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Abstract: Languages are a defining identity component, intrinsic to all individuals and societies. Identities are not fixed but ever fluctuating, hence the process of learning a second or foreign language may entail a negotiation of shifting identities, modifying positioning, attitudes and beliefs. Departing from this premise, in multilingual contexts the potential of education in shaping multilingual identities should be addressed.

This study contrasts the attitudes of two groups of secondary education students (n=73), partaking in two different language learning programmes in the Balearic Islands (formal instruction in English as a Foreign Language –EFL, and Content and Language Integrated Learning –CLIL), where the introduction of English as a medium of instruction may be perceived as a threat to the unbalanced coexistence of Spanish and Catalan as the majority and minority languages, respectively. A 31-item questionnaire quantified the values ascribed to multilingualism, Spanish, Catalan, and English, the internationalisation of the latter, and the perception of the classroom as a genuine community of language practice. Qualitative data were collected through an essay eliciting students’ metalinguistic reflection on the position of different languages in their future imagined communities.

The results shed light on the relevance of teaching methodologies in the development of identities, ascertaining the positive impact of integrative approaches such as CLIL on the construction of summative multilingualism.
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Resumen: Las lenguas constituyen un componente intrínseco e identificativo de los individuos y las sociedades. Las identidades no son fijas sino que fluyen de forma constante. Por ello, el aprendizaje de una segunda lengua o una lengua extranjera puede conllevar una negociación de identidades cambiantes, afectando el posicionamiento, las actitudes y las creencias del individuo. Partiendo de esta premisa, el potencial de la educación en la formación de la identidad plurilingüe no debería ser desdénable, especialmente en contextos plurilingües.

Este estudio contrasta las actitudes desarrolladas por dos grupos de estudiantes de educación secundaria (n=73), participes de distintas metodologías de aprendizaje de lenguas (enseñanza formal del inglés y Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenido y Lengua – AICLE) en las Islas Baleares, donde la introducción del inglés como idioma global puede percibirse como una amenaza en el desequilibrio existente entre el español y el catalán, las lenguas mayoritaria y minoritaria de la comunidad, respectivamente. Un cuestionario de 31 preguntas cuantifica los valores que los participantes atribuyen al plurilingüismo, el español, el catalán y el inglés, la internacionalización de este último, y la percepción del aula como una auténtica comunidad de práctica. Una última pregunta de respuesta abierta recoge las reflexiones metalingüísticas de los alumnos en cuanto a la posición de las diferentes lenguas en sus futuras comunidades imaginadas y aporta datos cualitativos al estudio.

El análisis demuestra la importancia de las metodologías de enseñanza de lenguas en el desarrollo de las identidades, así como el impacto positivo de enfoques integradores como CLIL y CIL en la construcción de un plurilingüismo aditivo.


Diese Studie kontrastiert die Haltung von zwei Studentengruppen der Sekundarstufe (n=73), in zwei verschiedenen Sprachlernmethoden auf den Balearen (der formale Englischunterricht und das integrierte Lernen von Inhalten und Sprache – CLIL) wo die Einführung von Englisch als Weltsprache als eine Bedrohung für die unausgesagliche Koexistenz von Spanisch als Mehrheitssprache und Katalanisch als Minderheitensprache wahrgenommen werden kann. Ein 32-Punkt-Fragebogen quantifiziert die zugeschriebenen Werte für die Mehrsprachig-

Die Ergebnisse geben Aufschluss über die Relevanz der Lehrmethoden in der Entwicklung von Identitäten, und bestätigt die positiven Auswirkungen der integrativen Methoden wie CLIL und ILC für die Erschaffung von der wachsende Mehrsprachigkeit.

1 Introduction

Situating language identity and attitudes

Language identity has received a notable explosion of interest in the field of applied linguistics. While it is unarguable that our mother tongue is part of our sense of self and contributes to the definition of nationhood (Anderson 1991), the intricate relationship between language and identity has recently been expanded to the acquisition of a second or foreign language (L2 or FL), since learning a new language often entails developing a new identity (Lightbown and Spada 2006: 61).

From a Poststructuralist perspective, the notion of identity as the core essence of an individual has been challenged. Research has hence portrayed identity as unstable and, because of its changeability, as holder of a myriad of new meanings and possibilities. In particular, linguistic identity cannot be understood as a fixed category and has been described as an ever-changing and fluctuating construct (Norton and Toohey 2011: 417). Being dynamic and multifaceted, identity opens up a wide array of opportunities of negotiation and engagement in the classroom that remains mostly unexplored by educators.

Since an individual’s involvement in learning a language heavily relies on contextual factors (Norton and Toohey 2011: 421), the classroom can be depicted as a social micro-cosmos that shapes students’ identity and attitudes towards language. Dörnyei (2005, 2009) coined the term “ideal L2 self” as part of a motivational self-system framework that explains students’ investment in language learning in relation to how they project themselves as users of the L2. In turn, the L2 self can be analysed into the broader frame of imagined communities (Anderson 1991; Norton 2001) to unveil the unequal relations of power that permeate languages. If speaking an L2 empowers learners to access new positions (Norton 1997: 410), learning a new language in an already multilingual context
might cause an imbalance between international, majority and minority languages. Nevertheless, research on the interplay between learner languages in multilingual settings and their impact on identity and attitudinal changes is still scant.

