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Abstract

This study deals with the relationship of the Social Context, Communicative Language Teaching and English Language Learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017. This thesis is descriptive-quantitative with a correlational design. The population and sample were 40 fourth grade students who studied English as a subject in a public school. The research was based on determining the relationship between the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning. After processing and correlating the results taken from a survey, the hypothesis' results founded to be satisfactory resulting that there was a 95% of reliability. For this reason, the social context has to be thought as an important content into communicative language teaching lessons in order that there is English language learning in foreign students.

Keywords: Social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning, attitude, ethnography, learning-centered.
Introduction

As an English teachers we should be aware of using an adequate approach to our TESEP students since we need to concern that students are not clean sheets, they come to classrooms with attitudes, expectations, needs, wants which are influenced by social forces from their institutions and the wider in which people deal and interact with them inside or outside the classroom. As a result, it is necessary to know about the social context if we want to develop language teaching correctly. English teachers and curriculum designers must not forget to consider social, political and methodological factors in the syllabus. On the other hand, teachers have to cut off importing English language teaching methodologies which are designed very much with a particular objectives into the institutions and students with specific objectives to learn English. It is obvious that foreign methodologies might not fit in our students´ context, and cannot adapt easily to our English language education system.

As ESL teachers, our students carry many different backgrounds, or may be from societies or cultural different to the local, it is our duty to be prepared to cope with this challenge. The flow of ideas, self-concepts, and theories in the classroom environment should consequently not be a burden for teachers, but an opportunity for further enrichment and inclusion. This means that teacher must be constantly amending their methods, varying their lessons plans, and complicating their previously held notion of how to impart knowledge to a class of diverse learners´ social contexts.

In this study, it is also suggested that the process of learning a foreign language not occur by accident: it is the direct result of a program design by a teacher who gathers information through the experience of living that changes the learners´ behavior. That process also departs from the idea of student´s attitude toward learning since these
attitudes are influenced by their kind of personality, goals, purposes, needs and wants causing the need for the development of courses for specific group of learners.

This research entitles how the social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 school in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

In chapter I, we present the determination of the problem, and formulate the general and specific problems. The respective objectives are also taken into account. The scope and relevance of the problem is also belong to this chapter and, we finish with limitation of this research.

In chapter II, we show the theoretical framework and its contents; background of the research, theoretical bases, and the definition of the basic terms.

In chapter III, refers to types of hypothesis and variables and finishes with the operationalization of variables.

In chapter IV, we mention about the research methodology in which it is found the research approach, type of research and method, research design, population and sample, research techniques and instruments for data collection (survey), and this chapter ends with the statistical treatment.

Chapter V is entitled Results where validity and reliability of Instruments, presentation and analysis of results and its discussion are presented.

Finally we arrived at the conclusion that the social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017. The correlation degree between variables is direct and moderate, 0.458 and 0.502 respectively; furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 with a 95% confidence interval.
Chapter I

Statement of problem

1.1 Determination of the Problem

All students learn a language with a certain goal in mind. The case is no different from English language courses taught in public schools. If an examination is taken about how methodologies are imparted in classrooms, perhaps it could be stated that language learning on its own is isolated from social context. Students alone cannot adequately apply the topics they learn to their lives outside the classroom. To what degree does learning have to do with the social context in which the student lives? If the student lives in the jungle, it is different from how one lives in the capital city. A single, neutral way of teaching English limits students’ ability to use it efficiently and to its full extent in real situations.

If a student cannot find a relationship between what he learns and what he lives outside of the classroom, he will not have attitude or be motivated to learn. English language learning, in order to make a real impact on the student, must find a connection between the student’s social context and the material imparted by the teacher in the classroom. The relationships among students, and between the student and the teacher, create a unique environment that can often times be closed off from the outside world. Although there is ever only one English, it must be molded to the needs, wants and the environment of the student. It is up to the teacher to know how to teach their students with specific courses in order to open up the connection between useful forms of communication for their purposes and the social context lying outside of the classroom.
1.2 Formulation of the problem

1.2.1 General Problem

To what extent is the social context related to communicative language teaching and English Language Learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017?

1.2.2 Specific Problem

SP01 To what extent is the classroom context related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017?

SP02 To what extent is the cultural context related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017?

1.3 Objectives

1.3.1 General objective

To determine the relationship between the social context and communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

SO01 To determine the relationship between the classroom context and communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.
To determine the relationship between the cultural context and communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017

1.4 Relevance and scope of the problem

1.4.1 Theoretical relevance

This research explores the theoretical bases of social context, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and English language learning as a school subject. We provided further proof of the connection between English language learning approaches (ELL), the principles of the CLT and students’ social context.

1.4.2 Practical relevance

This investigation looks to encourage the development of an adequate application of Communicative Language Teaching and English language learning according to the diverse social context of the student population.

1.4.3 Methodological relevance

The result of this study we will formulate a new instrument capable of measuring the usefulness of Communicative Language Teaching’s applications and English language learning approaches given to the existence of different social contexts.

1.5 Limitations of the research

Bernal (2010) proposed three main limitations in a research project, can distinguish between time limitation, geographic limitation and resources limitation. He states that there might be other limits due to restrictions in the access to information or to the population under study.
1.5.1 Geographical limitations.

The geographic limitation draws the geographical space where the study was taken place, this search was applied to 40 fourth grade students of secondary level at “Martir Daniel Alcides Carrion” school UGEL 05, located on Proyectos Especiales S/N in the district of San Juan de Lurigancho, Lima.

1.5.2 Time limitations.

The time limitation defines how long the study lasted. In this specific case, the execution took place from 2017 to 2018.

1.5.3 Resources limitations.

Bernal (2010) proposed that resources limitation mentions all the financial sources of the research project. This project was financed by the author’s own expenses.
Chapter II

Theoretical framework

2.1 Research background

2.1.1 International Background

Burešová (2007) in her diploma thesis Social Strategies in Foreign Language Teaching arrived at the following conclusions: Social strategies have become a standard part of foreign language lesson, because they involve communication and, as the research has shown, people learn foreign languages to be able to communicate. Concerning the frequency of dialogues in our daily life and the effort to prepare the language students to use the target language in common daily situations, it has to be admitted that pair work or work in small groups of students are inevitable.

Moreover, while using social strategies in lessons, the students are more active in the activity, practice communication, build relationships, etc. Also, students with special needs can be involved in these activities or can work with the teacher on another task, so social strategies can be very useful in mixed abilities classes.

Social strategies propose wide range of possibilities in foreign language learning and make all students active. In general, most students like being active. If they feel comfortable and not stressed, they learn easier. In other words, good friendly atmosphere in the classroom supports language acquisition.

Saeed and Cogman (2013) in their case study Applying Communicative Approach (CA) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL): a case study of Pakistan arrived at the following conclusions: It can be concluded from the data of the two empirical studies discussed above that the CA is better than the Grammar Translation Method in
teaching English at the higher secondary level in Pakistan. The experimental study included in this research proved the fact that, if provided with suitable conditions, Pakistani learners can increase their communicative ability. The use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach has shown to increase motivation for learning. The survey study also signifies the possibility of implementing CLT approach in Pakistan. The respondent teachers showed their willingness to incorporate communicative activities in classrooms.

They have a good understanding of the use of CLT approach. The identified impediments in applying the CA are teacher training, students’ hesitation in the use of target language, over-crowded class rooms, grammar-based examinations, and the lack of appropriate materials. However, the teachers in this study were found to be enthusiastic to apply the CA in the classroom. They appeared hopeful that the problems associated with the implementation of CLT approach in Pakistan can be overcome.

Also the author gives a recommendation: Further research is needed to explore techniques in filling the gap between an English As A Second Language (ESL) and English As A Foreign Language (EFL) context to fully utilize CLT approach.

2.1.2 National Background

Benito (2012), in the thesis entitled *Attitudes towards English language learning and academic performance in the students of the first cycle of the Program of English for Graduate Students at the Language Center of the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2012* at the Universidad Nacional de Educación Enrique Guzman y Valle, arrived at the following conclusions: Considering that attitudes influence significantly the success of doing well or poorly at certain situations such as the case of learning English, these should be strongly taken into account by English Language Teaching (ELT) teachers while performing their classes. What is
more, teachers’ job does not only consist of promoting the development of positive attitudes in students but also deal with the adaptation of these were it necessary: the students come to class with certain already acquired attitudes which were internalized from their family, culture, community, etc., that might not always be, look or seem appropriate with a view to their holistic development.

The author of this research also concludes that: Concerning the affective aspect of attitudes in relationship to English language learning, (...), state schools, or any other institution, curriculum planners should consider the needs analysis process as one of the most important aspects of curriculum planning. It seems evident that no student is equal to any other, i.e., each individual has personal characteristics depending to a large extent on their background (learning styles, high or low self-esteem, cultural identity, needs, expectations, etc.). A clear example of this is the notable difference that exists between the rural and the urban area students. The latter seem to show more positive attitudes towards learning English because it means a plus in their personal development, while the rural area students seem to categorize learning a foreign language just as a waste of time because they usually have some other basic necessities to be worried about like food, clothes, rearing up their children, and education in some basic subjects like math, social sciences, language and communication which are expected to enable them to deal more successfully with their daily life occupations.

Cardenas (2012), in the thesis entitled *Using popular songs as a didactic strategy in TEFL and its influence in the communicative competence in the fourth grade students at Jorge Chavez school in Comas, Perú, 2001* at the Universidad Nacional de Educación Enrique Guzmán y Valle concluded with the following ideas: From our research experience on how context with real meaning in Popular English Songs, influences the development of communicative competence of students in the fourth grade at “Jorge
Chavez” school in Comas, Peru, 2001, we conclude that the strategy is highly effective and consistent because of the 100% of students in the experimental group after the application of the Using Popular English Songs strategy, the total 100% said that this dimension affects positively in their learning environment (31% sometimes, 48% almost always and 21% always), while 0% acknowledges they were negatively affected by this dimension.

The author of this research also arrived at the following conclusions: How authentic natural language in Popular English Songs, influences the fortress of communicative competence of students in the fourth grade at “Jorge Chavez” school in Comas, Peru, 2011, we conclude that is highly effective and consistent because of the 100% of students in the experimental group after the application of the Using Popular English Songs strategy, 93% of them said that this dimension affects positively in their learning environment (34% sometimes, 38% almost always and 21% always).

We experienced through our research that songs not only make every student hear or dance, but practice a real communicative language, spoken in everyday life. They agree to deal with real-life topics and social problems, use slang idioms of each region or country in which English is spoken naturally. Derived from this we note, with Murphy (1992a), the benefit of using Popular English Songs that advantageously contain the advantage common short words (like you, I, me, love, gonna, wanna, wansta, etc.) and metaphors (you´re playing with fire, it´s a Russian roulette) that facilitate comprehension and discussion of those topics. Something we have to highlight and pay close attention to, is that the Popular English Songs would be only means immediately available in their contexts that connects us with the varieties of English in the world that Katchru (1985,1992) refers to, (…).
2.2 Theoretical bases

2.2.1 The Social Context

As a tradition, our profession has tended to grow and develop disconnected from the social context (Widdowson, 1978). This has not proved an exception in the local context, where most English teachers have been trained as language instructors and hence tend not to see beyond the classroom. Beyond this tradition, however, classrooms are somehow concerned with cultures that are part of social context. It is necessary to know about social context if we want to develop language teaching correctly. A great deal has been showed concerning what happens between people, it causes gaps in our knowledge that prevent us from achieving classroom methodologies appropriate for different situations. We do not know much about how to work with methodologies for English as a foreign language, or not enough about how learning might be affected by the attitudes and expectations that people bring to the learning situation, which is influenced by social forces. (Holliday, 1994)

English teachers and curriculum designers forget or simply attempt to consider social, political administrative, psycho-pedagogic and methodological factors in the syllabus. The social context is the interaction within and around classroom language teaching and learning, the classroom is the place where inner interaction is also influenced by the wider educational environment and society. There are still problems in the profession; on one hand, foreign students are put through foreign methodologies. Although teachers or curriculum developers are native to the countries in which they work, with the same nationality as their students, they utilize methodologies developed in foreign countries that are very different from the students’ reality and it is important to mention those methodologies come in ESL materials.
It is clear that there is a wide range and influence of social settings in language teaching. On the other hand, teachers tend to import these English language teaching methodologies from abroad, which are designed very much with a particular relation between the institution and students with specific objectives to learn English. It is obvious that foreign methodologies cannot fit in other situations, and cannot adapt easily to the other part of the English language education profession. Is there more than one social context? Based on reality, classrooms have two important aspects: the macro and micro context. The macro context holds that a classroom is influenced by society and the institution. The macro view explains how the social context influences from outside the classroom. We have to understand that each country has different factors in order to determine what can be appropriate in terms of classroom methodology. The classroom environment requires that we look at how the classroom relates to the outside world, and what happens within the classroom reflects this outside world so that you, teachers, need to manage EFL materials.

Additionally, the host educational environment provides strong influences, from parents, employers and so on, in the local community that bear on the classroom. Furthermore, this educational environment also includes influences on students and teachers from their respective peer and reference groups who provide them with values, standards, and goals. As pertains to the student, we also have to include their classmates and family members who act as role models. For teachers, their reference group is colleagues from different institutions, professional associations, and universities. For the material, another factor that includes methodologies. Hence, English teachers and curriculum developers need to incorporate into their approach to the classroom the capacity to look in-depth at the wider social forces which influence behavior between
teachers and students and to take a broad view of how these are in turn influenced by social forces from outside the classroom. (Holliday, 1994)

2.2.1.1 Definition

We think, Widdowson’s statement (see above) about the lack of connection between English Language Teaching and the wider context may well apply to the local Peruvian scene, since teachers apparently have no information about how learning takes place in the classroom and how students’ behavior and expectations brought to class are all influenced by social factors. This social context that we do not know and with techniques are necessarily for teaching appropriately.

Holliday (1994) proposed that:

Much has been learnt about how people learn or acquire second languages. But we do not know enough about how learning might be affected by the attitudes and expectations that people bring to the learning situations, which are influenced by social forces within both the institution and the wider in which people deal with each other in the classroom. (p.9)

Kumaravadivelu (2003) advanced this definition:

Culture is such a complicated concept that it does not lend itself to a single definition or a simple description. It brings to mind different images to different people. In its broadest sense, it includes a wide variety of constructs such as the mental habits, personal prejudices, moral values, social customs, artistic achievements, and aesthetic preferences of particular societies. (p.267)

Oré (2013) suggested that:

The teaching of English has not been sufficiently effective to make an English teacher know and share the perceptions of naturalness, neutrality or beneficiary – linguistics (...). Hence my personal conviction that there is a gap between
linguistics as a professional area and the field of English teaching, and between
the latter and the broader political and economic social context in which such
teaching takes place. The practical evidence and much of the consulted
literature seems to point to the fact that both the arguments used to promote the
so-called literature and commercial methods for teaching English as the
contents of the typical teacher training programs that have the applied
linguistics and methodology as their core content, and have ignored the natural
link between language teaching and community. (p. 33) (Own Translation)

Brown (2001) referred that:

Social context as a “Sociopolitical context”, it is easy to underestimate the
importance and power of sociopolitical aspects of language. We have already
seen, in looking at CLT, how dominant the social roles of language are.
Interaction, negotiation, interpretation, intended meanings, misunderstandings,
and pragmatics all underscore those roles. When such considerations are
extended into communities, regions, nations, and continents, the political side
of language becomes evident. (p. 115)

Holliday (1994) also added another concept about the Social Context, “the social
context with which I shall be concerned is the social interaction which affects and
therefore helps explain what really goes on. The classroom is the place where the
multiplicity and complexity of interactions referred to by Allwright take place. However, I
shall argue that it is not sufficient to look only within the classroom to understand this
interaction. I emphasize within and around the classroom because I wish to maintain that
much of what goes on within the classroom is influenced by factors within the wider
educational institution, the wider educational environment, and the wider society. (p.11)
As Firth (quoted in Richards et al, 1986) said, languages should be “studied in the broad sociocultural context of its use, which included participants, their behavior and beliefs, the objects of linguistic discussion, and word choice.”(p. 69)

2.2.1.2 Foreign methodologies for foreign students

There is still a continuing problem in the profession. English teacher and curriculum developers have a principal goal to develop new and original methodologies to teach English, however, there are different context and the latest is not necessarily the best. Between teachers and trainers, there must be an appropriate methodology-appropriate to social, economic and cultural context of those on the receiving end. The teaching of foreign languages has to be considered culture-sensitive since teacher are required to study and analyze their students’ behaviors in classroom which carry out ethnographic researchers.

From Oré’s (2013) perspective:

The social, economic and political factors that have determined their diffusion have a clear presence in the context of their teaching." "It has been attended to reflect to what extent the social, economic and political factors referred to (...)

They seem to influence the design of universal methods, the distinction -or no- of specific contexts for the teaching of English, the ethnography and intercultural aspects found in it and the scope of international projects related to that teaching.(p. 27) (Own Translation)

Following the recommendations of Holliday (1997) about ethnographic action research, the process of learning in a classroom needs to involve a cultural-sensitive approach, it has to undertake not only what teachers need to know inside or outside the classroom to fit her or his situation, but students’ behaviors. Ethnography is a particular step because it is an important branch of anthropology, which studies the behavior of
groups of people. The figure above shows how ethnography and action research are essential parts for learning about classroom. It says that the doing part is action research and the employment is ethnography. (p. 162, 163, 166)

**LEARNING ABOUT THE CLASSROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action research</th>
<th>applies</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Solves classroom problems to develop appropriate methodologies)</td>
<td>(Focus on cultures Provides methodology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Components of learning about the classroom

According to Coleman (1996), the ethnographic analysis of ELT classrooms reveals problematic areas with the curriculum. The teachers’ linguistic and pedagogical abilities, current practices reflecting the culture’s view of the language and language learning, and permissible and valued behaviors patterns need to match with curriculum. The author (ibid) also defines ethnography: micro-ethnography that examines behavior in a small social group (such as a classroom), and macro-ethnography that looks at behavior in a much larger organization (such as an education system). (p. 55, 230)

Brown (2001) asserted that:

Language policies and social climates may dictate the status accorded to native and second languages, which can, in turn, positively or negatively affect attitudes and eventual success in language learning. Two commonly used terms and eventual success in language learning. Two commonly used terms characterize the status of one’s native language to as subtractive if it is considered to be detrimental to the learning of a second language. Additive
bilingualism is found where the native language is held in prestige by the community or society. (p. 120)

According to Holliday (1994), (...) there are teachers and curriculum developers, who are native to the countries where they work, and the same nationality as the students they teach, but who are trying to make sense of methodologies developed in Britain, North America or Australasia for “ideal” teaching-learning situations which are very different from their own. In this latter scenario, the question of what is the optimum classroom situations, or how far received classroom methodologies are the most appropriate, becomes very important. Not only do we have insufficient data about what really happens between people in the classroom, we lack date for the wide range of social settings in which English language education is carried out around the world. (p. 11)

In the case of present study, students do not have “an instant ‘laboratory’ available twenty-four hours a day” characteristic of English as Second Language contexts. Instead, as defined in the EFL context, “intrinsic motivation is a big issue, since students may have difficulty in seeing the relevance of learning English.”

Brown (2001) explained the idea above:

To distinguish operationally between a second and a foreign language context, think of what is going on outside your classroom door. Once your students leave your class, which language will they hear in the hallways or, in case you are in the foreign language department hallway, out on the sidewalks and in the stores? Second language learning contexts are those in which the classroom target language is readily available out there. Teaching English in the United States or Australia clearly, falls into this ESL category. Foreign language contexts are those in which students do not have ready-made contexts for communication beyond their classroom. They may be obtainable through
language clubs, special media opportunities, books or an occasional tourist, but efforts must be made to create such opportunities. Teaching English in Japan or Morocco or Thailand is almost always a context of EFL. (p. 116)

As we live in a foreign language context, people who are learning English as a second language do not have the opportunity to keep in contact with the target language outside their classrooms. However, this does not mean that learning English in countries like Peru is impossible since many people have succeeded in doing so.

Brown (2001) also noted that:

CLT in what we might broadly categorize as an EFL context is clearly a greater challenge for students and teachers. Often, intrinsic motivation is a big issue, since students may have difficulty in seeing the relevance of learning English. Their immediate use of the language may see far removed from their own circumstances, and classroom hours may be the only part of the day when they are exposed to English. Therefore, the language that you present, model, elicit and treat takes on great importance. If your class meets for, say, only ninety minutes a week, which represents a little more than 1 percent of their waking hours, think of what students need to accomplish! (p. 117)

The situations mentioned above make the educational system comes face to face the fact that they overlook proper linguistic conditions and the social context where these methodologies are installed and students´ learning needs.

In Lopez´s (2000) Words,

(...) the insensibility of the educational systems that has not even recently taken into account the linguistic, cultural and social peculiarities of the learners (...). Such poverty is also the product of the inability of Latin American educational systems to take into account the experiences, knowledge and skills
of the learners they attend, despite of the fact of most generalized discourse of basic learning needs (...). (p. 5-6) (Own Translation)

Tollefson (1991) suggested that “(...) (Language) is built into the economic and social structure of society so deeply that is fundamental importance seems only natural. For this reason, language policies are often seen as expressions of natural, common-sense assumptions about language”.(p. 76)

Oré (2013) mentioned his perspective on that: The social, economic and political factors that have determined their diffusion have a clear presence in the contexts of their teaching. From the design of "universal" approaches and methods and efforts to implement them in different contexts without consideration of contextual differences until the implementation of international projects (...), the role and objectives of the English teaching has to be more elaborated carefully according to the specific characteristics of each context, avoiding generalities and supposed "universalities" that diminish the image of our profession and question the efficiency of our task.(p. 27-28) (Own Translation)

Kumaravadivelu (2003) asserted that:

Teachers, if they serious about ensuring social relevance in the classroom, cannot all afford to ignore the sociopolitical and sociocultural reality that influences identity formation in the classroom nor can they afford to separate the linguistic needs of learners from their social needs. In other words, they can hardly satisfy their pedagogic obligations without at the same time satisfying their social obligations.(p.258)

It is mentioned that an overlooking of adequate methodologies and social context are supposedly a principal mistake on an assumption that framed linguistic concepts can be adjusted to any different reality. However, we need to start with the basics those
teachers and trainers have sometimes no clear concepts about approaches and methods. For example, we have likely heard the titles EFL and ESL used across language classrooms. Though ESL and EFL are both applied interchangeably, they manifest distinct approaches to English language instruction for non-native speakers. Hence, teachers utilize methodologies developed in foreign countries that are very different from the students’ reality and it is important to mention those methodologies come in ESL materials.

Oré (2013) reflected this way:

Despite the differences between English as a second language (ESL) and English as a Foreign language (EFL) contexts in terms of language and learning needs, it is common to verify in practice a treatment and references to both contexts as undifferentiated entities, especially when it comes to applying in any of them methods which applicability is presumably "universal". (p. 27-28) (Own Translation)

Oré (2013) advanced that ESL and EFL are different in context teaching, the usual distinction made by literature between ESL and EFL contexts defines the former as the one in which the language studied in class is also used in the immediate social environment, usually as a mother tongue -Thus, ESL is studied in any English-speaking country; - In a context of EFL, however, the practice and use of the language is often limited to the classroom- this is the case, for example, of Peru or any other Latin American nation in which Spanish is the natural mean of social communication-. (p. 28) (Own Translation)

Richards and Rodgers (1986), quoted in Oré (2013) said that:

(...) they have questioned the widespread belief that – as it has been reflected by so many EFL teaching methods over the years – ‘the needs and objectives of
students are identical’, what they need is simply ‘language’, and the method that it proposes the best way to teach it. (p. 29) (Own Translation)

On the one hand, no argument based on the naturality of the expansion of English has been proven to be sufficient enough to explain the persistent ESL/EFL confusion. In the other hand, the concrete needs of ESL specific contexts, joined together with ESL’s commercial efforts of material publishers and their search for wider and more universal markets, are still the most decisive reference and they provide the most common explanation for this confusion. (Oré, 2013, p. 30) (Own Translation)

Ellis (1986) proposed that:

Second language acquisition is not intended to contrast with foreign language acquisition SLA is used a general term that embraces both untutored (or “naturalistic”) acquisition and tutored (or “classroom”) acquisition. It is however, and open question whether the way in which acquisition proceeds in these different situations in the same or different.(p. 5)

Oré (2013) emphasized a clearly difference between EFL and ESL that: the historical tradition of our professional area has been based until today on approaches of supposed universal applicability, omnipresent "one-size" methods for teaching English anywhere in the world and materials that are indistinctively valid for ESL and EFL contexts.(p. 31) (Own Translation)

Following Bowers (1986), Oré (2013) infered that "International experts on ESL often believe that the solutions they conceive for their context are, in one way or another, solutions for other people anywhere."(p. 31) (Own Translation)

2.2.1.3 The classroom and the outside environment

The social context of English language education, or any language education, can be broken into two different aspects: macro and micro. We can approach the macro aspect,
then, as a key to learning more about the types of relationships that form within the classroom and what methods can be utilized to teach language in a more applicable way. It is important to note that different countries have different methodologies that will be appropriate to them. More specifically, given the diverse social contexts of Peru, any study on this topic must focus on a particular region, district, or residential area in order to pick experiences, needs, goals, customs, and lives from students.

