hablar en inglés.</i>	11	5	2	3	1	2
12. <i>Soy muy bueno/a en inglés.</i>	2	-	9	8	3	3.45
11. <i>Mis notas dependen...</i>	19	1	2	-	-	1.22

**Table 4. Students' responses in relation to learner-level motivation.**

It is clear from table 5, which presents students' perceptions of causal attributions to their success and failures, that they do not ascribe their success or failures to external factors nor to the sympathy their teacher has for them, nor to the difficulty of the exams, nor to the stringency level of their teacher. Despite some students making reference to unstable and uncontrollable factors such as their high ability or high perceived L2 competence, they generally see the link between the effort they make and their relative success L2 learning. In this regard, it is also worth mentioning that 17 out of the 22 students claimed not getting bad marks in literacy, and only 3 acknowledged not obtaining good grades.

<i>Causal attributions (Qs. 9, 10 and 11)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
<i>De lo bien que le caigo al profesor.</i>	19 (86%) 1 (5%) 2 (9%) - - 1.22
<i>Estudio y trabajo mucho.</i>	13 (59.1%)
<i>Se me da bien el inglés.</i>	9 (40.9%)
<i>No estudio suficiente.</i>	3 (13.6%)
<i>El profesor no es muy exigente.</i>	3 (13.6%)
<i>El profesor no es muy exigente.</i>	3 (13.6%)
<i>No se me da bien el inglés.</i>	2 (9.1%)
<i>Me gusta el inglés y le pongo interés</i>	2 (9%)
<i>Los exámenes son muy fáciles.</i>	1 (4.5%)
<i>Los exámenes son muy difíciles</i>	1 (4.5%)
<i>A veces necesito prestar más atención</i>	1(4.5%)
<i>El profesor es muy estricto.</i>	-
<i>No suelo sacar malas notas en literacy.</i>	17 (77.3)
<i>No suelo sacar buenas notas en literacy.</i>	3 (13.6%)

**Table 5. Students' causal attributions to their successes and failures.**

Finally, I examined students' reasons for going to private English lessons. Results show (table 6) that only 6 students receive English lessons outside the school. Despite the fact that the decision of attending a language school would be taken by the families, students do not feel pressured by their parents to study English, since no student claimed to be forced to go to an English academy. Besides, three students show a low perceived L2 competence by saying that they need help, and three other students show need for achievement, by stating that they want to learn more.

<i>19. Voy a una academia o clases particulares de inglés...</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
<i>No voy a una academia o clases particulares de inglés.</i>	16 (72,7%)
<i>Porque necesito ayuda con el inglés.</i>	3 (13,6%)
<i>Porque quiero aprender más inglés.</i>	3 (13,6%)
<i>Porque me obligan mis padres.</i>	-
<i>Porque en el colegio no aprendo mucho inglés.</i>	-

**Table 6. Students' reasons for receiving private English lessons.**

### 5.2.3. Learning situation level

Table 7 shows students' answers regarding learning situation-level, and specifically, about the course specific motivational components. The results indicate that, out of the four factors identified by Dörnyei (1994), relevance, satisfaction and interest have the greatest significance on learners' motivation. Conversely, the distribution of the answers reveals that students do not find extremely literacy tasks and exams hard, nor do they think that the effort required in this subject is unreasonable, which is likely to positively contribute to students' motivation both towards the subject and towards English language.

<b>Motivational component measured</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Relevance	18. <i>Aprendo mucho inglés en clase de literacy.</i>	-	1	2	4	15	4.5
Satisfaction	22. <i>Me gusta que el profesor me corrija lo que hago mal.</i>	2	-	-	7	13	4.31
	23. <i>Las clases de literacy son muy divertidas.</i>	-	2	4	5	11	4.13
Interest	16. <i>Me gustan mucho las actividades...</i>	1	2	4	8	7	3.81
	17. <i>Los temas que tratamos en literacy son muy interesantes.</i>	-	1	4	9	8	4.09
Expectancy	20. <i>Tenemos que estudiar bastante...</i>	2	5	10	3	2	2.9
	21. <i>Los exámenes de literacy son demasiado difíciles.</i>	5	7	5	4	1	2.5

**Table 7. Students' views about literacy lessons at school.**

Table 8 shows results regarding teacher-specific motivational components. questions 29 and 30 demonstrate that most students' regard positively the way in which the teacher presents the tasks. Only one student reported not liking how he presents the tasks. With regards to feedback delivery, almost all students indicated that the teacher does not compare them with other students and gives them detailed indications on how to improve their work, thus motivating students to focus on their own progress and achievements. Moreover, the data extracted in question 22 (see table 7) indicates that most students enjoy receiving teachers' feedback, probably because they see it as something that will help them improve their English level, despite two students who do not like receiving feedback. This could be explained by students' special appreciation for their teacher, which seems to be a fairly strong force for students enjoying literacy lessons (see questions 26 and 27).

Even though teachers were reported to foster participation during the lessons (question 25), students do not feel included in the selection of the activities that are conducted

in literacy lessons (question 24). More data needs to be collected to verify whether the teacher is autonomy supporting or controlling, although the FN already advanced that the teacher advocates autonomy. Finally, in relation to modelling motivation, some students feel that the teacher does not insist much on the importance of learning English (question 28), but the answers to this question seem to be unclear, since some students firmly believe that the teacher emphasizes the relevance of English language, and hence the need of further evidence.

Motivational component measured	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Task presentation	29. <i>Me gusta mucho cómo explica...</i>	1	-	2	2	17	4.54
	30. <i>Presenta las actividades de una forma muy atractiva.</i>	1	-	2	8	11	4.27
Feedback and assessment	31. <i>Mi profesor siempre me compara...</i>	19	1	1	1	-	1.27
	32. <i>Mi profesor me explica cómo mejorar...</i>	1	-	4	5	12	4.22
Affiliative drive	26. <i>Me gustan las clases de inglés porque mi profesor es muy guay.</i>	-	-	4	11	7	4.13
	27. <i>Mi profesor de literacy es mejor...</i>	3	-	11	7	1	3.13
Authority type	24. <i>El profesor nos deja elegir algunas actividades...</i>	3	4	11	3	1	2.77
	25. <i>El profesor nos deja participar...</i>	1	1	1	5	13	4.33
Modelling	28. <i>Nos repite lo importante que es que aprendamos inglés...</i>	3	1	7	5	6	3.45

**Table 8. Students' perceptions on Teacher-specific motivational components.**

Group-specific motivational components have been studied in table 9. the results suggest that there is a strong goal-orientedness within students and that they are attuned to learning the L2, (questions 33 and 34)

On another note, students seem to have internalised speaking in English and listening and respecting their teacher as group norms, although there might not be complete agreement with regards to speaking in English, as the results in question 35 show that 4 children scored a low mark in it.

A strong group cohesion can be perceived from students' answers to question 36, in which 21 out of the 22 students feel and are happy to be part of the group. Yet, one student does not feel that she belongs to the group. This particular case will be discussed later.

Finally, results are not conclusive regarding classroom goal structure (questions 37, 39 and 40), since they show that there is not much cooperation nor competition among students when learning the L2.

Motivational component measured	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Goal-orientedness	33. <i>Tengo muy claro lo que el profesor espera que aprendamos...</i>	1	1	4	2	14	4.22
	34. <i>En general nos esforzamos por aprender inglés.</i>	-	2	5	6	9	4
Norm and reward system	35. <i>Intentamos hablar en inglés el máximo posible.</i>	2	2	4	10	4	3.54
	36. <i>Respetamos al profesor cuando está explicando.</i>	-	1	7	10	4	3.77
Group cohesion	38. <i>Me gusta ser de 6°C.</i>	1	-	-	3	18	4.68
Classroom goal structure	37. <i>Mis compañeros me ayudan a aprender inglés.</i>	4	7	4	5	2	2.72
	39. <i>Intento sacar mejores notas que mis compañeros/as.</i>	8	5	2	5	2	2.45
	40. <i>Me molesta que otros sepan más inglés que yo.</i>	13	4	2	1	2	1.86

**Table 9. Students' perceptions on Group-specific motivational components.**

Classroom goal structure is further studied in table 10. The answers reveal a preference for group work over pair or individual work, which could be related to the friendly relationships among students, and therefore would not indicate much about cooperation and the sharing of responsibilities and outcomes.

41. <i>Prefiero hacer actividades...</i>	Frequency (%)
<i>En pareja.</i>	5 (22,7%)
<i>Grupales.</i>	16 (72,7%)
<i>Individuales.</i>	1 (4,5%)

**Table 10. Students' preferences for groupings when doing the activities.**

As mentioned above, Ana's results on questions related to group-cohesion and classroom goal structure stand out from the group. In question 38 (table 9), the student indicated that she does not feel part of the group, and in question 41 (table 10) she clearly showed her preference for working alone, which as had been attested in classroom observation. This indicates a lack of close relationships with her classmates, which will adversely affect her motivation not just in the L2 but in many aspects of the learning process.

### 5.3. FOCUS GROUPS.

The data obtained from the classroom observations and the questionnaire raise the need for further exploration of certain issues, for what two focus groups (henceforward FG) were conducted (see Annex 2). In this subsection the answers provided by the students in both

interviews will be analysed and interpreted, identifying and summarising the most salient tendencies in relation to the three levels of Dörnyei's model (1994).

### 5.3.1. Language level

The already perceived instrumental orientation towards the L2 in the questionnaire is further evidenced by students' answer in question 1, when several students mentioned the need of learning English for their future or for travelling. However, the fact that some students mentioned going to an English-speaking country could be related to an integrative orientation as well, as this would mean a positive predisposition towards the L2 community and a need of become part of that community. Similarly, an integrative motivation was also found in question 17 in FG 1, in which another student stated enjoying talking with his teacher because he is a native speaker.