The present study examines English Language Learners’ (ELLs) processes of linguistic identification and their attitudes towards the languages that surround them in the Balearic Islands (Spain), where Catalan and Spanish are the minority and majority official languages, respectively, and English is the foreign language generally included in the school curriculum. More precisely, the impact of different language teaching methodologies at a state-run secondary school in Palma (Mallorca) is analysed. A comparison is drawn between the multilingual awareness and attitudes of ELLs who follow ordinary English language classes, and those who follow a Content-and-Language-Integrated-Learning (CLIL) methodology.

The classroom as a community of practice

Personal and social factors overlap in the process of identity construction (Benson et al. 2012). Positioning is both an active individual choice and a passive process by which others ascribe identity traits to subjects (Norton and Toohey 2011). On the one hand, individuals adopt different masks and identities depending on the nature of interaction and its participants. On the other, “we speak in the voices of our community” (Lemke 1995, as cited in Block 2010), since cultural and historical context determine how society functions and the place its individuals may occupy.

The process of adjusting one’s identity in interaction is referred to as negotiation: a perceived difference between interlocutors that prompts the adoption of determined subject positions as a reaction (Block 2007). The range of choices available in the negotiation of identity is limited by context but individuals still have agency to embrace or challenge these options (Block 2010, Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). Thus, choices unfold in terms of engagement, or of resistance to social discourses that place individuals in undesirable positions.

In language learning contexts, students’ reluctance or investment in the acquisition process is often underpinned by peer perceptions and social values assigned to multilingualism and particular languages or varieties (Ceginskas 2010). They are even more so in adolescence, coinciding with a stage of personality and identity creation and development, driven by a need to find one’s own voice and a strong desire to fit into social groups. This is equally true for language: depending on whose validation or appreciation they are looking for,
adolescents strategically configure identities that involve both their inner selves and their external facades (Taylor et al. 2013). In particular, students tend to develop inner selves which are harmonious to the public assumptions of their peers, and duplicitous in pretending a special eagerness and interest before the teacher which does not necessarily correspond to their inner thoughts. If this constant search for validation has been proven to have an effect on achievement and involvement (Taylor et al. 2013), it may seem plausible that teenage learners will also echo their peers’ language attitudes and perceptions.

ELLs enter the classroom with a set of social and cultural identities and, since these are malleable, setting up a rich learning environment results in them being transformed (Kramsch 1993). This may be achieved through the establishment of communities of practice in the classroom, which stems from the idea that learning is not individual cognition, but a situated social process, as Lave and Wenger (1991) remark. As cited in Block (2007: 865), Wenger (1998) later expanded the definition of learning as resulting from “our lived experience of participation in the world [...] a fundamentally social phenomenon reflecting on our own deeply social nature as human beings”. In identity terms, it is through practice in social circles that subjects position themselves in relationship to the community.

It is especially interesting to evaluate communities of practice in formal educational settings (Haneda 2006). Since language is the basis of human communication, the construction of communities of practice in the classroom needs to be based on students’ active participation. Socially situated language use takes place in authentic contexts students can relate to and, therefore, it can trigger learners’ reflections and incite them to position themselves and get involved in learning practices.

Imagined international communities and ideal L2 selves

Identities are performed in multiple dimensions and learners do not only take part in communities of practice in the classroom, they are also engaged in their own “imagined communities”. This term was coined by Anderson (1991) to define the concept of nation as a social construct based on the shared ideas of its members. Although an individual will never know all members of a nation, this mental representation infuses a sense of belonging to a community.

The notion has been redefined in the field of language learning as the potential memberships learners believe they can access through the FL (Norton 2001). Learning a new language is probably the educational experience that aims the most at broadening sets of social interactions. Although learners may not know any FL speakers in their immediate social networks, they envisage partici-
pation and interaction with them in the future (Kanno 2003). While communities of practice can be considered current learning contexts, imagined communities open up prospective memberships to learners.

Imagined identities are present in Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009) L2 motivational self-system. The tenets of this theory hold that language learners project themselves into ideal L2 selves, mental representations of who they would like to become as FL users (Dörnyei 2009). Since language is inseparable from its social use, it is conspicuous that these ideal representations are situated in an imagined community. A social aspect of this motivational system is that possible selves are influenced by context and role models. This is conceptualised by means of the ought self, a set of features one perceives to be expected to acquire and that may or may not coincide with one’s own wishes. As pointed out in the previous section, in adolescence, the ideal self is intrinsically bonded to the ought self in a desire to fit in social groups (Pizzolato 2006, as cited in Dörnyei 2009).

In terms of learning contexts, Dörnyei assigns a crucial role to L2 learning experiences, which includes the relationship between learners and their teachers and peers, the curriculum and students’ achievements (Dörnyei 2009). Considering the impact of social influence, school environments and pedagogical practices could contribute to instil in students “an image of society in which they have useful and fulfilling roles to play” (Kanno 2003: 287), conferring them solid identity foundations for the creation of imagined communities.