The macro context includes the wider societal and institutional influences on what happens in the classroom. Van Lier defines the micro aspect as “involving the wider community” On the other hand, the micro-social context consists of the socio-psychological aspect of group dynamics within the classroom. (Holliday, 1994, p. 14)

Similar contributions have emerged for the English teaching professional a role that evidences more sensitivity and concern for the context (a "contextual-sensitive" role) highlight among these contributions of Zeicher & Liston (1996), whose vision of the teacher as a "reflective professional" or "researcher" links the interaction of classes -micro level, with the broader institutional and social context in which the teaching-learning of English takes place -the macro level. (Oré, 2013, p. 32) (Own Translation)

Liston and Zeichner (1990), quoted in Kumaravadivelu (2003) mentioned that:

It is simply impossible to isolate classroom life from the school’s institutional dynamics, the ever-present tensions within the community, and the larger social forces.... in order to act effectively we have to recognize the influence of the social context.(p. 239)

Holliday (1994) and Coleman (1996), quoted in Oré (2013) stated that:

They made interesting observations on the "ritual forms of behavior" that occur inner and between English classrooms. Also, the way in which the national culture is reflected on school cultures and the effects of these two cultures: on
administrative aspects of the classroom and the personal interaction at the institutional level.(p. 32) (Own Translation)

Holliday (1997) also mentioned an extra influence of sociology and anthropology on classrooms: (...) we need to understand how these factors are different in different countries in order to determine what can be appropriate in terms of classroom methodology. Therefore, a sociology and anthropology of the classroom is necessary. A sociology is important because it can determine principles of influences across societies – generalisable principles about social actions which can be applied to all classroom situations. An anthropology is important because it can determine how these influences are different within specific societies – social features of specific classroom situations.(p. 14)

Oré (2013) affirmed that:

Our professional area does not seem to have paid enough attention to the fact that school experiences are usually given and implemented within the limits of a predetermined school curriculum given usually by a local ministry of Education. This curriculum tends to reflect the actual availability of resources, a series of minimum educational objectives and a set of social expectations determined by the context itself.(p. 31) (Own Translation)

To make teaching English as foreign language effective and relevant, one has to recognize that the representations of social, political, historical, and economic conditions that affect students and teachers also bounce off classroom aims and activities.

Coleman (1996), quoted in kumaravadivelu (2003), drew the following idea:

No classroom is an island unto itself. Every classroom is influenced by and is a reflection of the larger society of which it is a part. The term society itself refers to a very large unit consisting of a community of communities. In the
specific context of language education, it stands for “all of those wider (and overlapping) context in which are situated the institutions in which language teaching takes place. These include – but are limited to – the international, national, community, ethnic, bureaucratic, professional, political, religious, economic and family contexts in which schools and other educational institutions are located and which they interact. (p. 239)

Seeing, the necessary labor of connecting the teaching of English as a foreign language with the national context where it is applied and is taken to the schools. It is indispensable to have a proper and meaningful recognition of learning with an influence of the global context, and a clear awareness to link three levels; local, national and global context in an indisputable way that may give our profession credibility, strength and valuation. (Oré, 2013, p. 33) (Own Translation)

Holliday (1997) suggested that:

It can be defined the classroom as a microcosm which contains different elements in order to make the learning process progress. First, the classroom is influenced by students and their family and friends; they bring previous knowledge to classes so it is important to work with the background to hold students’ attention longer. Then, for teachers, the major influences are co-workers, institutions, universities or any training association. Third, the materials are our sources to teach curriculum developers, teachers, minister of education. In many ways, classroom interactions are among students, teachers, and materials. (p. 14)

Holliday (1997) stated a definition on classroom as a microcosm that: A macro view of the social context of teaching and learning requires that we look at how the classroom relates to the world outside. Indeed, there are many ways in which what
happens within the classroom reflects this world outside. As Bowers (1987, p. 8-9) suggests, “The classroom is a microcosm which, for all its universal magisterial conventions, reflects in fundamental social terms the world that lies outside the windows.” (…). Van Lier (1988, p. 9-10) suggests that the classroom possesses special features which crystallize the social world, such as routines and scripts, which occur in controlled contexts, and which make it particularly attractive to researchers. (p. 14-15)

Besides, Holliday (1994) laid out that “the host educational environment also includes influences on students and teachers from their respective peer and reference groups. A reference group of people which an individual looks to for self-evaluation, who provide the individual with values, standards, and goals”. (p. 15)

Holliday (1994) proposed another idea that for teachers, the major peers and reference groups would be colleagues, both in and out of the host institutions; these would, in turn, be influenced by professional associations, as well by training and other sources of attitudes toward expertise, such as universities. (p. 15-16)

Furthermore, Holliday (1994) said that the materials and the content and methodologies (…). These are of course created by teachers, to greater or lesser degrees through interaction with students. However, publishers, libraries, and production facilities within the host institution are important contributory elements within the host educational environment. (p. 15-16).
Holliday (1994) used this diagram to illustrate the ideas above:

**Figure 2:** The classroom and the host educational environment

Kumaravadivelu (2003) proposed the idea above to practical pedagogy in classrooms: Teachers have to allow themselves to bring the full range of appropriate sociocultural issues as topics for discussion on their classroom and use their learners’ varied experiences as sources of data for furthering their instructional goals. More specifically, teachers need to consider the following criteria from a practical pedagogic point of view:

- How they can make their learners aware of the complex connections between language use and culture identity;

- How they can sensitive themselves and their learners to the cultural richness that surrounds their classroom environment;
• How they can create conditions to enable and encourage their learners to participate in the negotiation and articulation of their culture meaning and values;

• How they can treat learners as cultural informants, and recognize and reward their cultural knowledge and individual identities;

• How they can design tasks and assignments to dispel stereotypes that create and sustain cultural misunderstandings and miscommunications; and finally,

• How they can help learners to “read” cultural events and activities in ways that resonate with their experience. (p. 274)

2.2.1.4 Language culture connection

Another problem in the profession is that English teachers and curriculum developers tend to standardize teaching methodologies with particular aspect in methodology, social, political and economic instruments to be thought in a different educational environment. It is not surprising that these teaching methodologies are designed very much with a particular instrumental approach in mind. But for all educators are visionary which means the development of comprehensive and flexible techniques of syllabus and curriculum is one of the best solutions to adjust foreign teaching programs to our social reality.

In addition to this, Oré (2013) mentioned that:

This is especially true if we refer to the formal educational contexts of EFL in which the role of English teaching has traditionally been a technical area disconnected from the institutional and social context. In this sense, an English teaching perspective that shows sensitivity to local EFL contexts and their characteristics, by the institutional role of English teachers and the teaching of the language itself – the vision of the English teacher as an educator and the teaching of English as an educational task. (p. 33) (Own Translation)
Following Wilhelm (1882), Kumaravadivelu (2003) advanced this reflexion:

Words should be presented in sentences, and sentences should be practiced in meaningful contexts and not be taught as isolated, disconnected elements. Introducing isolated sentences will result in pragmatic dissonance, depriving learning of necessary contextual clues, thereby rendering the process of meaning-making harder. (p. 214)

The old approaches to language teaching overlooked the vast diversity of world views that students have brought with them unto classes. It means, even though some learns, as in educational contexts, appear to share patterns of behaviors, values, and beliefs that guide their world view, they may slightly vary so far; consequently, those classes are not monocultural but rather are multicultural. With a standardized framework of teaching that does not belong to a TESEP (Tertiary, Secondary and Primary) English learning; indeed, the old approaches have failed to standardize at the rich cultural and linguistic resources that show most EFL classes.

Holliday (1994) claimed that “a probable reason for the difficulty of transporting these received English language teaching methodologies is that they are designed very much with a particular instrumental approach in mind.” (p.12)

In addition, Holliday (1994) highlighted that:

It is not surprising that methodologies designed for this type of situation may not adapt easily to the other part of the English language education profession, which is found in state education, either in primary and secondary schools or in universities and colleges. (p. 12)

Holliday (ibid), quoted in Oré (2013) explained also that:

The questionable universality of a good number of principles of validity quasi axiomatic in our professional area. Depending on, and
in consideration of the explicit and implicit ideological factors that
determine and condition the various local contexts, it has alerted the
relative applicability of these principles to specific national contexts.
Together against the so-called "universal" of our profession, we also
find it important to highlight the need to distinguish the nature, role
and objectives of learning and teaching English in different contexts
and at different levels of each national reality. (p. 58-59) (Own
Translation)

Oré (2013) mentioned that:

Despite the differences between English as a second language (ESL) and
English as a Foreign language (EFL) contexts in terms of language and
learning needs, it is common to verify in practice a treatment and references to
both contexts as undifferentiated entities, especially when it comes to applying
in any of them methods which applicability is presumably "universal". (p. 27-28) (Own Translation)

Beyond that, Oré (2013) noted that:

It has been a common practice to ignore that the students´ objectives may vary
dramatically but also these objectives must be determined before the
implementation of any approach or method. (p. 28) (Own Translation)

In order not to overlook the importance of the social context in foreign language
teaching and apply approaches and methods truly designed into EFL realities, Brown
(2001) advances the idea that English teachers have to apply the following classroom
applications:
1. Discuss cross-cultural differences with your students, emphasizing that no culture is “better” than another, but that cross-cultural understanding is an important facet of learning a language.

2. Include among your techniques certain activities and materials that illustrate the connection between language and culture.

3. Teach your students the cultural connotations, especially the sociolinguistic aspects, of language.

4. Screen your techniques for material that may be culturally offensive.

5. Make explicit to your students what you may take for granted in your own culture. (p. 64)

Richards (1986) noted that “language needed to be studied in the broader sociocultural context of its use, which included participants, their behavior and beliefs, the objects of linguistics discussion, and word choice.” (p. 69)

Larsen-Freeman (1986) drew the idea that:

Culture is the everyday lifestyle of people who use the language natively.

There are certain aspects of it that are especially important to communication - the use of nonverbal behavior, for example, which would therefore receive greater attention in the CA. (p. 134)

Larsen-Fraeman (1986) also added that taking into account if it is tried to transfer methodologies and teach them into cultural contexts what foreign values mismatch with local values, it creates a collision where there is no a rewarding contribution between the two realities. (p. 133)

Kumaravadivelu (2003) also highlighted that:

Communicative appropriateness depends on the social, cultural, political, or ideological contexts that shape meaning in a particular speech event. It
depends largely on the norms of interpretation, which varies from culture to culture. Acquiring knowledge of how extrasituational factors contribute to the process of meaning-making implies acquiring knowledge of how language features interface with cultural norms. (p. 212)

It is demanded that teaching English as a foreign language takes a more sensitive context roll, where culture can be split into three levels: national culture, professional culture, and institutional culture.

2.2.1.4.1 The context of the national culture

The words national culture themselves bring to mind ideas such as costumes, beliefs, traditions and a place with human history. Some countries have similar cultural frameworks including ideas, attitudes, behavior and religion that could be transformed one into another. This cultural transfer should not bring problems, but rather beneficially contribute in foreign experience exchanging of language and culture.

As Widdowson (1984), quoted in Oré (2013), proposed the remarkable problem of transfer that "The case of countries which ideologies and educational policies are distinctly different from those of English-speaking nations and" consequently, the areas of conflict will be obvious from the beginning of any attempt to "transfer."(p. 62) (Own Translation)

López (2000) commented that:

(... the insensibility of the educational systems that has not even recently taken into account the linguistic, cultural and social peculiarities of the learners (...).

Such poverty is also the product of the inability of Latin American educational systems to take into account the experiences, knowledge and skills of the learners they attend, despite of the fact of most generalized discourse of basic learning needs (...). (p. 5-6) (Own Translation)
Moreover, López (2000) emphasized that (...) the recovery and reconstruction of their histories, knowledge and of the consequent personal safety and self-esteem that such processes allow them, to enable the selective and critical appropriation of elements and products of other cultures as well as of the universal culture that enables them to find new and creative responses to the problems that confront their societies in the interests of better living conditions. (p. 17) (Own Translation)

Kumaravadiledu (2003) explained that:

Recall that a pedagogy of possibility demands for us take seriously the social and historical conditions that create the cultural forms and interested knowledge that give meaning to the lives of teachers and learners. As I have argued elsewhere (Kumaravadivelu, 2001), the experiences participants bring to the classroom are shaped not only by the learning and teaching episodes they have encountered in the past but also by a broader social, economic, and political environment in which they grew up. These experiences have the potential to affect classroom practices in ways unintended and unexpected by policy planners, curriculum designers, or textbooks producers. (p. 256)

A pragmatic educational ideology as in the United States of America (USA), for example, it surely tends to oppose of a country that in its own right can demand a high degree of acceptance of the established norms of conducts and to give special consideration of its educational policy even in the case of tasks and projects related to the teaching of English (ibid.p.24). The latter may the case of Peru, a country in which English is not one more component of the school curriculum and in which the foreign language teaching policy has and receives subsidiary attention in comparison with its ultimate educational partner’s objectives. (Oré, 2013, p. 62) (Own Translation)
The Diseño Curricular Nacional (DCN) (2015) added that:

(…) learning must be interconnected with the real life and social practices of each culture. If the teacher manages to make the learning meaningful for the students, it will make possible the development of the motivation to learn and the capacity to develop new learning and promoter the reflection on the construction of the same. (p. 18) (Own Translation)

The DCN (Ibid.), also, they develop affective, social, cultural and coexistence experiences that contribute to their integral development, and the progressive achievement of greater personal autonomy in order to apply what they have learned to situations of everyday life. (p. 13) (Own Translation)

The DCN (Ibid.):

The areas are curriculum organizers, which must be developed considering particular characteristics of the students, their needs, beliefs, values, culture, and language; in addition, the diversity of the human being, even more so in a multicultural and multilingual country as ours. (p. 39) (Own Translation)

The DCN (Ibid.), A process that consists of giving meaning to a text from the previous experiences of the students and their relationship with the context. (p. 12) (Own Translation)

The Orientaciones para el Trabajo Pedagógico (2010,) pointed out that

The learning of English brings with it the entrance to the culture of the English-speaking countries. This process, in the school, is carried out in parallel with the knowledge of its own culture: ways of life, customs, etc., in such a way that it is strengthening the identity with its own culture, developing its personal, social and cultural identity. (p. 12) (Own Translation)
The OTP (Ibid.), The national curriculum design of Regular Basic Education (DCN-EBR) contains general guidelines that must be adapted to the different realities and educational demands of the country”. (p. 23) (Own Translation)

The OTP (Ibid.) “a student must understand and respect the culture of others without considering that the culture of his/her country is better than the others”. (p. 53) (Own Translation) (Own Translation)

The OTP (Ibid.):

As the process of knowing the culture of the countries whose language is the object of learning, strengthens itself and develops an intercultural awareness that allows to locate both cultures in the world context and respect the culture in others.(p. 15) (Own Translation)

2.2.1.4.2 The Context of the Professional Culture

There are cultural forces from outside the classrooms which are reflected on teacher groups who have taught attitudes and allegiances from their academic cultural identity. These academic cultures have influence over practicing teachers to continue the status of the sociology of the education and defend their boundaries. At first sight, it might difficult to define one type of English language teaching. These two basic groups Britain, Austria, North America (BANA) and TESEP can be distinguished according to the countries they embrace in the world. Another difference is in terms of how the subjects which are taught are discerned by the learners. BANA’s methodology is essentially integrationist that means they focus on inter-disciplinary, discovery-oriented, team-oriented and democratic control; on the other hand, TESEP group tends to be collectionist, they have a strong allegiance with content-based pedagogy, subject-oriented, classroom practice and oligarchic control of the institution. Furthermore, there is a problematic transfer between the two branches BANA and TESEP, they differ from their learning
groups, the technology, the social influence, institutional norms and the commercial sector.

Oré (2013) said that:

Therefore; it is logical to infer that, although our profession can be seen at first glance a unified block, different "branches" of it such as BANA (Britain, Australia, and North America,) places where English is taught as a second language) or TESEP (Tertiary, Secondary, and Primary levels of countries in which English is taught as a foreign language) for sure they have different professional ideologies based on their own time in the broader ideologies of the respective national culture of which they emanate. (p. 63) (Own Translation)

Holliday (1994) asserted that:

I appreciate that it is impractical to speak of TESEP English language teachers as one consolidate group - varied as they are between tertiary, secondary and primary levels, between rural and urban areas, and across a whole variety of countries. (p. 71)

In addition to that, Holliday (1994) possessed the idea that “I wish to argue that the professional-academic culture of the TESEP teacher group is essentially collectionist. (…) I suggest that the professional-academic culture of the BANA English language teacher group is essentially integrationist” (p. 71)

Here we have a comparative chart taken from Holliday (1994) to explain about BANA and TESEP difference: (p. 72)
Table 1: Collection and integration.

Oré (2013) explained that:

(...)the series of efforts to teach English implemented over the years with the "professional belief" that "the ideas of the international experts (BANA) are in some way the answers for other people elsewhere" or in the critical finding that while teachers in the BANA area tend to show greater capacity to focus on methodological intricacies, aspect on which they base their experience, teachers of the TESEP branch may have greater social concerns and responsibilities that limit severely their methodological views. (p. 64) (Own Translation)

In addition, Holliday (1994) added that: whereas BANA teachers are often more able to concentrate on the intricacies of methodology, upon which their expertise is based on, TESEP English language teachers may have other, wider social preoccupations and responsibilities which can overrule their choice of methodologies. Their role in state education demands that they comply with wider
educational principles set by the institutions within which they work. TESEP English language teachers also need to consider how they fit within the structure of a host institution; and where this is itself collectionist in orientation. (p. 93)

TESEP teachers have a responsibility as role models in the process of socializing their students into membership of the wider society. Here, the purpose of education is primary not only to teach language skills according to the learner’s sociolinguistic needs, but also to take students or pupils through a complex process in preparation for life in their society. (…). In contrast, BANA English language education is likely to see socialization in the far narrower terms of preparing students language users or as participants in the learning group ideal.

A further factor potential conflict is the possibility that the integrationism which BANA professional-academic group attempts to import into largely collectionist TESEP institutions is in itself destructive. (…). (p. 94)

There is grave danger of teachers and curriculum developers, from both the BANA and TESEP groups, naively accepting BANA practice as superior, and boldly carrying what are in fact the ethnocentric norms of particular professional-academic cultures in English language education from one context to another, without proper research into the effect of their actions. (…) (p. 102)

2.2.1.4.3 The context of the institutional culture

There is no doubt some values and beliefs could not be transferred to a specific national culture or a profession since they respond to certain needs and stereotypes if it concerns to a BANA or TESEP teaching field. Unfortunately, It is inevitable such as conflict can be caused as well by using inappropriate images or texts from foreign cultures into teaching English in EFL classrooms.
Oré (2013) affirmed that:

It is regrettable in this sense that pretending to teach "different" ways of seeing the world, ESL methods and related materials have been oriented for many years to instill into students or cause alienating images (...) as in the stereotypical vignettes of American cinema or TV -have tended to project essentially, almost as a rite, its superlative characteristics. (p. 65) (Own Translation)

Oré (2013) posited an additional idea that (...) it is totally alienating as it implies a negative assessment of the student's own personal identity and culture and, at least, to a conflict with his self-esteem. It is also assumed that a risky generalization of emphasis on superfluous characteristics (...). (p. 65) (Own Translation)

Oré (2013) reflected this way that:

(...) it only encourages students to form a conceptual map that idealizes this place by projecting an image of perfection that (...) minimizes the characteristics of their own city or immediate surroundings. Depending on the objectives of a formative nature of our educational system; for example, students must first know his/her immediate context as it is, learning to value it as their own, with virtues and defects. (...) (pp. 65, 67) (Own Translation)

Cummins (2001) highlighted that: students do not need to learn the concept of saying the time again; it is enough to acquire new labels or "superficial structures" for an intellectual ability that have already been internalized. Similarly, in more advanced phrases, a transfer between languages is produced while learning academic skills, of reading and writing, for example, how to distinguish the main idea of the secondary details in a written passage or in a history, or how to identify
cause and effect, or how to distinguish a fact from an opinion and to situate chronologically the sequence of facts in a narrative or historical narration. (p. 5)

They are, apparently, alienating content and messages or excessively artificial images (...) - which must constitute a real priority concern for our profession when it comes to discussing its cultural components, the possibilities of conflict of values, beliefs and ways of thinking or its inevitability. (Oré, 2013, p. 68)

Textbooks are not a neutral medium. They represent cultural values, beliefs, and attitudes. They reflect a social construction that may be imposed on teachers and students and that indirectly constructs their view of a culture. (...). Critical recognition of the hidden cultural values embedded in centrally produced textbooks is a prerequisite for ensuring social relevance in the L2 classroom. Textbooks, to be relevant, must be sensitive to aims and objectives, needs and wants of learners from a particular pedagogic setting. (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 255)

Cummins (2001) advanced the idea that:

However, "assimilation" is similar to some aspect to "exclusion", in the sense that both orientations are designed to make the "problem" disappear. Under both policies, the culturally different groups become invisible and lose their voice. Assimilation policies in the educational world encourage students not to use their mother tongues. Students who maintain their culture and language are less able to identify with the host culture and learn the official language in the society (p. 2) (Own Translation)

Snook (1972) argued that "some cases of teaching may not be cases of indoctrination" but, greater or lesser degree, "all cases of indoctrination are teaching cases." The very concept of indoctrination, therefore, cannot be graciously disconnected from the concept of teaching. For this reason, it is my opinion that the systematic use of
materials for teaching English that disseminate false images or stereotypes of Anglo-Saxon culture by inexperienced teachers who see the teaching of English dissociated from an educational ideology can cause students an alienating effect that resembles the description of "indoctrination" (...). (quoted in Oré, 2013, p. 70)

Also, Snaw (1985) contemplated the following idea:

Of course, cultures differ somewhat in their behavior, and these differences are reflected in language. Although most utterances will retain their value across language boundaries (if correctly translated), problems will arise in specific and limited cases. For instance, there may be languages where all requests are marked as such (perhaps by a special particle or intonation pattern), so that a simple unmarked statement such as “There´s a window open” cannot in these languages function as a requests. Speakers of such languages who study English (and English-speaking students of these languages) will need contrastive information about this particular point if they are to understand or speak correctly. Again, there are phrases and sentences in any language which conventionally carry intentional meaning that are not evident from their form. (...)(p. 10)

Oré (2013) clarified that:

(...) it is reasonable to think that there should be or seek a minimum degree of coincidence of values, beliefs, and attitudes if we hope some type of "cultural transference" or "technological transference" might achieve even a relative success through the teaching of English. In this sense, the clear influence of cultural factors implicit in, determined by and derived from; social, economic and political influences will be decisive -it must be said once again -to consider
a relative applicability and adequacy of approaches and methods for teaching English in the world. (p. 72-73) (Own Translation)

Cortazzi and Jin (1999), quoted in Kumaravadivelu (2003), suggested that:

Three types of cultural information that can be used in preparing teaching materials:

1. Target cultural materials that use the cultural of a country where English is spoken as a first language.
2. Source culture materials that draw on the learner’s own culture as content; and
3. International target culture materials that use a variety of cultures in English and non-English speaking countries around the world. (p. 256)

2.2.2 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Many times it seems that as teachers who have undergone a process of training or have experienced certain exposure to teaching methodology, particularly of the ESL variety, we take for granted that we’re dealing with a changeable and unique group of individuals. The culture outside (and thus inside) the classroom is in a constant state of flux. This mean that teachers must be constantly amending their methods, varying their lesson plans, and complicating their previously held notion of how to impart knowledge to a class of diverse learners.

As ESL teachers, our students may come from many different backgrounds, may be from societies or cultures different to ours, and we must be prepared to take on this challenge. CLT or CA is thus a pathway to success in such myriad conditions. The flow
of ideas, self-concepts, and theories in the classroom environment should consequently not be a burden for the instructor, but an opportunity for further enrichment and inclusion.

Given all of this freedom to communicate and express one’s self in the classroom, we must also maintain a certain degree of structure for students to effectively learn language. Weak/strong teaching methods can be used to balance the use of the CA, especially for those who deny the complete efficacy of this approach. Informal chatter in the classroom can have just as strong an effect of learning as rote vocabulary memorization or a graded language workbook activity. The key, is to make students produce language, without worrying about their minute mistakes or own fear of being incapable of communicating. This latter preoccupation should thus be regulated to the realm of the impossible: communication is always present.

2.2.2.1 What is communication?

Before starting to talk about how communicative the CA is and that it is grounded and justified on the interpretation that language learning is learning to communicate, we need to define an important term that will help us understand the use of a language.

Communication is part of a language, it is the process of conveying and transmitting information; however, it needs to be carried out by 2 or more people called the speaker and the listener. Another aspect of communication is its effectiveness. That is, that the receiver understands the exact information or idea that the sender intended to transmit. The following is a good definition of communication:

The term 'Communication' has been derived from the Latin word 'communis' that means 'common'. Thus 'to communicate' means 'to make common' or 'to make known'. This act of making common and known is carried out through exchange of thoughts, ideas or the like. The exchange of thoughts and ideas can be had by gestures, signs, signals, speech or writing. People are said to be
in communication when they discuss some matter, or when they talk on telephone, or when they exchange information through letters. Basically, communication is sharing information, whether in writing or orally.\(^1\)

Another definition is found in the Oxford Dictionary:

Communication: Noun

1. the imparting or exchanging of information or news:

   *I am in communication with London.*

2. A letter or message containing information or news.

3. The successful conveying or sharing of ideas and feelings:

   *There was a lack of communication between Pamela and her parent's*

4. social contact:

   *She gave him some hope of her return, or at least of their future communication.*\(^2\)

Given that CLT is very widely used and studied, defining it objectively can be a difficult task. As such, we can approximate an adequate definition by providing a series of goals and techniques at the center of this theory.

According to Brown (2001):

It is a unified but broadly based, theoretically well informed set of tenets about the nature of language and of language learning and teaching...For the sake of simplicity and directness, I offer the following six interconnected characteristics as a description of CLT: (p. 43)

1. Classroom goals are focused on all of the components (grammatical, discourse, functional, sociolinguistic, and strategic) of communicative
competence. Goals, therefore, must intertwine the organizational aspects of language with the pragmatic.

2. Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are not the central focus, but rather aspects of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purposes.

3. Fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques. At times fluency many have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use.

4. Students in a communicative class ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in an unrehearsed context outside the classroom. Classroom tasks must, therefore, equip students with the skills necessary for communication in those contexts.