### 5.3.2. Learner level

Regarding learner level components, the students interviewed have revealed on many occasions that their self-confidence is, in general terms, fairly high. In this sense, students stated enjoying talking in English, which indicates that students are intrinsically motivated, as is shown in students' responses to questions 17 in FG 1 or question 20 in FG 2; as well as a lack of language use anxiety (see questions 1 in FG1 and questions 4 and 17 in FG 2).

Similarly, self-efficacy seems to be high in some students who revealed having learnt a lot and having improved his fluency, as can be seen in question 1 in FG 1 and question 20 in FG 2. In line with Self-Determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), this motivation would have been caused by a high sense of accomplishment and competence. However, as one would expect, self-efficacy is not high among all students of the group, which is in this case evidenced by a student who claimed "not being good at English" (see question 1 in FG 1).

Moreover, in line with Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), students' responses to questions 24 in FG 1, and questions 10 and 18 in FG 2 have shown that the sense of feeling autonomous and competent drives their motivation, which are fostered by the use of PBL methodology.



### 5.3.3. Learning situation level

In terms of course-specific motivational components, students' answers provided extensive evidence of the satisfaction produced by the activities conducted in the lessons, as one student indicated when responding to question 2 (FG 1), such as games (question 2 in FG 2), group activities (question 6 in FG 2), or projects (question 7 in FG 2). Further to this, students disclosed not liking activities in which they have to copy (see questions 4 and 6 in FG 1) while recognising that they do not do many activities of that kind in literacy lessons (see question 15 in FG 2).

Apart from the satisfaction produced by the project, students showed interest in the topic thereof (question 5 in FG 1 and question 10 in FG 2). Besides that, students' answers to question 4 in FG 2 showed that some of them find it interesting to talk about their own experiences, which motivated them to use the language. This could be related to the next point, relevance, since talking about their lives and about things that are important for them in the classroom might help students see the relevance of the instruction. Moreover, in different occasions, students further proved that they acknowledge the relevance of the instruction. For instance, one student stated that she feels that she is learning, and another student said that he sees that he is improving (question 7 in FG 2).

Students claimed that code-switching helps them to better understand the important things, thus it serves as guide and assistance for many students (question 13 in FG 1 and question 16 in FG 2). In the same way, students have posited receiving help from the teacher which helps them a lot (question 12 in FG 1), therefore reducing perceived task difficulty and ultimately enhancing their expectancy of success.

Conversely, one student noted that he struggles more with exams now than he used to in previous years (question 3 in FG 1), which seems reasonable due to the increasing demand as students move onto higher levels of Primary School. This should not be dismissed because it is highly likely that this is the case for a relevant number of students, especially for those whose English level is not so good. For those students, not having a lot of exams would be beneficial because it would mean that their final mark does not only depend on how well they do in the exams.

With regard to teacher-specific components, I tried to further explore the authority type of the teacher, since the results obtained in the questionnaire were not conclusive. First, students really value the fact that their teacher (John) does not reprimand them and that he supports and helps them, as well as he lets them actively participate (question 10 in FG 1 and question 13 in FG 2). However, students feel that the teacher only gives opportunities to choose in a limited number of activities, but not in all of them (question 11 in FG 1, question 14 in FG 2). In spite of students' views, it is legitimate that students cannot choose every activity that is done in class, since this would hinder the learning process, and, moreover, it would be impossible to meet every student's preference. Thus, it could be concluded that, despite the fact that generally children cannot take part in the selection of the activities, the teacher's authority type is autonomy supporting.

Besides, students' responses supported the idea that they are moved to speak in English by their affiliative drive towards the teacher (see question 2 in FG 2). In connection therewith, students reported that they love the way in which the teacher presents the tasks, and therefore task presentation will raise students' interest. In contrast, they did not mention to be encouraged to pay attention to the purpose and practical value of the tasks.

Concluding with teacher-specific components, students also mentioned that they like the way in which the teacher provides them with feedback (question 12 in FG 1), in the sense that when the teacher corrects them, they notice their mistakes, and this helps them to improve (question 17 in FG 2). This would tell us that the teacher uses informational feedback, by explicitly explaining students how to improve, but also that he does not overemphasize students' errors.

Concerning group-specific motivational components, the focus groups have provided evidence for the strong group cohesion (perceived, at least, by some members of the group) but at the same time they have raised the idea that there might be some issues between students. The fact that they prefer group-work over individual work tells us that there are positive friendly relationships between students (question 6 in FG 2) and, moreover, some students have explicitly reported that, broadly speaking, they get along well (question 18 in FG 1), but, simultaneously, in question 21 in FG2, other students have recognised that some students disturb during the lessons and that there sometimes is a gloomy atmosphere.

regarding classroom norms, students mentioned the “secret police” (question 19 in FG 1 and question 22 in FG 2) strategy used by the teacher in order to have students talk in English while they work in their groups. This technique was witnessed during classroom observation, and stated that still, not everyone speaks in English. Further to this, they mentioned the “Stop and continue” rule (question 23 in FG 2), and, although they believe that they respect the teacher when he is speaking, they recognised that this norm is not always followed.

In a similar way, goal-orientedness has been identified among a group of students, since some stated that many of them talk in English because they like (and therefore they want to improve) (question 19 in FG 1), but they also recognised that there is people who don’t even try to speak in English (question 22 in FG 2), which indicates that the goal of learning the L2 is not shared by all the students.

Finally, in question 24 in both FG 1 and 2, students acknowledged the difficulties of group work and cooperative work, but, on the whole, it could be affirmed that the classroom goal structure is cooperative, since they also posited that they help each other and that they are learning how to work in groups, which reveals cooperation among students.

#### *5.4. INTERVIEW WITH THE TEACHER.*

Finally, yet importantly, the answers provided by the teacher in the interview will be analysed in hereunder, heeding the most relevant conclusions corresponding to the learner level and the learning situation level.

##### *5.4.1. Learner level*

According to the teacher (lines 8-10) students’ motivation was not inherent since the beginning. However, to achieve motivating students, he had to be very strict at first, and then he started using humour in class (lines 12-13), which tells us that intrinsic motives played an important role in developing students’ motivation.

Additionally, when the teacher was asked about the reasons for which many students are willing to talk in class, he mentioned students’ different personal features. He claimed

some students are motivated to talk in English because of a high perceived L2 competence (23-26), and therefore by a high self-confidence, leading one to think that they are moved by the feeling of competence (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In contrast, some students might be driven by the desire of being able to speak English as well as some of their classmates (lines 26-29), which may be related to their ideal version of themselves. he also posited that some learners are motivated by a high need for achievement (lines 29-31).

Finally, the teacher contended that the reason why some students do not talk is because they are not motivated and asserts that these students struggle with English (lines 31-32). In this case it would be interesting to analyse where that lack of motivation arises, since it could be caused by a low perceived L2 competence and a low self-confidence.

#### 5.4.2. Learning situation level

Regarding learning situation motivational components, in question 7, the teacher answered that not many things could be changed and adapted in terms of the course content to consider students' motivation. However, he claimed adapting the way in which he delivers the lessons to the features of the different groups (lines 36-41), for what he uses humour and encourages enjoyment (lines 42-45). Accordingly, it seems that in order to enhance students' motivation, he tries to increase students' interest and to promote satisfaction.

Moreover, the teacher claimed that code-switching reinforces students' hypothesis about what they had understood (lines 58-60), thus, it increases students' expectancy of success. Students' expectancy is also likely to be raised by the use of formative assessment, as stated by the teacher in lines 68-73. This is achieved by an efficient feedback delivery and task presentation on the part of the teacher, since he contended providing students with a clear message about the purpose of the tasks, the priorities in its development, and the strategies that will be required in order to successfully complete them for instance explaining rubrics and success criteria. Besides, the teacher promotes students' autonomy by making use of flipped learning (lines 49-53).

Similarly, the teacher's answers showed in different occasions that he models students' orientations towards the L2 (lines 13-15) by emphasizing the real value of being able to communicate in English language, along with modelling in terms of effort expenditure (lines 75-76).

Lastly, regarding group specific motivational components, the teacher seems to have a pessimistic view of the group cohesion, claiming that they are starting to form groups and leading one to think that relationships among students are not as positive as it was perceived (lines 84-85). Likewise, he asserted that their social skills are not very well developed and recognized that students do not take into account their classmates (lines 91-92), which indicates that an individualistic classroom goal structure would be affecting their group-work performance. For that reason and with the objective of improving students' group-work and socialization skills, he noted that he has been promoting cooperative learning.

Finally, the teacher confirms that there is indeed a norm system that is updated and reinforced over the course of the academic year (lines 96-102), which would be facilitative of those behaviours required for efficient learning, and therefore would drive students' effort.

## 6. Discussion.

This last chapter discusses the results obtained from the different instruments, comparing the data collected corresponding to each component. In so doing, the objective is to draw conclusions in order to pinpoint the main factors affecting language learning motivation among the group of students who participated. These findings are expected to be transferable to other EFL context in which the learners have similar characteristics to our participants. In such a way, we aim to help EFL teachers, since, despite teachers being only one of the many factors that affect second language acquisition, it has been proved that they can have a significant impact on the rest of the components. For that, the data will be presented using the same outline that has been used throughout this paper.

Starting with the Language Level, the questionnaire and the focus group interviews have provided further evidence of the strength of instrumental orientation, as was first perceived during classroom observations. In this sense, many students mentioned needing English to travel to other countries or for their future, which implies that they place value on the pragmatic and instrumental dimensions of English language. Conversely, although students' answers to the questionnaire show that there is a well-formed ideal L2 self among the majority of students, there is no demonstration of this component being a motivational force in the rest of the instruments employed. Finally, students' answers to the questionnaire and in the focus group demonstrate that some students are interested in the L2 community and are driven by the desire to interact with them, since they mentioned their desire of moving to an English speaking country in the future. These findings do not concur with the results obtained by Dörnyei (2010), since, in this case, it seems that integrativeness is a better predictor of intended effort than the Ideal L2 Self or the Ought to L2 Self. Nevertheless, the subject of Dörnyei's study was an older population, which could explain this difference.