Self-projections and affiliations to imagined communities are inseparable from learners’ identities and engagement in the learning process (Norton and Toohey 2011). A student’s drive to learn a language is, therefore, a desire to minimise the breach between the actual self and the ideal self (Csizér and Kormos 2009). Similarly, the mental representation of imagined communities favours investment as it awakens a desire to be able to communicate with members of the target community (Norton and Toohey 2011).

Whereas Anderson’s communities have national boundaries, in ELL the concept has become transnational (Norton and Toohey 2011) parallel to the rise of English as an International Language (EIL). Deriving from Britain’s imperial past, in the age of globalisation, English is seen as the world’s lingua franca (Crystal 2003). Taking this into account, the creation of “imagined international communities” has been encouraged in educational environments, since the foreign language enables global communication and is not limited to interaction with L2 native-speakers (Yashima and Zenuk-Nishide 2008).

The introduction of the term “international” in imagined communities has major implications in ELLs’ linguistic perceptions and, hence, in their engagement to learn the language. The international status of English blurs the old established dichotomy between instrumental and integrative motivation (Gardner
and Lambert 1959). Whereas instrumental motivation means language is learned to achieve a utilitarian goal, integrative motivation implies the language is acquired with a view to become part of a group of L2 speakers. Considering the latter, the worldwide spread of English has dissociated the language from its cultural cradle and, therefore, imagined communities are no longer constrained to join a particular set of native speakers. Instead, they embrace a global community.

Dörnyei’s motivational L2 self-system theory also challenges integrativeness. In language learning contexts students may not have had enough interaction, if at all, with the target community so as to develop attitudes towards the language and its speakers. Due to the international status of English, other components need to be taken into consideration:

more general attitudes and beliefs, involving an interest in foreign languages and people, the cultural and intellectual values the target language conveys, as well as the new stimuli one receives through learning and using the target language

(Dörnyei 1990: 4)

These factors have led Dörnyei (2005) to talk about World English identities, based on the development of a global vision of EIL. Alluding to the scarcity of contact between learners and native speakers, Yashima (2002) advocates for the adoption of international posture in English language learning, an umbrella term involving an interest in foreign affairs, eagerness to study or work abroad, a desire for interaction with foreigners and openness towards other cultures.

These claims are supported by the fact that the figure of non-native speakers is around four times higher than that of native speakers (Crystal 2003). With such data, it is more likely for a non-native L2 user to interact with another non-native than with a native speaker, pushing out the “foreign” in EFL. While in some cases learners identify with the language, its perception as foreign may lead others to feel alienated. Therefore, EIL has an inclusive potential. Awareness of internationalisation may contribute to learners portraying themselves as legitimate FL users rather than speakers of a lower status (Block 2007) or “failed native speakers” (Crystal 2003: 3). Furthermore, students are no longer required to cling to a particular culture to construct their imagined communities. To ensure engagement, educators need to incorporate learners’ identities into the classroom and provide students with tools to project themselves as an active part of imagined international communities. However, additional considerations may be required in contexts in which different languages already coexist.
An additional dimension in multilingual contexts

In multilingual societies, the importance attached to the symbolic value of languages for individual and group identities is an essential distinctive feature that cannot be overlooked (Ige 2010). Nevertheless, the multilingual repertoire is subject to varying attitudes and perceptions in which notions of prestige and status come into play, which has effects on the inequality between different languages and the consequences of language relations in terms of status, functions and domains (Ennaji 2005).

In his definition of imagined communities, Anderson (1991) highlighted that not all individuals exert agency in their mental representations of national communities. Often, those in power carry out the imagining while others just adopt the established conceptions. The same consideration may be applicable to languages, as perceptions are often conditioned by Foucauldian underlying discourses of power and individuals adopt existing social viewpoints on linguistic status (Prieto-Arranz 2013). These biased standpoints permeate linguistic imagined communities and some languages are perceived as being more important or as enabling access to more desirable positions in society than others. This inequality has repercussions on negotiation in multilingual contexts as

some identity options are more valued than others, and (...) individuals and minority groups may appeal to – or resist – particular languages, language varieties, or linguistic forms in the struggle to claim the rights to particular identities and resist others that are imposed to them.

(Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004: 3)

With the spread of EIL as a powerful language of world communication, notions of language endangerment and extinction have come to the front (Crystal 2003). The need to strike a balance between international and local languages has emerged. Generally, this vision does not portray the minority language as a summative resource but dichotomises its perception as a problematic imposition or as a sociocultural right, which somehow reduces language to a political and ideological disagreement (Ceginskas 2010). Under more utilitarian labels, some authors have focused on the division between languages with an ethnolinguistic value, cornerstones of national identity, and languages as commodities, keys to access better socioeconomic positions (Cots and Martin Rubio 2008).

