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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role of receptivity and defensiveness in communicative language learning and teaching. In order to set the scene it is essential at the beginning to review some of the related literature concerning the impact of cognitive and affective factors, such as intelligence, aptitude, attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, anxiety, etc., on learning second/foreign language. This introduction is important because these factors are the main learners’ variables which have been given the primacy in previous studies.

The first chapter states the need for the study, reviews some of the related literature on learners’ variables that enhance achievement in second/foreign language learning, and presents the significance and the purpose of the study.

The second chapter, which is divided to two parts, considers in the first part communicative language learning and teaching as an approach in language teaching methodology, and secondly as strategy for using the language to achieve any possible language functions. In part two attention is directed to some learners’ surrounding factors that affect their receptivity and defensiveness. First, definitions of receptivity and defensiveness have been presented, then these concepts have been equated with factors related to the target language, its culture and people, the English language teacher as a person and his way of teaching, the fellow learners, the course content
and the teaching materials, success in language learning and using language for communication.

The third chapter presents the related literature and empirical studies on some affective factors such as self-esteem, attitudes and motivation, and anxiety. These factors have been defined, classified and related to both receptivity and defensiveness. In addition, 'attention' has been introduced (defined and related to receptivity). The focal point of chapter three is the equation between receptivity and these affective factors on one hand, and receptivity and attention on the other, since this relationship has been neglected in previous studies, and because communicative language learning and teaching needs the incorporation of a composite of such learners’ factors as mentioned in chapters two and three. In the light of the literature reviewed in chapters two and three the research hypotheses were formulated and presented.

Chapter four presents the methodology of the research, the description of the subjects, the method used, and the procedures for data collection and analysis are presented.

Chapter five presents data analysis, results and discussion. The results of the questionnaire are tabulated and discussed. First, a discussion of the results related to self-esteem and its correlation with receptivity is presented. Secondly, the results related to anxiety, motivational intensity, attention follow. Finally, receptivity is presented. The correlation between all these variables is presented, and the results are discussed in terms of the research hypotheses.

Chapter six is devoted to summary, conclusion, implications and recommendations. It is divided into four sections. Section 6.1 summarises the results of the study and the conclusions that can be drawn from them. Sections 6.2 and 6.3 present some implications and recommendations for further studies. Section 6.4 presents some conclusions for this study.
اللغة التدريس والتعلم في المجال العاطفي الدولي بعض الدافع والقبول، اللغة التواصل عبر اللغة الإنجليزية.

كما أنها تتعلق بالدروس من خلال دراسة هذا الأهداف اللغوية وال التواصل يمكن أن تكون ضرورية. يمكن أن تكون هذه الأجراء بعض بدءًا من القدرة على اللغة، والقدرة العقلية، والقدرة العاطفية بالتأثير في التحليل، في المقابل، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية.

واستطاعنا استكشاف بعض الظروف والظروف، والثقافة، واللغةبونية. باستعمال اللغة الإنجليزية، واتخاذ الأشياء الأولية باللغة الإنجليزية. وتكون هذه الأهداف الثانوية لتحسين اللغة أجنبية، ونسبة إلى اللغة الإنجليزية. يتقدم لنا إلى القدرة على اللغة، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية.

والدراسة، هذا الحالة لتشمل بعض الظروف إلى اللغة، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية.

إليك بعض الأشياء في اللغة، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية. ودائمًا في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها.

وبعد ملاحظة هذه الأشياء، ملاحظان بعض الأشياء في اللغة، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية. ودائمًا في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية.

وملاحظان بعض الأشياء في اللغة، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية. ودائمًا في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية.

وملاحظان بعض الأشياء في اللغة، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية. ودائمًا في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية.

وملاحظان بعض الأشياء في اللغة، والاستخدام في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية. ودائمًا في اللغة الإنجليزية، ودعمها الثقافية وثقائتها، وثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية، وثقافة اللغة أجنبية.
مقالة

العنوان:

التناول:

الملخص:

هذه الأقسام ذات الصلة، واللغة القلقة، والثانية مثلاً.

ذلك.

لدراسة بالإضافة إلى البداية والاستعراض في السابقة والعامل، والفصل، والدراسة، والتعلم، والفصل.

الاستبانة المختصرة في التقبل أهمية الدواعي، وتدريس الأول.

في وصول وتأشيره في التنازلات، وصولاً إلى الآسيوي، والتحليل أقسام، وted: 

البحث البيانات والمواقع، وخاصة في استبانة وبيان، حيث التنازلات وتمثيل، وجدير فكража الدروس.

التنازلات والواقع، والغرض، والفصل.