Concerning the Learner Level Motivation, the initial observations raised the necessity of further exploration of students' need for achievement, since it was perceived in a small number of students. This component was later analysed in the questionnaire, in which most students answered that they try to obtain the highest mark possible in English, showing a fairly high need for achievement. However, this is not fully consistent with the previous observations and nor with the teacher's view, inasmuch as he claimed that only those students with an intermediate level of English strive towards obtaining the best grade possible.

After analysing the observations, there was also need for additional data to ascertain whether students' self-confidence was high or low. Despite the overall high self-efficacy and the low L2 use anxiety perceived, the questionnaire allowed us to access the singularity, where some students indicated a low self-efficacy and a high language use anxiety, which was later supported by the teacher's view. The teacher posited that those students with a lower level of English are not motivated, which was related to a low perceived L2 competence. Unexpectedly, in the focus groups, self-efficacy was only found to be low in one student. Therefore, the short representation of this group of students in the focus group could have generated some biased results.

Moreover, students have definitely made links between the effort they make and their academic outcomes, which was demonstrated in the questionnaire, and besides, no other instrument indicated an external causal attribution on the part of the students.

In line with Self-Determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) the results obtained from the different instruments highlighted that the feelings of autonomy and competence act as a strong motivational force for these learners, which has been identified as a broad tendency in the group. In this regard, learners have demonstrated effort driven by the sense of autonomy, when for instance, carrying out the project, as has been ascertained in the observations and with students' answers in the questionnaire and in the focus groups. Similarly, both in the questionnaire and in the focus groups, students claimed to be motivated because of the feeling of having improved their English level, that is, intrinsic satisfaction also emerges from the sense of competence. In this issue, both the type of activities conducted in the classroom and teacher authority type, which will be later discussed, will play a very important role.

In terms of course-specific motivational components, satisfaction has been found as the most effective aspect driving students' motivation, specially when it arises from intrinsic pleasure and enjoyment. This component was first identified during classroom observation and was later corroborated by students' responses to both the questionnaire and the focus groups. By contrast, students' interest is not always high, since there are some topics or tasks that might not be intrinsically motivating for students. With regards to this, the teacher pointed to the impossibility of taking into account every student's interest when planning the course. Despite this, he claimed he attempts to foster students' satisfaction by delivering the lessons in a way that produces enjoyment. For instance, he makes use of jokes, funny

examples and situations, and uses methodologies that are attractive for students, such as games, group work or projects.

According to the questionnaire results, expectancy was not found to be a significant motive for the students of this group as a whole. Conversely, the rest of the instruments indicated that the use of code-switching and the guidance provided by the teacher indeed play an important role on reducing students' perceived task difficulty and, in turn, have a positive effect on students' engagement within the lessons and on their motivation towards the L2. It is worth noting that a small number of students' answers in both the questionnaire and the focus groups showed that their expectancy of success has decreased compared to the preceding years of Primary Education, which could be suggesting the need of giving additional support to some children.

It could be stated that when learners see that their English is getting better thanks to literacy lessons, their motivation towards the subject and the language are enhanced. The analysis of the FN showed that the contextualisation of the activities helps students to see the relevance of the instruction, and the students recognised that Literacy is helping them in improving their English level both in the questionnaire and the focus groups.

Regarding teacher-specific components, the data obtained from all the instruments have proved that receiving feedback has a positive effect on students' motivation. During classroom observations it was attested that the teacher gave informational feedback to students which was not aggressive, and students' errors were not overemphasised. Moreover, the teacher uses formative feedback over the lessons, which, in line with the curriculum guidelines, motivates students to seek continuous improvement (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, p.54). This type of feedback delivery results in students appreciating receiving feedback and believing that it helps to improve, as the learners themselves indicated in the questionnaire and the focus groups. However, in the questionnaire two students confessed they did not like receiving feedback, but there is not enough data to identify the reasons for this. It should also be mentioned that there is no proof of praise or positive feedback to students in any of the instruments used, which would be a good strategy to use on the part of the teacher if it is sought to boost students' self-confidence (Dörnyei, 1998).

The teacher is also an influential model for students in terms of attitudes towards the language and in terms of effort expenditure, which was noticed during classroom observation



and in the individual interview with the teacher. Nevertheless, the fact that the questionnaire provided unclear results on this item, and that it was not mentioned either during the focus groups, means that students might not be completely conscious of this modelling.

Students' affiliative drive for their teacher is a strong motivational force for them, as it was first recognized in the field notes analysis and later confirmed in both the questionnaire and the focus groups. In relation to this, students have claimed that they like the way in which the teacher presents the tasks, therefore task presentation is attractive for students. However, in the focus group interviews, students did not mention to be explicitly informed about the purpose of the activities or their practical value by the teacher, which would not correspond to the high relevance and instrumentality perceived. A possible cause for this could be a lack of awareness of students, since, for instance, they might not relate the fact that the teacher explains success criteria with the necessary strategies in order to successfully complete the tasks. Thus, the teacher might need to be more explicit to directing students' attention to both the pragmatic usefulness of the tasks and when raising their metacognitive awareness.

The data obtained from students does not allow us to identify unequivocally the teacher's authority type. However, from the data obtained in the observations and in the teacher's interview one could conclude that his authority type is autonomy supporting, since he uses methodologies such as PBL, flipped learning, encourages self-assessment, and offers children the possibility to choose certain aspects in the activities that are conducted.

Finally, within group-specific motivational components, a well-formed norm and reward system first identified during the observations was later confirmed by both the teacher and the students. There are some group norms about which all students in the classroom seem to be aware, considering that they have been extensively discussed in the lessons. Despite this, as indicated by students in the focus groups, these norms are not respected by everyone. This is corroborated by the diverse answers of four children to the questionnaire. Therefore, as previously attested, the group usually puts pressure on the members who violate the established norms, thus functioning as a motive to comply with the rules.

For a high number of students goal-orientedness seems to be a strong motivational force to talk in English, although, this is not the case for every child. From an idiographic perspective, the fact that some students do not share the goal of learning the L2 could explain why they do not want to participate in the lessons. For the purpose of increasing the groups'

goal-orientedness, Dörnyei (1994) suggests teachers should have open discussions with learners about their goals and priorities and make them reflect about the extent to which they are addressing their goal every so often.

The teacher's view of group cohesion does not fully agree with students' answers in this respect, since from the responses given by the learners one could conclude that the group cohesion is fairly strong, but the teacher claimed that they are starting to form groups. According to the teacher, this would be affecting group work performance, and as a result, he refers to an individualistic classroom goal structure. Similarly, students did not show nor competition nor much cooperation in the questionnaire, but, according to some learners' responses in the focus groups, they are learning to work in groups, and they help each other, which suggests that there is some cooperation among them. By all means, what is clear is the necessity of further developing students' socialization and cooperative skills, which is in fact acknowledged by the teacher.

Finally, special mention should be made of Ana, because despite proving not to have any friendly relationship with her classmates nor to take part in any group work, her English level seems to be fairly good, and she seems to be motivated for speaking in English. This would lead us to think that, for her, group-goal components do not play a significant role in her language learning motivation, which could be caused by her medical conditions. However, it would be beneficial to study the possible measures that could be implemented in order to help her improving her social skills, since, as stated in the Aragonese curriculum (Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2022), primary education must contribute to the complete development of students, preparing them for an active and democratic citizenship in today's society.

## 7. Conclusions

Taking into account the complex and unstable nature of the construct of motivation and the design of the present study, this paper provides evidence on how L2 motivation can be boosted but which is bounded to a very specific context. Our research indicates that the learning situation level not only plays an important role by itself but also has significant impact on the other two levels, that is, its factors might influence students' orientations attitudes and orientations towards the L2, and they might also influence students' personal emotional features.

Firstly, as it was expected, students really value the pragmatic gains of learning English, thus an instrumental orientation towards English language is a strong motive for the subjects of this study. Surprisingly, some students from the 6<sup>th</sup> year of Primary Education are also worried about interacting with the L2 community, although in a much more limited way.

In this sense, the learning situation is influencing students' orientations. Specifically, the use of relevant tasks and the model provided by the teacher are enhancing instrumental orientations, but they are not promoting integrative motives.

With regards to students' personal affects, need for achievement has only been proved to move a limited number of students towards making an effort during the lessons. Therefore, it is not clear whether it is relevant to examine it as a factor affecting a group of eleven-year-old students' motivation.

Conversely, it has been demonstrated that a high self-confidence and the feelings of autonomy and competence have a more significant and long-lasting impact on students' overall L2 motivation, while a low expectancy of success has been found to have a deterring effect on students' classroom performance. Some strategies implemented by the teacher definitely showed to boost students' self-confidence, for instance, the use of code-switching or positive feedback delivery. Regarding the feelings of autonomy and competence, PBL stands out for their enhancement. Thus, it has been demonstrated that, even though learner level components are reasonably stable personality features (Dörnyei, 2007), the learning situation, and more specifically the teachers' methodological decisions, could represent a substantial change in these affects and cognitions.

Finally, the factors of the learning situation that would be expected to influence students' L2 motivation to a greater extent shall be the following: the satisfaction produced by the instruction; the relevance of the instruction, which would correspond to instrumentality; the teacher's authority type; the direct socialization of motivation; and the norm and reward system.

Given that this is a multiple case study, we cannot guarantee the external validity of our findings. However, this research was never meant to provide statistical generalizations, but its results are likely to provide support to reviewed L2 motivational theories. Thus, English teachers who work in a context similar to the one of this study can apply some of the suggestions made expecting that students' L2 motivation will be almost certainly enhanced.