Focusing on the Balearic Islands, an Autonomous Community in Spain where Spanish and Catalan are the majority and minority co-official languages, Spanish, endorsed by official status all over the state and further supported by its position in the world in terms of number of speakers and geographical spread, tends to be regarded as more powerful than Catalan, notwithstanding its legal standing and
the efforts made towards its linguistic normalisation. Adding English as an international and more powerful language to this duality may represent an additional challenge in the projection of balanced multilingual communities.

Although studies on the situation in the Balearic Islands are scant (see, however, Juan-Garau and Salazar-Noguera 2015), research in the Basque Country sets a precedent in multilingual areas in Spain (see, e.g., Cots and Martin Rubio 2008; Doiz et al. 2011; Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009). This geographical area presents a similar triad of Spanish, Basque and English and, in the midst of this linguistic strain, the need to find a balance between EIL and local languages has been emphasised (Doiz et al. 2011).

Social beliefs are replicated within the classroom walls and multilingual societies are not an exception. As such, the status accorded to languages by students in their imagined communities needs to be carefully examined by educators to avoid a situation in which the richness of local languages might be undermined (Lasagabaster 2015).

2 The present case study

The impact of CLIL on identity and attitudes in the Balearic Islands

With the aim of scrutinising the impact of language learning practices on attitudes towards languages and on the formation of plurilingual identities, a case study was carried out at IES Ramon Llull, a secondary education located in the Balearic capital, Palma. This institution was selected due to its renowned long-standing experience in multilingual methodologies.

IES Ramon Llull was one of the first schools to adhere to the project of European Sections (EESS), launched experimentally by the Education Council of the Balearic Islands during the academic year 2004–2005. EESS is a CLIL initiative in which a non-linguistic subject is taught in the FL, with a twofold focus: the development of FL mastery and the acquisition of subject-content knowledge (see Juan-Garau and Salazar-Noguera 2015 for an overview of EESS learning outcomes).

By means of CLIL, the FL is no longer regarded as an independent subject of instruction, but as a means of communication, a tool to access content knowledge. Students are set to reach a more encompassing perception of their learning processes through this integrative approach by contrast to a partitioned conception where different subjects stand in isolation and bear no connection with one another. In terms of the present research, CLIL has the potential to offer purpose-
ful and significant contexts for ELL, authentic communities of practice. It enables students to improve their linguistic skills in the FL through incidental experience, drawing from the benefits of learning by doing (Pérez-Vidal and Roquet 2015).

Regarding imagined international communities, CLIL counts with internationalisation among its aims. Therefore, it is likely this approach will infuse a more global view of EIL in learners and, in consequence, positively-enhanced attitudes towards multilingualism and multiculturalism. Concerning the linguistic strains that may arise between the lingua franca and other languages in multilingual contexts where a minority language is spoken, it has been stated the value of the latter may actually be increased through participation in CLIL programmes (Marsh 2002). This is corroborated by findings in the Basque Country, where the emergence of EIL has evoked reluctant concerns that it could interfere with the preservation of Basque. Despite mistrust, CLIL has been revealed to have a positive impact on attitudes towards the local language (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2009).

**Research questions**

The study aims at answering the following three research questions related to the impact of CLIL in the construction of additive multilingual identities and attitudes:

1. Do CLIL students display a tendency towards international posture as opposed to their non-CLIL counterparts?
2. Do participants in the CLIL project develop a broader understanding of EIL and its global value than non-CLIL learners?
3. Do CLIL learners show more positive attitudes towards all the languages in their community, including local languages, and multilingualism in general, in contrast with non-CLIL learners?

**Methodology**

**Participants**

Participants in the study were 3rd and 4th year secondary-education students at a state-run high school in the Balearic Islands. In their first year of secondary education, all students take an initial evaluation test to assess their communicative skills in English. Due to a limit on the number of participants in the CLIL programme, only those students who perform best in the test are offered to take
part, a decision that is subject to parental consent. Continuity in the programme depends on the learners’ ability to follow the content classes in the foreign language and on their academic achievement.

From a total of 94 samplings, 15 were discarded from analysis due to either incomplete or inaccurate answers to the survey or previous participation in the language programme for one to three years before joining mainstream classes. An additional 6 CLIL students who had participated in study abroad programmes were also ruled out, as these experiences may trigger the development of international attitudes (Benson et al. 2012).

From the 73 students included in the study, 43 had taken part in CLIL consistently throughout all their years in secondary education, whereas 30 had never participated in either of the programmes. Students’ ages ranged between 14 and 17 when data were collected. In terms of gender, the groups were fairly balanced (CLIL/ILC: 55% male and 45% female; and non-CLIL/ILC: 40%-60%).

**Questionnaire design**

Students answered an individual, self-administered online questionnaire on Google Forms. As some of the topics could be perceived as sensitive, and in order to avoid biased answers based on perceived social desirability (Dörnyei 2003), questionnaires were anonymous and items carefully phrased.

The questionnaire combined quantitative and qualitative items, as recommended in language identity studies by Ceginskas (2010). Quantitative data aimed at correlating attitudinal responses and multilingual identities to CLIL and non-CLIL methodologies. On the other hand, qualitative research explored individual beliefs and self-projections within each of the groups, since it is precisely through narrative answers that identity insights are elicited from learners (Benson et al. 2012; Block 2007; Cots and Martin Rubio 2008).

