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Resumen

El Ministerio de Educación peruano establece explícitamente el enfoque comunicativo como la metodología de preferencia para desarrollar la comunicación en las clases de inglés. Este estudio investigó el conocimiento de los principios de CLT por profesores de inglés, participantes del Programa de Maestría de Enseñanza de Inglés como Lengua Extranjera (TEFL) en la Universidad Nacional de Educación Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016. La población objetivo consistió de 20 Profesores de inglés quienes pertenecen a diferentes instituciones educativas. Para medir el conocimiento sobre los principios de CLT se aplicó un cuestionario de 12 preguntas. El estudio reveló que la mayoría de los docentes encuestados saben cuáles son los principios que cumplen con CLT. Sin embargo, la información recabada es a nivel de teoría, por lo que para saber si los maestros de inglés encuestados aplican estos principios, se debe desarrollar otra investigación en sus clases.

Palabras clave: principios, conocimiento, comunicación
Abstract

The Peruvian Ministry of education states explicitly the communicative approach as the methodology of preference to develop communication in English classes. This study investigated the awareness of CLT principles by English teachers, participants of the Master's Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016. The targeted population consisted of 20 English teachers who belong to different types of schools. To measure the awareness about CLT principles a questionnaire of 12 questions was applied. The study revealed that most of the teachers surveyed know what the principles are that comply with CLT. However, the information gathered is at the level of theory; thus in order to know whether the English teachers surveyed apply these principles another research has to be developed in their classrooms.

Keywords: principles, awareness, communication
Introduction

The Peruvian Ministry of Education in the document “Diseño Curricular Nacional” promotes the importance of communication and points out its explicit preference for the communicative approach (Diseño Curricular Nacional, 2016). The communicative approach describes a specific group of principles that provide the basis of the notion of the communicative competence (Richards, 2006). Grammar used to have a central role in what learning a language meant to students (Scrivener, 2011) whereas learning a language applying the communicative approach is not entirely a cognitive task since the attitude and motivation are some affective factors that deserve special attention (Oré, 2013). It is necessary to know to what extent Peruvian EFL teachers are aware of the principles behind the communicative language teaching and thus can help develop the communicative competence in their students. This information may be considered for future researchers to develop experimental studies.

The main reason for choosing this topic for my master thesis: Awareness about the Communicative Language Teaching principles by English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016 was to know whether Peruvian English teachers have the knowledge required to apply CLT principles in their classes. Richards (2006) pointed out that most language teachers today, when asked to name the
methodology they utilize in their classrooms on a daily basis, perhaps the most common answer is “communicative” as the methodology of preference. Yet, when forced to be more specific and define what they imply by “communicative”, interpretations usually vary to a wide extent.

This dissertation comprises five chapters

In chapter I, I describe and formulate the problem. I also mention the objectives and relevance of the problem. I’m going to explore CLT based on the principles described in Larsen-Freeman and Anderson(2011) and suggest some relevant aspects related to the concept of evaluation and goals, students and teacher roles, students learning characteristics and interactions, language view, areas and skills emphasized the roles of the culture, the roles or the student’s native language, and error.

In chapter II, I present the research background and the literature review about CLT. Here also we present the theoretical basis of the topic and definition of key terms whereas in chapter III, I present the hypothesis and variables as well as the operationalization of variables for this research and in chapter IV, I mention the methodology I used for this research. Research approach, research type, research design, population and sample, techniques and instruments of data collection in addition to the statistical treatment.

Finally, in chapter V, I depict the results, validity and reliability of the instruments, presentation and analysis of results, discussion and the conclusion where we can confirm that most of the teachers surveyed know what the principles are that comply with CLT. However, the information gathered is at the level of theory, so in order to know whether English teachers apply these principles in their classes another research has to be developed.
Chapter I

Statement of problem

1.1. Determination of problem

English is currently perceived as the language for international communication since it is spoken worldwide and people feel the necessity to learn this language for academic purposes, to do business or to communicate to feel part of globalization. According to Crystal (2003) the need for a global language is particularly appreciated by the international academic and business communities, and it is here that the adoption of a single lingua franca is most in evidence, both in lecture-rooms and board-rooms, as well as in thousands of individual contacts being made daily all over the globe. (p.13)

Based on this premise more emphasis has been put on teaching English as a communicative language in contrast to the traditional way of teaching grammar to develop grammatical competence. Grammar competence puts emphasis on accuracy and gives students little or no opportunity to use the language in real life and in different situations. Richards (2006) posits that “the centrality of grammar in language teaching and learning was questioned, since it was argued that language ability involved much more than grammatical competence.” (p.9)
Swan (1985) asserts that “it is fashionable to criticize old-style courses for being excessively concerned with teaching structure, and [that] there is certainly some truth in the criticism.” (p.80)

Shumin in Richards and Renandya (2002, p. 208) concludes that:

Communication in the classroom is embedded in meaning-focused activity. This requires teachers to tailor their instruction carefully to the needs of learners and teach them how to listen to others, how to talk with others, and how to negotiate meaning in a shared context. Out of interaction, learners will learn how to communicate verbally and nonverbally as their language store and language skills develop. Consequently, the give-and-take exchanges of messages will enable them to create discourse that conveys their intentions in real-life communication.

In Peru, the Ministry of Education in the document “Diseño Curricular Nacional” promote the importance of communication and not the focus on grammar rules or vocabulary, that is to say it stresses the use of the language and not the knowledge about it. Pointing out its explicit preference for the communicative approach (Diseño Curricular Nacional, 2016).

1.2. Formulation of the problem: General and specific

1.2.3. General problem

To what extend English teachers, participants of Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language are aware of the communicative language teaching principles at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?
1.2.2. Specific problems

SP1. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about evaluation and goals as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

SP2. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about student and teacher roles as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

SP3. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about the students learning characteristics and interaction as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

SP4. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

SP5. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about the role of culture as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?
SP6. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the native language role as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

SP7. What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about error treatment as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

1.3. Objectives

1.3.1. General objective

To determine the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about the Communicative Language Teaching principles at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

SO1. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about evaluation and goals as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SO2. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about student and teacher roles as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
SO3. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, have about the students learning characteristics and interaction as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SO4. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, have about language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SO5. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, have about the role of culture as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SO6. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, have about the native language role as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SO7. To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, have about error treatment as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
1.4. Relevance and scope of the problem

1.4.1. Theoretical relevance

We explored CLT based on the principles described in (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011) and suggest some relevant aspects related to the concept of teacher evaluation and goals, students and teachers’ roles, students learning characteristics and interactions, language view, areas and skills emphasized, the roles of the culture, the roles or the students native language, and error. This information may be considered for future researchers to develop experimental studies.

1.4.2. Practical relevance

The results of this study can be used by any institutions interested in the applicability of the CLT principles by their English language teachers.

1.4.3. Methodological relevance

In this research we built and validated a questionnaire about the knowledge teachers have on the CLT principles and their perceptions about its applicability in their classes.

1.5. Limitations of the research

This research was based on the knowledge (theory) about the CLT principles and whether English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016 are aware of them; however, another study has to be developed in order to know whether the teachers apply these principles in their classes.
Chapter II
Theoretical framework

2.1. Research background

2.1.1. International Research

In China, Fung-King (2009) developed a study to find out about the perceptions of EFL among English language teachers who have learned English in a traditional manner and to understand the current English teaching approach and how possible it is to be changed. The main objective was to know how Chinese mainland teachers perceive English language teaching (ELT) these days and whether they are ready for the paradigm shift. There were 214 primary school teachers who answered questionnaires and two teachers were selected to develop demonstration classes from where information was registered and studied. Fung-King concluded that teachers believe that communicative classes are more useful than traditional English classes. However, most of the teachers need more teaching training to develop more effective classes using this new approach.

In Taiwan, Chang (2011) developed a study to evaluate the EFL teacher’s attitudes toward communicative teaching in Taiwanese College and the reasons behind these attitudes. A survey was given to 55 full-time English teachers from two selected
universities agreed to participate who also were interviewed. Chang’s study revealed that teachers hold a favorable attitude toward the communicative language teaching (CLT) and that it is helpful for the students to practice rules in meaningful contexts.

In Pakistan, Ahmad and Rao (2013) developed a study to evaluate the feasibility of applying CLT approach in Pakistan at intermediate levels of education and the perception about the theory and practice of the CLT approach. The main objective was to understand whether it is a good idea to shift the grammar translation method (GTM) for the communicative language approach CLA. A survey was given to 128 teachers and to get the qualitative data 10 teachers were interviewed. Ahmad and Rao’s study concluded that based on teachers answers the communicative approach is better than the traditional method in teaching English.

2.1.2. Latin-American Research

In Chile, Muñoz, Chandía and Véliz (2013) developed a research on the use of the communicative approach at school Level in Hualpén whose objective was to identify and describe the teaching methodologies employed by three in-service English language teachers in three different municipal school in Hualpén, Chile, and to determine their degree of congruence with the tenets proposed by the Communicative Approach. The research was based on semi-structure interviews for 3 teachers and structure interviews for 15 students (five pupils of each teacher). The conclusion was that sometimes teachers use some tenets established by the CA; however, they also use the Total Physical Response, Audio Lingual Method, and Grammar Translation Method in their classes.
2.1.3. Peruvian Research

In Peru, Nicoli (2009) developed a study on how the communicative tasks and interaction can contribute to language acquisition at the "Instituto de Idiomas de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú" (INIPUC) at the upper intermediate level. The objective was to know how communicative tasks can really help students learn and acquire the [English] language and 16 students took part of the investigation. Questionnaires with general questions and opened ended questions were given at the beginning of the course, and at the end of the study a different questionnaire was given to students to confirm the teacher’s observation data and to compare the results. The study confirmed the hypothesis that communicative tasks can lead to the development of the communicative ability in the classroom as opposed to the traditional form-focused methodology.