It is equally important to address several limitations that should be taken into consideration for a comprehensive understanding of the findings.

One of the limitations of my study concerns data collection, as some particular environmental factors of each child were not taken into account, such as the family context. Moreover, I did not further examine the impact of the extra-curricular English lessons on students' motivation, since it was not considered relevant due to the small number of students receiving this private lessons. However, it should be noted that focusing on environmental factors was not the primary objective of this research, but rather analysing the learning situation and its impact on learners' L2 motivation.

Another constraint would be the brief period of observation, which may have prevented from identifying some other factors that could also influence students' motivation. Moreover, a longer observation period would have allowed us to further explore other issues, such as whether the teacher uses positive feedback or praise at some point. It also would have allowed us to observe other kind of activities, such as chants or games, and students' behaviours and responses towards them.

Notwithstanding these limitations, they do not substantially affect the practical applications of the research, since the findings offer meaningful evidence of how motivation towards the L2 learning process can be enhanced from the classroom environment.

To conclude, this research leaves some aspects that could be further investigated in the future. For instance, the reasons why students' expectancy of success seems to have

decreased compared to the preceding years could be further studied, as well as the role played by students' Ideal L2 Self in their motivation. In the same way, this paper opens up new avenues for research, inspiring further inquiries into the potential beneficial use of humour in class. Another possibility would be to implement the strategies mentioned in earlier or higher levels, in other schools and settings, in order to ascertain the applicability of the findings in different contexts.

## Bibliography

Adams, E. J., Nguyen, A. T. & Cowan, N. (2018). Theories of working memory: Differences in definition, degree of modularity, role of attention, and purpose. *Language, speech, and hearing services in schools*, 49(3), 340-355.

Atkinson, J.W. and Raynor, J.O. (eds) (1974) *Motivation and Achievement*. Washington, DC: Winston & Sons.

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self efficacy. *Developmental psychology*, 25(5), 729-735.

Brehm, J. W. & Self, E. A. (1989). The Intensity of Motivation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 109-131.

Brophy, J. & Good, T. L. (1984). Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement. *Occasional Paper*, 73, 107-122.

Brown, D. (2001) *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Longman.

CAST (2018) *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>

Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z. & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language learning*, 44(3), 417-448.

Clément, R., Gardner, R. C. & Smythe, P. C. (1980). Social and individual factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 12(4), 293-302

Council of Europe (2020) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Council of Europe Publishing. [www.coe.int/lang-cefr](http://www.coe.int/lang-cefr)

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

Cook, D. A. & Artino A. R. J. (2016) Motivation to learn: an overview of contemporary theories. *Medical Education*, 50, 997-1014.

Cox, W. M. & Klinger, E. (2023). Assessing current concerns and goals idiographically: A review of the Motivational Structure Questionnaire family of instruments. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 79(3), 667-682.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000) Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000) Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge!. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 515-523.

Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Motivational factors in second language attainment: A review of research in Hungary. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 44 (1/2), 261-275.

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language teaching research*, 2(3), 203-229.

Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. & Malderez, A. (1999). The role of group dynamics in foreign language learning and teaching. *Readings in Methodology*, 52, 155-171

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizér, K. (2002) Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey, *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 421–462.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009) *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010) Researching motivation: from integrativeness to the ideal L2 self in Hunston, S & Oakey, D. *Introducing Applied Linguistics* (1<sup>st</sup> ed., pp. 74-83).

Dörnyei, Z. (2013). *The Psychology of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford Applied Linguistics. Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2014) Motivation in second language learning. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 4, 518-531.

Duff, P (2008) *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics*. Routledge.

Forsyth, D. R. (2014). *Group dynamics*. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13(4), 266–272.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0083787>

Graham, S. (1994) Classroom motivation from an attributional perspective. In O’Neil, H. F. Jr. and Drillings, M. (eds), *Motivation: Theory and Research* (pp. 31–48). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Hadfield, J. (1992) *Classroom dynamics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henry, A., Thorsen, C., & Uztosun, M. S. (2023). Exploring language learners’ self-generated goals: Does self-concordance affect engagement and resilience? *System*, 112, 102971.

Higgins, E. T. (1987) Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, pp. 319-340.

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional design theories and models* (pp. 386-433). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McKay, S. (2006) *Researching Second Language Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.

Maslow, A. (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.

Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986) Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969.



Peterson, C., Maier, S. F. & Seligman, M. E. (1993). *Learned helplessness: A theory for the age of personal control*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Skinner, E. A. & Belmont, M. J. (1993) Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behaviour and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of educational psychology*, 85 (4), 571.

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

Weiner, B (1992) *Motivation*. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Vol. 3. New York: Macmillan.

## **Legislation**

Orden ECD1112 de 2022 [Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte]. Por la que se aprueban el currículo y las características de la evaluación de Educación Primaria y se autoriza a su aplicación en los centros docentes de la Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón. 18 de julio de 2022.

Real Decreto 157 de 2022 [Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional]. Por el que se establecen la ordenación y las enseñanzas mínimas de Educación Primaria. 1 de marzo de 2022.

## 8. Annexes

### 8.1. ANNEX 1. FIELD NOTES

#### 8.1.1. First observation

*Thursday, April 13th, 2023. From 11:15 am to 12:45 pm.*

---

#### *Procedures (critical incidents)*

1. The lesson starts with the teacher (T) asking students (SS) to tell me (the researcher) what they have been doing for the last few weeks. They tell me in English that they have started a project in which they have to make a short film by themselves. SS seem to be enthusiastic about the project and start telling me some of the different aspects that they have to think about, such as the plot and the script.  
The teacher asks them if they remember the difference between the plot and script.  
They tell me that they are writing their scripts through google classroom with tablets and chromebooks.

---

#### *Reflection and possible implications*

SS with a good level of English usually participate in this conversation, however, children whose level is not so good also want to participate and intervene.

The fact that they do Project Based Learning (hereinafter, PBL) tells us that the teacher uses innovative methodologies with the aim of developing socialisation skills as well as autonomy and compromise. This is likely to foster group cohesion, a cooperative goal structure and perhaps a well-developed goal orientedness.

PBL also gives us information about the authority type of the teacher, which is autonomy supporting, by allowing students to take responsibilities and to make decisions.

---

- 
2. Since it is the first day that SS have literacy since we came back from Easter break, the T decides to review with them the progress check film list. It contains the items that their films should have.

T tells the students that they need to share with him the link of the script so that he can give them feedback.

He asks the students to tell him which are their favourite camera shots (They answer: Cowboy, close up, point of view, extreme close up and he makes fun of this last one by telling a joke).

- 
3. They take the chromebooks and T tells them that they are going to have two secret police, but students do not listen to him because they have started to join their team members and group their tables. He doesn't shout and waits until they have moved the tables and got in groups.

At one point, he says, stop (just once and with a moderate voice level) and he starts counting with his fingers (not aloud),

The fact the teacher explicitly explains success criteria and makes sure SS know what they need to include is likely to improve SS' expectancy by guiding them and providing them with a thought about the amount of effort that will be required, raising their perceived task difficulty. Moreover, task presentation is effective since the teacher explicitly explains the priorities in the creation of the films.

The T asking them about their personal interest and preferences is related to interest in the course specific motivational components and may lead to an intrinsic motivation increase, at the same time that it is related to socialisation of student motivation as the teacher actively stimulates students' motivation.

---

Classroom goal structure is undoubtedly cooperative, they divide and organise the tasks and share responsibilities within their small project groups.

Some SS shouting to others to keep quiet is a behaviour that can be related to the group's norm and reward system, in the sense that this group has accepted respecting the teacher above all as a group norm.

---

---

some children start telling and shouting to the ones who are talking: “Stop!”.

Then, the teacher continues saying that there are going to be two secret police: two children will be the secret police and they have to be listening while they work in their group, and if they hear somebody speaking in Spanish, they have to write the name of the person in a paper and give it to him.

They started working and every student was talking in English.

Ana is not working in the project, she is sitting on her chair doing other kind of things.

However, during the allotted time to work in their groups, some SS were paying more attention to check that everybody was talking in English instead of working in their teams, and surprisingly not those SS’ who were the police were the ones that were distracted.

---

Those students that were not very motivated and therefore were not making an effort in their task, started paying more attention to the secret police strategy than to completing the task. Not every student is cooperating within their groups.

SS intrinsic satisfaction is undoubtedly high, they seem to enjoy the activity, both by the materials used (Chromebooks) and the fact that they are working by themselves, without the teacher’s intervention, which is related to the desire of feeling competent and autonomy.

- 
4. He explains assessment criteria for the STORYBOARD not the FILM. Evaluation of the storyboard, he shows SS and explains the rubric he will use to assess them. For that, T takes a student as an example Criteria specific to this project: Talking about the item “Use of time”:  
Teacher talk: “What do you think that means? (SS answer in

---

The fact the teacher explicitly explains success criteria and makes sure SS know what they need to include is likely to improve SS’ expectancy by guiding them and providing them with an idea about the amount of effort that will be required, raising their perceived task difficulty.

This is also related to the way in which the teacher presents

---

---

spanish: el uso del tiempo). “Have you used your time very well, Necane? I saw you going out to the bathroom, talking in Spanish, all of this as an example, and he tells her that is an example to make sure she does not feel embarrassed or scared”).

---

the task, as he calls SS attention to the strategies to be used in order to achieve the task.

5. At half twelve: T asks SS what they have done this lesson.  
SS answer: “We started the storybook and we continued the script” “We continued with the script”.  
T ends the lesson telling SS what they will do in the following literacy lesson: “Tomorrow we will continue with some other things” “You need to make the most of your time: do you know what that means? Can anybody explain to me?”
- 

Modelling: teacher models in terms of the effort students will have to make in order to successfully complete the task and makes students aware of the necessity of appropriately using their time.