5. Students are given opportunities to focus on their own learning process through an understanding of their own styles of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for autonomous learning.

6. The role of the teacher is that of facilitator and guide, not at all-knowing best owner of knowledge. Students are therefore encouraged to construct meaning through genuine linguistic interaction with others.

Richard and Rodgers (1986) commented that:

There is no single text or authority on it, nor any single model that is universally accepted as authoritative. For some, CLT means little more than an integration of grammatical and functional teaching. Littlewood (1981: 1) states, ‘One of the most characteristic features of communicative language
teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language.’ For others, it means using procedures where learners work in pairs or groups employing available language resources in problem-solving tasks. (p. 66)

Oré (2013) explained that:

Unlike previous approaches, the Communicative Approach (AC) part of a cognitive vision of learning while praising the fact that learning of a language is eminent but not exclusively a cognitive task - it suggests, therefore, that effective factors such as attitude and motivation deserve attention. (p. 47)

2.2.2.1.1 Nature and Function of language

We understand human language as an individual ability or every single person’s characteristics. Besides, it depends on how biology allows speakers to do it; language cannot be developed isolated from the society or arise out of the social interaction; consequently, it is a social phenomenon, but biological. As a result, it is an interaction between particular human beings and even before a process of individualization establishing as human speakers of a certain language; where a fundamental precondition of language appears in the constitution of a consensual domain. The language arises from a beginning of a consensual domain which is produced in the social interaction differentiation between human language and the one observed in other species. Also, another characteristic of the language is its recursive capacity that means language speakers may turn language about itself; for instance, a language could be talked about; speech, linguistic differences, own language, the way humans coordinate their coordination of actions. Therefore, it could do that over and over. We are what we are as consequence the relationships establishing with others. A person is incorporated as interactions with others.
In other words, a basic principle of the systematic approach is the recognition that human behavior is modeled by the structure of the system to which individuals belong and by the position they occupy in such a system. When the structure of the system changes, it can be expected that an individual’s behavior will change as well. Individuals act according to the social systems they belong to. But through their actions, although conditioned by these social systems, they can also change such as social systems. One of the greatest contributions of language is the competition that offers people to invent and regenerate a meaning in their lives. The language also allows us to take full responsibility for our lives or allow us to choose the actions that will lead us to become the being we have chosen. It is an instrument of fundamental importance in the design of our lives, ourselves and the world.

When referring to the function of language, we, as communicative promoters of the foreign language, take as a primary goal the enabling of our students to communicate using the target language. Consequently, teachers and trainers have to emphasize the language function, forms, structures and vocabulary so that students will be able to use the language in negotiation meaning if they just merely know the rules of language usage.

Echeverría (2003), in addition, affirmed that:

1. “The individual is the one who speaks and listens, then the individual is assumed as a precondition of language”. (p. 30) (Own Translation)

2. We do not oppose this vision, it is postulated; however, that the members are not particular species where they are also constituted in the language. This implies that language proceeds from these individuals. It is clear that in order to speak, certain biological conditions must be given. A biologist, Humberto Maturana, reminds
us of saying that we can only do what our biology allows us to do; we cannot go beyond the limits of our biological capacities, but language is not generated by our biological capacities nor isolated way. Language is born of social interaction between human beings. As a result, language is a social, non-biological phenomenon. Before we could be constituted as people in the process of individualization a fundamental precondition of language is the constitution of a consensual domain where it consensually allows the participants to share the same system of signs (gestures, sounds, etc.) to designate objects, actions, and coordinate common actions. A consensual domain constitutes the interaction of individuals in a social context. (p. 30) (Own Translation)

3. Following Maturana, a consensual domain is still not enough to produce the phenomenon of language because of language, as a phenomenon, it is what an observer thinks when he sees consensual coordination of action coordination –when the participating members of an action coordinate how they coordinate the action together. Language, we uphold, is a recursive coordination of behavior. (p. 31) (Own Translation)

4. The linguistic capacity of human beings and other species differ in our ability to encompass a large number of consensual signs and especially to create new ones. There is also another factor that is the recursive capacity of human language; that means the language itself can deal with itself, to talk about linguistic differences, about speech, on how we coordinate our coordination of actions. Thus it is
concluded that once the biological capacities are in order, we need social interaction as a breeding ground for the emergence of language. (p. 32) (Own Translation)

5. Individuals are truly constituted from the place that these human beings occupy within broader linguistic systems through a language which is a system of coordinating coordination of actions in the community, in social practices and as such members interact each other. This language system is a diversified interaction in which each member plays a different role. This role allows us to establish ourselves as the beings that we come from the relationships with other individuals.

6. Individuals act according to the social systems from which they belong to. But through their actions, but conditioned by these social systems." It is the relationship between the social system and the individuals, between the whole and its parts, which produce the dynamics of development. The social system constitutes the individual, in the same way, that the individual constitutes the social system. (p. 35) (Own Translation)

Larsen-Freeman (1986) stated that:

Furthermore, since communication is a process, it is insufficient for students to simply have knowledge of the target language forms, meanings, and functions. Students must be able to apply this knowledge in negotiation meaning. It is through the interaction between speaker and listener (…) the meaning becomes clear. (p. 123)
The DCN (2015) proposed the following idea:

The area adopts the CA which implies learning English in full operation, in simulations of communicative situations and meeting the needs of the students’ interests. The learning of a language is done with authentic texts and with complete meaning, thus avoiding the presentation of words and isolated phrases that do not contribute the meaning. (p. 359) (Own Translation)

The OTP (2010) points out that:

Learning a language in its use. Students should communicate in the target language in the most appropriate way. Employing tools to generate student participation in such a way that classes are motivating and participating and therefore learning is to become meaningful. (p. 8) (Own Translation)

The function of language is also concerned with the communicative meanings that a language learner needs to understand and express. Basically, these meanings describe requests, denials, offers, complaints, etc. Indeed, this function has to be seen in a social context of its use and even more broadly than learning a language in a classroom; we also have to recall how we as children manage to deal with the function of language. Holliday (1975), quoted in Richards and Rodgers (1986), gives us more details: (…) seven basic functions that language performs for children learning their first language: (p. 70-71)

1. The instrumental function: using language to get things.
2. The regulatory function: using to control the behavior of others.
3. The interactional function: using language to create interaction with others.
4. The personal function: using language to express personal feelings and meanings.
5. The heuristic function: using language to learn and to discover.
6. The imaginative function: using language to create a world of the imagination.

7. The representational function: using language to communicate information.

When we interact in a conversation, language is used to carry out some functions. In addition to this, we have to use these functions within a social context. At this stage, if our students infer from the latter assumption that they are expected to have language competence, clearly our expectations will be fulfilled. The stage, entitled language or Communicative Competence (CC), has three basic parts: linguistic competence; the knowledge of forms and meanings; the knowledge the function of the language is used for and the meaning that students take into consideration since the language can be used for a variety of functions.

Larsen-Freeman (1986) also stated that:

The goal of Teacher is to have one’s student become communicatively competent (...). CC involves being able to use the language appropriate to a given social context. To do this, students need knowledge of the linguistic forms, meanings, and functions. They need to know that many different forms can be used to perform a function and also that a single can often serve a variety of functions. They must be able to choose from among these the most appropriate form given the social context and the roles of the interlocutors. They must also be able to manage the process of negotiation meaning with their interlocutors. (p. 131)

Beyond to this, Kumaravadivelu (2003) mentioned that language communications is inseparable from its communicative context. Taken out of context, language communication makes little sense. What all this means to learning and teaching an L2 is
that we must introduce our learners to language as it is used in communication contexts even if it selected and simplified for them; otherwise, we will be denying and important aspect of its reality. (p. 204)

2.2.2.2 Principles

2.2.2.2.1 Meaningful learning

Teachers can handle from different resources to be presented in class, so students can benefit from that diversity of various topics and contexts so that in simple words, themes should be shown in sentences with meaningful contexts and not be taught as isolated, disconnected to their reality, if contexts mismatch, they need to be adapted to leaners´ context. Introducing foreign topics will sooner or later result in a dissonance, depriving the learning process, hence no acquisition of useful information.

With the tenets of the CA in mind, it is clear that “We are concerned with how to facilitate lifelong language learning among our students, not just with the immediate classroom task.” (Brown, 2001, p. 42)

The activities that occur within the classroom must have a link to the outside world, the personal goals, and the motivation of the students. Additionally, the learning process, not just the material covered, must be meaningful to the students.

Based on Finocchiario & Brumfit (1983), Brown (2001) suggested that “teachers help learners in any way that motivates them to work with the language...Language is often created by the individual through trial and error.” (p. 45)

Moreover, one of the basic assumptions of the CA is that students will be more motivated to study a foreign language since they will feel they are learning to do something useful with the language they study. (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 133).

Indeed, interest and motivation are essential to meaningful learning on the student’s part. If the student does not have his own set of goals in mind when learning the
target language, it will be difficult to apply the CA values mentioned above. “Intrinsic motivation will spring from an interest in what is being communicated by the language (Finocchiario & Brumfit, 1983).” (Brown, 2001, p. 45).

Yet, what exactly makes learning meaningful? The present investigation describes how by taking social context further into account, teachers can produce more meaningful class curricula. As stated by Larsen-Freeman (1986):

> When we communicate, we use the language to accomplish some function, such as arguing, persuading, or promising. Moreover, we carry out these functions within a social context...Students must be able to apply this knowledge in negotiating meaning. It is through the interaction between speaker and listener (or reader and writer) that meaning becomes clear. (p. 123)

This is not to say, however, that every moment spent in the classroom must be planned and proven through repeated use. In fact, “More spontaneity is present in communicative classrooms: students are encouraged to deal with unrehearsed situations under the guidance, but not control, of the teacher” (Brown, 2001, p. 44).

**Language for real social context**

To some extent, of course, we assume that to put into practice a structured framework to teach languages, somehow helps us to develop a good class; however what greatly concerns me is that all ideas work in different social contexts. Bowers (1986) also claimed that:

> (…) what is effective here and now may or may not be effective there and now or here and sometime else. When we apply this understanding to the export of methodological norms from the inner circle to the outer and expanding circles -
for these terms apply in language education, in my view, as they do in language -we, as purveyors of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) expertise, have to recognize the fact of differential development. This is to say that especially when we take account of cross-cultural preferences -no current method can be uniquely and invariably good (…).(p. 406)

Hence, we as English teachers not only need to research methods or techniques that are part of our pedagogic approach knowledge but we must consider and find out more about the social context.

Bowers (1986) noted that:

(…) the interaction between pedagogic approach and pedagogic context. Not only is the effectiveness of methods and techniques but their basic feasibility controlled but the current resources of the context (…).(p. 406)

(…) we find it difficult to recognize that just as in technology so also in methodology -for different contexts the latest is not necessarily the best. Between ourselves and those we teach and we train, there must evolve an appropriate methodology– appropriate to the social, economic, and cultural context of those on the receiving (…).(p. 398)

After the arguments of the foregoing quotes, it is attested that languages need to be studied interacting between a pedagogical approach and a sociocultural pedagogic context of its use which included participants, their beliefs and feelings, and word outside all together in classroom. Regarding the participants, we include teachers, students, and materials with their reference groups who participate in the educational environment.
Holliday (1997) pointed out that:

A reference group is the group of people which an individual looks to for self-evaluation, who provide the individual with values, standards and goals (...).

For students, these would include other students and other parties such as family members who provide role models. There would also be expectations brought to the classroom experiences, (...). For teachers, the major peer and references groups would be colleagues, both in and out of the host institution; these would in turn be influenced by professional associations, as well as by training and other sources of attitude towards expertise, such as universities. (...). A third important participant in the classroom, after students and teachers, is the materials and the content and methodologies which they carry. These are of course created by teachers, to greater or lesser degrees through interaction with students. However, publishers, libraries and productions facilities within the host institutions are important contributory elements within the host educational environment. All of these are also influenced by teachers and students groups. (see figure 1 on page 32 for further illustration) (p. 16)

Students’ beliefs and feelings are relatively useful motivation and integrative one also as part of usage of language in real contexts because they, as speakers, will choose a particular way to express their arguments not only based upon ideas, but also on level of emotion. Larsen-Freeman D. (1986) said that:

(...) Students will be more motivated to study a foreign language since they will feel they are learning to do something useful with the language they study. Also, teachers give students an opportunity to express their individuality by having them share their ideas and opinions on a regular basis. This helps
students “to integrate the foreign language with their own personality and thus to feel more emotionally secure with it” (Littlewood, 1981, p. 94). Finally, students’ security is enhanced by the many opportunities for cooperative interactions with their fellow students and the teacher. (p. 133)

The last point, which greatly relies on how to teach languages according to real contexts, teachers have to identify the outside world where their real social context with communication takes place. Classrooms need to show what students experience in their outside world so when they go out outside, language learners must be able to choose from among of the pieces of information given in the classroom to communicate with their interlocutors.

Holliday (1997) posited that:

A macro view of the social context of teaching and learning requires that we look at how the classroom relates to the world outside. Indeed, there are many ways in which what happens within the classroom reflects this world outside. As bowers (1987, p. 8-9) suggests, “The classroom is a microcosm which, for all its universal magisterial conventions, reflects in fundamental social terms the world that lies outside the windows.” (…). Van Lier (1988,p. 9-10) suggests that the classroom possesses special features which crystallize the social world, such as routines and scripts, which occur in controlled contexts, and which make it particularly attractive to researchers. (p. 15)

Holliday (1997) also mentioned an extra influence of sociology and anthropology on classrooms :(...) we need to understand how these factors are different in different countries in order to determine what can be appropriate in terms of classroom methodology. Therefore, a sociology and anthropology of the classroom is necessary. A sociology is important because it can determine principles of influences across societies –
generalisable principles about social actions which can be applied to all classroom situations. An anthropology is important because it can determine how these influences are different within specific societies – social features of specific classroom situations. (p. 14)

2.2.2.2 Authentic language (AU)

AU plays an integral role in applications of CLT. Yet AU must be utilized correctly in the classroom to achieve a meaningful result among students. As cited in Brown, “A great deal of use of authentic language is implied in CLT, as we attempt to build fluency (Chambers 1997).” (Brown, 2001, p.43).

Larsen-Freeman (1986) concurred that “Whenever possible, ‘AU’-language as it is used in a real context- should be introduced.” (p. 128)

Teachers should also take into account that there are limits to the uses of AU:

Avoid overdoing certain CLT features: engaging in real-life, AU in the classroom to the total exclusion of any potentially helpful controlled exercises, grammatical pointers, and other analytical devices; or simulating the real world but refraining from ‘interfering’ in the ongoing flow of language (Brown, 2001, p. 46).

AU activities ought to appear in any given curriculum in a variety of ways as to introduce the student to the many variations of English language use. According to Larsen-Freeman (1986):

To overcome the typical problem that students can’t transfer what they learn in the classroom to the outside world and to expose students to natural language and a variety of situations, adherents of the CA advocate the use of authentic language materials. (p. 135)

To choose an AU when you teach languages, it is perhaps based upon knowing what happen between people in the classroom, and considering that the classroom culture must be influenced by the cultural outside the classroom. In other words, there are specific
social-contexts where people will interact differently in different educational environments. Therefore, learning about the classroom takes part of investigating aspects of our classroom and of course knowing the culture in what people’s behavior takes place.

According to Holliday (1997), there are the following prerequisite to become appropriate English language teaching methodology appropriate:

a) It should have a built-in facility for the teacher to reflect upon and learn about the social dimension of the classroom and to continue learning.

b) It should, therefore, incorporate ongoing ethnographic action research.

c) It should be able to put into practice what has been learned and should, therefore, be continually adaptable to whatever social situations emerge. (p. 164)

Regarding the latter assumptions, the author brings in the idea that an authentic methodology must be culturally sensitive, which means being aware of the surrounding culture and considering using into classrooms. Holliday A. (1997) poses and Ethnographic research that is focusing on people’s behavior. The quotes below are Holliday’s (1997) proposals that “An appropriate methodology, which must by nature be culture sensitive, therefore has two major components: a teaching methodology and a process of learning about the classroom.” (p. 161-162). Also, “ethnography is particularly important because it is a branch of anthropology which studies the behavior of groups of people.” (p. 163)

Clearly, the CA is essentially adaptable, has different learning modes, and is culturally sensitive; thus, teachers should employ CA so that it fits her or his own situations. To add the idea above, Holliday. (1997) argues that “I wish to argue that the CA already contains potentials or cultured-sensitivity which can be enhanced and developed to suit any social surrounding and TESEP classrooms.” (p. 165)
Kumaravadivelu (2003) claimed about communicative appropriateness that:

It depends on the social, cultural, political, or ideological contexts that shape meaning in a particular speech event. It depends largely on the norms of interpretation, which varies from culture to culture. Acquiring knowledge of how extrasitualional factors contribute to the process of meaning making implies acquiring knowledge of how language features interface with cultural norms. (p. 212)

2.2.2.2.3 Communicative events

The most obvious feature of CLT is that most activities done in classroom are done with an intention of conveying and transmitting information. CLT departs from the idea that language is for communication of ideas or messages productively and receptively. Its goal is developed CC. The quote below is Holliday’s (1997) pointed of view:

A development view, on the other hand, sees the advent of communication language teaching as an important breakthrough in which the language learner is no longer an empty receptacle who must learn a new language by means of a new set of stimulus – response behavior traits, but an intelligent, problem solving person, with an existing communicative competence in a first, or perhaps second or third language. Once this breakthrough is appreciated, it is no longer possible to go back to choose and earlier method if communicative language teaching does not appeal. What is needed is a further development of the CA. (p. 166)

The following are some characteristics advanced by Finocchiaro and Brumfit’s (1983) to compare of the Audio-lingual Method and CLT:

Dialogues, if used, center around communicative functions and are not normally memorized; Drilling may occur, but peripherally; Comprehensible
pronunciation is sought; Judicious use of native language is accepted where feasible; Reading and writing can start from the first day, if desired; Students are expected to interact with other people, either in the flesh, through pair and group work, or in their writing. (Brown, 2001, p. 45).

The types of possible communicative events vary widely, and Larsen-Freeman (1986) argues that “Games are important because they have certain features in common with real communicative events -there is a purpose to the exchange. Also, the speaker receives immediate feedback from the listener on whether or not she has successfully communicated”.

Picture strip stories, in which students must predict the parts of a story based on a sequence of pictures, and role-play, “very important in the CA because they give students an opportunity to practice communicating in different social contexts and in different social roles.

Richards (1986) proposed the idea that:

The range of exercises types and activities compatible with a communicative approach is unlimited, provided that such exercises enable learners to attain the communication, and require the use of such communicative processes as information sharing, negotiation of meaning, and interaction. Classroom activities are often designed to focus on completing tasks that are mediated through language or involved negotiation of information and information sharing. (p. 76)

Furthermore, “The students find them (games) enjoyable, and if they are properly designed, they give students valuable communicative practice. Games that are truly communicative, according to Morrow (in Johnson and Morrow 1981), have three features of communication: information gap, choice, and feedback (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 136).
Speaking of CA, Brown (2001) manifests that language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic functional use of the language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are not the central focus, but rather aspects of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purposes. (p. 57)

Regarding the areas of language emphasized in the CA, Larsen-Freeman (1986) states that:

Students work on all four skills from the beginning. Just as oral communication is seen to take place through negotiation between speaker and listener, so too is meaning thought to be derived from the written word through an interaction between the reader and the writer. The writer isn’t present to receive immediate feedback from the reader, of course, but the reader tries to understand the writer’s intentions and the writer write with the reader’s perspective in mind. Meaning does not, therefore, reside exclusively in the text, but rather arises through negotiation between the reader and the writer. (p. 134)

2.2.2.2.4 Communicative Competence (CC)

According to Bachmann (1990) and Canale & Swain (1980), in its skeletal form, CC consists of some combination of the following components: organizational competence (grammatical and discourse); pragmatic competence (functional and sociolinguistic); strategic competence; psychomotor skills (Brown, 2001, p. 68).

Kumaravadivelu (2002) advanced the idea that:

CC is the ability to manipulate the system, selecting forms that not only make for coherent text but also meet goals and fit the ritual constraints of communication. That is, communicative competence is the ability to create
coherent text that is appropriate for a given situation within a social setting.

Brown (2001) references the central significance of CC when he posited that:

Given that CC is the goal of a language classroom, instruction needs to point toward all its components: organizational, pragmatic, strategic and psychomotor. Communicative goals are best achieved by giving due attention to language use and not just usage, to fluency and not just accuracy, to AU and contexts, and to students’ eventual need to apply classroom learning to previously unrehearsed contexts in the real world. (p. 69)

Larsen-Freeman (1986) reflected that:

CC involves being able to use the language appropriate to a given social context.” As such, students must be able to identify, from a variety of forms at their disposal, the correct variations to communicate in an efficient, competent manner.

In fact, CC has sub-elements, including linguistic competence, or the knowledge of forms and meanings. Separate from this type of competence is a knowledge of “the functions language is used for,” which takes into account “the social situation in order to convey [the] intended meaning appropriately.” (Larsen-Freeman, 1986,p. 133).

Among Brown’s guidelines for support communicative learning in an EFL setting is using class time for optimal authentic language input and interaction (Brown, 2001,p. 117).

One view is Chomsky’s, he explains about the fundamental characteristic of language that is creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences. According to Chomsky’s theory of competence, quoted in Richards (1986):
Chomsky held that linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal
speaker-listener in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows
its languages perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant
conditions as memory limitation, distractions, shifts of attention and interest,
and errors (random or characteristics) in applying his knowledge of the
language in actual performance. (p. 70)

The goal of teachers who use CLT in the area of English is related to CC and the
DCN (2015) supported the idea that:

The achievement of the communicative competence (...) the acquisition of
information of the most recent and latest scientific and technological advances,
either digital or printed in English, as well as the access to new information
and communication technologies to broaden their cultural horizon. In addition,
it creates conditions and opportunities for the management of innovative
methodologies that strengthen their autonomy in the learning of other
languages (p. 359) (Own Translation)

(…) forming student-citizens of the world who can communicate through
various means, either direct or indirect (…). (p. 359) (Own Translation)

The OTP (2010) claims that “to provide students with opportunities to
implement communicative, social and learning strategies that enable them to learn
how to communicate assertively”. (p. 8) (Own Translation)

The OTP (Ibid) affirms that “the communicative competence refers to the
capacities that students have developed to know what and how to say something at
the appropriate time according to the situation, the participants, their roles and their
communicative intentions.” (p. 9) (Own Translation)
2.2.2.3 Criticism for Communicative Language Teaching

Regarding the teaching contributions of the CA or CLT and how it has made positive progress in syllabus design in the last few years. Michael Swan, an ELT writer, contemplated theoretical ideas underlying the background knowledge and first language skills that students bring with them to classes. Swan also proposed the ideas of a double level of meaning according to rules of language and meaningful communicative behavior; and the ability to manipulate the language appropriately; and training learners with predicting and negotiating meaning skills in target language. All of this is a very positive improvement in pursuing the quality of foreign language learning.

2.2.2.3.1 Usage and use

According to Swan’s position, language has two propositional functions: usage and use, this can be specified by rules of communication and rules of use or in other words; the meaning according to rules of language and the meaningful communicative behavior.

Wilkins (1976) quoted in Swan (1985), posited the following idea:

One of the major reasons for questioning the adequate of grammatical syllabuses lies in the fact that even when we have described the grammatical (and lexical) meaning of a sentence, we have not accounted for the way it is used as an utterance... Since those things that are not conveyed by the grammar are also understood, they too must be governed by “rules” which are known to both speakers and hearer. People who speak the same language share not so much a grammatical competence as a CC. Looked at in foreign language teaching terms, this means that the learner has to learn rules of communication as well as rules of grammar. (p. 3)
Although the CA may have some new information and insights to contribute (for instance about the language of social interaction), there is nothing here to justify the announcement that we need to adopt a whole new approach to the teaching meaning. The argument about “usage” and “use”, whatever value it may have for philosophers, has little relevance to foreign language teaching. (Swan, 1985, p. 5)

Based on the prior Swan’s idea, Widdowson (1985) disagreed saying that:

Swan talks approvingly, for example, about the teaching of notions and functions: “We must make sure our students are taught to operate key functions such as, for instance, greeting, agreeing or warning.” But why should this be necessary if the function of an utterance (use) can always be inferred by a common-sense association of sentence meaning (usage) and situation, as has previously been claimed, and, in the case of warning, (...). And if Swan accepts that functions need to be taught as aspects of language other than structure and lexis, how does he propose that this should be done in a principled way without invoking the ideas about use and usage he has so summarily dismissed? (p. 2)

Swan (1985) answered Widdowson’s question:

Here is Widdowson again, this time talking about languages production, rather than comprehension. It is possible for someone to have learned a large number of sentence patterns and a large number of words which can fit into them without knowing how they are put to communicative use. (Widdowson, 1978, p. 18-19). He also adds up that “what is perhaps more novel is the suggestion that the value of any utterance in a given situation can be specified by rules (rules of communication or rules of use), and that is our business to teach these rules to our students.” (p. 4)
In addition to this, Swan (1985) draws the following examples, Widdowson asserts, effectively, that a student cannot properly interpret the utterance *the policeman is crossing the road* (or any other utterance, for that matter) if he knows only its propositional (structural and lexical) meaning. In order to grasp its real value in a specific situation, he must have learnt an additional rule about how the utterance can be used. (p. 4).