الاستبانة وضع حقيقة، وصولاً إلى الآسيوي، والتحليل أقسام، وted: 

البحث البيانات والمواقع، وخاصة في استبانة وبيان، حيث التنازلات، وصولاً إلى الآسيوي، والتحليل أقسام، وted: 

البحث البيانات والمواقع، وخاصة في استبانة وبيان، حيث التنازلات، وصولاً إلى الآسيوي، والتحليل أقسام، وted:
1.0 Statement of the Problem

There has been a successive drop of standard of English in schools, universities and higher institutes of education in the Sudan in the recent decades. Many people believe that the standard of English language was good up to the sixties. They think that the methods of teaching used, the previous syllabuses, and teacher training were the cause of that good standard of English. However, that good standard of English Language was mainly the product of the status of English as a medium of instruction, on one hand, and as a means of earning a living on the other. That is to say English at that time used to be the language of interaction at different governmental departments. Moreover, as a result of the presence of the British colonists up to the end of the 1950s, there was a great chance for people to have good exposure to English from its native speakers. According to Sandel (1982), the English of that period was of a native like quality, to the extent that many Sudanese used to be described as ‘black English men’.

However, after the 1960s, a continuous complaint about the drop of the standards of English language has started to be heard. Consequently, syllabuses have undergone several modifications followed by changes in textbooks, approaches, and methods of teaching. Unfortunately, all the reforms have
been subject-centred, i.e. the learners’ interests and needs have been neglected, the thing which has led to a drastic mismatch between theory and practice, and consequently to a drop of standards in learning and teaching English language. The only motive the learners have had, was the final English language examinations at the end of the academic year.

The processes of learning and teaching English language have been greatly affected by subject-centred approach. For example, the format, and even the writing of the examinations themselves have been designed to help students to pass. This practice in English language learning and teaching has led to concentration on linguistic competence rather than on communicative competence. Thus, the syllabuses and textbooks have been concerned with language structures, and communicative competence has been completely neglected. The development of communicative competence requires understanding of learners’ characteristics and needs.

More recently, learners’ characteristics have been the central issue in which most of current research projects are interested. These characteristics are either cognitive such as aptitude and intelligence, or affective such as self-esteem, motivation, and anxiety. Besides, social factors have attracted researchers’ interest. Social factors are related to the status of
the target language, its culture, its people, and the context of learning and teaching, which includes the teacher, fellow learners, and the physical environment of the class. These factors have not been studied together in the previous studies, because the emphasis was on either affective or cognitive factors.

1.1 The Need for the Study

The aim of the present study is to investigate the relationship between receptivity and defensiveness, on one hand, and learners’ affective factors on the other, because they seem to be closely related. This approach of studying the relationship between affective factors and receptivity and defensiveness has not received great interest in previous studies.

Receptivity and defensiveness, as introduced by Stevick (1976), and later by Allwright and Bailey (1991), aim at bringing together different learners’ factors such as motivation, self-esteem, anxiety, attention, and learners’ attitudes towards the language and toward how it is learned and taught. Receptivity implies the student’s openness and acceptance of the activity at hand, and defensiveness is the tendency that a student shows to set up defences against a given activity.
The present study is needed as to the best of my knowledge it is a new attempt to study learners’ affective factors by bringing them together, and then equating them with receptivity and defensiveness. These learners’ factors, namely self-esteem, attention, anxiety and motivation were dealt with separately in previous studies.

This study is also needed to provide enlightening explanation of attention as receptivity. That is to say, when someone feels that he/she is open to a certain activity more attention will be paid to this activity, and this in turn implies success in the intended activity. The same approach by which attention is going to be studied, the other affective factors will also be studied because this study is about the investigation of the factors that enhance learning of language performance activities. Performance activities are greatly affected by the affective factors. That is to say the most successful way by
which learners develop language skills is the best way for
increasing positive attitudes such as self – esteem and
motivation, and decreasing or even modifying the negative ones
such as tension and anxiety.

1.2 The Significance of the Study

This study is significant in that it is intended to investigate the impact of receptivity and
defensiveness on communicative English language learning and teaching. It is believed that
communicative language learning and teaching need a comprehensive approach to be applied in
the language classroom. That is because learning and teaching a language communicatively aim
not only at developing communicative competence, but also at developing linguistic competence
as well. Moreover, communicative language learning and teaching need readiness and
preparation from both learners and teachers since communicative language learning and
teaching necessitate the importance of considering receptivity and defensiveness in studying
communicative language learning and teaching. The incorporation of receptivity and
defensiveness in this study makes it possible to consider different learning factors either of the
student him/herself, or of the learning context in general.

The present study introduces a new approach, in the
study of learners’ factors, which unites affective factors as self –
esteem, motivation, anxiety, and attention. It is also intended to
investigate learners’ attitudes toward the target language which
is English, the speakers of English, the use of English for
communication, and success in English, and toward the teacher,
the fellow learners, the textbooks and materials.
1.3 The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the factors that enhance the learning and teaching of English communicatively. To do this some learners’ factors, namely their attitudes toward their teachers, fellow learners, course content and materials, success and communication in English; in addition to their attitudes toward English, the speakers of English and English culture, will be equated with receptivity and defensiveness. Receptivity and defensiveness factors will further be correlated with some affective factors namely motivation, self – esteem, and anxiety, and attention. More specifically, the purpose of this study is (1) to examine the relation of motivation and receptivity, (2) to discover if the students’ attitudes, measured by the instruments in this study, toward the English language speakers, the English language classroom, and the English language teachers, are predictors of students’ receptivity and defensiveness, (3) to find out if self – esteem is related to receptivity, 4) to find out if a low - level of anxiety is related to receptivity, and 5) whether attention is related to receptivity.
1.4 Summary