In the first part of the questionnaire, quantitative items inquired about personal and attitudinal factors. Personal data was needed to evaluate if individual circumstances interfered with the impact of particular methodologies in the classroom (age, gender, identity ascription, learning and linguistic background, and language choice in social interaction). Attitudinal questions were phrased as statements and divided into three different subareas:

---

1 It is possible that CLIL and non-CLIL participants already differed in some respects with regard to their linguistic identification and their attitudes towards languages, among other affective factors including self-esteem and motivation, at the start of the study. Data to rule out that possibility could not be gathered.
A) Views towards multilingualism in society (1–4).

B) Features of the English lessons (5–9), including their connection to Spanish and Catalan classes, the relation between contents and meaningful real contexts, the perception of the classroom environment and language of communication used. All questions were aimed at evaluating the creation of effective communities of practice.

C) Beliefs with regards to English in general (10–15) and its global scope in particular (16–18), Spanish (19–23) and Catalan (24–31), encompassing both linguistic and cultural items.

All questions responded to a 5-point Likert scale format, in which 1 meant ‘Strongly disagree’ and 5, ‘Strongly agree’. Several questions were related to the same subarea to check the internal consistency of the scale and to form analytic clusters (Dörnyei 2003). A large number of items were borrowed from Ryan’s (2009) adaptations of Dörnyei et al. (2006), notably those concerning international views and learning milieu. Questions related to language perception were drawn from Lasagabaster (2003). The remaining questions were gathered from qualitative literature data, and reviewed with both specialists and non-specialists, to ensure investigative congruence and general comprehension.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of an open-ended, brief essay-like question in which students were asked to project themselves into an imagined community. Participants were specifically required to reflect on the position of English, Spanish and Catalan in their future lives. They could also refer to any other languages they already knew or intended to learn.

Final piloting was carried out with a group similar to the target respondents, a 4th year group at IES Ramon Llull where the vast majority of students had dropped out from the EESS programme and were therefore excluded from analysis.

### 3 Results and discussion

#### Identity and attitudinal findings

Table 1 below includes the average results corresponding to the first part of the questionnaire for non-CLIL and CLIL groups, which have been compared by means of a T-student test with alpha set at 0.05. Chronbach’s alpha values have also been provided for each section in the questionnaire, showing good to moderate correlations between the different items in each section.
Table 1: Average results and significant differences between non-CLIL/ILC and CLIL/ILC groups. Note: Figures marked with an asterisk show the original answers for negatively-worded items in which a higher degree of agreement involved more negative perceptions or attitudes. The scales were then inverted for statistical purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections and items</th>
<th>Mean non-CLIL</th>
<th>Stand. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean CLIL</th>
<th>Stand. Deviation</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes towards multilingualism</strong> (Cronbach’s α = 0.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Everyone should speak more than one language</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speaking more than one language develops your mind</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All languages are valuable</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in learning about other cultures and languages</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the English class as an international community of practice</strong> (α = 0.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In the English lessons, we talk about real topics and situations</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The atmosphere in the English lessons is positive</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Generally, I use English to communicate in English lessons</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel strange when speaking English with my teachers and peers</td>
<td><em>3.23</em></td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td><em>2.23</em></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In the English class I learn about world cultures, including non-English-speaking countries</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes towards English</strong> (α = 0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel comfortable speaking English</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I like the sound of English</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If English was not compulsory at school, I wouldn’t learn it</td>
<td><em>2.20</em></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td><em>1.37</em></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There are more useful languages to learn than English</td>
<td><em>2.07</em></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td><em>1.95</em></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In general, my classmates think it is important to learn English</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is important to know about the traditions of English-speaking countries</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections and items</th>
<th>Mean non-CLIL</th>
<th>Stand. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean CLIL</th>
<th>Stand. Deviation</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Attitudes towards EIL**  
(α = 0.67) | | | | | |
| 16. It is better to practise English with a native than a non-native speaker | 3.86 | 0.69 | 4.10 | 0.48 | 0.11 |
| 17. I would like to meet people from English-speaking countries | 4.37 | 0.81 | 4.51 | 0.63 | 0.39 |
| 18. To speak English properly, it is necessary to have a native-like accent | *3.13* | 1.28 | *3.6* | 0.90 | 0.09 |
| **Attitudes towards Spanish**  
(α = 0.64) | | | | | |
| 19. I feel comfortable speaking Spanish | 4.93 | 0.25 | 4.72 | 0.88 | 0.21 |
| 20. I like the sound of Spanish | 4.60 | 1.00 | 4.49 | 0.88 | 0.56 |
| 21. I prefer speaking Spanish than Catalan | 4.60 | 0.93 | 3.70 | 1.47 | 0.00 |
| 22. In general, my classmates think it is important to learn Spanish | 3.97 | 1.00 | 4.05 | 1.09 | 0.75 |
| 23. It is important to know the Spanish traditions | 4.13 | 0.97 | 4.12 | 0.96 | 0.94 |
| **Attitudes towards Catalan**  
(α = 0.79) | | | | | |
| 24. I feel comfortable speaking Catalan | 3.03 | 1.40 | 3.88 | 1.30 | 0.01 |
| 25. I like the sound of Catalan | 3.20 | 1.32 | 3.79 | 1.19 | 0.06 |
| 26. If Catalan wasn't compulsory at school, I wouldn't learn it | *3.00* | 1.37 | *2.23* | 1.43 | 0.03 |
| 27. There are more useful languages to learn than Catalan | *4.00* | 1.46 | *3.70* | 1.36 | 0.05 |
| 28. I prefer speaking Catalan than Spanish | 1.63 | 1.19 | 2.40 | 1.49 | 0.02 |
| 29. Being able to speak Catalan in all situations is a right | 2.83 | 1.70 | 3.51 | 1.20 | 0.05 |
| 30. In general, my classmates think it is important to learn Catalan | 2.23 | 0.97 | 3.09 | 1.09 | 0.00 |
| 31. It is important to know the traditions of the Balearic Islands | 3.63 | 1.38 | 4.28 | 0.98 | 0.02 |
Attitudes towards multilingualism