Also, Swan (1985) said that:

The ‘rules of use’ that determine how we interpret utterances such as Widdowson’s sentence about the policeman are mostly non-language-specific, and amount to little more than the operation of experience and common sense. The precise value of an utterance is given by the interaction of its structural and lexical meaning with the situation in which it is used. (…). If you indicate that you are hungry, the words “There’s some stew in the fridge” are likely to constitute an offer, not because you have learnt a rule about the way these words can be used, but simple because the utterance most plausibly takes on that value in that situation. (p. 5)

Wilkins (1983), quoted in Swan (1985), also added that:

It seems reasonable to assume that the relation of linguistic and pragmatic features that we have referred to here is characteristic of all languages. If we consider second language learners, there, it appears that although there will be values, attitudes, norms and even types of information that are culturally restricted and consequently not know to the learners, they will be aware that such relation does exist in principle and that much in their previous experience will remain relevant in the second language. What the learners have to learn is less that there is a connection between language and context than the forms and
meanings of the second language itself, together with whatever differences there are in the society that might affect the operation of the pragmatic element in communication. The learners will also know that if they can convey the meanings that they wish, even without making their intentions (i.e. illocutionary forces) explicit, the hearer has the capacity to make appropriate inferences ... Provided one understands the meaning of the sentences, in the nature of things one has every chance of recognizing the speaker’s intention. (p. 6)

2.2.2.3.2 The real goal of language teaching

This notion begins with the idea of choice adequate words, expressions, sentences and topics in the language between the speaker and the listener so that it is clear that the ability to manage grammatical structures does not determine a student is communicatively competent.

Scott (1981), quoted in Swan (1985), contemplated that:

Structural dialogues lack communicative intent and you cannot identify what communicative operations the learner can engage in as a result of practice. The result of purely structural practice is the ability to produce a range of usages, but not the ability to use forms appropriately. This is true even in cases where it looks as if communication is being taught. For example, the exclamation form “What a lovely day” might be covered. But the interest is in the form, not on when and where to use it or what you achieve by using it. (p. 6)

Johnson (1981), quoted in Swan (1985), affirmed that:

Most of us are familiar with this phenomenon of the structurally competent but communicatively incompetent student, and he bears striking witness to the
truth of the one insight which, perhaps more than any other, has shaped recent trends in language teaching. This is the insight that the ability to manipulate the structures of the language correctly is only a part of what is involved in learning a language. There is a “something else” that needs to be learned, and this “something else” involves that ability to be appropriate, to know the right thing to say at the right time (...) (p. 7)

Widdowson (1985) wrote the following question:

Again we are told that one of the reasons for poor performance at classroom comprehension tasks may be that “the learner’s command of the language is just fluent enough for him to decode the words, but this occupies all his faculties and he has no processing capacity to spare for “interpreting” what he hears”. But how is this possible if the ability to understand, that is to say to provide language items with appropriate communicative value in context, follows automatically from knowledge of language combined with the skills the learner has already acquired from the experience of using his own mother tongue? (p. 2)

In additions, Swan (1985) concured that:

Nobody would deny that there are language items that are appropriate only in certain situations, or (conversely) that there are situations in which only certain ways of expressing oneself are appropriate. English notoriously has a wealth of colloquial, slang, and taboo expressions, for instance, whose use is regulated by complex restrictions. In French, it is not easy to learn do things for you is a delicate business in most cultures, and this tends to be reflected in the complexity of the relevant linguistic rules. Although there is nothing particularly controversial or novel about this, it is an area where the CA (with
its interest in the language of interaction) has contributed a good deal to the coverage of our teaching. (p. 6)

2.2.2.3.3 Predicting skills and Negotiating meaning

These day the phase “language skills” is not limited to the four well-known activities of comprehension (reading and listening) and production (speaking and writing), but also it includes to think in terms of training learners with predicting and negotiating meaning behaviors in the target language. In particular, learners have to produce and understand language for particular purposes in each single situation. It is unreasonable to assume and take for granted that students cannot use their communicative skills from their first language (L1) to the second language (L2), so it is our duty as English teachers to give them the ability to predict recalling information based on their background knowledge of the subject in their L1. Furthermore, this is necessary to make students practice negotiation meaning in L2 since they already know, how to negotiate in L1, the important thing with the latter ability is that language learners will be exposed to samples of language and given word patterns in order that the communication goes on between a listener and a speaker.

Widdowson (1985) pointed out a question “So why do they need any training? Why indeed do we need to bother with teaching these abilities at all?”. (p. 2)

Swan (1985) quoted Widdowson (1978), in order to answer the question above:

If, for instance, there is a special “comprehension skill” involved in interpreting messages, then surely (it is claimed) we had better teach this skill to our students. Otherwise they will “comprehend” the words they “hear” as examples of usage”, but will fail to “listen” and “interpret” messages as
instances of “use”; they will respond to “cohesion” but not to “coherence”, and so on. (p. 8)

Widdowson (1985) emphasized this point of view:

This problem of poor performance may also, we are told, be caused by the fact that the learners ‘have been trained to read classroom texts in such a different way from “real-life” texts that they are unable to regard them as pieces of communication’. But how can this be? If they know the language, why can’t they automatically apply this knowledge? And what, anyway, does it mean to say that learners treat texts in a ‘different way’? How then is this distinct from regarding them as ‘pieces of communication’? These questions can be clarified by reference to the concepts of cohesion and coherence and strategies of prediction and negation, (…). We are told that the inability of learners to regard texts as pieces of communication is the result of poor methodology and that ‘the solution involves changing what happens in the classroom, not what happens in the student’. What exactly is it that might lead us to assess one methodology as poor, another good? What sort of change in the classroom is called for? And anyway what is the point, we might ask, of changing what happens in the classroom unless it brings about changes in the student? (p. 7)

Swan (1985) replied the idea above suggesting that:

One of the comprehension skills which we now teach foreigners is that of predicting. It has been observed that native listeners/readers make all sorts of predictions about the nature of what they are about to hear or read, based on their knowledge of the subject, their familiarity with the speaker or writer, and other relevant features. Armed with this linguistic insight (and reluctant to believe that foreigners, too, can predict), we ‘train’ students in ‘predictive
strategies’. (For instance, we ask them to guess what is coming next and then let them see if they were right or wrong.) But I would suggest that if a foreigner knows something about the subject matter, and something about the speaker or writer, and if he knows enough of the language, then the foreigner is just as likely as the native speaker to predict what will be said. And if he predicts badly in a real-life comprehension task (classroom tasks are different), it can only be for one of two reasons. Either he lacks essential background knowledge (of the subject matter or the interactional context), or his command of the language is not good enough. In the one case he needs information, in the other he needs languages lessons. In neither case does it make sense to talk about having to teach some kind of ‘strategy’. (p. 8)

Brumfit (1981), quoted in Swan (1985), posse this reflexion:

Speakers and writers perform an unconscious guessing game, because they have to establish what the agreed goals are (and this is not always clear, especially at the beginning of the conversation). As well as how much knowledge, or past experience, or understanding is shared. Thus if you ask me where live, I may answer ‘Britain’ or ’London’ or ‘Surrey’, or the name of the exact road, depending on why I think you asked me and how well I think you know South-east England. If I answer ‘London’ and you answer ‘Whereabouts in London?’ you are telling me that you want more specific information: we are negotiating about the purpose of the conversation, for you are showing that you really want to know, rather than just making a general social enquiry… .It needs to be emphasized that everyone, in any language, needs to develop the skills of adjustment and negotiation. (p. 9)
Swan (1985) also added that:

At higher levels, students may perform badly at classroom comprehension tasks (failing to make sense of texts that are well within their grasp) simple because of lack of interest; or because they have been trained to read classroom texts in such a different way from ‘real life’ texts that they are unable to regard them as pieces of communication. Here the problem is caused by poor methodology, and the solution involves changing what happens in the classroom, not what happens in the student. We cannot assume without further evidence that students lack comprehension strategies (p. 10)

This ‘tabula rasa’ attitude – the belief that students do not posses, or cannot transfer from their mother tongue, normal communication skills is one of two complementary fallacies that characterize the CA. (Swan, 1985, p. 10)

2.2.2.4 Weak version and strong version in teaching

When a teacher chooses CLT as method of teaching, he or she has to distinguish between the sense of a weak and strong version. The weak version has become one of the most well-known standard practices in many language classrooms. It provides learners with opportunities of using their English for communicative purposes and characteristically, attempts to have students with each other and with the teacher.

Holliday (1997) noted that:

This version focuses on the practice of language use, with the basic lesson input as presentation of language models. These models can be, and often are, in the form of ‘structures’, albeit within a context provided by a ‘function’, ‘notion’ or ‘topic’, followed by a ‘communicative activity’ to practice the language item (…). The weak version produces much of the classroom methodology in current use and has been successful in many ways; some of its
elements are restricted in applications to classrooms (...). Students’ oral participation is at a premium; and student talking time is an important measurement of a ‘good lesson’ (... (p. 170)

However, as we said before, what if effective for some students may or may not be effective for others. Now we know that there are different learning styles, especially when we teach large classes where everyone’s language production might not be monitored and where students behave according to their preferences and personalities. Thus the strong version of the communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired not only by oral communication but also written communication, for example: in texts, newspaper, books, etc, so that it is not merely a question of having students talk, but of giving them a greater amount of sources to develop the language system itself.

In addition to this, Holliday (1997) said that:

Whereas in the weak version the term ‘communicative’ relates more to students communicating with the teacher and with each other to practice the language forms which have been presented, in the strong version, ‘communicative’ relates more to the way in which the students communicates with the texts. (…) the student puts her or himself in the position of the receiver of the texts, in communication with the producer of the text (…) (p. 171)

Holliday (1997) said that: (…) as long as individual’s students are communication with rich texts and producing useful hypotheses about the language, what they are doing is communicative. The output, the producing of new texts, could certainly be the speaking or writing of something which displays the language forms taken from the first texts. It could also be a report of the activity outcome. (…) it will be whatever the student thinks as a
result of the activity, in the form of hypotheses. This might well be the subject of
discussion with peers during the activity, but might be internalized and not produce any
new external language until much later, possible outside the classroom. (p. 172)

Neville (2006), following Tollefson (1991), stated the idea that:

Language competence remains a barrier to employment, education, and
economic well being due to political forces of our own making. For while
modern social and economics systems require certain kinds of language
competence, they simultaneously create conditions which ensure that vast
numbers of people will be unable to acquire that competence. A central
mechanism by which this process occurs is language policy. (p. 6)

2.2.2.5 Learner-centered vs. learning-centered

These two concepts, learner-centered and learning-centered, are misunderstood since
we refer to the first term; it fits with the idea of a unique element in the classroom.
Sometimes it makes the CA failures in language classrooms.

Holliday (1997) emphasized that:

The term ‘learner-centered’ is especially vague, and has been largely
responsible for the failure in making the CA work outside (...). The notion
states an intention which is admirable, but does not say sufficient about the
discipline or rigor with which it will be carried out. The purpose of teaching
should be to enable learning to take place. This tells us what we have to do in
the classroom, and exactly to what our technology must be directed. That the
learner is the recipient of this learning goes without saying, but this does not
tell us what to do. (p. 175)
In regard to Hutchinson and Waters (1984), quoted in Holliday (1994):

(…) suggest that learner-centered ignores the wider social context of what happens in the classroom: We feel the term ‘learner-centered’ misleading, since it simples that the learner is the sole focus of the learning process.

Education is, by its nature, a compromise between the individual and society. Thus, we would reject the view that a CA is learner-centered: rather, it is learning-centered, and implies taking into account the needs and expectations of all the parties involved. (p. 175)

According to the arguments below, some teachers have learned a wrong perception of the CA, as they think students must be set totally free, students can control, lead and produce themselves their own language. It leaves teacher with no roles or play in the learning process. Teachers should give learners the power of their learning but in a controlled way, we could give students sense of ownership of their learning and guide them to their intrinsic motivation in order to learning flows properly and correctly.

Holliday (1997) also followed that:

Another outcome of the vagueness of learner-centeredness is the lack of direction it gives (…). It seems a common perception among such teachers what makes the CA different is that students are set free, both in that they can follow their own agendas in group work, and in that they can produce their own language. This notions immediately threatens the order of many establish classroom cultures by implying that the status of the teacher, often involving her or his ability to control language input and output, is threatened by allowing a language output which is controlled by the students. (p. 176)
Brown (2001) included some techniques:

- Techniques that focus on or account for learners´ needs, styles and goals.
- Techniques that give some control to the student (group work or strategy training, for example).
- Curricula that include the consultation and input of students and that do not presuppose objectives in advance.
- Techniques that allow for student creativity and innovation.
- Techniques that enhance a student´s sense of competence and self-worth. (p. 46-47)

In a learning-centered approach, students, teachers and classrooms are factors of the teaching process. Learners are seen as communicative competent; however teachers are expected to played in the learning, as be a good counselor, giving confirmation and feedback. Being a needs analyst, bring to the classroom what students need and want.

Holliday (1997) added that:

A learning-centered approach, on the other hand, which acknowledges the social context of education (Hutchinson and Waters 1984) (...). It puts such worries about the CA as group work clearly in their place. The aim is to enable students to learn. Group work and free language production are possible means to this end, amongst a potential of many more. The stronger version of the CA (...) makes this variety possible and can be informed entirely by communicative, ethnographic action research, which will decide whether or not such procedures as group work are appropriate to a specific classroom setting. (p. 176)
Furthermore, Holliday (1997) concurred that “In a learning-centered approach, teacher monitoring is one factor that has to be decided about in the light of what strategy will bring learning about.” (p. 176)

Brown (2001) advanced the idea of cooperative-learning:

Cooperative learning does not merely imply collaboration. To be sure, in a cooperative classroom the students and teachers work together to pursue goals and objectives. But cooperative learning “is more structured, more prescriptive to teachers about classroom techniques, more directive to students about how to work together in groups (…). In cooperative learning models, a group learning activity is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners. In collaborative learning, the learner engages “with more capable others (teachers, advanced peers, etc), who provide assistance and guidance”. Collaborative learning models have been developed within social constructivist schools of thought to promote communities of learners that cut across the usual hierarchies of students and teachers. (p. 47)

2.2.3 Schemas

The former goal of an English teacher with our student is enabling them to communicate using the target language and, how to use the CA within a social context. The latter important goal is to appreciate students’ general knowledge in language understanding. The next questions are obvious enough, what kind of information or knowledge learners bring to classrooms, that knowledge is accurate, vague or distorted, how those chunks of memories are stored so that it is on tap when required to convey conversations. It is perfectly clear that memories in our mind are not very well arranged because bits of information come popping or fail to come in the right moment. However,
concepts or events, without having experienced in life, could be explained or ourselves. Our memories have stored full of information we have seen, read or gone through that giving a correct association may interpret what it in outside the world.

One theory of memory which emphasizes the idea above that what is remembered is affected by what we already know is schema theory. It gives us a clear idea about chunks of knowledge called as schemas, each of which encapsulates concepts about everything related to a specific event. In order that understanding how schemas work, it is necessary to explain two important concepts about cognitive operations and their differences. These two mental activities are bottom-up processing and top-down processing. One activity perceives incoming information and the other delivers information already stored in memory. Furthermore, when they interact together, it is known as interactive processing.

Cohen et al (1993) explained further that:

The analysis of the sensory information coming in from the outside is known as bottom-up processing or data-driven processing because it relies on the data received via senses. The sensory information often incomplete or ambiguous, but the information already stored in the memory in the form of prior knowledge influences our expectation and helps us to interpret the current input. This influence of prior knowledge is known as top-down or conceptually-driven processing. (p. 26)

Cohen et al (1993) also contemplated the idea that in practice, the two sorts of processing operate in combination. For example, bottom-up processes may yield sensory information about processes based on already stored knowledge enable this to be identified as a labrador dog. The top-down processes interact with the information provided by the bottom-up processes. This is sometimes known as interactive processing. (p. 26-27)
2.2.3.1 What is a schema?

Indeed, a concept of a schema is the knowledge already stored in memory; it functions in the process of understanding new information using old knowledge. To say that, a person has comprehended an idea is to say that they have got a mental “home” for the information, or else that they have modified an existing mental home in order to accommodate the new information. Grounded on schema operation, it finally can be made a straightforward statement about the use of past experiences to deal with new experiences is a necessary characteristic of the way a person’s mind functions.

Following to Bartlett (1932), Carrell et al (1996) said that:

The term “schema” refers to “an active organization of past reactions or past experience.” The term active was intended to emphasize what he saw as the constructive character of remembering, which he contrasted with a passive retrieval of “fixed and lifeless” memories. (p. 39)

Cohen et al (1993) suggested that:

Bartlett first introduces the notion of schemas as early as 1932 in order to explain how it is that when people remember stories they typically omit some details and introduce rationalizations, reconstructing the story so as to make more sense in terms of their own knowledge and experiences. According to Bartlett, the story is assimilated to pre-stored schemas based on previous experiences. (p. 37)

New experiences in turn can be stored as new schemas or modifications of old schemas, adding to our store of general knowledge. Schemas, then, are packets of information stored in memory representing general knowledge about objects, situations, events, or actions. Rumelhart and Norman (1986) list five characteristics of schemas:

(Cohen et al, 1993, p. 28)
1. Schemas represent knowledge of all kinds from simple knowledge about the shape of the letter “A”, to more complex knowledge such as knowledge about picnics or political ideologies, and knowledge about motor actions like riding a bicycle or throwing a ball.

2. Schemas can be linked together into related systems. An overall schema may consist of a set of sub-schemas. The picnic schema may be part of a larger system of schema including “meals”, “outings”, and “parties”. Packets of knowledge about one topic are linked to packets of knowledge about related topics.

3. A schema has slots which may be filled with fixed, compulsory values or with variable, optional values. For example, a general schema for a picnic consists of slots for place, food, people, activities, etc. Values are the specific concepts that fill the slots. The place slot take the fixed value “outdoors” (by definition), and optional values (such as woods, rivers, beach) can be added. The values for food, people, etc. are also optional and can be filled according to the particular occasion. Slots may also have defaults values. That is, the schema tells us what probable values the slots can take if specific information is lacking. In the episode shown, the food has not been specified, so the schema supplied “sandwiches” as a default value for the food slot. Note that, as shown, the general picnic schema contains the fixed and default values. The optional values originate from the specific episode.

4. Schemas incorporate all the different kinds of knowledge we have accumulated, including both generalizations derived from our personal experience and facts we have been taught.
5. Various schemas at different levels may be actively engaged in recognizing and interpreting new inputs. Bottom–up and top-down processes may go through repeated cycles, and the final interpretation of new inputs will depend on which schema constitutes the best fit for the incoming information. For example, if we see some people sitting on the grass we might first activate the picnic schema, but if further bottom-up information reveals banners instead of food, we might shift to the “demo” schema instead. In this case, the demo schema turns out to be the best fit and becomes the dominant or most active schema.

The following map is made by Cohen et al (1993) that points out the ideas above:

![Diagram of a picnic schema]

**Figure 3:** A picnic schema: the values mesh with the schema

### 2.2.3.2 Schemas, frames, and scripts

According to definitions about schema, it is considered all kinds of knowledge which are organized in our memories for typical events, situations and linguistic
conventions. Bartlett’s notion of schemas for an organization of knowledge in our mind they represent situations and events. Perhaps, a word related to schema is frames they represent expectations about an event. A frame has networks which have slots filled in with compulsory or optional values, but about particular events general expectations, called default values, are used. When frames form a scenario, the notion of scripts comes into mind. Scripts are sequences of routines actions. One important point to take in consideration about schemas, frames and scripts is that they together enable language understanding.

Minsky (1977) proposed to use knowledge schemas for representing different kinds of situations. He called these knowledge representations frames because he thought of them as frame-like networks for describing categories of objects and events. Schemas can be represented as frames which have slots which can be filled in with appropriate values. Some of these slots have compulsory values to represent particular situations. (Greene, 1989, p.35)

Greene (1989) explained some ideas:

For instance, dogs are always animals and usually have four legs, so these slots are filled in with the expected values. Variable slots can be filled in by many different optional values, each of which represents particular events. If you encounter or read about, a brown collie in a park, you can fill in the appropriate slots to interpret that particular situation. At the same time, the schema will allow you to make inferences about the situation. e.g. is there an owner walking the dog? You will notice that many of the slots are interconnected (...). Many of the slots invoke other schemas with frames of their own, (...). All this helps to make sense of situations and stories in terms of inferences based on probable events. (...).
A particular useful aspect of frames is that, when specific information is lacking about slots, we can fill them in with what Minsky called default values. The idea is that, if nothing else is indicated, by default we select the most commonly expected value for a slot. (p. 36-37)

Greene (1989) drew the following schema:

![Diagram of a "dog" frame]

**Figure 4**: A “dog” frame.

Minsky used the special term scenario for frames which describe events. This idea has been extended by Roger Schank (...) in the form of scripts, which describe simple routine events. (...) Perhaps the best way to think about scripts is that they list the defaults values
for actions which you would expect to occur in any restaurant. Actual events on a particular visit to a particular restaurant can be represented by filling in the slots for “roles”, “props” and “actions”. (Greene, 1989, p. 39).

### 2.2.3.3 Schema theory

Carrell et al (1996) drew the next concepts:

A schema is an abstract knowledge structure, a schema is abstract in the sense that it summarizes what is known about a variety of cases that differ in many particulars. An important theoretical puzzle is to determine just how much and what sort of knowledge is abstracted and how much remains tied to knowledge of specific instances. A schema is an structured in the sense that it represents the relationships among its component parts. The theoretical issues are to specify the set of relationships needed for a general analysis of knowledge. The overriding challenge for the theorist is to specify the form and substance of schemata and the processes by which the knowledge embodied in schemata is used. (p. 42)

Greene (1989) arrived at the following ideas:

The basic idea, originally suggested by Bartlett (1932), is that human memory consists of high-level structures known as schemas, each of which encapsulates our knowledge about everything connected with a particular object or event. This notion has been taken up and expanded to cover many different situations. Examples are schemas for actions, like riding a bicycle, schema for events, like going to a restaurant, schemas for situations, like working in an office, schemas for categories like birds or mammals. (p. 34)
In addition, Greene (1989) pointed out that the organization of memories as schemas guides the interpretation of events, utterances, and written texts. For instances, my schema for a room includes information about chandeliers, my schema for a party allows for people leaving for various reasons, my picnic schema helps to make sense of remarks about warm beer. (p. 34-35)

In fact, all the schemas discussed so far have based on experiences of the world, (...) According to this view, the schemas are used to understand language, the world around us and the motives of people’s action. Besides, knowledge about what it is outside and in real life contexts, people manage schemas which represent expectations, intentions, and ideas about the form of linguistic inputs in stories and texts. (Greene, 1989, p. 45)

2.2.3.4 Problems in schema theory

Certain problems could be interpreted when the usage of schemas initiates in our mind. Suppose a schema is activated, where it takes place first, in encoding process or retrieving process. Another criticism of schema theory is that the representation of knowledge tries to explain anything about what it is in real life, no ensuring that it is the right schema to explain the idea. However, it does not consider that memory can be recalled accurately. Another problem about schemas and what it is difficult to explain is that children could understand and remember exactly experiences even though they have not had vivid descriptions of them.

Cohen et al (1993) endorsed the prior idea saying that:

Schema theorists are not very clear as to whether the processes of selection, abstraction, integration and normalization take place at the time the memory is encoded, while it is a store, or at the time the memory is retrieved. Suppose your memory of a family party contains no record that a cousin was present. Did you fail to note his presence at the time, or did you excise him from the
representation at some later date? Additions, deletions, interpretations, and distortions may be made when the memory representation is originally constructed, or the representation may be tinkered with at some subsequent time when it is reconstructed for recall. Schema-driven encoding and schema-driven reconstruction would produce very similar results and are therefore hard to distinguish. (p. 30-31)

Anderson and Pichert (1978), quoted in Cohen et al (1993), concurred the next conclusion:

Schemas must have some effect at retrieval as well as at encoding since the new schema, which was only given at the retrieval stage, produced additional recall. The experiment also shows that people do encode some information which is irrelevant to their prevailing schema, since those who had the buyer schema at encoding were able to recall burglar information when the schema was changed (and vice versa). (p. 32)

Greene (1989) proposed the following problem in schema theory, in fact, it is probably fair to say that one of the main problems with schema theory is that it can be used to explain anything. If we remember or use any type of knowledge, we can think up a schema to explain it – perhaps we have a schema for inventing schemas. The trouble with such a flexible notion is that it simply restates the problem of how knowledge is represented, leaving us with the unresolved difficulty of defining how particular schemas are represented and accessed when needed. (p. 35)

Cohen et al (1993) contemplated these problems:

Another objection to schema theory is that whole idea of a schema is too vague to be useful. A structure that is general enough to represent such a variety of
different kinds of knowledge must be so unspecific that is hard to say anything about what it is like. (p. 32)

Critics of schema theory also overlook the fact that complex events may sometimes be remembered in very precise and exact detail. Schema-driven processes of the kind described above are good at accounting for memory imperfections but have difficulty in accounting for a memory representation that is accurate in every detail or one that retains unusual or unexpected elements. People often remember what is odd or peculiar. (Cohen et al, 1993, p. 32)

Another problem is that it is difficult to see how schemas are acquired in the first place. How do children manage to interpret and remember a completely novel experience when they have no prior knowledge about it, and no schema to guide the interpretations and shape the memory representations? How are schemas built up out of these unstructured experiences? (Cohen et al, 1993, p. 32)

Cohen et al (1993) considered that “finally, there are problems concerning the selection of the most appropriate schema. What ensures that a new input is recognized and interpreted by the right schemas?” (p. 32)

2.2.3.5 Schemas and memories

When a person interacts with new information coming from the outside world, a series of processes trigger. First, it is important to mention that very relevant information is saved in our memory; however, after information or knowledge is put through analysis, general schemas are stored in our memory. In addition, when new information is presented, integrated representations as current knowledge and prior information are used to explain what is not understandable. After that, memories tend to be analyzed and incorporated to prior experiences to fit in most typical frames. Finally, schemas are aid to recall appropriate knowledge so as to unleash other schemas to infer the meaning.
Cohen et al (1993) mentioned five different ways: (p. 29-30)

1. *Selection and storage*: the schema guides the selection of what is encoded and stored in memory. Information that is not relevant to the schema that is currently the most active may be ignored. So you may not remember what clothes you wore when taking an exam because clothes are not relevant to the activated exam schema. As well as guiding selection, the schema also provides a framework within which new information relevant to that schema can be stored.