---

*Extra comments*

In a conversation with the teacher after the lesson, he reported that those SS’ that are distracted are because their teammates were not paying attention to them and therefore nor every person on the team was engaging in the task. Those that were not engaged in the task and “had nothing to do” were the ones distracted. We also talked about Ana, they do not make her work in teams because they know she struggles with socialization, moreover, the teacher told me that although she usually does not do what the rest of her classmates are doing and although she doesn’t seem to be paying attention, she follows the lessons and she understands everything, her English level is quite good.

### **8.1.2. Second observation**

*Friday April 14th, 2023. From 9am to 10am.*

*Procedures*

1. T greets students and asks how they are today. Then, he explains what they will do in the arts lesson: continue with the storyboard.

After that, he explains what they are going to do today: “Today we are going to do something different because we have been for a long time with the film thing, so take out your notebooks and write the date”. He asks for the date: “What day is it today?”; and one student answers: “Friday the 40”. T replies: “Is it? Is it Friday the 40th?”. Most SS at the same time reply: “No, It is Friday the 14th”.

T tells them to write the title: shopping; and he asks for a volunteer, but he does not allow for volunteer, he chooses one student: “Luis you are going to be the volunteer”.

*Reflection and possible implications*

He does not allow for a volunteer so that he encourages SS who usually do not talk that much, fostering participation of every SS. However, this may cause some students to feel uncomfortable, which could raise their affective filter.

- 
2. “Luis, you are going to conduct a survey, you need to ask your classmates whether they like shopping or not. Another volunteer will help you. Carla, you will take the results”.

Alejandro stands up and starts asking: “Do you like shopping?” One student says “Yes I like shopping” And T taps his head: “Can anybody help her? DO YOU like shopping?” Another S answers: “Yes I do”.

Alejandro continues asking his classmates one by one. Once he has finished, T asks Carla for the results, there was just one girl who doesn’t like shopping. T asks “Paula why don’t you like shopping?” She says that she doesn’t like shopping because it is boring.

The way in which the teacher presents the task is likely to foster students’ interest because they are asked about their personal opinions. The teacher asks students about their personal opinions, which is likely to increase their interest in the activities, which is directly related to the intrinsic motivation and satisfaction that provides the activity itself.

Conversely, the teacher does provide clear instructions.

However, task presentation may not be very effective as the teacher does not state the purpose and utility of the task.

- 
3. “There are a lot of things you can go shopping for. Can anybody tell me examples of things that we can go shopping for?”

A lot of students raise their hand: toy shop, greengrocers, supermarket, clothes shop, Hardware shop.

One student asks: “What is the name of the shop in which you buy tables and beds...?” Another student responds: “Furniture store”.

Again, the teacher engages SS in a conversation that both is enjoyable for students’ and it is related to their personal life, experiences or preferences, which is likely to foster students’ interest in the subject but also their intrinsic satisfaction for the activities carried out. Many students are willing to participate, even if their English level is not very high or even if they don’t know how to express what they want to say perfectly.

When talking about games shops, T asks some students about the playstations they have.

When talking about sports shops, T says: “Maybe the PE teachers need to go and buy new sports equipment. What do you think they would need to buy?”. Some students answer: “They could need hoops”, “Balls...” “Ropes for jumping”.

Although the teacher does not clearly state the purpose of the task he links it with a real-life example, and therefore students can see the usefulness in using that specific piece of language.

- 
4. T sets out a task: “Okay very simple, in this piece of paper, it says, clothes, food, furniture, sports equipment”.

There is a list of 20 but you have to write a minimum of 15. You can work in pairs or individually.” All of them want to work in pairs but Ana.

Ana is working on the task as well.

The teacher gives them freedom to choose whether they want to work individually or with their table partner, which makes us think that the authority type of the teacher is autonomy supporting as he offers students options and choices and lets them have a say in the way that activities are carried out.

The fact that most students want to work in pairs gives us some information about the strength of the relationships that are built among the students, which seems to be strong. Equally important is to note the presence of one student (Ana) who prefers working alone.

---



---

5. The teacher monitors students' work and talks with children giving them ideas... T also pays attention to Ana, and tries to speak to her and asks her about her interests so that she writes something. They start talking about her favourite shop (Fnac) and the things she can buy there.

Support and guidance is provided. Teacher makes an effort in order to develop a good relationship with students, although it has already been built because this is the second year he is their literacy teacher.

T promotes autonomy at the same time that helps them in order to lower perceived task difficulty and enhances expectancy of success.

---

6. While some students had few words written and they were focusing on brands to write as shops (such as "Primark" in order to write it on the Clothes shops column), other students were asking (me and the teacher) for names of products in English and the name certain shops receive (such as "jewellery store").

Perceived high need for achievement in some students.

---

7. While T was going around the classroom, he noticed that many students had written the word "shopping" incorrectly: "Does anybody know this word? HOP" (and he writes it on the blackboard and discusses the meaning with students). And continuedly he asks, "Does anybody know this word? "HOPE" (And he writes it on the blackboard and discusses

Incidental teaching: T takes any learning opportunity to review things.

Related to task presentation and feedback delivery, he is not aggressive, and he explains it to all the students in the class.

the meaning with students).

Then, T asks, “Why do they sound different?”

He explains I am hopping, and I am hoping and the need of doubling the p so that the long /o/ sound does not change.

“Somebody in their title has written “Shoping”, do you know how do I read it?” And he reads it and says, “you need to double the P so that I can read it properly”, and he reads it properly.

- 
8. At 09:40 T poses a question to SS: “Have you ever been shopping at Ikea?” (And they start a little conversation about Ikea) “Do you like jumping on the sofas?”

“We are going to watch a short video about a family going shopping. What do you think is going to happen?”

“Do you think she is a good girl, or do you think she is a bit naughty? Do you think that that little girl will touch everything in ikea? Okay, let's have a look, see what she does”.

Several students do not pay much attention to the video.

Students’ interest and relevance may not be very high at this point. It could be due to the fact that the teacher did not explain to students why this was relevant or important for them.

Students may not see the connection between the video and what they have been doing previously in the lesson because it only has to do with shops because the story occurs in Ikea.

The video used by the teacher may not very attractive or interesting for students, and it could be related to the use of materials in the course.

---

---

9. T finishes the lesson setting out the homework: finish the sheet.

Question to be asked: Are SS usually assigned a lot of homework? Do they usually do their homework? Do they enjoy doing their homework?

---

***Extra comments***

I asked the teacher how he thought students would feel when he made them participate, to which he answered that he does not “force” every student, but just the ones that rather don’t want to participate because of laziness, or those that need a little push, because they want to participate but they are shy to raise their hand. Moreover, the teacher was asked about the way in which he gives feedback, when he stated that he tries to explain the mistakes to the whole group so that everyone can benefit from that mistake as well as to not make that specific student feel embarrassed or nervous.

---

***8.1.3. Third observation***

***Monday, April 17th, 2023. From 10am to 11am.***

***Procedures***

***Reflection and possible implications***

---

1. He starts remembering what they did on the last lesson. He talks about the survey, the chart they had to fill in. They talk

---

T uses different strategies to call students’ attention, he makes a joke out of a random topic.

---

---

about people in Ikea, a student says that people usually take the pencils and the paper ruler, and they find it funny, everybody laughs. Other student says that he likes going to the bedroom part and he likes lying on the beds.

Finally, they talk about the video they watched, and he says that they are going to watch it again.

Some students have already given out the script of the video to their classmates.

100% concentration and T waits. Teacher talk: "Listening is very difficult, it requires concentration". Imagine Fernando Alonso (everybody listens) he is waiting in the car, waiting, what do you think he is doing, do you think he has the scissors in his hands, do you think he is listening to the radio? What do you think he is doing just before the race? He is very very concentrated, but he is doing only one thing. Can you do two things at the same time?

Watching the video requires a lot of attention because you have to be doing more than two things at a time: watching, listening... You are Fernando Alonso, Ready, Steady... Go!".

---

Again, T uses examples that are likely to catch students' attention.

- 
2. Ten seconds after playing the video: He calls out a student who is not paying attention, he checks that everybody is watching.

T stands up to María, who is still not paying attention, and stands and stays next to her.

A small number of students are still not paying attention.

The strategies used by the teacher to call students' attention are efficient because they are (in general) paying more attention than the last day. It can also be that students find the video interesting, and it may be that students were tired the last day and thus not paid attention to it.

However, the teacher's strategies still do not work with all students, which could lead one think that they are not intrinsically motivated for the activity.

The students who are not paying attention struggle with English language, they might not be paying attention because of their expectancy of understanding it.

- 
3. Look through the script and look for three very special words and we are going to learn how to use them correctly.

He gives a clue to students: "Two of the words are very small". Students do not find the words.

T writes on the blackboard: "So" "Too" "Enough"

He reads ENOUGH as usually Spanish speakers read it.

T asks SS to look through the text and find and highlight the words written on the blackboard.

---

Traditional teaching: PPP. The T explicitly presents the target structure.

- 
4. They start looking for the words.

I am going to go through the text, when you listen to “enough”, you say, stop, and you check that you have underlined it.

Feedback and correction of the exercise is given by getting students to actively participate instead of being the teacher, the one who explicitly gives the correct answer. → Autonomy supporting and children as active agents of their learning process (in line with the curriculum guidance).

- 
5. Teacher talk: “I want you to think when do I use the word “So”, I use it all the time. They start discussing it: asi que, bueno, pues... introduces the sentences. But if we use so and we use an adjective, what does that mean? I am so hungry.” (SS talking and not paying attention).

“I am going to wait here until everyone is quiet. I know it is almost two o'clock now. I know you are tired.”

He goes on explaining: “On Friday Cristian was sooooo tired that he felt asleep in the class, no that is a lie. “William (referring to the English collaborator) is sooooo slow that a turtle would win him in a race”. (He puts other examples to show SS how to use so)”.