On average, CLIL and non-CLIL students did not show significant differences in their consideration of multilingualism. However, while both groups coincided in signalling multilingualism as desirable and attributing value to all languages (items 2 and 3 in Table 1), non-CLIL students failed to recognise its cognitive benefits and did not evoke much interest in learning about other languages and cultures (1 and 4).

Still, attitudes towards multilingualism appear to have an impact on language choice. Examining language use in students’ processes of socialisation with family and friends reveals multilingualism to be more present in CLIL groups, with similar results for the languages used in cultural products and social media. It is also worth mentioning that CLIL seems to broaden students’ description of their identity, as reflected in the survey. In fact, 37% of CLIL participants stated they felt “European”, as opposed to only 17% of non-CLIL students who marked this option in their descriptions.

Perception of the classroom as an international community of practice

The construction of a community of practice in the classroom is more clearly and significantly perceived by CLIL students. In particular, participants from this group sensed a stronger bond between class contents and real situations (5). They additionally enjoyed a positive classroom environment and felt more at ease using English naturally as the language of communication (6, 7 and 8).

These results have several implications. First, the identification of the language with a real context of use adds vividness and authenticity to the mental representation of the ideal L2 self (Dörnyei 2009), an important motivational factor. Also, the comfort found through interacting in the FL may entail lower levels of alienation in CLIL programmes than in mainstream lessons, as students are more prone to feel identified with the language.

Finally, communities of practice have been described as “aggregate(s) of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour” (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992: 464), emphasising the fact that a sense of community leads students to work as a group towards the achievement of a common goal. Members of a community of practice are also depicted as “shar[ing] beliefs, motives and values” (Block 2010: 337). As a consequence, it is predictable that in a particular group of learners, students will hold similar opinions on the prestige and status attributed to English and other languages, as can be confirmed in the following subsections.
With regards to the presence of culture in the English classroom, CLIL pupils extended cultural notions to a broader global context (9) to a larger extent than their non-CLIL counterparts, evidencing that CLIL contexts offer a more international perspective, as stated by Marsh (2002).

**Attitudes towards English**

Both groups coincided with non-significant differences in attaching a high value to English in terms of usefulness (13), putting forth a utilitarian point of view. In spite of the coincidence in the value accorded to the connection between language and culture (15), the mean for this point is close to the answer “I’m not sure” for both groups, indicating a weak sense of identification with the foreign culture. Notwithstanding this observation, CLIL students developed a stronger and more significant identification with English than their non-CLIL counterparts. Not only did they feel more comfortable speaking the target language (10), probably due to their higher exposure and practice, but they also liked its sound (11).

Echoing findings on peer influence in adolescence by Taylor et al. (2013), peer pressure (14) plays a decisive role in learning involvement in teenager ELLs: CLIL participants were aware of the importance attached to English by their peers, with this having a positive impact on their attitudes, while non-CLIL learners were not sure about the opinion held by their classmates, partly explaining their weak inclination towards this language.

**Attitudes towards EIL**

Despite the positive attitudes towards English shown by CLIL students, these were not extrapolated to EIL. Both CLIL and non-CLIL groups put forth very little awareness of the implications of the global spread of English with non-significant differences between them. Participants from both groups showed high interest in meeting English native speakers (17), denoting sympathy and positive attitudes towards them. Along these lines, the two groups attached a much higher value to native varieties of the FL (16 and 18).

CLIL students recognised an international cultural constituent in their English lessons (see results obtained for question 9) that went beyond native English-speaking countries. However, this internationalisation is not extended to linguistic perceptions of non-native speakers and varieties, indicating that neither CLIL nor mainstream English language lessons were successful in transmitting a broader view of World Englishes.
**Attitudes towards Spanish**

The usefulness of Spanish is taken for granted as it is viewed as the majority language in the community. All of the items assessed display high averages, denoting a very positive positioning towards the Spanish language (19, 20 and 23). Both groups perceive their peers’ appreciation for the language (22). The only significant difference is found in the dominance of Spanish as the language of preference among participants (21). While most non-CLIL students chose Spanish over Catalan, it was the opposite case for their CLIL peers.