Chapter one introduced the study. First, a background was given about language learning and teaching, and the emphasis of the approaches to study the problems that face learners of a second/foreign language, those based on subject – centred and later the learner – centred approaches which put the learner and his/her factors in focus. The need for the study was presented, that is the present study is basically designed to approach the learning and teaching of English language communicatively through the investigation and analysis of different learners’ factors, either those surround the learning context starting with the teacher him/herself, the fellow learners, the learning and teaching materials such as textbooks and teaching materials, and the consequences of learning and teaching English with regard to success and the use of English for communication. In addition to all these surrounding factors the study will also try to equate some of the affective factors, such as self – esteem, motivation and anxiety, and attention, with the concepts of receptivity and defensiveness. The significance of the study, which is mainly derived from the need for the study, was explained. The purpose of the study was also explained, that is the present study aims at exploring the factors that enhance the learning and teaching of English communicatively. The study aims also at identifying specifically the impact of the classroom factors that surround the students, some of the affective factors, and attention, receptivity and defensiveness.

Chapter one is the introduction and the plan on which the subsequent chapters will be built on. Therefore, chapter two will set up the scene for the theoretical background of this study, mainly with regard to communicative language learning and teaching, and the learners’ classroom factors that affect the learning/teaching experience. On the same level chapter three will be devoted to the presentation of the related literature concerned with affective factors, attention, and receptivity and defensiveness.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is intended to set the scene by presenting the theoretical framework on which the study is based. It is divided into two parts. Part one is a background about the nature of language learning and teaching. In section 2.1 the concept of communicative language learning and teaching is presented, and in 2.2 its theoretical framework. Its strengths are explained in 2.3, and the shortcomings in 2.4.

In part two the concepts receptivity and defensiveness will be introduced, then all the factors related to them such as the course contents and materials, the teacher, the fellow learners, the language itself and its use for communicative functions, and success in language tests, and the speakers of the language and their culture, will be explored.
Part One

2.1 Background

The complexity of language has been the major motive to encourage research in the fields of language learning and teaching. Many attempts have been made to facilitate the tasks of both teachers and learners. The first attempts were based on a behavioural view of language, which regarded language as a matter of habit formation. The behaviourists view language behaviour as a description of external stimuli, and the concomitant responses, which lead to habit formation. The behaviourist approach has been built on four principles: imitation, repetition, frequency and reinforcement. Therefore, all the methods of language teaching, before the 1960s, were based on the behaviourist theory, which denies the mental capacities of the learner. These methods, which dominated the field of language teaching for a long time, are the ‘Grammar Translation Method’ and the ‘Audiolingual Method’. In the development of the direct methods the greater concern was a subject – centred rather than learner – centred.
However, in the late sixties and early seventies the approach to language learning and teaching shifted to the learner him/herself and his/her inner capacities, which have been considered as integrating factors that allow a learner to gain insights and make choices appropriate to learning. This approach towards language learning has come to be known as the ‘Humanistic Approach’ to language learning. According to Rivers (1990: 113) ‘Humanistic Approaches’ have the following principles; they consider the whole personality of the learner; second language learning is quite different from first language acquisition; they encourage inductive learning; they try to avoid tension and debilitating anxiety by focusing more on proficiency and communicative skills rather than correctness and error free situations; and they try to create a strong social relations among learners and teachers.

The current changes in English language teaching methods have been affected by this ‘Humanistic Approach’, such as ‘Counseling Learning’, ‘Suggestology’, ‘Communicative Approach to Language Teaching’, etc.
Being influenced by research in language teaching, applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and philosophy in the sixties and seventies, these changes in English language teaching led to a general shift of emphasis on the individual learner and individual learning strategies, with teachers trying to minimise their amount of instruction. It is obvious that the situation is towards a mentalist view of language teaching as a revolution against the behaviourist view. It was also clearly seen, under the umbrella of the traditional methods to language teaching, that there was emphasis on certain parts of language, neglecting the view that language is a system of interrelatedness, in which it is impossible to consider a part and neglect the other. According to Swan (1990: 74) the traditional approaches to language teaching focused on usage and they neglected the incorporation of use, which helps in teaching language properly.

Swan’s ideas indicate that the traditional methods have been structured to cater for usage, which may or may not lead to the knowledge of the appropriate use. It seems that the traditional methods have led to a greater doubt about their
success in helping learners acquire communicative competence. Speakers of language share not only grammatical competence, they also share a great portion of communicative competence that facilitates intelligibility among them.

As a result of the failure of the traditional methods in catering for communicative competence, the 1960s witnessed a change towards the situational approach, which was also criticized. According to Richards and Rodgers (1991: 64), it is not helpful to go on teaching language depending on situations. Language should be studied clearly through authentic utterances that help in conveying the user’s meaning and intentions.