---

It seems that SS do not engage with grammar explanations. Again, T is explicitly explaining the features of the structures → traditional teaching.

Question to be answered: Do SS like teacher's explanations? Is it difficult for them to follow the explanations?

---

*Extra comments*

As a general rule, most of the SS talk to the teacher directly in English. It is interesting to ask both the teacher and the students why they think it is. Is it because he is a native speaker? Is it because they know he expects them to talk in English? Is it just because they enjoy speaking English with him?

---

**8.1.4. Fourth observation**

***Friday, April 21st, 2023. From 9am to 10am.***

---

***Procedures***

1. Good morning, so... what happened yesterday? (Yesterday they went on a trip with the bikes). T starts asking different students. SS seem to be tired but when the teacher asks them they do answer with enthusiasm to the teacher. Most students want to intervene in the class, not just the ones that have a good level of English, all of them laugh when talking about a fall of one of them (they are not laughing at that particular student and he does not feel embarrassed or

---

***Reflection and possible implications***

The teacher engages SS in a conversation that both interests students' and is related to their personal life, experiences or preferences, which is likely to foster students' satisfaction for the activities carried out.

Students are enjoying and having fun in the conversation, and their intrinsic satisfaction seems to be high.

This atmosphere is likely to lower students' affective filter. Students seem to have a low level of language use anxiety, which would not mean that their self-efficacy or perceive

---

---

bothered, he is also laughing with the rest of them).  
Going back to where they left the lesson the previous day...:  
Watching the video requires a lot of attention because you  
have to be doing more than two things at a time: watching,  
listening... You are Fernando Alonso, Ready, Steady...  
Go!”.

L2 proficiency is high. It is interesting to analyse the  
reasons behind this: Is it because there is a comfortable and  
supporting environment in the class? Is it because they are  
not afraid of receiving corrective feedback?

- 
2. “Okay so... wait, did you hear what I say?”  
“So... when do we use so?” SS do not answer. Come on, we  
use it a lot of times: one girl says, “before an adjective”.  
He writes “He is \_\_\_\_ stupid”.  
“What do we put if we want to intensify? Some students try  
to answer: “Very”  
Teacher: “He is Very stupid?? No, we want to make it even  
more intense”  
Students: “Too”, “Super”.  
T writes “so” in the blank space.  
Now SS have to write 4 more sentences but changing the  
subject and the adjective.  
Student were engaging with the teacher in the explanation of  
the grammar rule.  
He approaches a girl that is usually quiet, and she asks her

Traditional teaching (PPP) This part would correspond to  
the practice of the target structure.  
However, the teacher, again, uses examples that call  
students attention.  
T again uses real-life examples and models instrumental  
orientations towards the L2: by showing the purpose and  
use of the word “so”:



---

for an animal and an adjective. She asks another girl for the same.

T gives SS two minutes to create the sentences.

- 
3. He asks SS to tell him one of their sentences. All students take turns responding. Ana makes a mistake: “They are the oldest”. Instead of talking directly to her, he explains to the whole class.

He uses code switching: “Ya se que en castellano usáis “tan” para comparar, pero en inglés nunca, no se puede poner “so” y un adjetivo superlativo o comparativo”.

The fact that he did not correct the student directly may have contributed not to raise her affective filter or her anxiety.

Questions to be answered: Do SS like when the teacher speaks in Spanish, or do they prefer him to talk in English? Does it make them feel more comfortable? Does it lower their affective filter?

Do SS usually feel embarrassed when the teacher corrects them? Do they like being corrected?

- 
4. He goes back to the sentence: He is so stupid... and he adds “THAT” and explains what it is used for.

He asks for more examples. SS wants to participate: “He is so stupid that he left his door open” “He is so stupid that he chases stopped cars”.

Anymore?

Again, explicit explanation of the grammar rule by the teacher and practice with the target structure (PPP).

Those students who are intrinsically motivated might engage in this activity which is much more traditional, while students who are not intrinsically motivated may need a more attractive way of leading with

---

Some students seem to be engaged with the activity but some of them are not.

Teacher talk: “Vamos a hacer 8, os las voy a dictar vale? Number one...(the exam was so easy that..., you have to finish the sentence)”.

grammar.

- 
5. He stops dictating and says: Stop, “pronunciation, that”, and starts to point at the students one by one: that that that.... One S at a time saying: that.

Bite your tongue with your front teeth. It is not a d: it vibrates, if you pronounce that you can feel the vibration of your throat.

Now, this word: thin.

Put your hand on your throat, if you pronounce that, you can feel the vibration, but if you pronounce thin, you cannot feel it.

Incidental teaching of pronunciation. He makes the instructions clear, and he is modelling SS’ gestures, encouraging them to copy him and not being embarrassed or nervous for doing faces to produce the sounds.

- 
6. T continues dictating the sentences. When he finishes, he reminds students to not forget that after that we need to repeat the subject: the person, the thing or the animal that does the action.

Focus on form. T explicitly explains the feature.

Again, corrective feedback is given without pointing at any particular student and it is not aggressive.

---

---

SS start working on the sentences while the teacher monitors.

T tells SS to pay attention to him, he wants to correct some spotted mistakes. He explains that, in the second clause they always have to use past simple.

The lesson finishes with students doing their sentences, if they haven't finished them, they have to do it as homework.

---

## 8.2. ANNEX 2. FOCUS-GROUPS

### 8.2.1. Focus group 1

#### 1. *I: ¿Os gusta el inglés? ¿Por qué?*

S1: A mí sí porque hay países que hablan mucho en inglés y como de mayor quiero viajar pues me servirá.

S2: A mí sí que me gusta porque he aprendido mucho y en un futuro nos podría servir si nos mudamos o para encontrar trabajo o lo que sea.

S3: A mí me gusta escribir y pronunciar el inglés. Y también me gusta porque cuando viajo me sirve para hablar con la gente.

S4: A mí me gusta, aunque no se me dé muy bien.

#### 2. *I: ¿Te pones contento cuando la siguiente hora de clase es literacy? O sea que no te gustan las clases de literacy*

S3: Bueno, depende, el jueves como tenemos dos horas, aunque se pase rápido a veces da un poco de pereza.

S2: Sí, es lo que dice él, el jueves cuando hay dos horas cuesta un poco, pero bueno, hacemos cosas bastante divertidas.

#### 3. *I: ¿Y siempre os han gustado las clases de literacy? ¿Echáis de menos algo que hacíais antes y ahora ya no?*

S1: Sí, porque desde siempre hemos hecho muchos juegos.

S4: A mí me gusta más ahora porque siento que estoy aprendiendo más y sé hablar mejor en inglés.

S3: Antes hacíamos un mini examen llamado “rocket” que me gustaba mucho porque sacaba buena nota, ahora los exámenes me cuestan más.

#### 4. *I: ¿Os gusta más cuando vais con William porque habláis más en inglés o porque hacéis más juegos?*

S4: No nos gusta mucho porque nos manda hacer muchas frases, nos manda repetir muchas veces algo cuando no le gusta.

S2: Sí, es mucho más estricto con nosotros.

S3: Nos echa bastante la bronca.

5. *I: ¿Qué tipo de actividades os gusta más hacer en literacy?*

S4: Mmmm, ahora mismo...la película está muy bien, me gusta mucho el proyecto.

S2: Sí, a mí también me gusta mucho.

6. *I: ¿Y qué es lo que menos os gusta de las clases de literacy?*

(Silencio).

S4: Los dictados no me gustan mucho, pero tampoco hacemos muchos.

7. *I: ¿Y por qué os gustan? ¿Cuántos proyectos habéis hecho?*

S1: Pues ahora en este curso que yo recuerde 1, pero llevamos bastante tiempo con él porque es de varias asignaturas y tiene diferentes partes.

S4: A mí me gusta porque lo de las pelis es muy chulo.

S2: Sí, y porque estamos solos, bueno, no estamos solos, John está en clase con nosotros, pero nos deja trabajar solos, no está todo el rato con nosotros ni preguntándonos qué estamos haciendo.

8. *I: ¿Soléis tener muchos deberes? ¿Y qué tipo de deberes os suelen mandar? ¿Os gustan?*

S3: No, no nos manda muchos deberes. Pero cuando nos manda deberes, me gustan depende de lo que sea y de cuánto sea.

S2: A mí me gusta porque nos manda poco, aunque cuando nos manda nos manda bastante pero no pasa nada porque nos deja bastante tiempo para hacerlos.

9. *I: ¿Soléis hacer muchos exámenes de literacy?*

S1: No, no hacemos muchos la verdad.

S2: Solemos hacer uno cada trimestre o así.

S3: Sí, hacemos muy pocos, porque yo creo que a John le interesa más que participemos y hablemos bien.

S4: El último examen que hicimos no fue de literacy en sí fue de un libro que teníamos que leer, entonces exámenes de literacy de gramática solemos hacer muy pocos.

*10. I: ¿Os echa mucho la bronca John?*

S1: Eee, te explica las cosas, no te echa la bronca.

S2: Sí, por ejemplo, a mi ayer me explicó una cosa porque me porte un poco mal y me lo explicó, pero no me echó la bronca.

S3: John no es que suela echar mucho la bronca, pero cuando la echa es porque debe echarla, porque nos comportamos mal o lo que sea.

*11. I: En la encuesta muchos de vosotros me dijisteis que John no os deja elegir las actividades que hacéis en clase o parte de ellas. ¿Creéis que esto es así? Por ejemplo, ¿no creéis que John os ha dejado libertad para tomar decisiones en vuestro proyecto?*

S3: A ver, es verdad que en el proyecto nos deja libertad, pero también la mayoría de las actividades las elige él.

S2: Sí, las actividades que hacemos en clase en el día a día pues las elige él, no podemos elegir qué hacemos.