2.2. Theoretical bases

This part of the thesis presents some background information and principles concerning the grammar translation method, the direct method, and the audiolingual method which are some of the most important methods used before CLT.

2.2.1. The grammar translation method principles

Richards (2006, p. 6) stated that:

The approach to the teaching of grammar was a deductive one: students are presented with grammar rules and then given opportunities to practice using them, as opposed to an inductive approach in which students are given examples of sentences containing a grammar rule and asked to work out the rule for themselves.
Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) pointed out some of the most important principles of the grammar translation method:

- A fundamental purpose of learning a language is to be able to read literature written in it. Literary language is superior to spoken language. Students’ study of the target culture is limited to its literature and fine arts.
- An important goal is for students to be able to translate each language into the other. If students can translate from one language into another, they are considered successful language learners.
- The ability to communicate in the target language is not a goal of language instruction.
- The primary skills to be developed are reading and writing. Little attention is given to speaking and listening, and almost none to pronunciation.
- The teacher is the authority in the classroom. It is very important that students get the correct answer.
- It is possible to find native language equivalents for all target language words.
- Learning is facilitated through attention to similarities between the target language and the native language.
- It is important for students to learn about the grammar or form of the target language.
- Deductive application of an explicit grammar rule is a useful pedagogical technique.
- Language learning provides good mental exercise.
• Students should be conscious of the grammatical rules of the target language.
• Wherever possible, verb conjugations and other grammatical paradigms should be committed to memory.

2.2.2. The direct method principles

Franke in Richards and Rogers (2001, p. 11), accorded that:

A language could best be taught by using it actively in the classroom. Rather than using analytical procedures that focus on explanation of grammar rules in classroom teaching, teachers must encourage direct and spontaneous use of the foreign language in the classroom. Learners would then be able to induce rules of grammar. The teacher replaced the textbook in the early stages of learning.

Speaking began with systematic attention to pronunciation. Known words could be used to teach new vocabulary, using mime, demonstration, and pictures.

Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) posited some of the most important principles of the direct method:

• Reading in the target language should be taught from the beginning of language instruction; however, the reading skill will be developed through practice with speaking. Language is primarily speech.
• Culture consists of more than the fine arts (e.g. in this lesson we observed the students studying geography and cultural attitudes).
• Objects (e.g. realia or pictures) present in the immediate classroom environment should be used to help students understand the meaning.
• The native language should not be used in the classroom.
• The teacher should demonstrate, not explain or translate. It is desirable that students make a direct association between the target language form and meaning.
• Students should learn to think in the target language as soon as possible.
• Vocabulary is acquired more naturally if students use it in full sentences, rather than memorizing word lists.
• The purpose of language learning is communication (therefore students need to learn how to ask questions as well as answer them).
• Pronunciation should be worked on right from the beginning of language instruction.
• Self-correction facilitates language learning.
• Lessons should contain some conversational activity—some opportunity for students to use language in real contexts. Students should be encouraged to speak as much as possible.
• Grammar should be taught inductively. There may never be an explicit grammar rule given.
• Writing is an important skill, to be developed from the beginning of language instruction.
• The syllabus is based on situations or topics, not usually on linguistic structures.
• Learning another language also involves learning how speakers of that language live.
2.2.3. The AudioLingual Method (ALM) principles

The Audioligual Method shares some similarities with the direct method. However, there are some differences to consider. Lee and VanPatten (2003) stated that:

The Audio Lingual Method was predicted on the marriage of behaviorist psychology and the current structural linguistics. According to behaviorist psychology, all learning—verbal and nonverbal—takes place through the process of habit formation. Habits are formed through repetition, imitation, and reinforcement. In ALM, language habits were formed by memorizing dialogues and practicing sentence patterns, usually through drills that required learners to imitate and repeat what their instructor said.

Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) described some of the most important principles of the audiolingual method:

- Language forms do not occur by themselves; they occur most naturally within a context.
- The native language and the target language have separate linguistic systems. They should be kept apart so that the students’ native language interferes as little as possible with the students’ attempts to acquire the target language.
- One of the language teacher’s major roles is that of a model of the target language.
- Teachers should provide students with an accurate model. By listening to how it is supposed to sound, students should be able to mimic the model.
- Language learning is a process of habit formation. The more often something is repeated, the stronger the habit and the greater the learning.
• It is important to prevent learners from making errors. Errors lead to the formation of bad habits. When errors do occur, they should immediately be corrected by the teacher.

• The purpose of language learning is to learn how to use the language to communicate.

• Particular parts of speech occupy particular ‘slots’ in sentences. In order to create new sentences, students must learn which part of speech occupies which slot.

• Positive reinforcement helps the students to develop correct habits.

• Students should learn to respond to both verbal and nonverbal stimuli.

• Each language has a finite number of patterns. Pattern practice helps students to form habits which enable the students to use the patterns.

• Students should ‘overlearn,’ i.e. learn to answer automatically without stopping to think.

• The teacher should be like an orchestra leader—conducting, guiding, and controlling the students’ behavior in the target language.

• The major objective of language teaching should be for students to acquire the structural patterns; students will learn vocabulary afterward.

• The learning of another language should be the same as the acquisition of the native language. We do not need to memorize rules in order to use our native language. The rules necessary to use the target language will be figured out or induced from examples.

• The major challenge of language teaching is getting students to overcome the
habits of their native language. A comparison between the native and target language will tell the teacher in which areas her students will probably experience difficulty.

- Speech is more basic to language than the written form. The ‘natural order’ (the order children follow when learning their native language) of skill acquisition is: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

- Language cannot be separated from culture. Culture is not only literature and the arts, but also the everyday behavior of the people who use the target language. One of the teacher’s responsibilities is to present information about that culture

### 2.2.4. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

With the advent of the Communicative Language Teaching the way teachers taught languages change greatly. “The origins of CLT are to be found in the changes in the British language teaching tradition dating from the late 1960’s. […] CLT is best considered an approach rather than a method” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001 p. 153).

Savignon (1991, p.263) described a little story of the origin of CLT:

In Europe, during the 1970s, the language needed of a rapidly increasing group of immigrants and guest workers, and a rich British linguistic tradition that included social as well as linguistic context in description of language behavior, led to the Council of Europe development of a syllabus for learners based on functional-notional concepts of language use. Functions were based on assessment of learner needs and specified the end result, the product of an instructional program. The
term communicative was used to describe programs that used a functional-notional syllabus based on needs assessment, and the language for specific purposes (LSP) movement was launched.

Brown (2007, p.241) offered the following four interconnected characteristics as a definition of CLT.

1. Classroom goals are focused on all of the components of CC and not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence.

2. Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purpose.

3. Fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques.

4. In the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts.

Since CLT is considered more an approach than a method, Anthony (1963) in Richards and Rogers (2001, p.19) pointed out clear definitions of method, approach and technique:

“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.”

“Method is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material, no part of which contradicts, and all of which is based upon, the selected approach. An approach is axiomatic, a method is procedural.”

“A technique is implementational- that which actually takes place in a classroom. It is particular trick, stratagem, or contrivance used to accomplish an immediate objective.
Techniques must be consistent with a method, and therefore in harmony with an approach as well.”

2.2.4.1. Conceptualization of the Communicative Approach (CA)

Richards (2006) about the communicative approach stated that:
Since the 1990s, the communicative approach has been widely implemented. Because it describes a set of very general principles grounded in the notion of communicative competence as the goal of second and foreign language teaching, and a communicative syllabus and methodology as the way of achieving this goal, communicative language teaching has continued to evolve as our understanding of the processes of second language learning has developed. Current communicative language teaching theory and practice thus draws on a number of different educational paradigms and traditions. (p.22)

Canale and Swain (1980) posited that:
It is useful to make a distinction between grammatical (or grammar-based) and communicative (or communicative-based) approaches to second language teaching. In choosing these particular terms we hope to avoid the confusion that has resulted from the use of the more inclusive terms ‘formal’ and ‘functional’. By a grammatical approach we mean on that organized on the basis of linguistic, or what we will call grammatical forms (i.e. phonological forms, morphological forms, syntactic patterns, lexical items) and emphasizes the ways in which these forms may be combined to form grammatical sentences[...] a communicative (or functional/notional) approach on the other hand is organized on the basis of communicative functions (e.g. apologizing, describing, inviting, promising)
that a given learner or group of learners needs to know and emphasizes the ways in which particular grammatical forms may be used to express these functions appropriately. (p.2)

### 2.2.4.2. Conceptualization of the communicative competence

In contrast to grammatical competence which refers to the knowledge of structures and the ability to produce correct sentences Hymes (1972) comprised that:

Competence refers as the most general term for the capabilities of a person

[...] The concept of “performance” will take on great importance, insofar as the study of communicative competence is seen as an aspect of what from another angle may be called ethnography of symbolic forms – the study of the variety genres, narration, dance, drama, song, instrumental music, visual art, that interrelate with speech in the communicative life of a society, and in terms of which the relative importance and meaning of speech and language must be assessed. (p.284)

Savignon (1991) explained that:

From its introduction into discussions of language and language learning in the early 1970s, the term communicative competence has prompted reflection. Fortunately for the survival of communicative competence as a useful concept, perhaps, the term has not lent itself to simple reduction and with it the risk of becoming yet another slogan. Rather, it continues to represent a concept that attracts researchers and curriculum developers, offering a sturdy framework for integrating linguistic theory, research, and teaching practice. (p.263)
Richards (2006) pointed out that communicative competence includes the following aspects of language knowledge:

- Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions
- Knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants (e.g., knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication)
- Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g., narratives, reports, interviews, conversations)
- Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge (e.g., through using different kinds of communication strategies) (p.3)

According to the language Policy Unit of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages CEFR (2001) the communicative language competence has three components:

- Linguistic, socio-linguistic and pragmatic competences.