The criticism of the situational methods is the outcome of the criticism directed against the traditional methods to language teaching; or it was partly a response to the sort of criticism Chomsky (1957) had leveled at linguistics. Richards and Rodgers (1991: 64) summarize Chomsky’s concepts about the incapability of the present structural theories of language to account for the main characteristics of sentences as creativity and uniqueness. Then they go on to say that “British applied
linguists ... saw the need to focus in language teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures.”

It seems that the criticism of the traditional and situational methods is directed towards making a compromise between what is known as grammatical competence and communicative competence, or simply between usage and use, between correctness and appropriateness. Brumfit and Johnson (1991: 3) express this tendency by saying that there should be a parallel emphasis among language teachers between mastery of structures and use. There is now a reaction against considering the language as just a set of structures. It is a move towards a ‘view’ where meaning and the uses of language play an important part. This view is one of the central elements in the ‘Communicative Approach’ to language teaching.

Not only has the change in language teaching affected the approach to its teaching, but also it has affected syllabus design as well. Brumfit and Johnson (1991: 1) explain these influences on syllabus design by saying that the emphasis of syllabus designers is to set up syllabuses to cater for teaching some sets
of language structures. This can be handled by means of two types of strategies; the first is called ‘synthetic’ in which the student gradually builds up the structural items of the language. The other strategy to syllabus design is based on an analytical approach, which means that language teaching is considered as a presentation of whole chunks of language assuming that learners are innately prepared and capable of perceiving rules and making generalisations out of them.

2.2 Methodological Background and Procedures of the Communicative Approach

Communicative language teaching has come to be a counterattack to ‘Audiolingual’ methodology. If communicative language teaching is considered as an approach to language teaching, it is necessary to perceive that the approach to language teaching should involve a commitment to a particular theory of language teaching and learning. The theory on which the communicative language teaching approach is built has come from the ‘Humanistic Approach’ to language teaching, which has started to dominate the field of language teaching
since the sixties. The characteristics of this approach have been mentioned by Brumfit (1991: 11) by saying that ‘humanistic teachers’ seek to create a world of students who have their personal and affective needs that should be secured in a world that depends on learners’ autonomy so as to participate actively in learning and teaching.

To discuss the main characteristics of the ‘Communicative Approach’ on the basis of the characteristics mentioned about the ‘Humanistic Approach’ to language teaching the following points should be explained: first, the communicative approach is designed around two main domains or sources namely the scientific and the pedagogic sources. Two of the scientific and three of the pedagogic sources can be distinguished. The first of the scientific sources comes as a result of the tendency to widen the scope of language studies, and to adopt an increasingly social and semantic view of language learning, a trend which became noticeable in the 1960s and the early 1970s; and since then many linguists have turned their backs on the highly abstract structural view of language, which has dominated linguistics since the 1930s. These studies have been
directed to continued growth of psycholinguistics, the rapid
development of sociolinguistics, the renewed interest in
semantics and the study of pragmatics or language in relation to
the real world.

The second scientific source was the explosion of
research in second language learning, which led to the
convention that the learner constructs his second language
learning relatively independently and not necessarily following
the graded steps of a planned syllabus. All these have led to
questions about the learner’s role and characteristics which
enable him/her to have autonomy, and to perform tasks; and to
the demands for more flexible, open, individualized and more
negotiable approach to teaching considering learners’ affective
factors such as motivation, and self – esteem, the cognitive
such as intelligence and aptitude, and the other personality and
social factors such as age and social status.

The pedagogic sources are grouped into three areas the
first of which is due to the curriculum development in the 1970s
to cater for the learner’s needs depending on situations, social
roles, notions and language functions. The second pedagogic
source is the outcome of the development in ESP to help learners pursue their learning. The third pedagogic source deals with the humanistic approach to language teaching as it has been explained by Brumfit (1991: 13) as follows:

One fact in particular needs to be explained: there can be no instant solutions, for human beings are so infinitely complex that teachers must be infinitely sensitive to their students’ variabilities. And there is no method, and no book, which can be a substitute for the guidance of another experienced teacher ... Being a good teacher means enabling students to learn. ... Teaching is an art in which the relationship between human beings, between teacher and taught, is crucial to real success.

In addition to the sources of the communicative approach, its methods and procedures aimed at developing the learners’ communicative competence as opposed to their purely linguistic competence. The former as has been explained by Canale and Swain (1980), is based on four essential components: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. These four components represent the learner’s needs in a communicative approach to language learning. They also represent the code through which the learner is expected to receive and retrieve language messages. The social context, through which the learner achieves
appropriateness, depends on factors such as status, role, attitude, purpose, degree of formality, social conventions and so on. These factors in fact come as a result of the involvement of the study of pragmatics in communicative language learning and teaching, and they determine to a great extent the appropriateness of what is said.