2. *Abstraction*: information in memory tends to undergo transformation from the specific to general. So if you try to recall the occasion of a particular visit to a restaurant you tend to recall the general features common to many such visits rather than the specific details of a particular visit. Only the general schema is retained in memory, while the particular episode is forgotten. Similarly, in remembering conversations or stories you tend to retain the gist or general meaning, but not the exact wording.

3. *Integration and interpretation*: according to schema theory a single integrated memory representation is formed which includes information derived from the current experience, prior knowledge relating to it, the default values supplied by the appropriate schemas, and any interpretation that are made. (...). The observation, the interpretation, and the prior knowledge are intergraded in the memory representation may be impossible to distinguish later. In this way, we use schema-based knowledge to infer much that is not actually seen or explicitly stated. We fill in missing information, we try to make sense of what is not readily comprehensible, and we infer the reasons, causes, and results of the events we witness.
4. **Normalization:** Memories of events also tend to be distorted so as to fit in with prior expectations and to be consistent with the schema: they are therefore transformed toward the most probable or most typical event of that kind. People may misreport an event they witnessed because they remember what they expected to see rather than what they actually saw. For example, a witness may report that a bank-robber wore a mask when actually he wore dark glasses. The witness’s memory was distorted by schema based on films of the baks robberies.

5. **Retrieval:** schemas may also aid retrieval. People may search through the appropriate schema in order to try to retrieve a particular memory. If the required information is not represented directly, it may be possible to retrieve it indirectly, through schema-based inferences. So, if you cannot remember what John and Sue ate at the picnic, the schema supplies the values ”sandwiches” which has a good chance of being correct.

### 2.2.3.6 Implications for EFL learners

The background knowledge that students of EFL bring to classes are culturally specific, maybe there are problems due to of attempts at adjusting standardized frameworks from BANA classrooms unto TESEP classrooms, so the conflicts lie in no projecting a suitable schema fitting to students´ real contexts.

Carrell et al (1988) asserted that:

Most commonly, accessing appropriate content schemata depends initially on textual cues; the graphic display must be somehow reconstructed by the reader as meaningful language. At this point, general language processing skills are most important. (...) Consequently, poor readers are encouraged to expand their vocabularies and to gain greater control over complex syntactic structures.
in order to improve reading comprehension. Indeed, come reading problems are related to such language skill deficiencies. However, as we have noted, reading comprehension depends crucially on the reader’s being able to relate information from the text to already existing background knowledge. (p. 81-82)

Fries (1945, 1963), quoted in Carrell et al (1988) mentioned that “the meaning that transcends the language code and is related to the background knowledge of native speakers of that code” (p. 82)

Carrell et al (1996) also concluded that “the important point is that problems with individual lexical items may not be as pervasive as problems related to the absence of appropriate generalized information assumed by the winter and possessed by a reader sharing that writer’s cultural background.” (p. 83)

Cummins (2009) gave the following conclusion:

Any sincere educator would endorse that schools should be fed by experience and knowledge that children bring to the classroom and that training must promote the talent and skills of the young learners. Either unconsciously or intentionally, when we destroy the language of children and gap their relationship with their parents and grandparents, we are contradicting the very essence of education. (p. 3) (Own Translation)

Such is the case of the emphasis that is being placed on the whole continent today about the importance of learning, on one hand, previous experiences and knowledge of learners, and on other hand, learning is meaningful, placed and cooperative. Principles as above, as one way or another, have been always present in any proposal of bilingual education. (Lopez, 2009, p. 19) (Own Translation)
2.2.3.7 Schema availability and activation

Availability concerns how can be utilized knowledge in top-down processing; however, it demands that learners need to acquire prior background information. In seeking to manage the schema availability it is often to get a distinction between formal and content areas.

Cummins (2009) gave the following conclusion: that students do not need to learn the concept of saying the time again. It is enough to acquire new labels or "superficial structures" for an intellectual ability that have already been internalized. Similarly, in more advanced phrases, a transfer between languages is produced while learning academic skills, of reading and writing, for example, how to distinguish the main idea of the secondary details in a written passage or in a history, or how to identify cause and effect, or how to distinguish a fact from an opinion and to situate chronologically the sequence of facts in a narrative or historical narration. (p. 5) (Own Translation)

Carrell and Eisterhold (1983), quoted in Carrell et al (1996), argued that:

One of the most obvious reasons a particular content schema may fail to exist for a reader is that the schema is cultural-specific. Studies by Steffensen et al. (1979), Johnson (1981), and Carrell (1981) have all shown that implicit cultural content knowledge presupposed by a text and a reader’s own cultural background knowledge of content interact to make texts whose content is based on one’s own culture easier to read and understand than syntactically and rhetorically equivalent texts based on a less familiar, distant cultural. (p. 104)

Thus, (...), a number of empirical studies have shown that the absence of the content and formal schemata appropriate to a particular text can result in processing
difficulty with that text. If ESL readers are not able to engage successfully in an appropriate degree of knowledge-based processing because they lack the appropriate content and/or formal schemata, they will resort to other strategies. Either they will overrely on text-based processes, and try to construct the meaning totally from the textual input (a virtual impossibility, because no text contains all the information necessary for its comprehension), or they will substitute the closest schema they possess and will try to relate the incoming information to that schema, resulting in schema interference. In either case, comprehension and recall suffer. (Carrell et al, 1996, p. 105).

Activation can be understood as how schemas are evoked, and it is well-comprehended. Carrell (1983) and Carrell and Wallance (1983), quoted in Carrell et al (1996) mentioned that:

Studies previously mentioned showed that ESL reading comprehension may be affected not because the ESL readers lack the appropriate schema, but because they fail to activate the appropriate schema. In one part of the Carrell and Wallace (1983) study, advance ESL readers were faced with a text about a familiar topic (“Brushing your teeth”), which did not contain sufficient textual (i.e. lexical) cues to signal the appropriate schema to be activated. (p. 105)

2.2.4 English Language Learning (ELL)

2.2.4.1 What is learning?

Learning is the ability to process information in our minds, and it is an exclusive skill to human beings. This information may be a newer input or modify an existing idea. It may be obtained as part of a formal educational process, personal development, or schooling. It may initiated as a goal-oriented activity or may be aided
by motivation. However, learning might be described as part of an informal acquisition since it starts spontaneously when the individual experiments with new information found outside the classroom.

Learning refers to a process in which conscious rules about a language are developed. It results in explicit knowledge about the forms of a language and the ability to verbalize this knowledge. Formal teaching is necessary for “learning” to occur, and correction of errors helps with the development of learned rules. Learning, according to the theory, cannot lead to acquisition. (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 131)

Learning is a change in a person’s ability to behave in certain ways. This change can be traced to two key factors – past experiences with the subject and practice. Learning can occur both formally (inside the classroom) and informally (outside the classroom). Formal learning does not occur by accident – it is the direct result of a program design by a teacher or trainer. An adult learner may intentionally set out to learn by taking classes or by reading about a subject. He or she may also gather information through the experience of living that changes their behavior. Informal learning occurs spontaneously and continually changes the adult learners’ behavior. Ideally, learning is created thought the blending of individual curiosity, reflection and adaption. (…)³

2.2.4.2 Acquisition versus learning

Based on ‘The Acquisition and Learning Hypothesis’, which claims that there are clear differences between these two distinctive ways of developing competence in a second or foreign language (Richards, 1986, p.131) when an individual acquires new knowledge, he/she gets this information in a natural manner, unconsciously. Acquisition involves using language to resolve real-life situations. Unlike acquisition, learning goes under a formal process, in which knowing about rules of the languages is needed to
manage the target language. As a result, this formal learning has to be taken in an academic way, and mistake correction is permitted to master the target language.

Second language acquisition (SLA) is sometimes contrasted with second language learning (SLL) on the assumption that these are different processes. The term ‘acquisition’ is used to refer to picking up a second language through exposure, whereas the term ‘learning’ is used to refer to the conscious study of a second language. However, I wish to keep an open mind about whether this is a real distinction or not, so I shall use ‘acquisition’ and ‘learning’ interchangeably, irrespective of whether conscious or subconscious processes are involved. If I wish to use either of these terms with a more specific meaning, they will be italicized and their reference made explicit. (Ellis, 1986, p.6)

The American Applied Linguist, Stephen Krashen, writing a short time later, appeared to be making similar suggestions about language learning too, though by dividing language ‘learning’ into acquisition and learning he was being far more specific. Language which we acquire subconsciously, he claimed, is language we can easily use in spontaneous conversation because it is instantly available when we need it. Language that is learnt, on the other hand, taught and studied as grammar and vocabulary, is not available for spontaneous use. Indeed, it may be that the only use for learnt language is to help us to monitor(check) our spontaneous communication; but then the more we monitor what we are saying, the less spontaneous we become!(Harmer, 2005, p.71)

Tillich (1972) quoted in Harmer (2005) asserted a definition on learning to explain the title above:

In fact, learning is the human activity which least needs manipulation by others. Most learning is not the result of instruction. It is rather the result of unhampered participation in a meaningful setting.(p.70)
Ellis (1986) gave a better summary about SLA

To summarize the term, the term ‘second language acquisition’ refers to the subconscious or conscious processes by which a language other than the mother tongue is learnt in a natural or a tutored setting. It covers the development of phonology, lexis, grammar, and pragmatic knowledge, but has been largely confined to morphosyntax. The process manifests both variable and invariable features. They study of SLA is direct accounting for the learner’s competence, but in order to do so has set out to investigate empirically how a learner performs when he or she uses a second language. (p. 6)

2.2.4.3 Language Learning cares about itself

What a person needs to learn a language there are three basic elements: exposure, motivation and opportunities for use. The person has to be exposed to the target language in a real context situation in order that he/she feels motivated to practice the language for both physical and emotional reasons. Motivation is accepted in many fields of the learning process as it is essential to succeed in achieving something. This internal device pushes learners to achieve a task of new information. Indeed, the individual needs to receive a number of outside factors or internal factors to get stimulated in learning something.

Our teachers’ main task is to establish well-prepared opportunities or situations to get students to communicate as those give them the chances to work on negotiation meaning. A teacher acts in a role of manager or advisor of classroom activities monitoring student’s performances since they are learners, they are not expected to produce new language immediately, instead to produce it accurately and fluently. The term ‘awarenessraising’ will give a great companion to this idea since learners are fully functioning
humans when ‘consciousness-raising’ occurs, it sinks into the brain appropriately and they may take responsibility for their learning.

From Allwright’s perspective (1979), Harmer (2005) proposed an explanation on Language Learning will take care of itself:

… if the language teacher’s management activities are directed exclusively at involving the learners in solving communication problems in the target language then language learning will take care of itself…..(p. 71)

Following Ellis (1982), Harmer (2005) concurred that:

“Communicative activities might be the switch that took language from the learnt to the acquired store.”(p.72)

Harmer (2005) advanced the idea that:

First language learning provides a perfect example of what is talked about. All children succeed at it to a greater or lesser extent. Although parents and other close adults may help to ‘teach’ the language in an informal way (for examples, through repetition, ‘play’, or made-up dialogues –where, in the early stages the parent will often take the baby’s part when the baby cannot actually speak the words), still the process of learning is unconscious. What the young child does get, of course, is considerable exposure to language which he or she more or less understands the result of exposure, a clear motivation to communicate –for both physical and emotional reasons –and an opportunity to use what is being acquired.( p.70)

Krashen saw the successful acquisition by students of a second language as being bound up with the nature of the language input they received. It had to be comprehensible, even if it was slightly above their productive level, and the students had to be exposed to it in relaxed setting. This roughly-tuned input is in stark contrast to the finely-tuned input
of much language instruction, where specific graded language has been chosen for conscious learning. Roughly-tuned input aids acquisition, Krashen argued, whereas finely-tuned input combined with conscious learning does not. (p. 71)

Harmer (2005) also contemplated the idea that:

There is some ‘covert teaching’ going on as they acquire not only the language itself but the social routines in which it is used. First language acquisition is also closely allied to social growth and general cognitive development.

(…) one of the teacher’s main tasks is to make students ‘aware’ of language as an alternative to teaching it. In this approach, often referred to as ‘consciousness-raising’, the teacher does not expect students to produce new language immediately but instead makes them to produce it accurately and fluency. (Harmer, 2005, p.73)

This emphasis on noticing and awareness-raising may lead people to suggest that rather than ‘teaching’ an item of language, the teacher’s job is to get students to notice it when it occurs so that it sinks into the brain where it processed one way of doing this is to organize tasks where certain language naturally occurs with frequency and where with or without a teacher’s help, the students will notice it. (Harmer, 2005, p.73)

Scrivener (2005) advanced the following idea:

People learn more by doing things themselves rather than by being told about them.(…). Learners are intelligent, fully functioning humans, not simple receptacles for passed-on knowledge. Learning is not simply a dimensional intellectual activity, but involves the whole person (…). We can no longer be content with the image of the student as a blank slate. Students may bring their needs, their wishes, their fears, their worries, their day so far, their dreams, their anger, their moods, etc. Give the opportunities, they will be able to make important decisions for themselves, to take responsibility for their learning and
to move forward (although their previous educational experience may initially predispose them to expecting that you, the teacher, need to do all that for them).(p.21)

New learning is constructed over the foundations of our own earlier Learning. We make use of whatever knowledge and experience we already have in order to help us learn and understand new things.(p. 21)

### 2.2.4.3.1 The experimental learning cycle

The learning process apparently contemplates five steps.

1. First, it is when you **do** something.
2. Second, you **recall** what happened.
3. Later, you need to **reflect** on that.
4. Next, you **draw** conclusions from the reflection.
5. Finally, you have to use those conclusions to inform and **prepare** for future experience.

Scrivener (2005) draws the following schema:

![An experimental learning cycle](image)

**Figure 5**: An experimental learning cycle
Perhaps, after reading the information previously presented, we (English teachers) could bear in mind how the experimental learning cycle affects the language teaching in the classroom. Scrivener (2005) clearly pointed out some conclusions that will help to our teaching experience:

1. Giving students opportunities to do things themselves may be very important in classroom.
2. Worrying less about our teaching techniques and trying to make the students’ enabling of learning our main concern.
3. Allowing the students practical experience, for example using language rather than simply listening to lectures about languages.
4. The more teachers do themselves, the less space there will be for the learners to do things.
5. Having students become more aware about how they are learning, what procedures, techniques or approaches would help them learn more effectively.
6. Making errors should be part of learning, teachers have to think that trying things out in order to get things wrong or well are part of the learning process. (p. 21)

2.2.4.3.2 How do students learn a language?

English teachers need to understand how a student’s progress when learning a new item is occurring so that the activities we plan can get along well with those things, that are important to the learning process. It is recognized the value of the language exposure and blending opportunities to use authentic language, so that new knowledge has to be a comprehensible stimulus.
Scrivener (2005) adds the following list table to reinforce the afore mentioned ideas:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Ignorance: the learner doesn’t know anything about the item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Exposure: the learner hears or reads examples of the item (maybe a number of items), but doesn’t particular notice it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Noticing: the learner begins to realise that there is a feature he/she doesn’t fully understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• Understanding: the learner starts to look more closely at the item and tries to work out the information rules and the meaning, possible with the help of reference information, explanations or other help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Practice: the learner tried to use the item in his/her own speech or writing (maybe hesitantly, probably with many errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Active use: the learner integrates the item fully into his/her own language and uses it (without thinking) relatively easily with errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The process of learning

Harmer (2007) contemplated some blending elements for students toward language learning:

Such eclecticism –choosing between the best elements of a number of different ideas and methods – is a proper response to the competing claims of the various trends we have described. (…) Believing that students need exposure, motivation and opportunities for language use, and acknowledge that different students may respond more or less well to different stimuli, it suggests that most teaching sequences need to have certain characteristics or elements, whether they take place over a few minutes ago, half an hour, a lesson or a sequence or lessons. These elements are Engage, Study and Activate.

a) Engage: (…) the reason why this element is so important in teaching sequences, therefore, is that when students are properly engaged, their involvement in the study and activation stages is likely to be far more
pronounced, and as a result, the benefit they get from these will be considerably greater. (p. 52)

b) **Study:** study activities are those where students are asked to focus on the construction of something, whether it is the language itself, the ways in which it is used or how it sounds and looks. (…) discovery activities ask the students to do all the intellectual work, rather than leaving it to the teacher. (p. 52)

c) **Activate:** this element describes exercises and activities which are designed to get students using language as freely and communicatively as they can. We will not be asking them to focus on the use of a particular structure, or to try to use words from a list we give them. (…) The objective in an activity is for them to use all and any language which be appropriate for a given situation or topic. (p. 53)

### 2.2.4.4 Students’ attitude toward learning

According to Ellis (1986), there are problems to define attitude and motivation, a person’s behavior is governed by certain necessities and wants which influence how he is actually responsive to the learning process. These attitudes cannot directly observed, they have to be gathered from students do in classroom. For Ellis (1986), it is not clear a distinction between motivation and attitude. (p. 116)

From Schumann (1978), quoted in Ellis (ibid.) ‘attitude’ as a social factor on a par with variables such as ‘size of learning group’, and ‘motivation as an effective factor alongside ‘culture shock’. Gardner and Lambert (1972), also quoted in Ellis (ibid.), define ‘motivation’ in terms of the L2 learner’s overall goal or orientation, and ‘attitude’ as the
persistence shown by the learner in striving for a goal. They argue that there is no reason to expect a relationship between the two; (...)(p. 117)

It is certainly that the teaching effect is far from personal satisfaction, because it should be connected in somehow with students’ learning rate. They desire a welcoming environment to foster their language development. We ought to concern in the relationship between the students’ affective factors and their learning since if something damages their self-esteem, they will be far from learning process. Therefore, lowering any affective factor may conduct the intake of comprehensible input. . (Harmer, 2005, p.74)

Theorists who are concerned with humanism say that learner’s feeling are as important as their mental or cognitive abilities. If students feel hostile towards the subject of study, the materials, or the teaching methods, they will be unlikely to achieve much success.(Harmer, 2005, p.74)

Ellis (1986) emphasizes the idea of types of attitudes in classroom:

Gardner and Lambert have also investigated a number of different attitudes which they consider relevant to L2 learning, Stern (1983, 376-7) classifies these attitudes into three types:

1. Attitudes towards the community and people who speak the L2 (i.e. ‘group specific attitudes’).
2. Attitudes towards learning and language concerned.
3. Attitudes toward languages and language learning in general.

These attitudes are influenced by the kind of personality of the learner, for instance whether he is ethnocentric or authoritarian. They may also be influenced by the social milieu in which learning take place. Different attitudes, for instance, may be found in monolingual and bilingual contexts. (p. 118)
Harmer (2005) concerned on how teachers have students feel positive about learning:

The psychologist Carl Rogers (1994), whose impact upon this line of thinking has been prefunded, suggested that learners needed to feel that what they were learning was personally relevant to them, that they had to experience learning (rather than just being ‘taught’) and that their self-image needed to be enhanced as part of the process.

In a humanist classroom, students are emotionally involved in the learning; they are encouraged to reflect on how learning happens, and their creativity is fostered. The teacher can achieve this by keeping criticism to a minimum and by encouraging them, in plain terms, to feel good about themselves. In a classroom learning a language is as much an issue of personal identity, self-knowledge, feeling and emotion as it is about language.(p.74-75)

Some humanist activities encourage students to speak from their ‘inner’ selves, saying, for example, how they feel about their lives, their closeness to different members of their families. Activities need to allow students to ‘exteriorize their own internal text’. But critics question whether it is the teacher’s job to ask students to reveal things of a private nature, and sometimes even to monitor and nurture the students’ inner selves.(p. 75)

2.2.4.5 The role of formal instruction

By considering how formal the instruction is, it may affect the language learning process. Language learning a wider issue, can have multiple purposes. One is to teach students the formal systems of a L2, in particular writing, listening, speaking or reading. Another assumption of the role of formal instruction is that syllabus are required to be well-organized in such way so as to convey the correlation between what is taught and
what is learnt as a result of this, formal instruction enhance SLA accelerating the whole process. Learners who receive formal instructions in classrooms may do much better than those who do not. In sum, although the informal or outside world may give more input to the learner, formal environment in classrooms is better equipped to ensure right quality input needed to learn the target languages through its learning skills.

Ellis (1986) contemplated two positive effects on learning:

It must be considered in two parts – the effect that instruction has on the route of learning and the effect that it has on rate of learning. (p. 15)

If SLA is the result of some kind of ‘language acquisition device’, which is trigger off only by the linguistic environment, then the learner must be credited with his or her own ‘syllabus’ which is more or less immune to influence from the outside. If, however, SLA is the result of attending to those features that are frequent and salient in the input, then the possibility rises that there is more than one ‘syllabus’ for SLA and that a specially constructed input, such as that provided by formal instructed, can influence the order in which the grammar of L2 is acquired. (Ellis, 1986, p. 15)

Formal instruction may help learners to perform in some types of situation but not in others. Irrespective of whether formal instruction affects the order of learning, it may enhance SLA by accelerating the whole process. Learners who receive formal instructions may learn more rapidly than those who do not. The experience of countless classroom learners testifies to this. Even if the L2 knowledge derived from formal instruction is not immediately for use in spontaneous conversation (a common enough experience), it soon becomes serviceable once the leaner has the opportunity to use the L2 in this kind of communication. Formal instruction can have a powerful delayed effect. (Ellis, 1986, p. 16)
Ellis (1986) highlighted the development of learning on its route, rate and success that:

Formal instruction is taken to include the instruction that results from deductive methods such as cognitive code, inductive methods (…), also, instruction based on national/functional materials where specific linguistic means for realizing various speech acts or semantico-grammatical categories are introduced and practiced. (…) in order to study the effects of this kind of instruction, it is necessary to consider separately in terms of the effects have on the route of development which is the sequence or specific order of learning and the effects on the rate of development which is the speed at learning takes place, or the success of development which is the proficiency level finally achieved. (p. 217)

2.2.4.5.1 Learning receptive skills

Receptive skills are the ways in which people obtain meaning from what it is seen or heard. We read a book or listen to radio, we use our previous knowledge as the process of internalizing and comprehension. When the learner reads or listens to new information, he or she will use pre-existing knowledge to predict the relevant content both before and after. However, if a student does not have such knowledge so-called schema. It might find it difficult to achieve the task. The use of these skills will depend on what we are interested in learning. This receptive language skills are also called passive knowledge as it gets and decodes and internalizes language so as to express language.

Golkova and Hubackova (2014) introduced receptive skills as passive knowledge - such as listening and reading - it symbolizes a springboard to active implementation of grammar structures, passive vocabulary lists, heard and repeated sounds of a foreign language. This theoretical background applies to any studied language.(p. 478)
McIntyre et al. (2017) suggested an new term for receptive skills, it is set out that “modes of communication” are generally described “as either receptive language, which involves receiving and decoding or interpreting language, or expressive language, which is the encoding or production of a message” (p. 2)

Bastami (2016) drew another definition for receptive language skills that:

Receptive language skill refers to answering appropriately to another person's spoken language. A lot of teachers try to develop receptive language skills in their language learners. When receptive language skills are not appropriately acquired, learners may miss significant learning opportunities resulting in delays in the development and acquisition of spoken language. The literature review demonstrated that teachers can play a key role in helping learners acquire their receptive skills in language learning. (…) receptive skills can be acquired through the active involvement and effort of the learners in learning English language and learners should develop their own learning strategies in order to work with written material or the spoken word. (p. 16)

Harmer (2005) proposed a number of reasons for the use receptive skills to process the new information.

a) *For identifying the topic:* learners with the help of their own schema quickly get an idea of what is being written or talked about.

b) *For predicting and guessing:* learners guess, predict or make assumptions in order to try and understand what is being written or talked about, especially if they have previously identified the topic. The following reading and listening helps them to confirm or readjust their expectations.

c) *For reading and listening for general understating:* it means not stopping for every single word, not analyzing everything. Skimming is a term...
commonly used in getting a general understanding or a quick idea of what it is all about.

d) For reading and listening for specific information: students frequently go spoken or written information to get specific details. Irrelevant information is discarded until we come to the specific information we are looking for. Scanning is the skilled commonly used in these situations.

e) For reading and listening for detailed information: sometimes learners read and listen in order to understand everything they are reading in detail. This is usually the case with written instructions or directions, or with the description of scientific procedures; (...).

f) For interpreting text: learners for readings and listening may able to see beyond the literal meaning of words, using a variety of clues to understand what is implied or suggested. Successful interpretation depends to a students´ schema. Students use their schema along with their knowledge of the world to expand the pictures they have been given, and to fill in the gaps which the writer or speaker seem to have left. (p. 201-202)

Harmer (2005) possessed an idea how schema helps receptive skills:

In order to make sense of any text we need to have ‘pre-existent knowledge of the world’ (Cook, 1989, p. 69). Such knowledge is often referred to as schema (plural schemata). Each of us carries in our heads mental representations of typical situations that we come across. When we are stimulated by particular words, discourse patterns, or contexts, such schematic knowledge is activated and we are able to recognize what we see or hear because it fits into patterns that we already know. (p. 199)
Hutchinson (1987) advanced the idea that:

As has been noted, in terms of materials this approach generally puts the emphasis on reading or listening strategies, the characteristic exercises get the learners to reflect on and analyze how meaning is produced in and retrieved from written or spoken discourses. Taking their cue from cognitive learning theories (…) the language learners are treated as thinking beings who can be asked to observe and verbalize the interpretive processes they employ in language use. (p. 14)

When we see a written text our schematic knowledge may first tell us what kind of genre we are dealing with. (…). Knowing what kind of a text we are dealing with allow us to predict the form it may take at the text, paragraph, and sentences level. Key words and phrases alert us to the subject of a text, and this again allow us, as we read, to predict what is coming next. (Harmer, 2005, p.200)

For Harmer (2005), schemata make spoken and written communication efficient. Without the right kind of pre-existing knowledge, comprehension becomes much more difficult. And that is the problem for some foreign language learners who, because they have a different shared knowledge of cultural reference and discourse patterning in their own language and culture from that in the English variety they are dealing with, have to work doubly hard to understand what they see or hear. (p.200)

There should not be questions that receptive and productive skills could work insolated to each other. Learning process usually depends on one first and it evokes or produce the other. Then, the final outcome will use both of them as Communication is a two way process that consists of receiving information and responding in the form of giving information (Kumar, 2015, p.91)
Golkova and Hubackova (2014) said that:

This should also prove that both types of skills are inseparable and one cannot exist without the other. When learning a foreign language, receptive skills usually come first and should be followed by practical application of productive ones. If a learning process lacks one of them, the final outcome will not be complete. (…). When one starts learning a foreign language, he surely and subconsciously is exposed to both categories of language skill. As mentioned before, productive skills - also called active skills - mean the transmission of information that a language user produces in either spoken or written form. Productive skills would not exist without the support of receptive ones. (p. 478)

The receptive skills are easy to attain than the productive skills as they need an enormous practice. However, in the case of EFL learning, this sequence does not always work the same way. The researcher has interviewed Saudi students and found that a child usually start to learn a foreign language in the sixth standard now. Then he learns listening, reading EFL comfortably but has to struggle to learn speaking and writing. But through teacher’s pragmatic approach, the students develop all the four skills simultaneously. We see in the language lab that listening to the target language usually helps to develop speaking skills and similarly reading does the same to writing skills. (…). The receptive skills usually prepare the foundation for the productive skills to produce output in the form of completion of task. The learners are required to attain all the four skills to accomplice their objective of language acquisition as attaining half would not serve the purpose. Communication is a two way process that consists of receiving information and responding in the form of giving information. The receiving information covers listening and reading skills whereas speaking and writing skills are productive skills. A person is
considered to be a complete gainer of Language when he speaks fluently and write effectively. (Kumar, 2015, pp.91-92)

### 2.2.4.5.2 Learning productive skills

Concerning productive skills, Kumar (2015) differs speaking from writing mentioning that: the productive skills are different from each other in many ways. The spoken language is often inconsistent and dynamic in nature except recorded, whereas the written language can be kept as a record for future references. Misunderstanding while speaking can be cleared up instantly ‘on the spot’, which is not possible in writing. The written language is thoughtful and conscious process that needs more time and is monotonous but spoken language serves to deal with feelings, emotions and different situations to clarify doubts, if any, to make communication constructive and effective. Written language often uses long and complex sentences comparing to that of spoken language where the sentences are shorter and easier to understand. Therefore, we should adhere to different ways to learn, attain and deal ELL and teaching. (p. 94)

Golkova and Hubackova (2014) stated a classification for productive skills:

The same process is done with writing which the same way as speaking belongs to the category of productive language skills, also described as active skills. More energy is needed to ‘produce’ any outcome of those types. Both types of language skills make an integral part of learning process at any stage of its development. (p. 478)

Kumar (2015) also gave another classification:

There are four language skills i.e. listening, reading, writing and speaking, involved in the language learning process. The reading and listening skills are called receptive skills and speaking and writing skills are called productive skills. (p. 91)
When an individual communicates, he or she has to organize the ideas in such way that they should be coherent and cohesive, particularly in written messages. Coherent writing makes sense because you can follow the sequence of ideas and points. Cohesion is a more technical matter since it is here that we concentrate on various linguistics ways of connecting ideas across phrases and sentences. (Harmer, 2005, p. 246).