Linguistic competence comprises the knowledge and skills related to lexis, phonology and syntax and other features of language systems, considered independently of the sociolinguistic impact of variations in use and of the pragmatic functions of the utterances produced. Socio-linguistic competence refers to the knowledge and skills involved in using language functionally in a social context.
Pragmatic competence involves the functional uses of linguistic resources (carrying out language functions, speech acts) using scenarios or predetermined scripts of interactional exchanges (p. 13).

There is a suitable definition of communicative competence that is explained by Habermas (1970) in Munby (1978):

Communicative competence relates to an ideal speech situation in the same way that linguistic competence relates to the abstract system of linguistic rules. The dialogue-constitutive universals at the same time generate and describe the form of inter subjectivity which makes mutuality of understanding possible. Communicative competence is defined by the ideal speaker’s mastery of the dialogue-constitutive universals irrespective of the actual restrictions under empirical conditions. (p. 11)

In the same vein and to have a better understanding of what communicative competence is about Widdowson (1983) established that:

Generally speaking, effective language use requires the creative exploitation of the meaning potential inherent in language rules — requires, in other words, what he has called communicative capacity. It is this ability which enables the language user to negotiate the gap between formula and the problem and which has to be provided for in the formulation of pedagogic objectives. (p. 13)

Amberg and Vause (2009) asserted that:

Being fluent means being able to use language in appropriate ways within particular social contexts. Our ability to use language in this way is called our communicative competence. When we respond appropriately to questions, tell jokes, use polite forms, give directions, and so on, we reveal our competence in language. (p. 10)
Littlewood (1981) summarized four broad domains which compose a person’s communicative competence:

- The learner must attain as high a degree as possible of linguistic competence. That is, he must develop skill in manipulating the linguistic system, to the point where he can use it spontaneously and flexibly in order to express his intended message.
- The learner must distinguish between the forms he has mastered as part of his linguistic competence, and the communicative functions which they perform. In other words, items mastered as part of a linguistic system must also be understood as part of a communicative system.
- The learner must develop skills and strategies for using language to communicate meaning as effectively as possible in concrete situations. He must learn to use feedback to judge his success, and, if necessary, remedy failure by using different language.
- The learner must become aware of the social meaning of language forms. For many learners, this may not entail the ability to vary their own speech to suit different social circumstances, but rather the ability to use generally acceptable forms and avoid potentially offensive ones (p.6)

2.2.4.3. Communicative language teaching principles

Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) pointed out some of the most important principles of the CLT:

- Whenever possible, authentic language - language as it is used in a real context- should be introduced.
• Being able to figure out the speaker’s or writer’s intentions is part of being communicatively competent.

• The target language is a vehicle for classroom communication, not just the object of study.

• One function can have many different linguistic forms. Since the focus of the course is on real language use, a variety of linguistic forms are presented together. The emphasis is on the process of communication rather than just mastery of language forms.

• Students should work with language at the discourse or suprasentential (above the sentence) level. They must learn about cohesion and coherence, those properties of language which bind the sentences together.

• 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. Having students work in small groups maximizes the amount of communicative practice they receive.

• Students should be given an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions.

• Errors are tolerated and seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills.

• One of the teacher’s major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communication.

• Communicative interaction encourages cooperative relationships among students. It gives students an opportunity to work on negotiating meaning.
• The social context of the communicative event is essential in giving meaning to the utterances.
• Learning to use language forms appropriately is an important part of communicative competence.
• The teacher acts as a facilitator in setting up communicative activities and as an advisor during the activities.
• In communicating, a speaker has a choice not only about what to say, but also how to say it.
• The grammar and vocabulary that the students learn follow from the function, situational context, and the roles of the interlocutors.
• Students should be given opportunities to work on language as it is used in authentic communication. They may be coached on strategies for how to improve their comprehension.

The author of this thesis explores each of the principles in CLT already mentioned by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011):

**Teacher goals and evaluation in CLT**

**Teacher goal**

Goals are important elements in any educational program or the intentions behind any learning task either communicative, affective or cognitive (Nunan, 2004) and the emphasis must be on the learner's communicative needs (Savignon, 2002). In CLT one of the objectives is to develop fluency in natural language use. And it occurs when there is comprehensible, meaningful interaction, and nonstop communication in spite of the limitations or faults of
someone’s communicative competence. For this to happen, there have to be created situations where students negotiate meaning which is an important teaching goal (Richards, 2006).

**Negotiation of meaning**

Whenever students negotiate meaning they put into practice what has been learned and they get feedback on the success or not of their own production based on the information they receive (Gass 1997). When students negotiate meaning they learn from each other and it can also enhance language learning and the process of language development (Al-Mahrooqi and Tuzlukova, 2011) and it facilitates L2 development because they link: input, the internal capacities of the learner and output (Long, 1996).

Pica et al. (1993) in (Nunan, 2004, p.84) stated that four conditions would maximize student’s opportunities for the negotiation of meaning:

- Each interactant holds a different portion of information
- It is necessary for the information to be exchanged for the task to be successfully completed
- Interactants have convergent goals
- Only one acceptable outcome is possible.

**Teacher evaluation**

Evaluation is a hard topic to talk about since it is not a discipline that has been developed by practicing professionals over thousands of years (Davidson, 2005). A way to understand evaluation is to look at the similarities and differences of evaluation models that have been used and identify similarities among them (House, 1978). It can be classified two types of evaluations: formative that strengthens or improve the object under evaluation and summative that examines the effects or outcomes of a program (Byram, 2004). There are also
two terms that are sometimes used interchangeable: evaluation and assessment. Assessment is the part of evaluation that comprises the collection and judgment of information about student learning while evaluation goes beyond student accomplishment and consider all aspects of teaching and learning (Carter and Nunan, 2001).

**Integrative evaluation**

Integrative means that it does not separate language skills but it assesses different skills at the same time and in this manner, integrative tests involve a global view of student’s proficiency (Heaton, 1988). In the same vein, Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill, and Pincas (1980) opinioned that:

Since language is seen as a number of systems, there will be items to test knowledge of both the production and reception of the sound segment system, of the stress system, the intonation system, and morphemic system, the grammatical system, the lexical system and so on (pp. 149-150).

**Students and teachers’ roles in CLT**

The learners and teachers play different roles, both in social and interpersonal relationships (Nunan, 2004). Teachers are the ones who take certain roles and at the same time assign different roles to students though in some cases teachers and students, depending on the context, must follow specific roles due to previous experiences and cultural principles (Christison and Murray, 2011).

**Student’s roles**

The students’ role is to work together and in cooperation; in pairs, in groups and as a whole class without depending entirely on the teacher and when in doubt they first ask each other and only when nobody knows the answer or give a solution to a problem they call on the
teacher for help (Jones, 2007). In CLT learners have the responsibility of participating in their own learning through cooperative activities rather than individualistic ones and get used to listening to their partners working in different group sizes rather than relying on the teacher as the only one model of the target language (Richards, 2006).

(Nunan, 1999) described 9 steps to get learners more involve in their own learning process:

1. Make instructional goals clear to learners
2. Help learners to create their own goals
3. Encourage learners to use their second language outside of the classroom.
4. Help learners to become more aware of learning processes and strategies.
5. Show learners how to identify their own preferred styles and strategies.
6. Give learners opportunities to make choices between options in the classroom.
7. Teach learners how to create their own learning tasks.
8. Provide learners with opportunities to master some aspects of their second language and then teach it to others.
9. Create contexts in which learners investigate language and become their own researchers of language.

**Teacher’s role**

The teachers and students’ roles have changed since the advent of autonomous learning in terms of methodology and teachers have to be prepared for this huge change in both practice and knowledge (Savignon, 1971). We as teachers have to help and support our students to develop their skills; however, we can’t give up our traditional role of source of information, knowledge, and advisor. Most importantly, monitor our students while they are
working together, encourage them to be independent learners and provide the appropriate feedback (Jones, 2007).

Littlewood (1981) mentioned some situations in which teacher’s roles become less controlling […], but no less significant:

- If learners find themselves unable to cope with the demands of a situation, the teacher can offer advice on any point, he can resolve their disagreement. In other words, he is available as a source of guidance and help.

- While learners are performing, the teacher can monitor their strengths and weakness. Even though he may not intervene at the time, he can use weakness as signs of learning needs which he must cater for later, probably through more controlled, pre-communicative activities.

- There may be occasions when the teacher decides to exercise a more immediate influence over the language used. Most obviously, he may also decide that a particular error is so important that he must correct it at once, to prevent it from becoming fixed in the learner’s speech. (p. 19)

**The teacher as a promoter of communication**

The teacher has to promote communication in the classroom through communicative activities that comply with the objectives of the curriculum, involve learners in communicative tasks as information sharing, negotiation of meaning and interaction (Richards and Rogers, 2001). The most efficient communicator in a foreign language needs to have the ability to process the complete situation that involves the speaker and the hearer, including the information shared between them in order to communicate their message effectively. Thus, it is of high importance for language learners to have ample opportunities to use the language
for communication and being exposed to meaningful situations not paying so much attention to the structure (Littlewood, 1981). There is ample evidence that when students are persuaded to communicate in the target language it is more likely to acquire a language much faster and also efficiently (Willis, 1996).