Discourse competence according to Maley (1980) is the ability to make combinations between meanings and acceptable spoken or written texts in different forms of speech and writing. Maley (1980) has also explained what is meant by strategic competence by saying that this competence is related to the verbal and nonverbal strategies that learners need to use as alternatives in cases of breakdowns of communication, such as hesitation fillers and paraphrases used to replace foreign words and expressions. Strategic competence also involves the individual’s feeling of the direction and the processing of the communication so as to be able to predict what comes next. These strategies indicate clearly the importance of involving the communicative approach in this present study which considers communicative language learning and teaching. This in
particular means the importance of using the language communicatively, and the factors needed to develop such a kind of learning and teaching.

From the discussion it is clear that the communicative approach is a process to overcome the failure of the traditional methods to cater for the communicative competence, which can be felt in the students’ failure to use the language for communicative functions outside the classroom. Therefore, the main interest of communicative language learning and teaching is to supply the student with the strategies that enable him/her to use the target language in conditions similar to those of real life. To this end Swan (1990: 78) says that second language learning in a part is restricted by some social and cultural norms which may not be known by the learner, and in another the learner’s previous language experience is relevant as a result of the common grounds that can be established among all languages. Therefore, one of the aims of communicative language learning and teaching is to make a compromise between the learner’s previous experience and the new norms and values in the target language.
With reference to the cultural restrictions in learning another language, it is important to emphasise the fact that language is the outcome of cultural specifications, and the cultural views of language can be emphasised in a learner through exposure to authentic use of the target language. Therefore, expressions such as immersion, task – based and activities have been used to enable learners to acquire a native – like competence and fluency.

To attain communicative competence, communicative language learning and teaching is based on some characteristics. These have been mentioned by Trudgill and Hannah (1983) cited in Maley (1990: 88) as follows: first, the emphasis is on appropriateness rather than just language forms, and fluency over accuracy. Secondly, communication tasks should be attained through using the language, and not by means of exercises about the language. Thirdly, the approach is mainly student – centred through interactions and activities initiated by students. Fourthly, differences among the students should be considered so as to provide them with materials that match their abilities. Finally, the students should know the
variations in language use to the extent that the students should be oriented that there are many forms of English.

In a learning teaching process these characteristics mentioned above can be manipulated as pre–communicative and communicative activities. Whenever pre – communicative activities occur; their essential function is a subordinate one; they serve to prepare the learner for later communications. Many teachers, according to Littlewood (1983: 85) will wish that most of their teaching sequences reflected this relationship directly. That is, they begin a teaching unit (e. g. a lesson or series of lessons) with pre – communicative activities in which the learners practice certain language forms and functions. These activities will lead to communicative work, during which the learners can use the new language they have acquired and the teacher can monitor their progress. In effect, this is a similar progression from controlled practice to creative language use. This sequence of presentation can be used interchangeably as well, or the teacher may start with a communicative activity such as role play, and move on to a pre – activity. These sequences allow the teacher to diagnose problems and allow learners to
become aware of their language needs. Therefore, it can be concluded that, in implementing the procedures of the communicative approach, a change is obvious in both learners and teachers; the learners become active participants in learning and teaching processes through the tasks and activities that they do, and the teachers become facilitators of learning. Consequently the traditional roles of teachers change to stimulate learning and help students to achieve competence in language. Littlewood (1983: 92) comments on these changes by saying that they do not neglect the importance of teachers, but for the sake of structuring the learning environment to be motivating for communication, bearing in mind that the classroom is not the natural environment. The teacher should be prepared ‘to subordinate his own behaviour to the learning needs of his students’. This implies that the teacher’s talking time and amount of direct instructions should be minimized to give learners more chances to initiate their own learning, or what is called “students’ spontaneous learning processes.” Therefore, the respect of the learner’s capacity is an essential part in communicative language teaching, and this helps to
motivate learners and release their potential power to learn a language. Maley (1990: 89) expresses the idea of students’ respect believing that some integration of activities and tasks should be found to set up apparent reasons for the activity in hand, for example between reading and listening texts and the questions that follow the activity. The task – oriented base is the main technique to cater for this. The activities should include interaction among students through pair and small groups work, and such activities lead to exchange of information among students. This emphasis on interaction activities shows the discontent about the layout of the classroom in the traditional rows that may impede communication.

The discussion up to now leads to the fact that the communicative approach is a complex system that tries to build its rationale on a comprehensive review to all the previous approaches for teaching and learning foreign and second language. According to Littlewood (1983: 95) learning and teaching a foreign language should be based on the authenticity of communication, and on the factual matters about the learners themselves. These two points about communication and
realities of learners out and inside the classroom are necessary for producing ‘definitive teaching methodology.’ The main principles of the communicative approach are: the information gap, problem – solving to bridge the gap between what is known and what is unknown; the game principle where activities are given primacy to language; the stimulation of students’ capacities by exposure to unusual combinations of language, such as arriving at rhyming words to compose end rhymes in a ten – line poem.