**Attitudes towards Catalan**

This last subsection displays more negative attitudes overall. A T-Student test comparing the averages for the three languages verified that non-CLIL groups’ views on Catalan (and English) were significantly more negative than those on Spanish whereas, in CLIL groups, Spanish and English were held in similar high esteem to the detriment of the local language. In spite of this observation, the gap between both groups is significant, with CLIL participants exhibiting more positive trends (24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 31). This difference seems to corroborate Lasagabaster and Sierra’s (2009) findings on the positive impact of this approach on the perception of local languages.

The comparison between the attitudes towards Catalan of the participants who marked “Majorcan” in the description of their identity and those who chose other options is deemed non-significant within both CLIL and non-CLIL groups, which challenges the belief that one’s identification necessarily corresponds to language predilection, additionally reinforcing the role of CLIL in the valorisation of languages, and confirming the decisive influence of peer pressure (30).

All in all, CLIL programmes appear to contribute to foster summative multilingualism, but the value attached to local languages is still far behind when compared to the status of global and majority languages.

**Projected imagined communities**

The final open-ended question shed light on the position languages occupied in students’ future imagined communities. Participants were required to reflect on the use they would make of the languages they were learning in adulthood. Out of the 73 answers provided by participants, 4 off-topic contributions were eliminated. Therefore, 29 texts from non-CLIL and 40 from CLIL students were examined.
In general, narratives by CLIL students were more vivid and minutely depicted than those of their non-CLIL counterparts, denoting that the former had more distinct images of the communities they may access through language learning, an indispensable motivation ingredient (Dörnyei 2009). The scope of the analysis has been limited to the relationship between English and Catalan as the global and local languages of the community. In order to quantify the results of this qualitative insight, thematic units, repeated elements in the answers, have been counted and categorised in the following subsections.2

Languages for work

Table 2: Projection of English and Catalan use in work contexts. Note: Figures correspond to the percentage of participants who mentioned these aspects in their narratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-CLIL</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as an asset in the workplace</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan as an asset in the workplace</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All languages as an asset in the workplace</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions to work (total):</td>
<td>68.97%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most recurrent elements was the usefulness of languages at work (see Table 2). Non-CLIL students were more work-oriented in their imagined communities, displaying an essentially instrumental motivation. A difference in the perception of each of the languages can be noted. Non-CLIL participants tended to believe English was the most useful. In three instances, the students surveyed specifically alluded to the tourist sector as being the motor of economy in the Balearics to justify the superior position of English in the workplace. By contrast, CLIL learners held more encompassing views and considered both English and Catalan equally important for employability, recognising summative potential in the local language.

2 The first author conducted weekly observations of the English lessons of the two groups included in the analysis for a period of three months. These observations provided valuable first-hand information about the perceptions of the participants, which contributed to the interpretations of the results obtained in the questionnaire.
Foreign contexts

Table 3: Projection of language use in foreign contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-CLIL</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live abroad</td>
<td>41.38 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>10.39 %</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel abroad</td>
<td>10.39 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation through communication</td>
<td>10.39 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there seems to be little divergence between the participants’ intentions to go abroad (see Table 3), the motives exposed in their narratives are qualitatively different: non-CLIL students refer to work opportunities, while among CLIL students there abounds the desire to live specifically in an English-speaking country with no specific mention to the workplace, but to cultural interest, which is consistent with findings of their positive attitudes towards native communities:

My dream for the last few years has been to live in an English-speaking country, preferably England, because I am very interested in the language and its potential on the Internet [CLIL_2] ³

I wouldn’t mind spending two or three years in an English-speaking country to practise the language and master it [CLIL_12]

Also, in terms of internationalisation, CLIL students mention the value of English as a means of communication with people from around the world twice as much as their non-CLIL peers.

Language of the community vs. territoriality

Table 4: Perception of Catalan as a local language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-CLIL</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan is the language of the community</td>
<td>17.24 %</td>
<td>37.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan is less important because it is geographically limited</td>
<td>27.59 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Students’ answers have been translated into English by the authors. Students have been identified as either “CLIL” or “NON-CLIL” and assigned a participant number.
Catalan is often depicted dichotomically in terms of its ethnolinguistic value as the language of the community, or of its limited geographical territoriality (Cots and Martín Rubio 2008). In this sense, CLIL participants were more inclined to enhance the cultural value of Catalan than its locality (see Table 4). Even among non-native speakers of the language, the association of the language to its context was patent:

Catalan is a language that took me only two years to learn, because of its Latin roots and its similarity to Spanish. I ended up embracing it because it belongs to the island and lots of my friends speak it [CLIL_2]

Non-CLIL students, on the other hand, perceived Catalan negatively for geographical constraints to a larger extent than their CLIL counterparts.

I don’t think Catalan is very useful, because it’s only spoken in a small part of Spain [NON-CLIL_5] I can only use Catalan with a reduced number of people [NON-CLIL_14]

By contrast, those non-CLIL participants who felt it was the language of the community harboured their identity as “Majorcans” and their desire to pass over the language to their children.