**Characteristics of the learning process and interaction in CLT**

**Communicative activities**

Communicative activities involve learners in using the language for communication which focuses on fluency rather than accuracy where students interact in pair or group work so that communication can happen (Spratt, 1999). Teachers can employ a wide range of language games and activities to learners of all ages in different types of interaction as long as they are not used or promoted as the only solution to different types of language learning problems (Savignon, 1971). These activities emphasize a functional feature of communication and learners must solve a communicative problem where it doesn’t matter whether the structure is correct as long as they get their message across as effectively as possible and reach a conclusion in an immediate and specific situation (Littlewood, 1981)

**Types of communicative activities**

Communicative activities are used in the language classroom so that students can practice the target language as much as possible. Crookes and Chaudron (1991) classified the communicative activities into three categories:

1. Controlled activities, basically teacher-lead activities. Some examples are: reading aloud, question-answer, drills, translation, dictation, etc.
2. Semi controlled, students have some kind of control over the process. Some examples are: referential questions-answers, cued narratives, information gap activities, etc.

3. Free activities, students have more control over the activities and there is little intervention on the part of the teacher who behaves as a facilitator during in the activity. Some examples are: role plays, games, problem solving, interviews, discussions, simulation, etc. (pp. 52–54)

**Information gap**

In information gap activity students use information the other doesn’t know and each have a message that have to be discovered by the other (Xiaoqing, 1997). Students are to use the communicative resources available to them in order to obtain information that is beyond the practice of language forms and must complete a task (Richards, 2006).

**Discussions**

What is of common use in the classroom are different group discussions whose main purpose is to change the pace of classes and increase the participation of the student (Richards and Rogers, 2001). The best discussions entail the sharing of personal experiences and giving opinions, mostly used in student-centered classrooms (Jones, 2007).

**Role plays**

Roles plays might be the most used communicative activity which a few teachers would claim not to have used at some time in their careers for its versatility that ranges from highly-controlled guided conversations or simple rehearsed dialogues to improvised activities or very complex simulated situations (Porter-Ladousse, 1987).
Class surveys

Class surveys are activities where students ask each other questions for the purpose of finding information that has to be analyzed and then reported back to the class. By applying the use of surveys in classrooms students learn how to produce questions forms, interact, collect data and analyze genuine information due to the survey’s usefulness in communication and dynamism (Tuyet, 2013).

Purpose of communicative activities

Communicative activities create a scenario which encourages learning not only for students but also for teachers since they develop positive personal relationship and individual efforts to learn to communicate inside or outside the classroom. Whenever students perceive some improvement in their ability to communicate they feel eager to go further and learn to use the language not only as separated skills but as an integrated one (Littlewood, 1981).

Interaction

When people meet for the first time, they commonly exchange greetings, get involved in small talk and chit chat, describe past events simply because they want to be friendly and establish a situation of interaction with others where the focus is on the speakers more than the message (Richards, 2008). A long time ago interaction was initiated mostly by the teacher questions and the student elicited answers. Nowadays more opportunities are given for learners to get more involved in language production through communication strategies, the tasks and opportunities for interaction (Carter and Nunan, 2001). More importantly, interaction occurs even if the linguistic items used are not yet part of the learner’s competence and he or she can use a verbal exchange to modify or add information to what was already said (Ellis, 1984). Situations are created by the teacher who also sets activities in motion and
the students, who are responsible for managing the interaction and conduct it to its final part, are instructed to work in several groups at the same time without the teacher’s supervision. This might make students feel uncomfortable at the beginning, though (Littlewood, 1981). Group work increases the interaction in a great deal among students because it reduces the inhibitions of students who are not willing to speak in front of the whole class, and it is very positive even when teachers cannot take notes on the mistakes the learners might have (Ur, 1996). When students work individually they can advance at their own pace, focus and organize their thoughts; on the other hand, pair and group activities provide opportunities for students to develop longer chances of interaction and fluency. They can also feel more confident for practicing in a non-threatening environment especially those shy or weak learners (Spratt, Pulverness and Williams, 2011).

**Participants of the interaction**

In the language classroom students learn apart from the language intended in each lesson, the teacher’s instructions, discussions, funny remarks, small talk and the comments. Thus, it would not be sensible for a teacher to control the lesson so much as to not let students participate as much as possible (Scrivener, 2001).

There are some ways of organizing interaction in the classroom. According to Dagarin (2004) it depends on who communicate with whom and these are the most frequent:

a) Teacher – learners - It occurs when the teacher is talking to the whole class. At this moment the teacher is the leader or controller and the person who decided what to do and not.

b) Teacher – learner/a group of learners- it occurs when the teacher refers to the whole class, but wants only one student or just a group of students to reply.
c) Learner – learner- It refers to what is called 'pair work'. Students are asked to do a task in pairs and the teacher circulates while helping when necessary.

d) Learners – learners- It is commonly called 'group work'. Students are asked to do a task in groups and the teacher has the role of a consultant. (p.129)

Language view, areas and skills emphasis in CLT

Language view

Language is seen as a tool for communication and not anymore as a set of phonological, grammatical and lexical items to be learned or memorized just because it is part of the language (Nunan, 2004). Learning is a process, which improves little by little from the interaction among different elements such as the learners, teachers, texts and activities which objectives are to develop the language skills necessary within the learner’s developing competence in a platform of shared negotiation, articulated interpretation and the exchange of expressions (Hall and Hewings, 2001). The knowledge of the language is not considered the outcome, it may be desirable though. However, the goal is to be able to use the language for what is needed or wanted to do (Van Ek and Trim, 1990).

Richards (2006) proposed that in recent years, language learning has been viewed from a very different perspective. It is seen as resulting from processes such as:

Interaction between the learner and users of the language

Collaborative creation of meaning

Creating meaningful and purposeful interaction through language

Negotiation of meaning as the learner and his or her interlocutor arrive at understanding
Learning through attending to the feedback learners get when they use the language

Paying attention to the language one hears (the input) and trying to incorporate new forms into one’s developing communicative competence

Trying out and experimenting with different ways of saying things (p.4)

**Language form**

Grammar is seen as a separated set or meaningless, static and decontextualized structures and prescriptive, however, grammar not only has form (morphosyntax) it also expresses meaning (semantics) and use in appropriate context (pragmatics) (Celce-Murcia, 2001). There is also growing evidence that students struggle to understand the basic structure of a language in programs which don’t give specific attention to the form of a language (Lightbown and Spada, 1993). In this manner, students need to learn how to express functions such as apologizing, describing, inviting, promising, etc. as well as how to use particular structural forms in order to use a language correctly (Canale and Swain, 1980).

**Language function**

A function is a type of communicative activity: it is the use of language for the purpose of reaching an objective, and it commonly involves the interaction of not less than two people. It might be a suggestion, a promise, an apology, or a greeting. These functions are usually 'binary'; it means that, the performance of one function suggests a certain reply or some kind of response which takes the form of another, corresponding function. For instance, compliments are typically followed by acknowledgment and some extra information about what was complimented (Ur, 1996).
A language function is what the learner wishes to achieve when he or she says or writes something; by doing so, they are carrying out an act of communication. For example, when they say 'I apologize', they are performing the function of apologizing and when they say 'I promise', they are performing the function of promising (Harmer, 2010). We need to make students aware of the communicative functions they are using since they are not easy to understand or infer from a communicative activity (Widdowson, 1990).

Halliday (1973) distinguished seven language functions:

- **Instrumental**, to express needs. E.g. I want...;
- **Regulatory**, to tell others what to do. E.g. Do this...;
- **Interactional**, to relate to others. E.g. I love you...;
- **Personal**, to express feelings. E.g. I’m happy...;
- **Heuristic**, to explore and gain knowledge. E.g. What is this?;
- **Imaginative**, to create an imaginary environment, tell jokes. E.g. Once I...;
- **Representational**, to convey facts and information. E.g. I have this

**Language functions are emphasized over language forms**

Attention used to be focused on the linguistic skills because it was supposed that once they were mastered, the communicative abilities would be improved automatically; however, it is not the case since an over emphasis on drills and grammar exercises is likely to inhibit the development of communicative abilities (Widdowson, 1978). In CLT, language is seen as a means of communication, although this concept is well grounded it seems insufficient inasmuch as the functional and structural perspectives are not being considered. (Littlewood, 1981) illustrates this view of language with the following example: The sentence ‘Why don’t you close the door?’ from a structural frame of reference is undoubtedly a question and from a
grammar perspective it is a declarative or imperative. However, from a functional frame it is unclear because its communicative function can be of a question, a command, a plea, a suggestion, or a complaint; it all depends on social and specific factors. Hence, when so much attention is given to terminology like positive/negative, singular/plural, and active/passive; grammar is upgraded to a level of superiority by a kind of meaning substitute which is remarkably inaccurate (Sinclair, 2000).

Language skills

The four skills commonly included when teaching a language are divided into two types: productive and receptive. Although, some skills used to be more important than others as (Richards and Renandya, 2002) mentioned that teaching methods used to emphasize productive skills, and the relationship between receptive and productive skills was poorly understood.

Productive skills

Speaking

The speaking skill used to mean the repetition after the teacher, the memorization of a dialogue, or the reply to drills, reflecting what was known as the audio-lingual or similar methodologies of the 1970s. With the arrival of the CLT in the 1980s many changes related to syllabus and methodology have taken place in the way speaking is understood nowadays (Richards, 2008).

Writing

The writing skill is the hardest for L2 learners to master because they have to organize the ideas and translate these ideas into comprehensible text. This requires higher levels of skills of planning and organizing as well as lower skills of punctuation, word choice, and so
forth. It becomes ever more difficult if the learner’s competence in the target language is poor (Richards and Renandya, 2002).