For Golkova and Hubackova (2014), it is undoubtedly certain that grammatical structures, words and their proper use, and certain extent of accuracy need to be respected. These are implemented in both types of active skills. However Teachers must focus on promoting communicative competence in language students by applying “communicative activities” As Olshtain and Cohen (1991) quoted in Golkova and Hubackova (2014) say: ”if we wish to master another language we need to become more communicatively competent”. (p. 478)

In spoken messages, they follow conversational patters, some types of lexical phrases or organizing ideas and conversation analysis. Although spontaneous speech may appear considerably more chaotic and disorganized that a lot of writing, speakers nevertheless employ a number of structuring devices, from languages designed to buy time, to turn-taking language, and quite specific organizing markers. (Harmer, 2005, p. 246).

Learners who share some cultural contexts and linguistic backgrounds, get together in language activities, it is easy for them to transfer their ideas to each other as they quite know the rules of conversation. when those students exchange written messages, they obey certain rules or conventions corresponding to cultural level or schemas.
Harmer (2005) pointed out some recommendations which are needed to be considered to learn productive skills.

a) **Sociocultural rules**: speakers from similar cultural background know how to speak to each other in terms of how formal to be, what kind of languages they can use, how loud to speak, or how close to stand to each other. (…). Sociocultural rules and habits change and habits change over time, but at any time given moment they exist in the public consciousness so that obeying them or purposefully flouting them become acts of belonging or rejection.

b) **Turn-taking**: in any conversation decision have to be taken about when each person should speak. This is ‘turn-taking’, a term which refers to the way in which participants in conversation get their chance to speak. They do this by using visual or verbal signals to take a speaking turn.

c) **Rules for writing**: writing has rules too, which we need to recognize and either follow or purposefully flout.

d) **Output and input**: such input or feedback can take various forms. Some of it comes from ourselves, whether or not we are language learners. We modify what we write or say as we go along based on how effective we think we are being. Feedback also comes from the people we are communicating with. In face-to-face spoken interaction or listeners tell us in number of ways whether we are managing to get our message across.(p. 247, 250)

When learners of a foreign language deal with difficulty at these skills, they employ some strategies to resolve the difficulty they encounter. Harmer (2005) mentions four strategies, students use at the moment of communication:

a) **Improvising**: learners can come up with words or phrases in the hope that is about right.
b) Discarding: students may discard words for what they want to say.

c) Foreignising: learners sometimes choose a word in a language they know well and ‘foreignise’ it in the hope that it equivalent to the meaning that wish to express in the foreign language.

d) Paraphrasing: students paraphrase, talking about something in other words. (p. 249)

According to Golkova and Hubackova (2014), need analysis should be implemented in productive skills since more experienced language instructors bear in mind that students’ responses to need analysis forms bring valuable pieces of information for setting up the core of the language course plan. The content of such a plan should include some general activities, but there also should be a set of tailor-made exercises that suit the specific group of learners and where particular objectives are set. (p. 478)

2.2.4.6 What is ESP?

At the same time as we have being learning General English (GE), something has grown in our minds, the idea of our specific needs or why we study the foreign language. Our purposes to learn that language varies considerably in a number of different ways or from one context to another. For instance, language students may learn English to talk about a particular discipline as engineering, medicine, management or art. Those students’ goals or purposes are bounded up naturally causing the need for the development of English courses for specific group of learner. The idea is simple, if learning has an influence on their motivation and effectiveness of their learning, it should be possible to create specific courses to foster them to achieve their needs and goals because of this a phenomenon grow out of a number of converging trends, it was called ESP ( English for Specific Purposes) which has carried out all the former interests mentioned in this chapter.
Hutchinson (1987) proposed a definition for ESP:

ESP must be seen as an approach not as a product. ESP is not a particular kind of language or methodology, nor does it consist of a particular type of teaching material. Understood properly, it is an approach to language learning, which is based on learner need. The foundation of all ESP is the simple question: Why does this learner need to learn a foreign language? (...) ESP, then, is an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner’s reasons for learning. (p. 19)

ESP can be defined as teaching and learning English as a second or foreign language for the purpose of using it in a particular domain. Since 1960s ESP has become a distinctive part of TEFL its importance being due to the fact that English has become the contemporary lingua franca. Thus, the growing demand for English as a medium of communication and the introduction of governmental mass educational programs in which English was the first or even the only language contributed to the rapid expansion in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) to which ESP belonged initially. The communicative trend in teaching and learning English has resulted in different reasons for acquiring this language proficiency: daily communication, academic or business purposes and ESP was created with all these in view. (Simion, 2015, p. 54)

Choudhary (2013) asserted another definition for ESP:

This definition tries to identify ESP in contrast with GE. Therefore, the emphasis is on “Specific English” that belongs to some particular discipline, occupation or activity. This definition makes it mandatory that ESP courses should concentrate on the language, i.e. syntax, lexis, discourse, semantics etc., which is appropriate for some particular discipline, occupation or activity.
Simion (2015) based on Duddley – Evans (1988), also noted some characteristics of ESP:

Ten years later, Duddley – Evans et al gives a similar definition of ESP and both authors cooperated to offer absolute and variable characteristics of ESP. Most researchers seem to agree on two characteristics:

a) ESP is based on a particular context;

b) ESP is based on the learners’ specific needs. (p.54)

Choudhary (2013) based on Duddley – Evans and St. Johns (1988), added more characteristics of ESP:

ESP is a recognizable activity of ELT with some specific characteristics. Dudley-Evans and St. Johns” tried (1998) to apply a series of characteristics, some absolute and some variable, to outline the major features of ESP.

**Absolute Characteristics:**

1. ESP is defined to meet specific needs of the learners;

2. ESP makes use of underlying methodology and activities of the discipline it serves;

3. ESP is centered on the language (grammar, lexis, register), skills, discourse and genre appropriate to these activities.

**Variable Characteristics:**

1. ESP may be related to or designed for specific disciplines;

2. ESP may use, in specific teaching situations, a different methodology from that of GE;

3. ESP is likely to be designed for adult learners, either at a tertiary level institution or in a professional work situation. It could, however, be for learners at secondary school level;
4. ESP is generally designed for intermediate or advanced students.

5. Most ESP courses assume some basic knowledge of the language systems, but it can be used with beginners. (p. 4)

2.2.4.6.1 Why ESP?

The aforesaid definition tends to contemplate English courses as subjects of wishes, needs and demands of people that are interested in learning the language for business or commercial purposes; indeed, learners have a right path on motivation to learn and therefore on the success of their learning. This is the reason for the creations of specific courses in which students’ interests and goals are relevant.

Lamri (2016) drew a reason why ESP is employed in classrooms:

This denotes that, the role of ESP is to help language learners to build up the needed abilities in order to use them in a specific field of inquiry, occupation, or workplace. (p. 3)

But English has become the accepted international language of technology and commerce, it has created a new generation of learners who knew specifically why they were learning a language - businessmen and –women who wanted to sell their products, mechanics who had to read instructions manuals, doctors who needed to keep up with development in their field and a whole range of students whose course of study included textbooks and journals only available in English. All these and many others needed English and, most importantly, they knew why they needed it. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 6)

Simion (2015) conceived another reason for the use of ESP:

The communicative trend in teaching and learning English has resulted in different reasons for acquiring this language proficiency: daily communication,
academic or business purposes and ESP was created with all these in view (p. 1)

2.2.4.6.2 The types of ESP

The question arousing in our minds is how ESP at the present time is related to many ELT courses. At the beginning, ESP was considered into two main branches: EAP involving post-experience courses, and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) for study in a school subject. Another division of ESP has been considered into EAP and EOP according to discipline or professional area; however, this division has been narrow as it overlooks various types of ESP teaching and recently more academic fields; for example, business, economics, tech, psychology, social sciences courses. Regarding of this, the broad scope of ESP in many fields of studies has expanded to cover significant groups and the key of this expansion is to teach and take care of their specific needs by giving ESP more particular types.
Hutchinson (1987) contemplated the idea of branches of ESP in a tree, giving some remarked division that are looked down on ELT:
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**Figure 6**: The branches of ESP

The tree represents some of common divisions that are made in ELT. The topmost branches of the tree show the level at which individual ESP courses occur. The branches just below this level indicate that these may conveniently be divided into two main types of ESP differentiated according to whether the learner requires English for academy study EAP or for work/training (EOP/EVP/VESL: English for Occupational Purposes/English
for Vocational Purposes/ Vocational English as Second Language). This is, of course, not a clear-cut distinction: people can work and study simultaneously; it is also likely that in many cases the language learnt for immediate use in a study environment will be used later when the student takes up, or return to, a job. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 16)

At the next level down it is possible to distinguish ESP courses by the general nature of the learners’ specialism. Three large categories are usually identified here: EST (English for Science and Technology), EBE (English for Business and Economics) and ESS (English for the Social Sciences). This last is not common, probably because it is not thought to differ significantly from more traditional humanities-based GE. As we go down the tree, we can see that ESP is just one branch of EFL/ESL which are themselves the main branches of ELT in general. ELT, in turn is one variety of the many possible kinds of language teaching. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 16,18).

Choudhary (2013) noted another classification for ESP:

Dudley-Evans and St. John, (1998) have divided EAP into two divisions: English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and ESAP (English for Specific Academic Purposes). EGAP is related to the teaching of language skills that are common in different disciplines but ESAP refers to the teaching of language features that are specific for various disciplines. Research has offered insights into the mutual relationship of EGAP and ESAP. Skills and language functions learnt in EGAP programs may be transferred to specific disciplines in ESAP programs. Many researchers have discussed about the types of ESP and most of them have grouped ESP into two main categories: EOP and EAP (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991) whereas Carter (1983) has identified the following three types of ESP:
1. English as a restricted language

2. English for Academic and Occupational Purposes (EAOP)

3. English with specific topics. (p. 141)

Bdlokcuoğlu (2012) suggested another division:

Despite the fact that ESP is traditionally divided into two main branches as EAP, and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP), Carter (1983) suggests three types of ESP, which are, English as a Restricted Language, EAOP, and English with Specific Topics (EST). (p. 82)

2.2.4.7 Need Analysis

In a previous part, ESP was defined, but the question which starts in mind is why learners need to learn a foreign language. In fact, it is not complicated to find or specify needs for a target group of students; nevertheless, what is high worth is how conscious we are about certain needs. For Hutchinson (1987) what differs ESP from GE is that it is not the existence of a need, but rather an awareness of a need. If we take account of why students need English, that awareness will guide us to elaborate proper contents in language courses and achieve potential goals. That’s why teachers and trainers have to see ESP as an approach rather than a product.

According to Richards (1986), on the basis of such needs assessments, teachers are expected to plan group and individual instruction that responds to the learner’s need. These specific learning needs and communication needs of students have to be gathered before making any syllabus of contents for program relevant to language courses.

Richards and Rodgers (1986) added an assumption about need analysis and CLT:

The CLT teacher assumes a responsibility for determining and responding to learner language needs. This may be done informally and personally through
one-to-one sessions with students, in which the teacher talks through such
issues as the student’s perception of his or her learning style, learning asserts,
and learning goals. It may be done formally through administering a need
assessment instrument, (...). Typically, such formal assessments contains items
that attempt to determine an individual’s motivation for studying the language.
For example, students might respond on a 5-point scale (strongly agree to
strongly disagree) to statements like the following.

I want to study English because…

1. I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job
2. It will help me better understand English-speaking people and their way of life.
3. One need is a good knowledge of English to gain other people’s respect.
4. It will allow me to meet and converse with interesting people.
5. I need it for my job.
6. It will enable me to think and behave like English-speaking people. (p. 78)

Need analysis is concerned with identifying general and specific language needs
that can be addresses in developing goals, objectives, and content in a language program.
Needs analysis may focus either on the general parameters of a language program(e.g., by
obtaining data on who the learners are, their present level of language proficiency, teacher
and learner are goals and expectations, the teacher’s teaching skills and level of
proficiency in the target language, constraints of time and budget, available instructional
resources, as well as societal expectations) or on specific need, such as the kind of
listening comprehension training need for foreign students attending graduate seminars in
biology. (Richards and Rodgers, 1986. p. 156)
(...) it would be needs analysis, since is it the awareness of a target situation—a definable need to communicate in English—that distinguishes the ESP learner from the learner of GE. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 54).

From Munby’s perspective (1978), Hutchinson (1987) mentioned that:

Munby presents a highly detailed set of procedures for discovering target situation needs. He calls this set of procedures the Communication Needs Processor (CNP). The CNP consists of a range of questions about key communication variables (topic, participants, medium, etc) which can be used to identify the target language needs of any group of learners.

Simion (2015) added another definition for need analysis: (…), needs analysis consisted in assessing the communicative needs of the learners and the techniques of achieving specific teaching objectives.

Nowadays, the tasks of needs analysis is much more complex: it aims at collecting information about the learners and at defining the target situation and environment of studying ESP. According to Duddley-Evans and St. John (2009) there are eight components in today’s concept of needs analysis which have been grouped into five broad areas including:

1. Target situation analysis and objective needs analysis (e.g. tasks and activities learners will use English for);
2. Linguistic analysis, discourse analysis, genre analysis, i.e. knowledge of how language and skills are used in the target situations;
3. Subjective needs analysis, i.e. learners’ wants, means, subjective needs-factors that affect the way they learn(e.g. previous learning experiences, reasons for attending the course, expectations)
4. Present situation analysis for the purpose of identifying learners’ current skills and language use;
5. Means analysis, i.e. information about the environment where the course will run. (p. 54)

2.2.4.7.1 The target needs

Based on Hutchinson and Waters (1987), they define as “target needs”, what learners need to do in the target. In other words, the linguistics elements of the target language to obtain for learning purposes.

Following Robinson (1991), Lamri (2016) noted that: ‘Target needs’ are what the learner needs to do to actually acquire the language, what the students themselves would like to gain from the language course or what the students do not know or cannot do in English. (p. 12)

For Hutchinson (1987), it is referred into a target situation in expressions of 3 elements.

- **Necessities**: we can call ‘necessities’ the type of need determined by the demands of the target situation; that is, what the learner has to know in order to function effective in the target situation. (…) This information is relatively easy to gather. It is a matter of observing what situation the learner will need to function in and then analyzing the constituent parts of them. (p. 55)

- **Lacks**: to identify alone, however, is not enough, since the concern in ESP is with the needs of particular learners. You also need to know what the learner knows already, so that you can then decide which of the necessities the learner lacks. (p. 55-56)

- **Wants**: but awareness is a matter of perception, and perception may vary according to one’s standpoint. Learners may well have a clear idea of the ‘necessities’ of the target situation: they will certainly have a view as to their
‘lacks’. But it is quite possible that the learners’ view will conflict with the perception of other interested parties: course designer, sponsors, and teachers. (p. 56)

2.2.4.7.2 Learning needs.

So far, needs were considered in terms of target situation; however, what knowledge or abilities learners expect to be competent in such target situations. How can a language communicator function correctly in different situations? For Hutchinson (1987), these answers may be recorded in terms of language items such as skills, strategies, subject knowledge, etc. If we pay attention to needs, potential and constrains of the route in the learning situation, the learning process will be achieved. So a course design is not only focused on objectives, starting point or destination. It takes many factors for any useful need analysis.

Students have different motivation or interests for being in a language classroom even they do not know these learning needs. English teachers do have to know more about them before teaching classes. Moreover, Scrivener (2005) adds that various tools, procedures and materials used for finding out about learner needs, but also gather information about:

- Where learner are starting from: their present language level, current problems, etc.
- What learners would like to learn (which may be different from what they need);
- How they want to study it (people have different preferences about how they learn things).

Using our analogy of the ESP courses as a journey, what we have done so far is to consider the starting point (lacks) and the destination (necessities), although we have also
seen that there might be some dispute as to what that destination should be (wants).
(Hutchinson, 1987, p. 62)

For all manner of possible reasons learners may be well motivated in the subject lesson or in their work, but totally turned off by encouraging the same material in a ESP classroom. The target situation, in other words, is not a reliable indicator of what is needed or useful in the ESP learning situation. the target situation analysis can determine the destination; it can also act as a compass on the journey to give general direction, but we must choose our route according to the vehicles and guides available (i.e. the conditions of the learning situation), the existing roads within the learner´s mind (i.e. their knowledge, skills and strategies) and the learners´ motivation for travelling. . (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 62)

2.2.4.8 Approaches to ESP

For Richards (1986), an approach is a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. An approach is axiomatic. It describes the nature of the subject matter to be taught…. Another research on the same framework was conducted by Hutchinson (1987), ESP, then is an approach to language teaching in which all decisions as to content and method are based on the learner´s reason for learning. Designing language courses is a matter of data collection of integrated series of teaching-learning experiences, particular knowledge, needs analysis so this data must be interpreted in terms of what students need, want, and classroom facilities they may require.

In practical terms this entails the use of the theoretical and empirical information available to produce a syllabus; to select, adapt or write materials in accordance with the syllabus, to develop a methodology for teaching those materials and to establish evaluation procedures by which progress towards the specified goals will be measured. (…). There are probably as many different approaches to ESP course design as there are course
designers. We can, however, identify three main types: language-centered, skills-centered and learning-centered. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 65)

2.2.4.8.1 Language-centered approach

This course is designed to aim processes to analyze the relation between the target situation and the content of the ESP courses. It departs with learners as means to identify the target situation, the learner just limits the language to be taught, and then follows stages to revise the syllabus, thence verifies materials in use and finally, evaluates the learning of the syllabus items.

Moreover, Hutchinson (1987) contemplated that:

In the language-centered approach, the answer to this question would be ‘the ability to comprehend and/or produce the linguistic features of the target situation’, for example the ability to understand the passive voice. Thus what the CNP produces is a list of the linguistic features of the target situation.

Brown (2001) includes some steps that may help in this approach:

▪ Techniques that focus on or account for learners´ needs, styles and goals.
▪ Techniques that give some control to the student (group work or strategy training, for example).
▪ Curricula that include the consultation and input of students and that do not presuppose objectives in advance.
▪ Techniques that allow for student creativity and innovation.
▪ Techniques that enhance a student´s sense of competence and self-worth. (p. 46-47)
Hutchinson (1987) explains a procedure about the language-centered courses:
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**Figure 7:** A language-centered approach to course design

Hutchinson (1987) suggested some characteristics on this approach to show that learners are being people, learning is not a straightforward, logical process:

a. The learner is simply used as a means of identifying that target situation.

Instead of taking the whole of English and teaching it to the learner, as happens in GE, only a restricted area of the language is taught. (...), the learner is used solely as a way of locating the restricted area. Thereafter the learner plays no further part in the process.

b. The language-centered process can also be criticized for being a static and inflexible procedure, which can take little account of the conflicts and
contradictions that are inherent in any human endeavor. The unexpected students’ motivational attitude should be taken into account, any procedure must have flexibility, feedback channels and error tolerance built in so that it can respond to unsuspected or developing influences.

c. At first sight, the false belief that learning itself is systematic – that the systematic analysis and presentation of language date will procedure systematic learning in the learner. (…) we learn by fitting individual items of knowledge together to create a meaningful predictive system. But the most important point here is that it must be an internally-generated system not an externally-imposed system. The fact that knowledge has been systematically analyzed and systematically presented does not in any way imply that it will be systematically learnt. Learners have to make the system meaningful to themselves.

d. Data such that produced by a needs analysis, is not important in itself. Data must be interpreted, and in interpreting we make use of all sorts of knowledge that are not revealed in the analysis itself. What is actually happening in the language-centered approach is that an analytical model is also being used inappropriately as a predictive model. (p. 67-68)

2.2.4.8.2 Skill-centered approach

The Skills-centered approach has been traditionally popular in many countries, especially in Latin America; for example, Peru. Students who attend EFL classroom deal with the fact they do not practice the target language outside the classroom so that limitations to acquire and develop the four main skills in a language. In respond of this, a number of ESP courses focused more on reading activities than others; however those courses did not overlook the other learning skills.
For Brown (2001), he proposed an idea so-called integrating the ‘four skills’. It is said that (…) if anything, the added richness of the latter gives students greater motivation that converts to better retention of principles of effective speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Rather than being forced to plod along through a course that limits itself to one mode of performance, students are given a chance to diversity their efforts in more meaning tasks. Such integration can, of course, still utilize a strong, principal approach to the separate, unique characteristics of each skill. (p. 233)

The skills-centered model, therefore, is a reaction both to the idea of specific registers of English as a basis for ESP and to the practical constrains on learning by limited time and resources. In essence it sees the ESP course as helping learners to develop skills and strategies which will continue to develop after the ESP course itself. Its aim is not to provide a specified corpus of linguistic knowledge but to make the learners into better processors of information. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 70)

Garcia (1998, 1999) affirmed that:

Skills and strategies-based approaches to ESP have enlarged now the conception of authenticity in two principal ways. First, authenticity of text was both broadened to include texts other than written texts and narrowed to differentiate between the different types of text generated by each skill, so that reading, for example, could be sub-divided into reading reports, reading technical journals, reading instruction manuals ... etc. Secondly, the conception of authenticity was enlarged to embrace authenticity of task. (…)In terms of materials, then, this approach generally puts the emphasis on reading and listening skills. The characteristic exercises get the learners to reflect on and analyze how meaning is produced and retrieved from written and spoken discourse. Taking their cue from cognitive learning theories, the language
learners are treated as thinking beings who can be asked to observe and verbalize the interpretive processes they employ in language use. (pp. 218-219)

The role of needs analysis in a skill-centered approach is twofold. Firstly, it provides a basis for discovering the underlying competence that enables people to perform in the target situation. Secondly, it enables the course designer to discover the potential knowledge and abilities that the learners bring to the ESP classroom. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 70)

Hutchinson (1987) contemplated two fundamental principles about the skill-centered approach on theoretical and pragmatic forms:

a) The basic theoretical hypothesis is that underlying any language behavior are certain skills and strategies, which the learner uses in order to produce or comprehended discourse. A skills-centered approach aims to get away from the surface performance data and look at the competence that underlies the performance. A skills-centered course, therefore, will present its learning objectives in terms of both performance and competence.

b) The process-oriented approach tries to avoid failure by removing the distinction between the ESP course and the target situation. (...). The emphasis in the ESP course, then, is not on achieving a particular set of goals, but on enabling the learners to achieve what, they can within the given constraints: the process-oriented approach... is at least realistic concentrating on strategies and processes of making students aware of their own abilities and potential, and motivating them to tackle target texts on their own after the end of the course, so that they can continue to improve.
Hutchinson (1987) drew the chart below to explain a skills-centered approach:

**Figure 8**: A skills-centered approach to course design

Brown (2001) points out that the integration of the four skills is the only plausible approach within a communicative interaction framework, and he describes some observation:

a) Often one skill will reinforce another, we learn to speak, for example in part by modeling what we hear, and we learn to write by examining what we can read.

b) Proponents of the whole language approach have shown us that in the real world of language use, most of our natural performance involves not only the integration of one or more skills, but connections between language and the way we think and feel and act. (p. 234)

### 2.2.4.8.3 Learning-centered approach

Learning is seen as process of negotiation meaning between individuals and society. In classroom, students, teachers and society are factors of the teaching process. Learners are seen as communicative competent; however teachers are expected to play an
important role in the learning process. Indeed, Learning is a principal factor since the learner uses their knowledge and skills to convey a new information so they master competency in the target language. Learning, therefore, is an internal process due to knowledge, skills, abilities and (inner – outer) motivation.