2. 3 The Strengths of the Communicative Approach

As it has been stated above (Section 2. 2) that the communicative approach has been one of the major approaches that cater for the humanity of learners to comprehend and understand the complexity of language to an extent that enables them to learn a second or foreign language. Therefore, the major characteristic of the communicative approach is to respect the learner’s faculties. The personal relations between learners are also important to make interaction a successful activity, and as a result, both learners and teachers have new roles; teachers as
facilitators of learning to reduce debilitating anxiety and fear.
Tension and fear used to be dominant features in the traditional methodology as a result of the teacher’s concern, as an instructor, to get correct responses from the students, and this might be followed by punishment to correct the students’ mistakes. On the other hand students are regarded as active participants in the process of learning and teaching, and sometimes the teacher may withdraw when he/she feels that his/her intent in creating a real conversation among the students might be threatened.

For more strengths about the communicative approach Maley, (1990: 90) mentions the following advantages: First, the four types of competence, as mentioned in (2. 2), are introduced. Secondly, the learner is given the opportunity to use the language for his/her own purposes. Thirdly, the level of motivation that a learner gets, enables him/her to cope with the activities. Fourthly, the communicative approach helps in reducing the time spent in learning items because only what is relevant to the student’s needs is introduced. Finally, the learner
is supplied with “the appropriate skills for tackling the language in the real world.”

For all the advantages mentioned about the communicative approach, it is likely that if its techniques and procedures are introduced appropriately, they will help learners to use the target language for all its communicative functions, inside and outside the classroom, in a good way. This will also help the learners to develop both, communicative and linguistic competence.

2. 4 The Shortcomings of the Communicative Approach

In spite of its advantages, the communicative approach has also some shortcomings. These are mainly procedural either as a result of how the approach is implemented in a real language classroom context, or as a result of the complexity of human languages and teaching and learning languages in general. That is to say it is impossible to teach a language depending mainly on one approach, or the communicative approach will never be the only perfect and appropriate way for learning and teaching languages. These shortcomings have also been mentioned by Swan (1990: 92) when he says that the
classroom is an artificial context for practising language activities, and there is a difference between language use and language learning. However, “it is a serious mistake to condemn types of discourse typically found in the classroom because they do not share all the communicative features of other kinds of language use.” Maley (1990: 90) has also mentioned some of the procedural disadvantages that face the application of communicative language learning and teaching. These disadvantages are mainly due to the type of efforts done by teachers and educators to obtain suitable professional training and competence. Moreover, teachers need more effort, time and energy for setting activities and preparation. The teacher is deprived of the security of the textbook because he/she has to adapt and introduce the material which suits his/her learners needs without depending on something that has already been set up for this end.

The communicative approach may also lead to confusion among learners accustomed to the other traditional approaches and methods. There is also a problem of evaluation as it is difficult to measure the students’ competence, while it is
relatively easy to evaluate success in the other approaches, for example what amount of instruction has been attained in certain language items and so on. The implementation of the communicative approach, as a counter attack against the traditional approaches, may be faced by some objections especially by those who have been taught and trained by traditional methods.

It seems that the communicative approach has its advantages and disadvantages. Its disadvantages can be avoided by the choice of appropriate and purposeful teaching materials, techniques and procedures for attaining success, and the students’ set up needs.

The communicative approach is significant in the present study because it presents some of the procedures and strategies that address communicative language learning and teaching through strengthening students’ communicative competence.

Part Two

Receptivity and Defensiveness
2. 5 Introduction

Second and foreign language learning have witnessed a good deal of change in the recent years. The current approach in research dealing with factors in second language learning has become more humanistic than the previous one. The emphasis shifted to the learner’s cognitive and emotive factors as a human being who possesses his/her own choices and needs in second language learning. Heyde (1977: 226) describes the situation:

*Although no complete and accurate explanation exists of how a person learns a second language, we know that a variety of affective and cognitive factors interact to effect the acquisition, the use, and the output of a second language.*

This shift is followed by a great change in the roles of both teachers and learners in second language learning and teaching. Second language learning, itself, is considered as an activity that is quite different from learning a first language. According to Mackey (1965: 107) the motives for first language acquisition are not questionable; while the motives for second language learning are of a multidimensional space. The factors, which
affect second language learning, may be psychological, social, pedagogic, cultural or even political.

When a second language learner comes to the learning of a second language, he/she comes with already acquired skills of the first language. Schwartz and Sprouse (1996) suggest that the initial state of second language learning is the final of first language learning. Cook (1986: 5), in the same way, says “... L2 learners indeed start with a combining strategy, and consequently that this development is a matter of cognition rather than language.” Therefore, a lot of second language learners fail to master it. Mackey (1965: 107) explains some of the reasons that lead to failure in learning a second language such as the previous experience in the first language, the variations among people’s experience, and the first language user’s attempts to develop habits of thought related to his/her habits of language. These points indicate that the failure might be directly connected with the confusion that takes place between the two languages systems, and the first language becomes more dominant in the process of learning another language.
However, second language learning differs among learners for different reasons such as personal differences and situations. Cook (1986: 7) agrees with Mackey (1965) on the impact of personal differences on learning among learners of a second language, and he maintains this by saying “... not all L2 learners are equally successful and few achieve the height of a native child.” This is normal because the first language learner develops his/her language habits around authentic language situations, and intensive use of all the communicative language functions.