**Receptive skills**

**Listening**

The listening skill in contrast to speaking seems to be passive; although, this is far from reality since the act of decoding a message requires an active engagement in communication between the participants. For a receptive skill to be effective the message has to be understood, thus during the interaction the speaker is aware that his message is being understood when he notices from the hearer different kinds of signals like nods, glances, head movements or non-verbal noises (Broughton et. al, 1980).

**Reading**

The reading skill demands the reader to take information from a text as well as integrate it with the background information and the assumption the reader already has. Some new research on L1 reading has underlined the demand for readers to develop necessary reading processes and skills that help them identify words rapidly, acquire vocabulary, recognize text-structure, and read strategically. And it is also understood by researchers that for someone to comprehend more effectively and of course more efficiently what he reads there is not best way as to read in a great deal (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

**Skills emphasized in CLT**

When classes are developed integratively they expose language learners to the authentic use of the language and the struggle students might have, can help them to interact naturally in the target language and English becomes a real means of interaction and sharing where teachers can track the progress of each students in different skills at the same time.
(Oxford, 2001). An integrative approach, which has to do with the development of the language skills mutually dependent is often considered to be an offshoot of the communicative method (Kotkovets, 2014). Learners are required to develop a communicative competence in the language, in other others, an ability to understand discourse, in either productive or receptive skills and that it should be done without treating the skills in isolation from each other (Widdowson, 1978).

The role of culture in CLT

The relationship between language and culture is inextricably linked so that it is not easy to separate what people use for communication from body language, superstitions and also expressions of friendliness. Thus, culture refers to the lifestyle of a group of people, the way they behave, their beliefs, values and the way they communicate (Sirbu, 2015). Culture is also the knowledge, attitudes, and skills which are transferred among generations through social relations (Saville-Troike, 2006).

Native language role in CLT

Language is what people use to connect with others within a social context. It is also a means of communication that for it to be effective is necessary to understand the culture and the social influences that accompanies the language (Amberg and Vause, 2009). It is not easy to make a clear difference among the concepts of first language, native language, primary language, and mother tongue, which is a language that has been acquired during early childhood in contrast to L2 (Saville-Troike, 2006). The mother tongue is the language one has learnt first; knows best or uses most (UNESCO, 2003).
**Student’s native language**

In a monolingual classroom, learners are inclined to use their first language while they are working together in groups since it might seem easier and practical; nevertheless the classroom might be the only one place where they can practice English and teachers should persuade them about it (Jones, 2007). Although some students might find it hard to use only English in the classroom, we as teacher are the best suppliers of comprehensible input students have and must use only English in order to create an English environment (Harmer, 2010).

Scrivener (2001) detailed some reasons why students might use their native language in the classroom:

- Because it’s easier to speak their own language
- Because the teacher always corrects their English
- Because they don’t want to get it wrong in front of others
- Because it’s not ‘in’ to speak English
- Because the teacher is only pretending not to understand their own language
- Because they can’t say what they want in English
- Because the teacher can’t hear them
- Because it is silly to speak English
- Just because (p. 297)

**Error treatment in CLT**

Mistakes play an important role in language learning because it permits students to experiment with the language when they want to communicate. A mistake has two different classification, errors and slips. Errors happen when students want to say something they haven’t learnt yet, while slips are caused by distraction, anxiety, tiredness or any other
circumstances (Spratt et al., 2011). When a person is learning a language, they rarely get it right at first which is common even when people are learning the first language. Native speakers of a language tend to make mistakes during informal conversations too (Harmer, 2012). What teachers traditionally do whenever an error occurs is to correct it immediately, even though with the coming of the communicative approach it is required to redefine this common practice (Littlewood, 1981). Thus, it is recommendable for teachers to accept these errors as a natural occurrence in the process of learning a language, by doing so students will feel and show confidence about using the target language (Hendrickson, 1978). Errors have always been regarded as failure or obstruction to learning or as a strategy for punishing the student and it has been supported by behaviorism (Maicusi, Maicusi and Carrillo, 1999).

**Types of error correction**

Three types of error correction has been developed throughout the years; self-correction, peer correction and teacher correction.

**Self-correction**

Self-correction is a process of formative assessment through which students ponder on their own strengths and weaknesses over established goals or criteria (Andrade and Du, 2007). After reflecting on and evaluating their own work and learning, students must make decisions based on the performance regarding these stated goals or criteria (Boud, 1995).

**Peer correction**

Once the learner has reflected on his production and made some decision on how to improve it then it is the turn for a peer to provide some kind of correction. This peer correction has a powerful advantage since the learners are usually at the same level of knowledge, even
though it is the teacher’s part to assist and verify whether a correction has been done correctly or whether extra explanation is required (Crookes and Chaudron in Celce-Murcia, 1991).

**Teacher correction**

While the teacher is monitoring, and notices some errors in a student’s utterance he should take notes and avoid interrupting. This valuable information can be used as a reference to part from in order to give feedback afterwards (Jones, 2007). The feedback can be given in accuracy or communication. (Littlewood, 1981) illustrates an example of accuracy feedback: When a student says ‘what does you study?’ He might be informed by the teacher that the correct question is ‘what do you study?’ according to structural criteria. On the other hand, an example of a communication feedback is when the same question is answered ‘I’m a nurse.’ The student can know that the message was understood according to communicative criteria even though the structure is not correct.

**2.3. Definition of key terms**

**Competence:**

A term used in linguistic theory, and especially in generative grammar, to refer to speakers’ knowledge of their language, the system of rules which they have mastered so that they are able to produce and understand an indefinite number of sentences, and to recognize grammatical mistakes and ambiguities. It is an idealized conception of language, which is seen as in opposition to the notion of performance, the specific utterances of speech; the Saussurean distinction between langue and parole is similar, but there are important differences between the definitions of competence and langue.
Communicative competence:

Communicative competence is the fundamental concept of a pragmalinguistic model of linguistic communication: it refers to the repertoire of know-how that individuals must develop if they are to be able to communicate with one another appropriately in the changing situations and conditions. In this model, speaking is understood as the action of transmitting symbols (i.e. interaction). Communicative competence is the descriptive goal of various social-psychological disciplines.

Principles:

In teaching, beliefs and theories that teachers hold concerning effective approaches to teaching and learning and which serves as the basis for some of their decision-making

Context:

As a comprehensive concept in communication theory, ‘context’ refers to all elements of a communicative situation: the verbal and non-verbal context, the context of the given speech situation and the social context of the relation-ship between the speaker and hearer, their knowledge, and their attitudes. Catford distinguishes between linguistic context and situational co-text.
Chapter III
Hypothesis and variables

3.1. Hypothesis: General and specific

3.1.1. General hypothesis

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, are aware of the CLT principles.

3.1.2. Specific hypothesis

SH1. English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of what evaluation and goals imply as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SH2. English Teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of student and teacher roles as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
SH3. English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the students learning characteristics and interaction as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SH4. English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SH5. English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of the role of culture as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SH6. English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of the native language role as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

SH7. English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of what error treatment is about as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
3.2. Variables and operationalization of variables

Table 1  
*Operational Matrix of Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ awareness</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation and goals</td>
<td>The students learn how to negotiate meaning with their interlocutors.</td>
<td>1 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluation is mostly integrative (listening, reading, speaking and writing) at the same time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and teacher roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>The students are more responsible for their own learning.</td>
<td>2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher establishes situations to promote communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>Characteristics of learning process and interaction.</td>
<td>Students use the language through communicative activities.</td>
<td>4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction occurs mostly when one student talks to another in a great deal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language view, areas and skills emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students need to learn about forms, meanings, and functions.</td>
<td>6,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The areas emphasized are the language functions over and forms.</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Language view, areas and skills emphasis</td>
<td>The skills emphasized are the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) from the beginning.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Role of culture</td>
<td>Culture is important to understand the social situations in order to convey the intended meaning.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native language role</td>
<td>The students’ native language can be used if necessary.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error treatment</td>
<td>The students’ errors can be tolerated.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter IV
Methodology

4.1. Research approach

According to Hernandez, Fernandez and Baptista (2014), this research is descriptive and quantitative because it uniquely pretend to measure or get information in an independent or joint way about the concepts or the variables to whom they refer to; this is, its objective is not to point out how these variables are related to each other. (Own translation p. 92).

4.2. Research type

According to Valderrama (2013) this study is a basic research because it provides an organized body of scientific knowledge and does not necessarily produce immediate and practical utility results. The purpose is to collect information from reality to enrich the theoretical and scientific knowledge oriented to the discovery of principles and laws. (Own translation p. 38).

4.3. Research design

According to Hernandez et al. (2014), this research is transectional and simple descriptive design because it inquires the incidence of the modalities or levels of one or more variables in a population. The procedure consists in locating in one or different variables a specific group
of people or other living creatures, objects, situations, contexts, phenomena, communities, etc. and provide its description. (own translation p. 155)

4.4. Population and sample

The participants of this study are 20 English teachers of the Master’s Program at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima. Their ages range between 25 and 60 years old and the distribution of female and male students is about equal. Most of the students’ mother tongue is Spanish while a few of them have a native language as their L1.

4.5. Techniques and instruments of data collection

4.5.1 Survey

A survey a series of questions have been developed about one or several topics of a sample of people selected following a series of scientifically rules that makes this sample, as a whole, representative of the general population from there it precedes.