*12. I: ¿Os gusta como explica el profesor? ¿Os cuesta entenderlo a veces? ¿Y qué hacéis cuando no lo entendéis?*

S1: Sí, si hay algo que no entiendes vas y te lo explica.

S4: A mí me encanta como explica porque una palabra que suena raro, que no suena como se ve, lo tenemos que repetir todos hasta que al final suena bien y pues eso nos ayuda bastante.

*13. I: ¿Os gusta cuando a veces John habla en español? ¿O preferís que hable en inglés?*

S1: A ver, son clases de literacy y la verdad que sí que habla de vez en cuando en español, pero la verdad es que yo prefiero que hable en inglés porque aprendo más.

S2: Lo que pasa es que cuando hay una cosa que es muy importante la dice en español porque quiere que nos enteremos.

*14. I: ¿Y eso os gusta?*

S3: Sí, claro.

*15. I: ¿Os suele corregir mucho John? ¿Os da vergüenza cuando os corrige? ¿Cómo os sentís cuando os corrige?*

S4: Sí que nos suele corregir las palabras o la pronunciación.

*16. I: ¿Y cómo os la corrige, os da un poco de vergüenza y os sentís un poco mal o...?*

S3: No.

S2: A mí me da igual la verdad.

*17. I: Me he fijado en que muchas veces habláis directamente en inglés con John. ¿Por qué? ¿Es porque os gusta hablar en inglés con él? ¿O porque sabéis que él quiere que habléis en inglés? ¿O simplemente es algo a lo que estais acostumbrados?*

S1: Es porque llevamos muchos años aprendiendo literacy y yo creo que estamos acostumbrados.

S2: A mí es porque me gusta el inglés y más aún con una persona inglesa y no sé es que me sale así.

*18. I: ¿Creéis que os lleváis bien entre los alumnos y alumnas de clase?*

S1: Sí, nos llevamos muy bien entre nosotros la verdad.

S3: Sí, alguna vez hay algún enfado, pero en general yo creo que bien.

19. I: *¿Creéis que intentáis hablar en inglés lo máximo posible en clase?*

S4: En grupos cuando nos dice que tenemos que hablar en inglés sí que escuchamos alguna palabra en español y claro tenemos una cosa que se llama “secret police” que hay una persona que tiene un papel de policía en el que tiene que apuntar la gente que habla español y claro pues hablamos en inglés porque imagínate que nos apunta en el papel y eso.

S2: Yo creo que sí que intentamos hablar en inglés, muchos hablamos en inglés porque nos gusta.

20. I: *¿Pusisteis alguna norma a principio de curso con John?*

S3: Yo normas que yo creo que no hay.

S2: Una regla que si que tenemos y que nos molesta a mucha gente es la diferencia entre stop y continue.

21. I: *A ver explicadme un poco en qué consiste esa regla.*

S3: Tenemos una regla que es cuando John dice “Stop” tenemos que parar todos.

22. I: *Y eso cuando lo habéis hablado. ¿O cuándo surgió está norma?*

S1: Al final del primer trimestre creo.

23. I: *Y es como que todos lo tenéis muy claro ¿no? Porque yo me he fijado en clase que alguna vez cuando John ha dicho Stop y alguno de vosotros no ha parado los demás le habéis gritado “Que John ha dicho que paréis” como mandándole parar a los demás ¿no?*

S2: Sí, porque si una persona sigue hablando nos va a hacer copiar a todos y eso molesta mucho.

S4: Sí, alguna vez nos ha hecho copiar las diferencias entre stop and continue.



24. *I: En la encuesta muchos indicasteis que os gusta trabajar en grupo. Eso quiere decir que trabajáis bien en grupo ¿no? O sea, todos os esforzáis porque salga bien el trabajo ¿no? ¿O hay gente de clase con la que no trabajáis muy bien?*

S1: A ver yo creo que siempre es difícil trabajar en grupo, pero nos gusta porque aprendemos a organizarnos nosotros.

S2: Yo creo que en general sí que nos gusta porque, aunque tengamos problemas pues nos ayudamos los unos a los otros.

### 8.2.2. Focus group 2

1. *I: ¿Os gusta el inglés? ¿Por qué?*

S1: A mí en general me gustan mucho los idiomas, pero además de mayor quiero viajar a Estados Unidos y pues lo necesito.

S2: A mí sí porque así puedo ir a diferentes países y poder hablar más idiomas.

S3: A mí sí porque pues no se porque desde pequeño he hablado inglés.

2. *I: ¿Te pones contento cuando la siguiente hora de clase es literacy? O sea que no te gustan las clases de literacy.*

S1: Sí porque no solo hacemos trabajos y ejercicios, también hacemos actividades como juegos para divertirnos mientras aprendemos.

S2: Yo en las clases de literacy me lo paso muy bien en general, la gramática no me gusta mucho, pero en general sí que me lo paso bien.

S3: A mí me gustan mucho porque John es muy majo.

3. *I: ¿Y siempre os han gustado las clases de literacy? ¿Echáis de menos algo que hacíais antes y ahora ya no?*

S1: A mí siempre me han gustado muchísimo.

S2: A mí en primero y segundo no me gustaba mucho porque no sabía muy bien hablar inglés, pero cuando fui aprendiendo más y aprendí a hablar más fluido pues me ha ido gustando más.

S4: Yo echo de menos las asambleas.

4. *I: ¿Qué asambleas?*

S4: Pues nos sentábamos todos en frente de la clase y contábamos cosas y las hablábamos en inglés.

S3: Yo echo de menos cuando nos daban cada lunes una hoja de papel en la que teníamos que escribir algo que hubiésemos hecho en el fin de semana que nos hubiese gustado.

5. *I: ¿Os gusta más cuando vais con William porque habláis más en inglés o porque hacéis más juegos?*

S1: A mí me gustan más las clases con John porque William es más estricto y siempre nos dice que tenemos que hacer esto y esto, y no nos ayuda a entender las cosas, nos dice que nos las apañemos.

S2: John nos deja participar mucho más y William nos hace muchas veces copiar frases y no nos deja hablar.

6. *I: ¿Qué tipo de actividades os gusta más hacer en literacy?*

S1: Cuando hacemos proyectos en grupo porque los grupos no son siempre los mismos, sino que vamos cambiando.

S4: Sí a mí también me gustan las actividades de grupo.

S3: A mí sobre todo los juegos y bromas que hace John, porque consigue que aprendamos y que sea más divertido.

7. *I: ¿Y qué es lo que menos os gusta de las clases de literacy?*

S1: Cuando nos pone varias frases o un texto y tenemos que copiarlo.

S4: Cuando vamos a la sala de ordenadores.

8. I: *¿No te gusta ir a la sala de ordenadores?*

S4: Em... no

9. I: *No, a ti te gusta hablar en inglés ¿no? Y cuando vais a la sala de ordenadores no habláis mucho ¿no?*

S4: No.

10. I: *¿Os gusta hacer proyectos? ¿Cuántos proyectos habéis hecho?*

S4: Sí, a mí me gusta que nos podemos organizar nosotros y eso y hacer una película es muy guay.

S3: Sí, y cuando aprendimos los diferentes tipos de enfoques y fuimos por el colegio probándolos.

S2: Sí, es que en individual es un poco aburrido porque tenemos que hacer nosotros todo el trabajo.

S1: Es que, que el profesor esté todo el rato mandándonos cosas pues a veces aburre un poco y cuando hacemos el proyecto pues podemos trabajar nosotros solos y es trabajo más independiente y a mi me gusta más yo creo.

11. I: *¿Soléis tener muchos deberes? ¿Y qué tipo de deberes os suelen mandar? ¿Os gustan?*

S1: No, en literacy es de las que menos tenemos deberes. A veces sí que nos manda algo, pero no a menudo.

S2: No la verdad que no solemos tener.

12. I: *¿Soléis hacer muchos exámenes de literacy?*

S1: Si que...alguna vez cuando damos algo importante de gramática como algún verbo o palabras como “so” y “that” que las estamos dando ahora y las solemos

utilizar mucho sí que tenemos algún pequeño examen para mejorar y no equivocarnos tanto.

S2: Por ejemplo, en las otras asignaturas tenemos exámenes por temas, pero en literacy vamos dando como las palabras clave y pues a veces hacemos exámenes de eso.

13. I: *¿Os echa mucho la bronca John?*

S4: No nos hecha mucho la bronca.

S2: A mí una de las cosas que más me gusta de John es eso, que en vez de echar la bronca a la primera pues nos va avisando.

S3: Solo nos echa la bronca si nos pasamos.

14. I: *En la encuesta muchos de vosotros me dijisteis que John no os deja elegir las actividades que hacéis en clase o parte de ellas. ¿Creéis que esto es así? Por ejemplo, ¿no creéis que John os ha dejado libertad para tomar decisiones en vuestro proyecto?*

S1: Yo creo que más o menos, porque hay algunas actividades en las que nos da unas pautas que tenemos que seguir, pero por ejemplo en la película sí que nos deja elegir el tema y eso.

S2: Sí es que en algunas actividades sí que nos deja libertad, pero sí que hay algunos ejercicios que tenemos que hacer sí o sí y bueno pues no podemos elegir.

15. I: *¿Os gusta como explica el profesor? ¿Os cuesta entenderlo a veces? ¿Y qué hacéis cuando no lo entendéis?*

S4: Me encanta, porque pone ejemplos muy graciosos.

S2: Y por ejemplo si cuando explica no entendemos algo pues cuando lo explica se fija en todos y si ve que ponemos cara de “pues esto no lo entiendo”, nos pregunta si lo entendemos y si le dices que no pues te pone algún ejemplo gracioso e incluso algunas veces para explicar algunas cosas saca a compañeros para hacer como un teatro para que lo entendamos mejor.