A learning-centered approach says: we must look beyond the competence that enables someone to perform, because what we really want to discover is not the competence itself, but how someone acquires that competence. (Hutchinson, 1987, p. 70)

Holliday (1997) added up that:

A learning-centered approach, on the other hand, which acknowledges the social context of education (Hutchinson and Waters 1984) (…). It puts such worries about the CA as group work clearly in their place. The aim is to enable students to learn. Group work and free language production are possible means to this end, amongst a potential of many more. The stronger version of the CA (…) makes this variety possible and can be informed entirely by communicative, ethnographic action research, which will decide whether or not such procedures as group work are appropriate to a specific classroom setting. (p. 176)
Hutchinson (1987) drew the relationship among (language-centered, skill-centered and learning-centered) approaches:

![Diagram of course design approaches]

**Figure 9**: A comparison of approaches to course design

According to Hutchinson (1987), a learning-centered approach takes account of the learner at every stage. This has contemplations:

a) Course design is a negotiated process. There is no single factor which has an outright determining influence on the content of the course. The ESP learning situation and the target situation will both influence the nature of the syllabus, materials, methodology and evaluation procedures. Similarly each of these components will influence and be influenced by the others.

b) Course design is a dynamic process. It does not move in a linear fashion from initial analysis to completed course. Needs and resources vary with
time. The course design, therefore, needs to have built-in feedback channels to enable the course to respond to developments.

c) What is of most concern is how the learner can learn that knowledge most effectively. If the effectiveness of the process can be enriched by the use of other skills, then that is what should be done.

d) Variety is, therefore, not just a nice thing to have for its own sake: it is a vital element in keeping the learners’ mind alert and focused on the task in hand. Processing the same information through a variety of skills is one way of achieving reinforcement while still maintaining concentration. (p. 74-76)

Furthermore, Holliday (1997) concurred that “In a learning-centered approach, teacher monitoring is one factor that has to be decided about in the light of what strategy will bring learning about.” (p. 176)
2.3 Definition of key terms

**Acculturation:**
The process of becoming adapted to a new culture.

**Acquisition:**
The internalization of linguist structures on a target language which are assimilated into a L2 classroom. This learning can be considered conscious knowledge as the learner is aware of the new information. In this sense it is synonymous with ‘learning’.

**Attitude:**
An individual poses a way of behaving in their social context, or belief about reacting or responding in different situations, it depends on their own culture. These attitudes also influence their orientation toward language learning.

**Authentic language:**
It advocate the use of any authentic materials so the use of material sources have to be cultural sensitive, due to the interface of the target language and cultural norms. Language is seen naturalistic with total exclusion of controlled exercises.

**CLT:**
Communicative language teaching: an approach aimed at teaching current language in its use, rather than seeing its theoretical knowledge of how language works.

**Communicative competence:**
A set of knowledge of linguistic rules assimilated by the speaker that allows the use of the language in different communicative events in order to interact pragmatic and semiotic
strategies and knowledge among speaker-hearer who have to share the same language system.

**Context:**
A set of elements that are part of the same place and situation. The context in language teaching is the interaction that is also influenced by the wider educational environment and society.

**ESP:**
It stands for English for Specific Purposes, in contrast to General English, it creates specific courses to foster a group of learners to achieve their needs and goals; because of this, the phenomenon has grown out of a number of converging trends in different field of studies.

**Ethnography:**
It is the research and analysis of how a group of people behave and make their lives with others. It pays particular attention to people’s particular cultural context, everyday interactions in formal or informal places that guide some aimed activities.

**Foreign language context:**
Contexts in which students do not have ready-made contexts for communication in the target language beyond their classroom. They may be obtainable through language clubs, special media opportunities, or an occasional tourist, but efforts must be made to create such opportunities.

**Language proficiency:**
The students’ level of command of the target language that allows them the formation of comprehension and production correctly.
Language skills:
It is common to talk about four language skills; listening, reading, writing, and speaking. They are put into two groups: receptive or passive skills (listening and reading) and productive or active skills (speaking and writing).

Need analysis:
The ways of finding out what the students’ needs and wants are on a specific language course.

Learning-centered:
An approach aimed at the learning of languages. Its effectiveness may be enriched by the use of other language skills. Students are expected not to reach the competence itself, but how they acquire that competence step by step in the process of learning.

Schema:
It is the knowledge already stored in memory or mental representation that incorporate all the information of an object or an event acquired from experiences; it also functions in the process of understanding and processing new information using old knowledge.

Social distance:
The result of a number of factors which affect the learner as a member of a social group in contact with the target language group.
Chapter III

Hypothesis and variables

3.1 Hypothesis

3.1.1 General Hypothesis

The social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

3.1.2 Specific Hypothesis

SH01: The classroom context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

SH02: The cultural context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

3.2 Variables and Operationalization of variables

3.2.1 Variables

3.2.1.1 Variable I: The social context

The social context represents the set of factors that define the student’s environment outside of the classroom and student’s language culture connection. These factors include native language, dominant culture, availability of opportunities to practice the target language in an authentic manner, family structures, socioeconomic resources,
institutional stability, etc. The social context can determine to what degree English language acquisition serves the student outside of the classroom, and thus affects the teacher’s means of applying pedagogical theories efficiently.

### 3.2.1.2 Variable II: Communicative Language Teaching

CLT is an established theory that centers on the student’s ability to negotiate with other speakers in communicative events when producing language at a certain level of competency. CLT holds that authentic language ought to be a central part of the language learning process so as that students consider the learning process is meaningful in their lives.

### 3.2.1.3 Variable III: English Language Learning

English language learning (ELL) is considered as any approach that conducts learners’ acquisition of a foreign language. It is carried out in the formal instruction of a classroom where it could be initiated as a goal-oriented activity or aided by motivation. This involves using language to resolve real-life situations by managing the target language. The process also departs from the idea of students’ attitude toward learning since these attitudes are influenced by their kind of personality. Furthermore, ELL could be aimed to the students’ goals or purposes causing the need for the development of English courses for specific group of learner. Indeed, ESP, which is based on learners’ needs and wants, takes account of the need analysis for gathering relevant information and at determining the target situation and environment of studying. As a result of this, ESP takes the learning-centered approach as aim of English courses.
### Table 3. Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable I:</strong></td>
<td>Cultural context</td>
<td>• The context of the national culture. • The context of the professional culture. • The context of the institutional culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The social context</strong></td>
<td>Classroom context</td>
<td>• Attitude. (how students react when they talk about their culture) • Ethnographic profile. (how students behave in certain situations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable II:</strong></td>
<td>Communicative events</td>
<td>• Process of conveying and transmitting information effectively. • Use the language productively and receptively. • Give students valuable communicative practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authentic language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate the use of any authentic materials. • Total exclusion of controlled exercises or grammatical pointers. • Methodology must be culturally sensitive. • Target language interface with cultural norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicative Language Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Meaningful Learning</td>
<td>• Apply what is learnt in everyday life situations. • Apply this knowledge in negotiation meaning. • Themes need to be adapted to learners’ context • Integrate the foreign language with students’ own personality and thus they feel more emotionally secure with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners’ attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>• How receptive students are toward the target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feel what students are learning is personally relevant to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What students need to learn or want to be taught in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>• define the target situation and environment of studying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning-centered</td>
<td></td>
<td>• students are not expected to discover the competence itself, but rather how they acquire that competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• how the learner can learn more effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Oneself
Chapter IV

Methodology

4.1 Type of research

This is a quantitative research because “It assumes statistical procedures for data processing, making use of descriptive statistics and/or inferential.” (Sánchez et al, 1996, p. 19) (Own Translation). “Quantitative focus uses the collection of data to prove hypotheses, based on numerical measurement and statistical analysis, in order to establish behavioral patterns and prove theories” (Hernández Sampieri et al, 2006, p. 5) (Own Translation)

In order to obtain such results, the researcher collects numerical data of the objects, phenomena, or participants that he studies and analyzes by way of statistical procedures. From this set of steps, called **quantitative process of investigation**, are derived other characteristics of the quantitative focus which are identified below. (Hernández Sampiere et al, 2006, p.5) (Own Translation)

In a quantitative investigation one intends to generalize the results found in a group (sample) to a larger collection (universe or population). One also tries to duplicate the studies that were carried out (Hernández Sampieri et al, 2006, p. 6) (Own Translation)

In the end, with quantitative studies, one looks to explain and predict investigation, seeking out regularities and causal relationships among the elements. This means that the principal goal is the construction and demonstration of theories (that both explain and predict) (Hernández Sampieri et al, 2006, p. 6) (Own Translation)

4.2 Research method

This can be defined as an investigation what is carried out without deliberately manipulating variables. That is to say, it refers to studies where we do not cause the independent variables to vary in an intentional way in order to observe their effect on other variables. What we do in non-experimental studies is observe phenomena just as they
occur in their natural context, in order subsequently analyze them” (Hernández Sampieri et al, 2006, p. 205).

Descriptive designs have the objective of exploring the incidence and values among which one or more variables appear. The procedure consists of measuring one or more variables in a group of people or objects and providing a description of characteristics. Thus, they are purely descriptive studies which answer questions as what, how, where, when, how many, the latter can also give a feature of the phenomenon (Sánchez et al, 1996, p. 14,78) (Own Translation)

Hernandez Sampieri, Fernandez and Baptista (2006) suggested that:

Descriptive studies look to specify the properties, characteristics, and profiles of people, groups, communities, objects, or any other phenomenon that is submitted to analysis. That is to say, they measure, evaluate, or collect data concerning different concepts (variables), aspects, dimensions or components of the phenomenon to be investigated. (Sánchez et al, 1996, pp. 14,78) (Own Translation)

4.3 Research design

This design or type of descriptive research is the most used in the field of research in Psychology, Education, and Socials Sciences. It is oriented to determine a degree relationship between two or more variables of interest in the same sample of subjects or a degree of relationship between two phenomena or observed events. It's a relatively easy type of research to design and perform. (Sánchez et al, 1996,p. 79) (Own Translation)

When it is a sample of individuals, the investigator observes the presence or absence of the variables that they want to relate, and then relate them by means of a statistics technique of correlation analysis. In social sciences; for example, the investigator observes the moment in which a certain phenomenon appears, and other circumstances are
presented also in a contemporaneous way so as to be able to determine the possible relation between such events. This type of study allows us to affirm in what extent the variations in a variable or event are associated with the variations in the other or other variables or events. (Sánchez et al, 1996, p. 79) (Own Translation)

4.4 Population and sample

The participants of this study are 40 grade 4th secondary school students in school N° 142 in San Juan de Lurigancho, Lima. Their ages range between 14 and 17 years old and the distribution of female and male students is about equal. Most of the students’ mother tongue is Spanish and a few of them have a vernacular language as their L1. The sample includes the total number of students considered in the population.

4.5 Techniques and instruments of data collection

4.5.1 Survey

A survey is a research method for collecting information from a selected group of people using standardized questionnaires or interviews. While many people think of a questionnaire as the “survey”, the questionnaire is just one part of the survey process. Surveys also require selecting populations for inclusion, pre-testing instruments, determining delivery methods, ensuring validity, and analyzing results.

In continuous quality improvement, surveys help to identify customer expectations, measure satisfaction levels, and determine specific areas for improvement.
4.5.2 Questionnaire

The instruments were selected according to the design and research purposes of a questionnaire on the "The social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning ", which contains 20 items expressing their several variables.

A questionnaire consists of a group of questions of one or more variables to measure. We will first discuss the questions and later the desired features of this type of instrument, as well as the contexts in which we can administer the surveys. (Hernandez Sampieri, 2006, p. 310) (Own Translation)

**Instruments**

Technical data:

Name: Questionnaire to measure the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning.

Author:

Administration: Individual y collective.

Management of time: between 10 and 15 minutes, approximately.

Scope of application: fourth grade students of secondary level.

Relevance: perception about the social context and communicative language teaching that students posse in their English language learning.

Type of answer: the items are answered through Likert scale with five categorical values.

**Objective:**

The questionnaire is part of this study that aims to obtain information about the level of perception on the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 school in San Juan
de Lurigancho, 2017.

**Nature of application**

The questionnaire is an instrument that uses the technique of survey; is anonymous, therefore we ask people to respond with sincerity.

**Description:**

The questionnaire consists of 20 items, which one has five possibilities to choose just one answer: never (1), almost never (2), sometimes (3), almost always(4) and always (5). Also, the respondent only can make an alternative, with a cross (X). If they mark more than one alternative, the item is invalidated.

**Structure:**

The variables that are evaluated in the following study are the following:

a. The social context.

b. Communicative language teaching.

c. English language learning.

**Table 4**

Table of Specifications for the questionnaire about the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Structure of questionnaire</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The social context</strong></td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7, 12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicative Language Teaching</strong></td>
<td>8,9,10,11,13,14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English language learning</strong></td>
<td>15,16,17,18,19,20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Levels and ranges of the variables of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 6

Levels and ranges of the dimensions of the variable social context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom context</td>
<td>[02-04]</td>
<td>&lt;04-06]</td>
<td>&lt;06-08]</td>
<td>&lt;08-10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Statistical treatment

Quantitative data analysis is the process of presenting and interpreting numerical data. SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) is a computer application that provides statistical analysis mainly for quantitative data. It allows for in-depth access and preparation, analytical reporting, graphics and modeling of data for decision making. Currently, SPSS is widely used by Governments, businesses, law enforcement agencies, health care providers, academics and also in experimental and observational studies. It is a simple package to use. The user interface of the package is a Spreadsheet; there are cells, columns, and rows. The columns represent the variables and the rows, cases.6

To process the data, it was used the software SPSS version 23, defined by Hernandez (2014). et al (p. 273). SPSS (statistical package for Social Sciences) developed by the University of Chicago, is one of the most widespread and is currently owned by IBM. In addition to the reliability of the instrument, we will use the Alpha of Cronbach. If they are normal data will use R - Pearson and if they are not normal data Rho Spearman.
Chapter V

Results

5.1 Validity and Reliability of Instruments

5.1.1 Validity of the instruments

- Analysis of validity of contents about the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning questionnaire by the experts’ judgment

The validity of the instrument was measured through the validity of content which had intended to collect the experts’ judgment and suggestions who are dedicating to teach with Master or Doctor degrees in Education Sciences. In this procedure, each expert delivered a judgment valorization of a set of issues relating to the questionnaire about the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning. The range of values fluctuated from 0 to 100%. Taking into account that the average score of the judgments given by each expert was 90%, it was considered the score greater than 80% as an indicator that the questionnaire on the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning, reached an appropriate category on the aspect evaluated. The results are shown in the following table:

Table: 7

Validity of contents about the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning questionnaire by the experts´ judgment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Zarate Aliaga, Edith</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg. Ore de los Santos, Miguel</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Mendoza Tomaylla, Jean Pierre</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.66 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Values of the levels of validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Levels of validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91 – 100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 90</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 70</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Given the validity of the instruments by the experts´ judgment, where the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning questionnaire obtained the score of 89.66, by what we can deduce that instrument has a very good validity.

5.1.2 Reliability of the instruments about the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning questionnaire.

In this case, for the calculation of reliability by the method of internal consistency, derived from the premise: if the questionnaire has several alternatives in order to answer, considering case; Alpha of Cronbach, a coefficient of reliability, is used. Because of all, the following steps were followed:

a. To determine the degree of reliability of the instruments, by the method of internal consistency. First a sample of 10 members of the population was determined red. Subsequently the instrument was applied to determine the degree of reliability.

b. Then, it was estimated the coefficient of reliability for the instruments, by the method of internal consistency, which consists in finding the variance of each question, in this research the variances of the questions, according to the instrument, were found.
c. Subsequently we added the values obtained, the total variance was found and we set in the level of existing reliability. Therefore, Alpha of Cronbach’s coefficient was used. Then, we have:

\[ \alpha = \frac{K}{K - 1} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sum S_i^2}{S^2} \right] \]

Where:
- \( K \) = Number of questions
- \( S_i^2 \) = Variance of each question
- \( S^2 \) = Total variance

### Table 9

*Level of reliability of the surveys, according to the method of internal consistency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Alfa of Cronbach</th>
<th>N de elementos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The social context</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learning</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 20

*Values of the levels of reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Levels of reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.53 or fewer</td>
<td>null reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.54 a 0.59</td>
<td>Low reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60 a 0.65</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.66 a 0.71</td>
<td>Very reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.72 a 0.99</td>
<td>Excellent reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Perfect reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obtaining values of Alpha of Cronbach more than 700 in each variable, we can conclude that the applied questionnaire has an excellent reliability the social context, the communicative language teaching and the learning of the English language.

5.2 Presentation and analysis of the results

After the implementation of surveys to the target sample of the present investigation and processing the information obtained (qualification and scaling), we proceeded to analyze the information, both at the descriptive level and a inferential level, which enabled us to carry out measurements and comparisons necessary for this study, and the results were presented below:

5.2.2 Descriptive level

Description of the variables and dimensions of the social context, the communicative language teaching and the learning of the English language.
Table 11
*Distribution of frequencies on Item 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10:** Percentages on item 1: The English Teacher takes into account experiences, knowledge and skills to be used in the classroom

In table 11 and Figure 10, show 40 students that were asked that "The English Teacher takes into account experiences, knowledge and skills to be used in the classroom", 50% (20) mentions that the teacher almost never takes into account their experiences, knowledge and skills, followed by a 35% (14) who claims only sometimes, another 7.5% (3) shows almost always and a 5% (2) considers that the teacher never takes into account experiences, knowledge and skills. On the other hand it is invalidated the 2.5% (1) of the items.
Table 12
Distribution of frequencies on Item 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Percentages on item 2: The English teacher poses issues similar to real life and my cultural

In table 12 and Figure 11, shows 40 students that were asked "The English teacher poses issues similar to real life and my cultural.", the 47.5% (19), considers that the teacher almost never poses issues similar to real life and their cultural, followed by 20% (8) who says almost always, another 15% (6) shows never, and a 12.5% (5) suggests that only the teacher sometimes poses issues similar to real life and their cultural. On the other hand is invalidated 5% (2) of the items.
Table 13

Distribution of frequencies on Item 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Percentages on item 3: Can I apply what I learned in English class into my everyday life situations

In table 13 and Figure 12, show 40 students that were asked "Can I apply what I learned in English class into my everyday life situations", the 47.5% (19), considers that they almost never apply what they learned in English class into everyday situations, followed by 35% (14) who only says sometimes, another 12.5% (5) manifests almost always and 5% (2) considers that never applied what they learned in English class into everyday situations.
Table 14

*Distribution of frequencies on Item 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Percentages on item 4: I consider that English classes also train me to live in society

In table 14 and Figure 13, shows 40 students that were asked "I consider that English classes also train me to live in society," the 47.5% (19) contemplates that English classes almost always train them to live in society, followed by a 25% (10) who claims only sometimes, other 17.5% (7) shows almost never and 7.5% (3) manifests that English classes never train them to live in society. On the other hand is invalidated 2.5% of(1) items.
Table 15

*Distribution of frequencies on item 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14:** Percentages on item 5: The English teacher hangs out images different to my social reality which are from foreign countries that do not relate to my social context.

In table 15 and Figure 14, show 40 students that were asked "The English teacher hangs out images different to my social reality which are from foreign countries that do not relate to my social context.", the 27.5% (11), considers that never the teacher displays images of different realities, followed by 27.5% (11) who claims almost never; another 7.5% (3) considers almost always and a 5% (2) feels that the teacher never shows images of different realities, on the other hand 32.5% (13) is invalidated of the items.
### Table 16

**Distribution of frequencies on item 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15:** Percentages on item 6: I feel more identified with issues related to my cultural identity

In table 16 and Figure 15, show 40 students that were asked "I feel more identified with issues related to my cultural identity", the 37.5% (15) considers that they almost never feel more identified with issues related to their cultural identity; followed by a 32.5% (13) who says almost always, another 15% (6) mentions sometimes and 15% (2) concerns that they never feel more identified with issues related to their cultural identity.
Table 17: Distribution of frequencies on item 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Percentages on item 7: The English classroom activities strengthen my cultural identity

In table 17 and Figure 16, show 40 students that were asked “The English classroom activities strengthen my cultural identity”, the 47.5% (19) considers that English classes almost never strengthen their cultural identity, followed by a 22.5% (9) those who say only sometimes, other 17.5% (6) shows almost always and a 10% (4) contemplates that English classes never strengthen their cultural identity. On the other hand is invalidated 2.5% (1) items.
Table 18

**Distribution of frequencies on item 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing percentages](image)

**Figure 17:** Percentages on item 8: I receive and/or convey information into English oral activities

In table 18 and Figure 17, show sample of 40 students that were asked "I receive and/or convey information into English oral activities," the 42.5% (17), considers that they can only sometimes receive and convey information into English oral activities, followed by a 35% (14) who claims almost never, other 17.5% (7) manifests almost always and 5% (2) thinks that they never receive and convey information into English.
### Table 19

**Distribution of frequencies on item 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18**: Percentages on item 9: The activities of the English course help me practice my skills

In the table 19 and Figure 18, we sample 40 students, they were asked "the activities of the English course help me practice my skills", 40% (16), believes that English course activities sometimes help them practice communicative skills, followed by a 32.5% (13) who claims almost never; another 17.5% (7) shows almost always and a 7.5% (3) considers activities of English course never help them practice communicative skills. On the other hand a 2.5% (1) of the items were invalidated.
Table 20

Distribution of frequencies on item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 19**: Percentages on item 10: The English teacher uses real-life teaching materials related to my social context

In table 20 and Figure 19, show 40 students that were asked "The English teacher uses real-life teaching materials related to my social context", 40% (16), considers that the English teacher almost never uses real-life teaching materials related to the social context, followed by a 30% (12) who says sometimes, another 12.5% (5) says never and a 2.5% (1) considers that the English teacher always uses real-life materials related to the social context. On the other hand a 15% (6) of the items were invalidated.
Table 21

*Distribution of frequencies on item 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Percentages on item 11: The English teacher uses grammatical exercises to explain the class

In table 21 and Figure 20, shows 40 students that were asked "The English teacher uses grammatical exercises to explain the class", 40% (16), believes that the English teacher almost never uses grammatical exercises to explain the class; followed by a 25% (10) who says sometimes, another 20% (8) manifests almost always and 12.5% (5) considers that the English teacher never uses grammatical exercises to explain the class. On the other hand a 2.5% (1) of the items were invalidated.
Table 22. 
*Distribution of frequencies on item 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21:** Percentages on item 12: I can notice that English class topics are tailored to my social context or everyday life

In table 22 and Figure 21, show 40 students that were asked "I can notice that English class topics are tailored to my social context or everyday life", the 42.5% (17), considers that English class topics are almost never adapted to their social context or everyday life, followed by a 22.5% (9) who says sometimes. another 10% (4) manifests almost always and 12.5% (5) considers that English class topics are never tailored to their social context or everyday life. On the other side a 12.5% (5) of the items were invalidated.
Table 23

*Distribution of frequencies on item 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 22:** Percentages on item 13: "I can apply the learning knowledge into English class to interact with my peers in the classroom"

In table 23 and Figure 22, shows 40 students that were asked "I can apply the learning knowledge into English class to interact with my peers in the classroom", 30% (12), mentions that they almost never apply what they have learned into English class to interact with their peers in the classroom, followed by a 27.5% (10) who says sometimes; another 25% (10) manifests almost always and 12.5% (5) considers that they never apply what they have learned into English class to interact with their peers in the classroom. On the other hand a 12.5% (5) of the items were invalidated.
Table 24

Distribution of frequencies on item 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Percentages on item 14: The activities of the English course and my participation give me self-confidence

In table 24 and Figure 23, shows 40 students that were asked "The activities of the English course and my participation give me self-confidence", 45% (18), considers that the English course and participation activities almost never give them self-confidence, followed by a 32.5% (13) who says sometimes; another 15% (6) manifests almost always and a 7.5% (3) considers that the activities of English course and their participation never give me self-confidence.
### Table 25

**Distribution of frequencies on item 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niveles</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 24**: Percentages on item 15: I am willing to learn English in the classroom

In table 25 and Figure 24, show 40 students on item 15, 40% (16) believes that they are almost always willing to learn English in the classroom, followed by a 35% (14) who claims almost never; another 22.5% (6) argues sometimes and 2.5% (1) thinks that they are never willing to learn English language in the classroom.
Table 26

Distribution of frequencies on item 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Percentages on item 16: I notice that what I am learning on English classroom is important.