It is believed that young second language learners are more successful in learning a second language than adult second language learners because age is a crucial factor in enhancing second language learning. Second language learning can also be seen as a skill that is got by openness to the experience, to the extent that some people are ready to the experience of learning other languages to achieve their intended goals and needs. However, the rate of differences among languages, from a contrastive point of view, may either facilitate or debilitate the learning of other languages. Cook (1986: 7)
expresses the impact of differences among languages on learning them by saying that some languages may seem either difficult or easy to learn as a result of the cultural ties between them, the more related the languages are the more easy and successful their learning will be. This implies that learning a language necessitates the importance of learning it on the background of the associated culture; and whenever the target language culture is close to that of the first language learning is expected to be more productive. For Alptekin and Alptekin (1990: 21), the connection between language learning and closeness of cultures is that “... no real acquisition of the target language can take place without the learner's internalization of target language speakers’ patterns and values”. Therefore, as it has been stated by Trivedi (1978), second or foreign language teaching is considered a pedagogical process that tries to change the learner’s behaviour by injecting new norms and values into it.

The learner’s acceptance of the target language culture, and then the internalization of that culture in the process of learning is an essential factor in achievement in second/foreign
language. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 158) agree with Curtin (1979: 281) in the explanation of the idea of accepting the target language culture by saying that the learners’ success in the target language depends on their integration with its culture either inside or outside the target language country. Moreover, Allwright and Bailey (1991: 158) think that the attraction a learner may find in the life and the culture of the target language group may facilitate learning that language.

It seems that second language learning theories in the recent decades have concentrated on the learner’s affective factors which are of a multidimensional space. To avoid the complexity of the different concepts used in the study of affective factors, Allwright and Bailey (1991), following Stevick (1976), suggest the concepts receptivity and defensiveness to be used with extended learners’ affective factors such as self-esteem, motivation and anxiety.

2.6 Definition of Receptivity and Defensiveness

Stevick (1976) has studied receptivity and defensiveness under ‘receptive and defensive learning’. Allwright and Bailey
(1991) have also incorporated receptivity and defensiveness in their study of classroom interaction in the context of some affective and pedagogical factors. The concepts receptivity and defensiveness, are neither common terms in second language research, nor in pedagogy. As a result of their flexibility, receptivity and defensiveness can be correlated with the recent studies in the area of affective factors such as motivation, self-esteem, anxiety, etc.

Allwright and Bailey (1991: 157) justify their use of receptivity by saying that it is a useful ‘cover term’ that may help them to incorporate together different affective factors. Then, they define receptivity as “a state of mind, whether permanent or temporary, that is open to the experience of becoming a speaker of another language, somebody else’s language.”

Receptivity can be said to be a facilitating factor in second/foreign language learning. Defensiveness, on the other hand is “…the state of mind of feeling threatened by the experience and therefore needing to set up defences against it.”

Defensiveness according to this definition can be a distracting factor in second/foreign language learning.
On the background of their definitions, receptivity and defensiveness will be studied in this present study in the domain of some environmental learning factors such as the target language itself, and its people, culture, the teacher as a person and his/her way of teaching, the fellow learners, communication, the course content and materials, and receptivity to success. Defensiveness is assumed to be the opposite of receptivity to the extent that a receptive learner may be more successful than the defensive learner.

2.7 Receptivity to the Target Language

A. Importance

People normally learn a second or a foreign language to use it as a skill in real situations, i.e. by talking to people whose native language one has studied. However, people may learn
languages for other different reasons such as passing required examinations, improving one’s position and so on.

The most challenging thing in learning other people’s languages, however, is how to gain proficiency in the intended language. Therefore, learning others languages needs some kind of motivation, which is expected to be receptivity to that language because receptivity, by definition, is openness to the language. In the recent years a lot of research has been done in the area of motivation and other affective factors in learning a second or a foreign language. Hence the researchers have expressed many ideas about learners’ affective factors. Jakobovits (1967), Hansen (1981), and Brown (1994) consider the inner being, the attitudinal and sociological matrix, such as attitudes, motivation, and self – esteem, in which second language study is embedded in society so as to explain the mysteries of language learning. Heyde (1977: 226) expresses also some of the related factors in second language learning. She classifies these factors as a variety of “affective and cognitive factors” which play a role in acquiring, and using the language as an out put. Then she considers the attitudes toward
second language learning as external attitudes, which “refer to those evaluations which the learner directs towards factors outside himself” such as the worth of the second language, of the second language’s culture, and of his native language, etc. on the other hand, internal attitudes, are those evaluations which the learner directs towards him/herself such as his/her competence, his/her ability, and his/her self–worth.