16. I: *¿Os gusta cuando a veces John habla en español? ¿O preferís que hable en inglés?*

S1: A ver a mí me gusta más que hable inglés porque como es nativo habla muy bien.

S2: A mí alguna vez sí que me gusta que hable en español porque hay cosas que son difíciles y si lo explica en español lo entiendo mejor.

17. I: *¿Os suele corregir mucho John? ¿Os da vergüenza cuando os corrige? ¿Cómo os sentís cuando os corrige?*

S4: A mí me gusta que me corrijan.

S2: Cuando corregimos algunas frases o algo sí que nos dice lo que tenemos que cambiar y yo veo los fallos y veo que son fallos tontos entonces si me corrige me doy cuenta.

S3: Sí es que por ejemplo en la anterior clase que ha visto el trabajo que hicimos, ha visto los errores que más hemos hecho entonces ahora los estaba explicando para que todos podamos aprender de ese error.

18. I: *Me he fijado en que muchas veces habláis directamente en inglés con John. ¿Por qué? ¿Es porque os gusta hablar en inglés con él? ¿O porque sabéis que él quiere que habléis en inglés? ¿O simplemente es algo a lo que estais acostumbrados?*

S4: Es que yo tengo como un código que en clase de literacy, y aunque John entre por la puerta un segundo yo siempre hablo en inglés.

19. I: *¿Pero por qué?*

S4: No lo sé es como que me sale solo.

20. I: *Vale. ¿Y vosotros?*

S2: A John yo se que le gusta que hablemos inglés, pero yo creo que es porque me gusta, porque como tengo más fluidez sí que me gusta.

S3: A mí me gusta porque como sabe más que nosotros, si tengo algún fallo cuando hablo con él pues me pone cara como de que no lo ha entendido y entonces ya lo cambio y ya me responde.

S1: Yo porque me gusta hablar en inglés, e incluso a veces hablo en inglés hasta con mi compañero de mesa.

21. I: *¿Creéis que os lleváis bien entre los alumnos y alumnas de clase?*

S1: Yo creo que en general bien. Tenemos nuestras cosas, pero bueno.

S2: A ver hay algunos que molestan un poco en clase.

S3: Sí, hay veces que se crispa el ambiente.

22. I: *¿Creéis que intentáis hablar en inglés lo máximo posible en clase?*

S1: Hay gente de clase que directamente ni lo intenta.

S2: Sí, o hablan en spanglish.

S3: Hay gente que es un poco pasota, pero John cuando hacemos trabajos en grupo o algo así pone un policía secreto en cada grupo.

S4: Sí y tiene que poner eso para que hablemos en inglés.

23. I: *¿Pusisteis alguna norma a principio de curso o el año pasado con John?*

S4: El año pasado hicimos un tema de normas a principio de curso, pero yo creo que ya nadie se acuerda de ellas.

S2: Pero cuando hay mucho barullo John dice “Stop” y así pues todos paramos.

S1: Aunque hay gente que no siempre lo cumple, yo creo que en general respetamos al profesor.

24. I: *En la encuesta muchos indicasteis que os gusta trabajar en grupo. Eso quiere decir que trabajáis bien en grupo ¿no? O sea, todos os esforzáis porque salga bien el trabajo ¿no? ¿O hay gente de clase con la que no trabajáis muy bien?*

S1: Hay gente con la que trabajo mejor y con la que trabajo peor.

S2: Hombre yo creo que hay veces que hemos tenido algún problema porque no todos nos esforzamos lo mismo, pero al final sí que solemos hacer el trabajo bien.

S3: Yo pienso que estamos aprendiendo a trabajar en grupo de verdad porque al final la nota va a ser para todos.

1 8.3. ANNEX 3. TEACHER INTERVIEW.

2 1. I: I have been able to see that this group of students' is quite motivated. Has it always  
3 been like this?

4 T: They were motivated but in the wrong way, motivated to be naughty, motivated to not  
5 listen to the teacher, some of them weren't really engaging with literacy lessons at all.

6 2. I: Just this group?

7 T: Yes.

8 3. I: And don't you think that they are motivated to learn English now?

9 T: They are now. They are motivated now, but at the beginning (the beginning of year 5)  
10 they were motivated to shout and so we had to motivate them to use that energy to speak  
11 English rather just to shout.

12 4. I: And how did you do it?

13 T: By being very very strict at the beginning and then using humour in the class as time  
14 goes on, and of course building up a relationship with them and trying to make them see  
15 the real value of learning English, so that they don't see it just like a subject that they  
16 have to study to pass it.

17 5. I: And what about the other groups you teach? Are they all more or less equally  
18 motivated?

19 T: I think they were probably e..., there hasn't been as much of a change in the other  
20 group as in this group. The other groups were motivated at the beginning, am, I am  
21 talking about two years ago, when they were starting year 5, they were motivated.

22 6. I: I have been able to see that most of them are willing to talk and they seem to be  
23 quite confident when doing so. Why do you think this is?

24 Well, on one hand there are some students with a really good level of English, and they  
25 know it, and that is what makes them talk in English even with each other when I am not  
26 paying attention to them, just because they enjoy being able to communicate in a



language that is not Spanish. On the other hand, we have some students whose level might not be so good, but is still decent, and in that case, I believe that they try to speak in English and improve because they see that some of their classmates are really good, and they would like to be able to talk like them. Of course, there are some students that, not just in literacy, but they are moved by the desire to be perfect on every subject, those are very perfectionist kids. And then, we have some other students who don't talk in English but not because they are not confident but because they are just not interested in the subject and neither in English, and as you could expect, their English level is not very good.

*7. I: And how do you take into account students' motivation when planning the lessons?*

T: Am, well, because we have to do exactly the same with the four groups, you can't really take that into account, you can't change the planning, you just have to change the delivery, the way you give the class. Okay, within the planning you have to decide which group is going to do which things and in which order. But with this group you have to do things in a different way because you now that what groups with one group doesn't work with another group.

What I do is that I try to make a game out of the learning, I try to entertain students while I focus on teaching certain specific aspects, amm, I try to make them have fun, using funny examples or doing funny gestures, and in this way, they learn, they enjoy the lessons, and they see the real usefulness of speaking English.

*8. I: Okay, do you usually assign a lot of homework to students?*

T: No, no.

*9. I: And when you do it, they usually do their homework?*

T: It depends on what else they have. I think homework is very very important. I use what is called the flipped learning, all of the things that maybe you would normally do in class, like watching videos or reading or anything which doesn't require the teacher, I make them do that kind of things at home. And the actual problematic work for what they need the help of the teacher, if they need the teacher, that is what they do in the class.

55 10. I: Okay. Now... during my stay in the literacy lessons I have seen that you sometimes  
56 use codeswitching.

57 T: Absolutely.

58 11. I: Why?

59 T: Am, because there are many children in the class who don't follow anything in  
60 English, they are completely lost, and speaking in Spanish reinforces the ones that do sort  
61 of understand you it can reinforce what they think they have understood.

62 12. I: I guess that you use formative assessment, right? Both formative and summative.  
63 Can you please briefly explain how your evaluation system works?

64 T: Well, what I like to do is to, once we get to a certain point, I like to give them various  
65 tests, to see if that point, they can go on to the next point, we start from the basic level,  
66 then from there they have a test and that test can be anything from a small exam... it can  
67 be a question asking all the children one by one, it can be anything, it's to see what the  
68 next step is that I can take. Can I go onto the next step or do I have to go back and repeat  
69 everything or do things in a different way. It is a kind of formative assessment it is called  
70 "the next step assessment". Of course, I like to give them, occasionally, not for every  
71 piece of work, a rubric, I explain what the rubric is, I explains how rubrics work, I give it  
72 to them before I test them so that they can self-correct as well, so that is the formative  
73 part, that self-correction.

74 13. I: Yes, because they have told me that they don't do a lot of exams, that they have  
75 small controls which focuses on target structures such as "so" and "that".

76 T: Yes, but they do know that everything they do is evaluated. I always tell them: "Don't  
77 forget it is not just exams that give you the mark" because when they fail one of these  
78 exams, they get really sad, they feel terrible, but maybe it is not their fault, maybe is the  
79 teacher's fault for not preparing that particular grammatical point, or that step. You know  
80 I was talking about steps, if they are not all on that step, then you cannot go onto the next  
81 step. If you have 70% of the class who do okay you have to continue, but if you only have  
82 10% who passed the exam, then that it is your mistake, not theirs.

83 14. I: Do you think that the students of this group get along well? Do you think that this is  
84 a benefit for literacy lessons?

85 T: They look like they get along well but underneath... they start forming groups and... it  
86 is a really bad age year 6.

87 15. I: And do you think this is affecting literacy lesson or the project they are doing right  
88 now...

89 T: I think so, yes, and I don't know why this is, I think possibly it is because their social  
90 skills are not so good after the covid, when they were eight nine years old, just when they  
91 should be learning to socialize, they were all isolated at home, they weren't together with  
92 other children. They are very selfish children, they don't consider the others in the class,  
93 and so I have tried to work on that by doing group work.

94 16. I: Okay... and finally, did you develop a set "classroom rules" at the beginning of the  
95 year? This group of students seem to be very obedient. I also asked them and they told  
96 me about the "Stop and continue rule".

97 T: Yes, of course, it takes a long, long time to develop these rules, and you have to just go  
98 over them again and again and again, and they know exactly what they should do, but  
99 they sometimes don't do it and you have to remind them, and you will have it almost like  
100 a game as well. Yeah, the rules are like games, at the beginning of year five we did a  
101 whole project on classroom rules and link it to imperatives and giving instructions and  
102 instructional texts, and then we talked about the rules but of course they forget, and you  
103 have to develop new rules as you need them and so on.

#### 8.4. ANNEX 4. QUESTIONNAIRE.



[Link to the questionnaire](#)