4.5.2. Instrument of data collection

The instrument has been selected in accordance with the design and the objectives of the research in a questionnaire about “Awareness about communicative language teaching principles” that has 12 items.
a) **Instrument of the knowledge about the communicative language teaching principles**

Data sheet:

Name: A questionnaire to measure the knowledge of the principles about the communicative language teaching principles

Author: José Antonio Fajardo

Administration: Individual and collective

Time of administration: Between 10 and 15 minutes, approximately

Scope of application: English teachers

Signification: Level of knowledge of the principles about communicative language teaching principles that teachers have.

Type of answer: The answers are answered through a binominal scaling with two categorical values. (Correct and incorrect)

**Objective:**

The current questionnaire is part of this study that has the objective of getting information of the level of knowledge about the Communicative Language Teaching principles by English teachers, participants of the master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

**Character application**

This questionnaire is an instrument that utilizes the survey technique; it is of an anonymous character, for it is requested to the surveyed to be sincere in their answers.
Description:

The questionnaire is made up of 12 items, each of which has two possibilities of response: correct (2) and incorrect (1). Likewise, the respondent only has to choose one alternative with a cross (X). If more than one alternative is chosen, the item is invalidated.

Structure:

The dimensions that evaluate the awareness about communicative language teaching principles are the following:

a) Teacher evaluation and goals
b) Student and teacher roles
c) Characteristics of learning process and interaction
d) Language view, areas and skill emphasis.
e) Role of culture
f) Native language role
g) Error treatment
Table 2
*Table of specifications for the questionnaire of the awareness of communicative language teaching principles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Structure of the questionnaire</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation and goals</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and teacher roles</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of learning process and interactions</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language view, areas, and skills</td>
<td>6,8,9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language role</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error treatment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total items</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
*Levels and ranges of the questionnaire of the awareness of communicative language teaching principles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation and goals</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and teacher roles</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of learning process and interaction</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language view, areas, and skills emphasis</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of culture</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language role</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error treatment</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of awareness</td>
<td>12 – 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. **Statistical treatment**

For the data processing the software SPSS version 23 will be used, as it is defined by Hernández, et al. (2014, p. 273), El SPSS (Statistical package for the social sciences), developed by the University of Chicago, is one of the most widespread and nowadays belongs to IBM. Moreover, for the reliability of the instrument Cronbach’s alpha was used; for the descriptive statistics, data collected from the questionnaire was utilized, which were emptied into a tabulation of data, which were used to construct tables of frequency and figures with respect to the levels and ranges.
Chapter V

Results

5.1. Validity and reliability of the instruments

5.1.1. Validity of the instruments

a) Analysis of validity of the content by judgment of experts of the questionnaire

awareness of the communicative language teaching principles

The validity of the instrument: It was measured through the validity of the content, which objective was to collect the opinions and suggestions by experts dedicated to education with academic degrees of Magister and Doctor in educational sciences. In this process each expert issued an evaluative judgment of a set of aspects related to the questionnaire of the awareness about Communicative Language Teaching principles. The range of the values oscillates from 0 to 100%. Having into account that the average grade of the judgment issued by each expert was given 84.9%, it was considered the highest grade of 80% as an indicator that the questionnaire of the awareness about the Communicative Language Teaching principles meets the right category in the evaluated aspect. The results are shown in the following table:
Table 4
Validity of the content by expert judgment of the questionnaire of the awareness of communicative language teaching principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness about communicative language teaching principles</th>
<th>Experts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg. Jean P. Mendoza T.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dra. Betty M. Lavado Rojas</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dra. Edith Zárate Aliaga</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
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 instrument by expert judgment, where the questionnaire of the awareness about communicative language teaching principles got a score of 88.5% it can be deduced that the instrument has a very good validity.
5.1.2. Reliability of the instrument of the awareness about the communicative language teaching principles

The reliability of the instrument is going to be found through the procedure of Kuder-Richardson internal consistency – 20. In this case, for the calculation of reliability by the internal consistency method, it was based on the premise that if the instrument has questions with two response alternatives, as in this case; the reliability of Kuder-Richardson internal consistency – 20 is used.

On this research Kuder-Richardson internal consistency – 20 has been used through the software SPSS, which is the most frequent indicator of analysis. This coefficient determines the internal consistency of a scale analyzing the average correlation of a variable with all the others that make up this scale; for this the items have options in a binomial scale. The process of reliability has been done, for which it was necessary to carry out a pilot test to a small percentage of the study sample, a total of 5 teachers.

KUDER RICHARSON 20

\[ r_{20} = \left( \frac{K}{K-1} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma^2 - \sum pq}{\sigma^2} \right) \]

K = Number of items of the instrument
p = Percentage of people that answer correctly each item
q = Percentage of people that answer incorrectly each item
\( \sigma^2 \) = Total variance of the instrument
Table 6
*Level of reliability of the evaluation of the awareness of the Communicative Language Teaching principles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Nº of items</th>
<th>Nº of Cases</th>
<th>Kuder Richarson 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness about the Communicative Language Teaching principles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values found after the application of the instrument to the pilot group, at the level of the variable, to determine the level of reliability, can be understood by the following table:

Table 7
*Values of the levels of reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Level of reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0,53 to less</td>
<td>Null reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,54 to 0,59</td>
<td>Low reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,60 to 0,65</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,66 to 0,71</td>
<td>Very reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,72 to 0,99</td>
<td>Excellent reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>Perfect reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Since that in the application of the questionnaire on the awareness of the Communicative Language Teaching principles the value of 0.953 was obtained, we can deduce that this instrument has an excellent reliability.
5.2. Presentation and analysis of the results

5.2.1. Description of the questionnaire

Table 8
Distribution of the frequencies of item 1: One of the most important goals as a teacher is to make my students learn how to negotiate meaning with their interlocutors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Item 1: One of the most important goals as a teacher is to make my students learn how to negotiate meaning with their interlocutors

In table 8 and figure 1, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 80% (16) answered incorrectly while 20% (4) answered correctly confirming that one of the most important goals as a teacher is to make my students learn how to negotiate meaning with their interlocutors.
Table 9
Distribution of frequencies of item 2: One of the most important roles as a teacher is to establish situations to promote communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Item 2: One of the most important roles as a teacher is to establish situations to promote communication

In table 9 and figure 2, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 5% (1) answered incorrectly while 80% (19) answered correctly confirming that one of the most important roles as a teacher is to establish situations to promote communication.
**Table 10**  
*Distribution of frequencies of the item 3: One of the most important roles of my students is to negotiate meaning.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. Item 3:** One of the most important roles of my students is to negotiate meaning.

In table 10 and figure 3, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 25% (5) answered incorrectly while 75% (15) answered correctly confirming that the most important roles of my students is to negotiate the meaning of what they say.
Table 11
*Distribution of frequencies of item 4: It is very important that my students use the language through communicative activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Item 4: It is very important that my students use the language through communicative activities*

In table 11 and figure 4, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 0.0% (0) answered incorrectly while 100% (20) answered correctly confirming that it is very important that my students use the language in communicative activities.
Table 12
Distribution of frequencies of item 5: In the classroom, interaction in English mostly occurs when students interact in small groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Item 5:** In the classroom, interaction in English occurs when students interact in small groups

In table 12 and figure 5, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 45% (9) answered incorrectly while 55% (11) answered correctly confirming that in the classroom, interaction in English mostly occurs when students interact in small groups.
Tabla 13
Distribution of frequencies of item 6: The language my students need to learn is mostly everyday speech of users of the target language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Item 6: The language my students need to learn is mostly everyday speech of users of the target language

In table 13 and figure 6, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 45% (9) answered incorrectly while 55% (11) answered correctly confirming that what my students need to learn of the target language is mostly to communicate.
Table 14
Distribution of frequencies of item 7: Culture is important because it helps my students understand the daily behavior and lifestyle of everyday users of the target language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Item 7: Culture is important because it helps my students understand the daily behavior and lifestyle of everyday users of the target language.

In table 14 and figure 7, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, el 30% (6) answered incorrectly while 70% (14) answered correctly confirming that culture is important because it helps my students understand the daily behavior and lifestyle of the everyday users of the target language.
**Tabla 15**  
*Distribution of frequencies of item 8: What I mostly teach from the target language are the language functions and forms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8. Item 8:** What I most teach from the target language are the language functions and forms

In table 15 and figure 8, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, el 20% (4) answered incorrectly while 80% (16) answered correctly confirming that what I mostly teach from the target language are the functions and structures.
Table 16
Distribution de frequencies of item 9: The skills that I emphasize more are listening, speaking, reading and writing (together from the beginning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Item 9: The skills that I emphasize more are listening, speaking, reading and writing (together from the beginning)

In table 16 and figure 9, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, el 35% (7) answered incorrectly while 65% (13) answered correctly confirming that the skills that I emphasize more are to listening, speaking, reading and writing (together from the beginning).
Table 17
*Distribution de fréquences of item 10: My student’s native language can be used only if necessary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10. Item 10: My students’ native language can be used only if necessary*

In table 17 and figure 10, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 30% (6) answered incorrectly while 70% (14) answered correctly confirming that my students’ native language can be used only if necessary.
Table 18
Distribution of frequencies of item 11: What I mostly evaluate is listening, reading, speaking and writing (integrative evaluation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Item 11: What I mostly evaluate is listening, reading, speaking and writing (integrative evaluation)

In table 18 and figure 11, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 45% (9) answered incorrectly while 55% (11) answered correctly confirming that what I most evaluate is listening, reading, speaking and writing. (Integrated evaluation)
Table 19
Distribution of frequencies of item 12: The students’ mistakes are tolerated when they are interacting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12. Item 12**: The students’ errors are tolerated while they are interacting

In table 19 and figure 12, it can be observed that from a sample of 20 teachers, 70% (20) answered incorrectly while 30% (6) answered correctly confirming that the students’ errors are tolerated while they are interacting.
5.2.2. Hypothesis testing

General Hypothesis

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning of the null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (H1):

Null hypothesis (H0):

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1):

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical test

Table 20

*Awareness of the communicative language teaching principles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[21 - 24]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[17 - 20]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[12 - 16]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 20 it can be observed that 85% (17) of the English teachers surveyed have medium level of knowledge about the communicative language teaching while 15% (3) of them a high level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics, the average is 19.70, which indicates that the level of knowledge is of medium level.

Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted: English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, know about the communicative language teaching principles, at middle level.
Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the communicative language teaching principles at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Specific Hypothesis 1

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what evaluation and the objectives imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning of the Null Hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (H₁):

Null Hypothesis (H₀):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about what evaluation and objectives imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* know about what evaluation and objectives imply as principles of the communicative Language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical Testing

Table 21
Knowledge of the evaluation and objectives of the teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0 - 2]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 21 it can be observed that 65% (13) of the English teachers surveyed have a medium level on their knowledge about evaluation and objectives of the teacher, 30% (6) a low level while only 5% (1) have a high level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics, the average is 3, which indicates that the knowledge is of medium level.

Thus, it is accepted the alternative hypothesis: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the evaluation and objectives imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, which is at medium level.
Figure 14. Knowledge of evaluation and objectives of the teacher

Paso 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know what the evaluation and objectives imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Specific Hypothesis 2

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know what the students and teachers’ roles imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning the null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (H1):

Null Hypothesis (H0):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know nothing about what the students and teachers’ roles imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative hypothesis (H1):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know what the students and teachers’ roles imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical Testing

Table 22
Knowledge of the students and teachers’ roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0 - 2]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 22 it can be observed that 70% (14) of the English teachers surveyed have a high level of knowledge about the students and teachers’ roles, while 30% (6) have a medium level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics it is of 4, which indicates that the level of English is of medium level.

Thus, it is accepted the alternative hypothesis: The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know what the students and teachers’ roles imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Figure 15. Knowledge of the students and teacher’s role

Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know what the students and teachers’ roles imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Specific Hypothesis 3

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the learning characteristics and interaction imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (H1):

Null hypothesis (H0):

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about what the characteristics of learning and interaction imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the characteristics of learning and interaction imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical testing

Table 23
Knowledge of the learning characteristics and interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0 - 2]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 23 it can be observed that 55% (11) of the English teachers surveyed have a high level in their knowledge about the learning characteristics and interaction, while 45% (6) have a medium level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics the average is of 4, which indicates that the level of knowledge is high.

Thus, it is accepted the alternative hypothesis: The English teachers, participants of the Master’s program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the learning characteristics and interaction imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, which is at high level.
Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about the characteristics of the process of learning and interaction imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Specific Hypothesis 4

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the perception of the language, the areas and the emphasized skills imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about what the perception of the language, the areas and the emphasized skills imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning of the null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (H 1):

Null Hypothesis (H₀):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about what the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skills imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the perception of the language, the areas and the emphasized skills imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical Testing

Table 24
Knowledge of the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[4 - 5]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0 - 3]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 24 it can be observed that 75% (15) of the English teachers surveyed have a medium level of knowledge about the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skills, while 25% (5) have a high level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics the average is 5, which indicated that their knowledge is of medium level.

Thus, the alternative hypothesis is accepted: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skills imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016 which is at medium level.
Figure 17. Knowledge of the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skills

Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about what the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized abilities imply as principles of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Specific Hypothesis 5

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what culture implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning the null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (H1):

Null Hypothesis (H0):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about what the culture implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what culture implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical Testing

Table 25
Knowledge of culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 25 it can be observed that 70% (15) of the English teachers surveyed have a high level of knowledge about culture, while 30% (5) have a medium level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistical the average is 2, which indicates that their level of knowledge is high.

Thus, it is accepted the alternative hypothesis: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what culture implies as a principle of communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, which is at high level.
Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know what culture implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Specific Hypothesis 6

The English teachers, participants of Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*; know what the role of the native language implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning the null hypothesis (H₀) and alternative hypothesis (H₁):

Null Hypothesis (H₀):

The English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about the role of the native language implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the role of the native language implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical Testing

**Table 26**  
*Knowledge of the role of the native language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 26 it can be observed that 70% (14) of the English teachers surveyed have a high level of knowledge of the role of the native language, while 30% (6) have a medium level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics the average is 2, which indicates that the level of knowledge is high.

Thus, the alternative hypothesis is accepted: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the role of the native language implies as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, which is at high level.
Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program

*Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the role of the native language imply as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education

Specific hypothesis 7

English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the treatment of errors imply as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Step 1: Planning the null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (H₁):

Null Hypothesis (H₀):

The English teachers, participants of Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know nothing about what the treatment of the errors imply as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

The English teachers, participants of Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about what the treatment of the errors imply as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
Step 2: Statistical Testing

Table 27

Knowledge of error treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Absoluta Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Interpretation

In table 27 it can be observed that 70% (14) of the English teachers surveyed have a medium knowledge about error treatment, while 30% (6) have a medium level. Likewise, when verifying the descriptive statistics the average is 1, which implies that their knowledge is of medium level.

Thus, the alternative hypothesis is accepted: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know what the error treatment imply as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, which is at medium level.
Step 4: Decision making

Thus, it is verified that: the English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about the treatment of the errors as a principle of the communicative language teaching at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
5.3. Discussion

1. In the general hypothesis it was observed that 85% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium level of knowledge as it was described in the CLT principles. This result disagreed in part with (Fung-King, 2009) research about the perceptions of EFL among English language teachers whose result was that teachers believe that communicative classes are more useful than traditional English classes. And with the results of (Ahmad and Rao, 2013) research about the feasibility of applying CLT approach in Pakistan and whose conclusion based on teachers answered was that the communicative approach is better than the traditional method in teaching English.

2. In the specific hypothesis 1 it was observed that 62% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium level of knowledge of the teacher evaluation and goals as it was described in the CLT principles. This result disagrees in part with (Heaton, 1988) that evaluation should be integrative in order to see the global view of the student; and with (Savignon, 2002) that the emphasis should be put on the learner’s communicative needs.

3. In the specific hypothesis 2 it was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level of knowledge of the students and teachers’ roles as it was described in
the CLT principles. This result agrees with (Jones, 2007) that when in doubt students’ role is to first work together in cooperation in order to solve a problem, then when an answer can’t be found they should ask the teacher for help; and with (Savignon, 1971) that English teachers have to be prepared for a huge change of paradigm, from being the one who has all the answers to be a guide for students to find the answers themselves.

4. In the specific hypothesis 3 it was observed that 55% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level of knowledge of the learning characteristics and interaction as it was described in the CLT principles. This result disagrees in part with (Carter and Nunan, 2001) that more opportunities should be given for learners to get more involved in language production through communication strategies, the tasks and opportunities for interaction.

5. In the specific hypothesis 4 it was observed that 75% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium level of knowledge of the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skill as it was described in the CLT principles. This result disagrees with (Nunan, 2004) that the language is seen as a tool for communication and not anymore as a set of phonological, grammatical and lexical items to be memorized. It also disagrees with (Celce-Murcia, 2001) that besides structure, grammar also expresses meaning and use in appropriate context; and with (Oxford, 2001) that language developed integratively expose language learners to the authentic use of the language
and the struggle students might have.

6. In the specific hypothesis 5 it was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level of knowledge of culture, as it was described in the CLT principles. This result agrees with (Sirbu, 2015) that while teaching a language teachers are also teaching culture which refers to the lifestyle of a group of people who speak the language on a daily basis, the way they behave, their beliefs, values and the way they communicate.

7. In the specific hypothesis 6 it was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level of knowledge of the role of the native language as it has been described in the CLT principles. This result accords with (Jones, 2007) that most of the English teachers surveyed should let students use their native language in some occasions for practical reasons.

8. In the specific hypothesis 7 it was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium knowledge of error treatment as it was described in the CLT principles. This result disagrees in part with (Littlewood, 1981) that it is required to redefine the common practice of correcting students’ errors immediately.
Conclusions

1. It was observed that 85% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium level knowledge of the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).

2. It was observed that 62% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium level of knowledge of the teacher evaluation and goals as the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).

3. It was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level knowledge of the students and teachers’ roles as the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).

4. It was observed that 55% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level knowledge of the learning characteristics and interaction as the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).
5. It was observed that 75% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium level knowledge of the perception of the language, the areas, and the emphasized skill, as the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).

6. It was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level knowledge of culture, as the CLT principle described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).

7. It was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a high level knowledge of the role of the native language as the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).

8. It was observed that 70% of English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, have a medium knowledge of error treatment, as the CLT principles described by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2000).
**Recommendations**

1. We recommend the English teachers, participants of the Master’s program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzman y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016, to study more in deep the theory and practice of CLT principles, so that they can teach the language for communication and not only structures as it was traditionally taught.

2. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to relearn the way they evaluate their students and forget the traditional way of putting too much emphasis on one skill at a time rather to apply the integrative evaluation (Speaking, writing, listening and reading) as well as to teach students how to negotiate meaning so that they can learn from each other.

3. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to give more freedom to students to work cooperatively so that they can learn to not depend so much on the teacher as well as teachers have to be knowledgeable on how to promote communicative situations for student to use the language actively.

4. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to make students use English in communicative situations; make them interact as much as possible and reduce the use of grammar exercises in the classroom since most EFL students have the only one opportunity to practice English in class.

5. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to give equal attention to forms, meaning and functions when teaching the language since knowing only the form doesn’t guarantee students will be able to use the language for communication. As well
as to give the same value to the four language skills (speaking, writing, listening and reading) from the beginning, since all of these skills are closely linked in a language.

6. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to make students aware that learning a language also implies learning everything connected to culture of people who use the language on a daily basis such as certain habits, trends, ways of communication, etc.

7. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to continue allowing students to use their native language when necessary as CLT is permissive about the use of L1 in order to make it easier and more practical to understand certain aspects of the target language and not to force students to use only English in the classroom.

8. We recommend the English teachers in reference, to avoid the need of correcting students every time they spot an error but wait for the student to correct himself or use a different strategy rather than to react instantly.
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Appendices
### Appendix A: Consistency matrix (part 1)

### Awareness about the communicative language teaching principles by English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016

#### Formulation of the problem

**General problem**

To what extend English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

**Specific problem**

- What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about evaluation and goals as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?
- What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about student and teacher roles as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?
- What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the students learning characteristics and interaction as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?

#### Study objectives

**General objective**

- To determine the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

**Specific objectives**

- To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about evaluation and goals as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
- To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about student and teacher roles as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
- To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, have about the students learning characteristics and interaction as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

#### Research hypothesis

**General hypothesis**

- English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

**Specific hypothesis**

- English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of what evaluation and goals imply as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
- English Teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, are aware of student and teacher roles as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.
- English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, know about the students learning characteristics and interaction as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

#### Study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Population and sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Awareness                     | Quantitative| The participants of this study are 30 English teachers who are participants of the Master’s Program *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima. Their ages range between 25 and 60 years old and the distribution of female and male students is about equal.

#### Research approach

- *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

#### Research methods

- Descriptive research method
- Simple Descriptive design
- Questionnaire
- Survey

#### Research design

- Student and teacher roles as principles of CLT
- Communicative language (CLT)
- Principles

#### Research instruments

- Questionnaire

#### Data collection techniques

- Survey

#### Data analysis

- Techniques
- Instruments
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Awareness about the communicative language teaching principles by English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation of the problem</th>
<th>Study objectives</th>
<th>Research hypothesis</th>
<th>Study variables</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Population and sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, know about language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016?</td>
<td>To describe the knowledge English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, have about language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.</td>
<td>English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, are aware of language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.</td>
<td>English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, are aware of language view, areas and skills emphasis as principles of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.</td>
<td>English teachers, participants of the Master’s Program Teaching English as a Foreign Language, are aware of culture as a principle of CLT at the National University of Education Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.</td>
<td>Most of the students’ mother tongue is Spanish and a few of them have certain native languages as their L1; being thus the population of different cultural backgrounds. Regarding the sample, this is the same number of students considered in the population; therefore, it is a census.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Questionaire

Estimado docente:

Este cuestionario ha sido diseñado para conocer con cuál de los conceptos abajo descritos usted se encuentra más familiarizado. Tu respuesta permanecerá estrictamente confidencial, y solo será usada para el propósito de este estudio.

¡Gracias por tu tiempo!

INSTITUCIÓN EDUCATIVA DONDE TRABAJA:

FECHA: ……/……/ 2016 EDAD: ………………………..

INTRUCCIONES: Lee atentamente y marca con un circulo la respuesta que creas más conveniente. No hay respuesta correcta o incorrecta.

1. One of the most important goals as a teacher is to make my students learn______.  
   a. grammar rules and vocabulary  
   b. how to negotiate meaning with their interlocutors  
   c. a new habit of using the target language  
   d. to think in the target language

2. One of the most important roles of a teacher is to__________________________.
   a. be the authority in the classroom  
   b. direct the class activities  
   c. be the model of the target language  
   d. establish situations to promote communication

3. One of the most important roles of my students is to ________________________.
   a. listen and repeat what I say  
   b. do what I tell them to do  
   c. imitate what I do  
   d. negotiate meaning

4. It is very important that my students ________________________________.
   a. learn new vocabulary and structural patterns  
   b. learn dialogues by imitation and repetition  
   c. study grammar rules and apply them in exercises  
   d. use the language through communicative activities

5. Interaction in English mostly occurs______________________________.
   a. with me as a teacher  
   b. when my students converse with one another and with the teacher  
   c. when my students take different roles in dialogues  
   d. when students interact in small groups
6. The language my students need to learn is mostly_____________________
   a. everyday speech of users of the target language
   b. spoken but not written
   c. reading since it is superior to the spoken language
   d. to communicate

7. Culture is important because it helps my students to understand______________
   a. daily behavior and lifestyle of everyday users of the target language
   b. everyday speech.
   c. the history of the people who use the language and the information of their daily life
   d. only literature and the arts.

8. What I mostly teach from the target language is/are______________________
   a. language functions and forms
   b. vocabulary and grammar
   c. vocabulary over grammar
   d. the sound system

9. The skills that I emphasize more are/is______________________________
   a. listening, speaking, reading and writing (one after the other)
   b. listening, speaking, reading and writing (together from the beginning)
   c. reading and writing
   d. oral communication

10. My students’ native language________________________________________________________________
    a. is not used
    b. can be used only if it is necessary
    c. is mostly used
    d. is forbidden

11. What I mostly evaluate is___________________________________________
    a. listening, reading, speaking and writing (one skill at a time)
    b. the use of oral and written skills
    c. translation of the target language and how to apply grammar rules
    d. listening, reading, speaking and writing (integrative evaluation)

12. My students’ mistakes___________________________________________________________________________
    a. are avoided while they are doing grammar exercises
    b. are always self-corrected
    c. are tolerated while they are interacting
    d. are corrected by myself right away
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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. Apellidos y Nombre(s) del informante: Lavado Rojas, Betty Marline
   b. Cargo o institución donde labora: Jefe de Docencia
c. Nombre del instrumento: Cuestionario
d. Autor del instrumento: José Antonio Fajardo Astele
e. Sección: Maestría - Mención: Enseñanza de Inglés como Lengua Extranjera
f. Tesis: Conocimiento sobre los principios de la enseñanza comunicativa de idiomas que tienen los profesores participantes de la maestría de enseñanza de inglés como lengua extranjera de la Universidad Nacional de Educación Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

II. ASPECTOS DE VALIDACIÓN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN DEL INSTRUMENTO</th>
<th>CRITERIOS</th>
<th>Cualitativo</th>
<th>Cuantitativo</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>Esté formulado con lenguaje apropiado.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OBJETIVIDAD</td>
<td>Esté expresado en conductas observables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACTUALIDAD</td>
<td>Adequado al avance de la ciencia y la tecnología.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ORGANIZACIÓN</td>
<td>Existe una organización lógica entre variables e indicadores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUFICIENCIA</td>
<td>Comprende los aspectos en cantidad y calidad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. INTENCIONALIDAD</td>
<td>Adecuado para valorar aspectos de la actividad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CONSISTENCIA</td>
<td>Basado en aspectos técnicos científicos y pedagógicos del área.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. COHERENCIA</td>
<td>Entre las variables, dimensiones e indicadores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. METODOLOGÍA</td>
<td>La estrategia respeta al propósito de la investigación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PERTINENCIA</td>
<td>Adecuado para tratar el tema de investigación.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROMEDIO DE LA VALORACIÓN CUANTITATIVA: 87.5

III. OPINIÓN DE APLICABILIDAD: Aplicable

IV. PROMEDIO DE VALORACIÓN: 98.5

Lugar y fecha: Lima, diciembre de 2016
DNI N°: 10841192
Teléfono: 987514284

Firma del experto informante: [Signature]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN DEL INSTRUMENTO</th>
<th>CRITERIOS</th>
<th>Cuantitativos</th>
<th>Deficiente (51 - 60)</th>
<th>Regular (61 - 70)</th>
<th>Buena (71 - 80)</th>
<th>May Buena (81 - 90)</th>
<th>Excelente (91 - 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CLARIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cualitativos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OBJETIVIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ORGANIZACIÓN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUFICIENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CONSISTENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. METODOLOGÍA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROMEDIO DE LA VALORACIÓN CUANTITATIVA**: 86

**III. OPINIÓN DE APLICABILIDAD**: Aplicable

**IV. PROMEDIO DE VALORACIÓN**: 86.00

Lugar y fecha: [Fecha aquí]

DNI N°: [DNI número aquí]

Teléfono: [Número de teléfono aquí]

Firma del experto informante
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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. Apellidos y Nombre(s) del informante: Hernández Torres, José Pierre
   b. Cargo e institución donde labora: Docente Universidad
   c. Nombre del instrumento: Cuestionario
   d. Autor del instrumento: José Antonio Fajardo Arteche
   e. Sección: Maestría - Mención: Enseñanza de Inglés como Lengua Extranjera
   f. Tesis: Conocimiento sobre los principios de la enseñanza comunicativa de idiomas que tienen los profesores participantes de la maestría de enseñanza de inglés como lengua extranjera de la Universidad Nacional de Educación Enrique Guzmán y Valle, La Molina, Lima, 2016.

II. ASPECTOS DE VALIDACIÓN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN DEL INSTRUMENTO</th>
<th>CRITERIOS Qualitativo</th>
<th>Cuantitativo</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OBJETIVIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ORGANIZACIÓN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. INTENCIONALIDAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. COHERENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PERTINENCIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROMEDIO DE LA VALORACIÓN CUANTITATIVA

II. OPINIÓN DE APLICABILIDAD: Aplicable

IV. PROMEDIO DE VALORACIÓN:
Lugar y fecha: La Molina, 16 Dic. 2016
DNII N°: 00000000000
Teléfono: 000-00000000

Firma del experto informante