In table 26 and Figure 25, show 40 students. Where 42.5% (17), assumes that they almost never notice what they are learning on English classroom is important, followed by a 32.5% (13) who says sometimes, other 17.5% (7) shows almost always and a 7.5% (3) claims what they are learning on English classroom is important.
### Table 27

*Distribution of frequencies on item 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 26: Percentages on item 17: What I need and want, is taught in the English classroom

In Table 27 and Figure 26, show 40 students that were asked "What I need and want, is taught in the English classroom", the 40% (16) considers that what they need and want, is almost always taught in English classroom; followed by a 35% (14) claims almost never, another 22.5% (9) shows sometimes and a 25% (1) believes that what they need and want, is never taught in English classroom.
Table 28

*Distribution of frequencies on item 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 27:** Percentages on item 18: The topics in class foster an appropriate atmosphere to learn English in the classroom

In table 28 and Figure 27, show 40 students that were asked "The topics in class foster an appropriate atmosphere to learn English in the classroom", 60% (24), considers that the topics in class almost always foster an appropriate atmosphere for learning, followed by a 25% (10) who claims sometimes; another 10% (4) manifests almost never and a 25% (1) thinks that topics in class to never foster an appropriate atmosphere for learning. On the other hand the 2.5% (1) of the items were invalidated.
Table 29

*Distribution of frequencies del item 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Total frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 28:** Percentages del item 19: The English teacher develops activities that allow me to learn the target language step by step

In table 29 and Figure 28, shows 40 students that were asked "The English teacher develops activities that allow me to learn the target language step by step", 32.5% (13), considers that the English teacher almost always develops activities that allow them to learn the target language step by step, followed by 32.5% (13), those who say almost never, other 22.5% (9) manifest sometimes and a 12.5% (5) thinks that the English teacher never develops activities that allow them to learn the target language step by step.
In table 30 and Figure 29, show 40 students that were asked "The teacher develops activities in class to practice my English", the 37.5% (15), considers that the teacher almost always develops activities in class to practice their English, followed by a 27.5% (11) who claims almost never; another 25% (10) asserts sometimes and 10% (4) proposes that the teacher never develops varied activities to practice their English.
5.2.3 Inferential Level

General Hypothesis

The social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

Table 31

The Contingency table of the social context and Communicative Language Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The social context (grouped)</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that 15% of the respondent considered that the social context and communicative language teaching are in a bad level, 40% manifested at a regular level, a 2.5% claimed on a good level and none thought that the level is very good.
The table above shows that 5% of the respondent considered that the social context and the learning of the English language are in a bad level, a 27.5% contemplated on a regular level, a 2.5% said on a good level and no one thought that the level is very good.

**Ho:** There is no significant statistical correlation between social context against Communicative Language Teaching and the English Language Learning.

**Hi:** There is significant statistical correlation between social context against Communicative Language Teaching and the English Language Learning.
**Figure 30:** Diagram of scattering of the social context and communicative language teaching.

**Figure 31:** Diagram of scattering of the social context and English Language Learning.
**Table 33**

**Coefficient of correlation of Rho Spearman on the social context against communicative language teaching and English language learning.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The social context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative language teaching</td>
<td>Coefficient of correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (bilateral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language learning</td>
<td>Coefficient of correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (bilateral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 33:** shows less than 0.05 significance and therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis; that is, the social context is correlated with the variables: communicative language teaching and English language learning. In addition, there are 0.458 and 0.502 Rho Spearman on coefficient of correlation. Hence, the correlation is direct and moderate.
**Specific hypothesis 1.**

Classroom context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

**Table 34**

_The contingency table of the classroom context and communicative language teaching_

<p>| Communicative language teaching (grouped) | Very | | |
|------------------------------------------|------|---|---|---|
|                                           | Bad  | Regular | Good | Total |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom context (grouped)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57,5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that a 17.5% of the respondent considered that the classroom context and the communicative language teaching are in a bad level, 25% manifested at a regular level, a 7.5% affirmed on a good level and none believed that level was very good.
Table 35

The contingency table of the classroom context and English language learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom context (grouped)</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55,0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, we can see that a 7.5% of the respondent considered that the classroom context and the learning of the English language are in a bad level, 15% concerned on a regular level, a 12.5% mentioned on a good level and no one found that the level was very good.

Ho: There is no significant statistical correlation between classroom context against communicative language teaching and English language learning.

Hi: There is significant statistical correlation between classroom context against communicative language teaching and English language learning.
**Figure 32**: Diagram of scattering of the classroom context and communicative language teaching.

**Figure 33**: Diagram of scattering of the classroom context and English language learning.
Table 36

Coefficient of correlation of Rho Spearman on the classroom context against communicative language teaching and English language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classroom context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative language teaching</td>
<td>Coefficient of correlation: 0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (bilateral): 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language learning</td>
<td>Coefficient of correlation: 0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (bilateral): 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N: 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 shows less than 0.05 significance and therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis; that is, the classroom context is correlated with the variables: communicative language teaching and English language learning. In addition, there are 0.434 and 0.596 Rho Spearman on coefficient of correlation. Hence, the correlation is direct and moderate.
**Specific hypothesis 2.**

The cultural context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

**Table 37**

*The contingency table of the cultural context and communicative language teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural context (grouped)</th>
<th>Communicative language teaching (grouped)</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bad</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, we can see that a 15% of the respondent considered that the cultural context and Communicative language teaching are in a bad level, 32.5% concerned on a regular level, a 2.5% mentioned on a good level and no one found that the level was very good.
The table above shows that 5% of the respondent considered that the cultural context and English language learning are in a bad level, a 22.5% contemplated on a regular level, a 2.5% said on a good level and no one thought that the level is very good.

**Ho:** There is no significant statistical correlation between the cultural context against Communicative Language Teaching and the English Language Learning.

**Hi:** There is significant statistical correlation between the cultural context against Communicative Language Teaching and the English Language Learning.
**Figure 34:** Diagram of scattering of the cultural context and communicative language teaching.

**Figure 35:** Diagram of scattering of the cultural context and English language learning.
Table 39

Coefficient of correlation of Rho Spearman on the cultural context against communicative language teaching and English language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural context</th>
<th>Coefficient of correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (bilateral)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative language teaching</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language learning</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 shows that the correlation with Communicative Language Teaching has more than 0.05 significance; therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to determine that the cultural context and communicative language teaching are not correlated; however, the correlation with the English language learning has less than 0.05 significance; therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. That is, Classroom context is correlated with English language learning; in addition, we observe a 0.336 Rho Spearman coefficient correlation which means it is direct and weak.
5.3 Discussion and results

5.3.1 Relationship between the social context with communicative language teaching and English language learning

This search establishes the relationship between the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho. It has found that the correlation degree between the variables is direct and moderate.

The coefficient of correlations are 0.458 and 0.502 respectively between the social context with communicative language teaching and English language learning. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 with a 95% confidence interval which allow to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant statistical correlation between the social context against communicative language teaching and English language learning. We conclude “The social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017”. This results coincides with Lopez’s (2000) Words finding about (...) the insensibility of the educational systems that has not even recently taken into account the linguistic, cultural and social peculiarities of the learners (...). Such poverty is also the product of the inability of Latin American educational systems to take into account the experiences, knowledge and skills of the learners they attend, despite of the fact of most generalized discourse of basic learning needs (...). (p. 5-6).

In addition to this, Larsen-Freeman (1986) also states: “The goal of Teacher is to have one’s student become communicatively competent (…). CC involves being able to
use the language appropriate to a given social context. To do this, students need knowledge of the linguistic forms, meanings, and functions. They need to know that many different forms can be used to perform a function and also that a single can often serve a variety of functions. They must be able to choose from among these the most appropriate form given the social context and the roles of the interlocutors. They must also be able to manage the process of negotiation meaning with their interlocutors.” (p. 131).

Also, Holliday (1997) adds that: “A learning-centered approach, on the other hand, which acknowledges the social context of education (Hutchinson and Waters 1984) (…). The stronger version of the CA makes this variety possible and can be informed entirely by communicative, ethnographic action research, which will decide whether or not such procedures as group work are appropriate to a specific classroom setting.” (p. 176)

5.3.2 Relationship between the classroom context with communicative language teaching and English language learning

This search establishes the relationship between the classroom context with communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho. It has found that the correlation degree between the variables is direct and moderate. The coefficient of correlations are 0.432 and 0.596 respectively between the classroom context with communicative language teaching and English language learning. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 with a 95% confidence interval which allow to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant statistical correlation between the classroom context against communicative language teaching and English language learning. We conclude “The classroom context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth
Concerning this results, the recommendations of Holliday (1997) about ethnographic action research, the process of learning in a classroom needs to involve a cultural-sensitive approach, it has to undertake not only what teachers need to know inside or outside the classroom to fit her or his situation, but students’ behaviors. (p. 162, 163)

In addition to this, Oré (2013) explains that “Unlike previous approaches, the Communicative Approach (AC) part of a cognitive vision of learning while praising the fact that learning of a language is eminent but not exclusively a cognitive task - it suggests, therefore, that effective factors such as attitude and motivation deserve attention.” (p. 47)

In the same line, Kumaravadivelu (2003) claims about communicative appropriateness that “It depends on the social, cultural, political, or ideological contexts that shape meaning in a particular speech event. It depends largely on the norms of interpretation, which varies from culture to culture. Acquiring knowledge of how extrasituational factors contribute to the process of meaning making implies acquiring knowledge of how language features interface with cultural norms.” (p. 212)

5.3.3 Relationship between the cultural context with communicative language teaching and English language learning

This search establishes the relationship between the cultural context with communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho. It has found that the correlation degree between the variables is direct and weak. The coefficient of correlations are 0.298 and 0.336 respectively between the cultural context with communicative language teaching and English language learning. In the first correlation, the significance value is more than 0.05 confidence interval which
does not allow to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is not significant statistical correlation between the cultural context against communicative language teaching.

However, the second correlation with the cultural context against English language learning has less than 0.05 significance; therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Despite of the prior results, we could conclude that if and only if we use an approach that "The cultural context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017" the desired learning results tend to be meaningful, sensitive and encouraging. Concerning this results, Holliday (1997) contemplates that there are the following prerequisite to become appropriate English language teaching methodology appropriate:

d) It should have a built-in facility for the teacher to reflect upon and learn about the social dimension of the classroom and to continue learning.

e) It should, therefore, incorporate ongoing ethnographic action research.

f) It should be able to put into practice what has been learned and should, therefore, be continually adaptable to whatever social situations emerge. (p. 164)

Following this line, Kumaravadivelu (2003) mentions that language communication is inseparable from its communicative context. Taken out of context, language communication makes little sense. What all this means to learning and teaching an L2 is that we must introduce our learners to language as it is used in communication contexts even if it selected and simplified for them; otherwise, we will be denying an important aspect of its reality. (p. 204)
Cummins’ (2009) studies coincides with our study he said that any sincere educator would endorse that schools should be fed by experience and knowledge that children bring to the classroom and that training must promote the talent and skills of the young learners. Either unconsciously or intentionally, when we destroy the language of children and gap their relationship with their parents and grandparents, we are contradicting the very essence of education. (p. 3)

Finally, there is a similarity between our study and Gardner and Lambert (1972), quoted in Ellis (1986), they define ‘motivation’ in terms of the L2 learner’s overall goal or orientation, and ‘attitude’ as the persistence shown by the learner in striving for a goal. They argue that there is no reason to expect a relationship between the two; (…) (p. 117)
Conclusions

After the process of hypothesis testing we have arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017, due to the fact that the correlation degree between the variables is direct and moderate. The coefficient of correlations are 0.458 for the social context with communicative language teaching and 0.502 for the social context and English language learning. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 with a 95% confidence interval.

2. The classroom context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017 due to the fact that the correlation degree between the variables is direct and moderate. The coefficient of correlations are 0.432 for the classroom context with communicative language teaching and 0.596 for the classroom context and English language learning. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 with a 95% confidence interval.

3. For the results, we could conclude that if and only if we use an approach that the cultural context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017 the desired learning results tend to be meaningful, sensible and encouraging. The results have found that the correlation degree between the variables is direct and weak. The coefficient of correlations are 0.298 for the cultural context and communicative language
teaching and 0.336 for the cultural context and English language learning. In the first correlation, the significance value is more than 0.05 confidence interval which does not allow to reject the null hypothesis and we conclude that there is not significant statistical correlation between the cultural contexts against communicative language teaching. However, the second correlation with the cultural context against English language learning has less than 0.05 significance; therefore, there is enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Furthermore, the significance value is less than 0.05 with a 95% confidence interval.
Recommendations

1. The educational systems should be sensible to the cultural and social peculiarities of the learners taking into account experiences, knowledge, wants and needs of the learners they attend. Despite of the fact of most generalized methodologies are developed in foreign countries that are very different from the students’ reality, teachers and curriculum designers ought to be able to choose from among them, the most appropriate given the social context as such importance as it has a direct relationship with communicative language teaching and English language learning.

2. English teachers and curriculum developers should carry out and ethnographic action research since learning in a classroom involves a cultural-sensitive approach; furthermore, classroom learners have certain attitudes toward activities which resemble information about their cultures. These factors such as attitude and an ethnographic profile deserve attention because they are positively related to communicative language teaching and the process of English language learning.

3. English teachers, curriculum developers and host institution representatives should bear in mind that the Communicative Approach will only become appropriate if it is continually adaptable to students’ background. However, if it is not, we will be denying an important aspect of the learners’ reality. Therefore, our goal is to give learners the ability to manage the language appropriate for any situation within a social setting with predicting and negotiating meaning behaviors in the target language. Otherwise, they will become communicatively incompetent students since students may manipulate the structures of the language without knowing the communicative use. Besides, learner’s attitude should be orientated toward what
they are learning is relevant to them. When they strive to do the tasks in class they will be discovering that their language learning could be meaningful, communicative useful and encouraging. Hence, if and only if we use such approaches we will contemplate the idea that the cultural context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Consistency Matrix: The social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation of the problem</th>
<th>Study objectives</th>
<th>Research hypothesis</th>
<th>Study variables</th>
<th>Type of Research:</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Population and sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Problem: To what extent is the social context related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017?</td>
<td>General Objective: To determine the relationship between the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017</td>
<td>General Hypothesis: The social context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.</td>
<td>Variable I: The social context</td>
<td>Descriptive quantitative</td>
<td>Descriptive research method</td>
<td>The participants of this study are 40 grade 4 secondary school students in school Nº 142 in San Juan de Lurigancho, Lima. Their ages range between 14 and 17 years old and the distribution of female and male students is about equal. Most of the students’ mother tongue is Spanish and a few of them have a vernacular language as their L1. The sample includes the total number of students considered in the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Problem: SP01 To what extent is the classroom context related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017?</td>
<td>Specific Objective: SO01 To determine the relationship between the classroom context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.</td>
<td>Specific Hypothesis: SH01 The classroom context is directly and positively related to communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 School in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.</td>
<td>Variable II: Communicative Language Teaching</td>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En donde:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M = Muestra de Investigación</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ox = The social Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oy = Communicative Language Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oz = English Language Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r = Relación entre variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research instruments: Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection techniques: Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Variable I: The social context** | Cultural context | • The context of the national culture.  
• The context of the professional culture.  
• The context of the institutional culture. | 1,2,3, 12 |
| | Classroom context | • Attitude. (how students react when they talk about their culture)  
• Ethnographic profile. (how students behave in certain situations) | 6, 7 |
| **Variable II: Communicative Language Teaching** | Communicative events | • Process of conveying and transmitting information effectively.  
• Use the language productively and receptively.  
• Give students valuable communicative practice. | 8, 8, 9 |
| | Authentic language | • Advocate the use of any authentic materials.  
• Total exclusion of controlled exercises or grammatical pointers.  
• Methodology must be culturally sensitive.  
• Target language interface with cultural norms. | 10, 11 |
| | Meaningful Learning | • Apply what is learnt in everyday life situations.  
• Apply this knowledge in negotiation meaning.  
• Themes need to be adapted to learners’ context  
• Integrate the foreign language with students’ own personality and thus they feel more emotionally secure with it. | 13, 14, 15 |
| **Variable III: English Language Learning** | Learners’ attitude | • How receptive students are toward the target language.  
• Feel what students are learning is personally relevant to them. | 14, 15 |
| | Need analysis | • What students need to learn or want to be taught in the classroom.  
• Define the target situation and environment of studying. | 17, 18 |
| | Learning-centered | • Students are not expected to discover the competence itself, but rather how they acquire that competence.  
• How the learner can learn more effectively. | 19, 20 |

Source: Author’s own work
Appendix C: Spanish version of the questionnaire

ESTIMADO ESTUDIANTE:
La presente encuesta tiene por objeto recopilar información de tu aprendizaje de Inglés.
Te agradecería marcar con una aspa (x) tu respuesta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Valores de las respuestas</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Casi nunca</th>
<th>A veces</th>
<th>Casi siempre</th>
<th>Siempre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>El profesor de Inglés toma en cuenta mis experiencias, conocimiento y habilidades para ser usados en el salón.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>El profesor de Inglés plantea temas similares a la vida real y mi cultura.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Puedo aplicar lo aprendido en la clase de Inglés en situaciones de mi vida diaria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Considero que las clases de Inglés también me preparan para vivir en la sociedad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>El profesor de Inglés difunde imágenes diferentes a mi realidad social, de países extranjeros las cuales no se relacionan con mi contexto social.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Me siento más identificado con temas relacionados a mi identidad cultural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Las actividades en clase de Inglés hacen que fortalezca mi identidad cultural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Puedo recibir y/o transmitir información en Inglés en actividades orales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Las actividades del curso de Inglés me ayudan a practicar mis habilidades comunicativas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>El profesor de Inglés usa materiales didácticos de la vida real relacionados a mi contexto social.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>El profesor de Inglés usa ejercicios gramaticales para explicar su clase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Me puedo dar cuenta que los temas de clase de Inglés son adaptados a mi contexto social y/o vida diaria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Puedo aplicar el conocimiento aprendido en la clase de Inglés para interactuar con mis compañeros dentro del aula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Las actividades del curso de Inglés y mi participación en ellas me dan seguridad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Estoy dispuesto a aprender el idioma Inglés en el salón.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Noto que lo que estoy aprendiendo en clase de Inglés es importante para mí.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lo que necesito y quiero, me enseñan en la clase de Inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Los temas presentados en la clase de Inglés fomentan un ambiente apropiado para el aprendizaje en el salón.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>El profesor de Inglés desarrolla actividades que me permiten aprender el idioma paso a paso.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>El profesor desarrolla actividades variadas en clase para practicar mi Inglés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questionnaire**

The instruments were selected according to the design and research purposes of a questionnaire on the "The social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning ", which contains 20 items expressing their several variables.

A questionnaire consists of a group of questions of one or more variables to measure. We will first discuss the questions and later the desired features of this type of instrument, as well as the contexts in which we can administer the surveys. (Hernandez Sampieri, 2006, p. 310) (Own Translation)

**Instruments**

Technical data:

Name: Questionnaire to measure the social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning.

Author:

Administration: Individual y collective.

Management of time: between 10 and 15 minutes, approximately.

Scope of application: fourth grade students of secondary level.

Relevance: perception about the social context and communicative language teaching that students posses in their English language learning.

Type of answer: the items are answered through Likert scale with five categorical values.

**Objective:**

The questionnaire is part of this study that aims to obtain information about the level of perception on the social context, communicative language teaching and English
language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 school in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017.

**Nature of application**

The questionnaire is an instrument that uses the technique of survey; is anonymous, therefore we ask people to respond with sincerity.

**Description:**

The questionnaire consists of 20 items, which one has five possibilities to choose just one answer: never (1), almost never (2), sometimes (3), almost always (4) and always (5). Also, the respondent only can make an alternative, with a cross (X). If they mark more than one alternative, the item is invalidated.

**Structure:**

The variables that are evaluated in the following study are the following:

- d. The social context.
- e. Communicative language teaching.
Appendix D: Results of the questionnaire application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>DIMENSION: CULTURAL CONTEXT</th>
<th>DIMENSION: CLASSROOM CONTEXT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VARIABLE II: COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>DIMENSION: COMMUNICATIVE EVENTS</th>
<th>DIMENSION: AUTHENTIC LANGUAGE</th>
<th>DIMENSION: MEANINGFUL LEARNING</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>P9</td>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VARIABLE III: ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING

### QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>DIMENSION : LEARNER'S ATTITUDE</th>
<th>DIMENSION: NEED ANALYSIS</th>
<th>DIMENSION : LEARNING-CENTERED</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P14</td>
<td>P15</td>
<td>P16</td>
<td>P17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Validation formats filled by the experts

UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN
Enrique Guzmán y Valle
"Alma Máter del Magisterio Nacional"

INFORME DE VALIDACIÓN DE INSTRUMENTO POR JUICIO DE EXPERTO

I. DATOS GENERALES:
   a. Apellido y Nombre(s) del informante: Dr. Edith Zarate Sánchez
   b. Cargo e institución donde labora: Docente Dále - UNED
   c. Nombre del instrumento: Cuestionario
   d. Autor del instrumento: Paul Pierre VELIZ SARAVIA
   e. Tesis: *The social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 school in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017*

II. ASPECTOS DE VALIDACIÓN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN DEL INSTRUMENTO</th>
<th>CRITERIOS</th>
<th>Deficiente (61 - 66)</th>
<th>Regular (67 - 70)</th>
<th>Buena (71 - 80)</th>
<th>Muy Buena (81 - 90)</th>
<th>Excelente (91 - 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CLARIDAD</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esta formulado con lenguaje apropiado.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OBJETIVIDAD</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esta expresado en conductas observables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACTUALIDAD</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado al avance de la ciencia y la tecnología.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ORGANIZACIÓN</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existe una organización lógica variables e indicadores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUFICIENCIA</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprende los aspectos en cantidad y calidad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. INTENCIONALIDAD</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado para valorar aspectos referidos al tema.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CONSISTENCIA</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basado en aspectos teóricos científicos y pedagógicos del área.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. COHERENCIA</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrec las variables, dimensiones e indicadores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. METODOLOGÍA</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La estrategia responde al propósito de la investigación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PERTINENCIA</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado para tratar el tema de investigación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMEDIO DE LA VALORACIÓN CUANTITATIVA</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. OPINIÓN DE APLICABILIDAD: **Aplacable**

IV. PROMEDIO DE VALORACIÓN: **Muy Buena**

Lugar y fecha: [Lugar y fecha]

DNI N°: 09764135  Teléfono N°: 982573960

Firma del experto informante
UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN
Enrique Guzmán y Valle
“Alma Máter del Magisterio Nacional”

INFORME DE VALIDACIÓN DE INSTRUMENTO POR JUICIO DE EXPERTO

I. DATOS GENERALES:
   a. Apellido y Nombre(s) del informante: Méndez Toayilla, Jean Pierre
   b. Cargo a Institución donde labora: 
   c. Nombre del instrumento: Cuestionario
   d. Autor del instrumento: Paul Pierre VELIZ SARAVIA
   e. Tesis: The social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 school in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017

II. ASPECTOS DE VALIDACIÓN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN DEL INSTRUMENTO</th>
<th>CRITERIOS</th>
<th>Deficiente (51 - 60)</th>
<th>Regular (61 - 70)</th>
<th>Buena (71 - 80)</th>
<th>Muy Buena (81 - 90)</th>
<th>Excelente (91 - 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CLARIDAD</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aceptable que el lenguaje es apropiado.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OBJETIVIDAD</td>
<td>Cuantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aceptable que las conductas observables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACTUALIDAD</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado al avance de la ciencia y la tecnología.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ORGANIZACIÓN</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado a la organización lógica variables e indicadores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUFICIENCIA</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado al manejo de cantidad y calidad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. INTENCIONALIDAD</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado para ver las aspectos reñidos en el tema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CONSISTENCIA</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado a las lecciones teóricas científicas y pedagógicas del área.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. COHERENCIA</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado a las variables, dimensiones e indicadores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. METODOLOGÍA</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado a la estrategia en el propósito de la investigación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PERTINENCIA</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado para tratar el tema de la investigación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. OPINIÓN DE APLICABILIDAD: Apliquea - Muy Buena

IV. PROMEDIO DE VALORACIÓN: 87%
Lugar y fecha: La casa, 04 de noviembre de 2017
DNI: 91901314

[Signature]

[Stamp: Colegio Obrero Manifiesto]
UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN
Enrique Guzmán y Valle
"Alma Mutter del Magisterio Nacional"

INFORME DE VALIDACIÓN DE INSTRUMENTO POR JUICIO DE EXPERTO

I. DATOS GENERALES:
   a. Apellido y Nombre(s) del informante: DE LOS SANTOS, Miguel
   b. Cargo e institución donde labora: Docente - UNE
   c. Nombre del instrumento: Cuestionario
   d. Autor del instrumento: Paul Pierre VELIZ SARAVIA
   e. Tesis: The social context, communicative language teaching and English language learning in fourth grade students of secondary level at 142 school in San Juan de Lurigancho, 2017

II. ASPECTOS DE VALIDACIÓN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN DEL INSTRUMENTO</th>
<th>CRITERIOS</th>
<th>Deficiente (51 - 60)</th>
<th>Regular (61 - 70)</th>
<th>Buena (71 - 80)</th>
<th>Mayo Buena (81 - 90)</th>
<th>Excelente (91-100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CLARIDAD</td>
<td>Quantitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esta formulado con lenguaje apropriado.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OBJETIVIDAD</td>
<td>Qualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esta expresado en conductas observables.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACTUALIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado al avance de la ciencia y la tecnología</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ORGANIZACIÓN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existe una organización lógica variadas e indicadores</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUFFICIENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprende los aspectos en cantidad y calidad</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. INTENCIONALIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado para valorar aspectos referidos al tema</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CONSISTENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basado en aspectos teóricos científicos y pedagógicos del área</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. COHERENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entre las variables, dimensiones e indicadores</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. METODOLOGÍA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La estrategia responde al propósito de la investigación</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PERTINENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adecuado para tratar el tema de investigación</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMEDIO DE LA VALORACIÓN CUANTITATIVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES APLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. OPINIÓN DE APLICABILIDAD: ES APLICABLE

IV. PROMEDIO DE VALORACIÓN:
NOVENTA Y DOS (92)

Lugar y fecha: CAMBRIA, 7/11/17
DNI N°: 07.800.555
Teléfono N°: 460-1283 / 892-575615

Firma del experto informante