I will try never to stop speaking Catalan, teaching it to my children and continuing to read books in this language [NON-CLIL_3] It is my mother tongue and I will keep on using it with my family. I would like to teach it to my children, alongside Spanish [NON-CLIL_7]

**Language rejection**

**Table 5:** Instances of rejection of English or Catalan use in imagined communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-CLIL</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English deemed unnecessary</td>
<td>6.89 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan deemed unnecessary</td>
<td>24.14 %</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some languages are regarded as dismissible, a point of view chiefly held by non-CLIL students, some of whom stated that English would not be of use in their future, as opposed to CLIL learners who did not conceive this scenario (see Table 5). Almost a quarter of the former expressly stated that they would not use Catalan in the future, considering this language unnecessary in their lives. The percentage for CLIL students was well below this figure, which again reflects the positive impact of this teaching approach on minority language attitudes.
Cultural and linguistic interest

Table 6: Figures for explicit cultural and linguistic interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-CLIL</th>
<th>CLIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show cultural interest</td>
<td>13.79 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to learn other FLs</td>
<td>13.79 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning cultural and linguistic interests, CLIL students showed substantially more inclination towards learning about other cultures through languages (see Table 6). Whereas non-CLIL students referred to world cultures in general, CLIL learners were more specific in their compositions, alluding to technology, books and non-dubbed TV series, as well as a personal taste for languages. Similarly, 45 % of the personal narratives of CLIL participants captured a wish to learn at least an additional foreign language. These cultural and linguistic interests on the part of CLIL learners are consistent with the findings by Doiz et al. (2014).

Metalinguistic reflection

A large number of accounts by CLIL students showed metalinguistic reflection. By contrast, non-CLIL narratives did not provide such insights. More specifically, almost 25 % of CLIL learners referred to their current learning processes and their expected outcomes, e.g. “In ten years, I hope to achieve a very good level of English (at least C1)” [CLIL_10] and “speaking and practising English at school helps me be better at it every day” [CLIL_18].

A slightly lower figure (7 out of 40 participants) recognised language richness and interdependence, acknowledging the benefits of language transference (O’Duibhir and Cummins 2012). Among others, they suggested that languages are “a source of knowledge”, “the foundation to learn other (languages)” [CLIL_4] and that “(Catalan) is a very helpful tool to translate from other Romance languages, such as French” [CLIL_16].

4 Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that CLIL appears to have a positive impact in the establishment of effective communities of practice in the classroom, provid-
ing ELLs with authentic contexts of participation in the target language. While this sense of community is an essential condition for the creation and performance of identities, our research questions aimed at defining the nature of these identities in terms of attitudes towards English, the languages in the community and multilingualism in general. In particular, our interest was to assess the degree to which a new multilingual approach such as CLIL, in contraposition to English language instruction, could help to explain differences in learner attitudes.

In reply to research question one, which enquired into the development of international posture by students in CLIL programmes, our findings reveal that this multilingual approach seems to be successful at instilling vividness to students’ ideal L2 selves and an international constituent to their imagined communities. Students in CLIL groups acknowledge they learn about global cultural aspects in class, and show a higher development of international inclination and linguistic interests in their future imagined communities, which range from studying, working or living abroad, to the consumption of international cultural products or the acquisition of an additional foreign language. Thus, it can be said that CLIL fulfils the need observed by Norton and Toohey (2011) to promote cosmopolitan and global identities.

However, the answers to the second research question, related to the development of a global vision of EIL by CLIL learners, limit the scope of the above-mentioned internationalisation. While results point at an international component in CLIL participants’ imagined communities, their desire to go abroad shows a predilection for countries where English is the native language. Similarly, CLIL students’ answers in the attitudinal test harbour a clear preference for native varieties of English. This entails that the programme does not appear to contribute significantly to a broader understanding of the implications of EIL in terms of its non-native production, hinting at a need to further decentre the English language in the classroom.

Finally, our third research question aimed at assessing the effects of CLIL on the development of positive attitudes towards multilingualism in the community, including local languages. The effectiveness of CLIL at internationalisation is parallel to the enhancement of the value of minority or local languages. It is particularly interesting to observe that CLIL fosters metalinguistic reflection, as students partaking in this programme do not only value languages per se, but they also realise their skill transference potential. Still, although CLIL programmes lead to substantially better positioning vis-à-vis Catalan as a local language, attitudinal results are lower than the standards obtained by global and majority languages. These considerations, together with the contrastingly negative answers obtained from non-CLIL groups, call for careful assessment by
educators, who can implement strategies to foster minority languages and, in consequence, a healthier multilingualism in the classroom (Cenoz 2009).

Further research in CLIL is required to find out more about differences in the perception of languages. In particular, it would be revealing to analyse if there are existing differences in language attitudes and motivations between CLIL and non-CLIL groups from the onset, as suggested by Rumlich (2014), and to follow the same students throughout secondary education in a longitudinal study so as to evaluate if there is a significant shift in attitudes as CLIL learners progress in the programme in comparison to their mainstream peers.
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