Many researchers investigated students’ attitudinal and motivational characteristics relevant to success in second language learning. The affective variables in general refer to the feelings that learners have toward a given object, whether these feelings are positive or negative. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 157) consider receptivity and defensiveness as components of affective factors because they are the feelings that the learners direct to the target language. Therefore, they say that the learner “can be actively receptive, and therefore be working actively to promote the learning experience, or actively defensive, taking definite steps to avoid it.” Learning a language is an experience that involves both the student and the teacher.
In their discussion of receptivity and defensiveness, Allwright and Bailey (1991: 157) considered receptivity to the target language, the focal point in this section, as one component of nine related issues to the factors that surround the experience of learning a second language. To the definition stated in (2. 6), receptivity is openness to a given activity or experience, and this is the first step for success in that activity or experience at hand. People in general show different attitudes toward the correlation between positive attitudes and success in learning a language. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 158) themselves believe that “… some people may find a language elegantly systematic, while others are put off by what they see only as complicated rules.” This point emphasises that the ability to learn another language differs from one person to another.

Learners’ receptivity to the target language might also be affected by other factors which do not relate to the classroom experience; for example, some social factors such as the other social priorities may play important roles to prevent a learner from learning a language. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 160) believe that the learner might be distracted from learning by
other factors such as how to live and how to find medical care and so on. In addition to these distracting factors, the social attitudes towards the language may affect learners’ receptivity positively, if the learners feel that their attachment in learning the target language offers them good chances in the future, i.e. they may get a high status in the community and so on; in this case they may exert great efforts to learn that promising language. However, if learners feel that learning the target language may affect some of their beliefs or virtues, this will threaten their receptivity to the target language, and consequently leads to defensive feelings. For example, if the learner connects between the target language and the colonial powers and other similar issues (i.e. the New World Regime), he/she may set up these defensive feelings towards the target language.

Receptivity to the target language, therefore, is the beginning either for more advancement in the study of the target language, or within time may turn out to be defensiveness as a result of some social, political or even religious factors, and
consequently leads to withdrawal from the experience of learning another language.

B. Classification of Receptivity to the Target Language

Receptivity towards the target language is equivalent to the positive attitudes that learners have towards learning a second or a foreign language. In some studies a positive attitude towards the target language is considered the most important factor for success in second language learning. Savignon (1976: 295) for example, considers attitudes as the only important factor in language learning. Savignon (1976) mentions some previous studies of motivational and attitudinal factors in second language learning such as Gardner and Lambert who have exerted great efforts to study these factors. Savignon also explains the importance of the learner’s positive attitudes towards the members of the target language and their culture and behaviour in successful second language learning. Thus, receptivity towards the target language, such as receptivity to culture, the teacher, the methods of teaching, the community of
learners, etc., is an essential factor that activates second/foreign language learning.

Receptivity to the target language can be classified as specific and general in the same way that attitudes can be. In the light of the classification of attitudes, receptivity towards the target language can be classified as specific when it is directed to specific language and specific language factors such as culture and a community of speakers. General receptivity refers to a more generalised motive towards language learning without linking it to a certain language, culture, or even a certain speech community and so on. According to Cook (1986) learning more than a language enhances learning other languages, and this is typically the second classification of receptivity to learning languages. This is a self-evident factor, i.e. a lot of people have shown such abilities to learn more than one language.

Receptivity to the target language is, therefore, an important issue in successful language learning, and it can be equated with the positive attitudes that an individual has towards studying language or languages.
2. 8 Receptivity to the Teacher as a Person

A. Importance

Receptivity to the teacher’s personality is another influential variable in second/foreign language learning. However, it is a controversial variable because determining the characteristics of the teacher, to whom the students are open, is not an easy task. The teacher is the direct person who faces the learners in a classroom situation. Therefore, in most cases the learners are affected greatly by the characteristics and personalities of their teacher. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 160) explain the influence of the teacher on his/her learners by saying that there is a link between the teacher and the language taught because memories of language are directly connected with the teacher that teaches the language either positively or negatively. That is to say the teacher’s role is very vital or even serious in the experience of second/foreign language learning. This implies that if all the other factors work well the teacher’s personality may threaten the experience of learning a language, or on the other hand may increase or assure success. This practice of learners’ receptivity of their teachers is not only confined to
language learning, but it is also applicable in learning other subjects. It is a common practice at schools that some learners name subjects by their teachers, and this reflects the students’ satisfaction with their teachers.

Mabbot et al (1994) emphasise the role of the responsive teacher in raising the students’ receptivity to the target language and its culture, which in the end reduces the psychological and sociological distance. Hill and Dobbyn (1979: 1) explain some of the characteristics of the good teacher:

*Some people are born teachers: they have the ability and the wish to transfer knowledge or skills from themselves to others, and they have the sympathy and patience to do this in ways that the student can really understand and learn from.*

The teacher’s personality and characteristics, as can be seen in the points mentioned, are essential components for successful language learning and teaching. The consequences of the positive teacher’s personal characteristics will definitely lead to a healthy learning and teaching environment.
B. Classification of Receptivity to the Teacher as a Person

It is not easy to classify the students' priorities and preferences in a teacher's personal qualities, or it is a bit complicated to come out with a general agreement on these personal characteristics. In this connection, Allwright and Bailey (1991: 160) say that the situation of determining certain teacher's personal characteristics is complicated as a result of the learners' disagreement about a certain teacher within the same classroom. This indicates that there are great variations among students to determine the personality factors which they prefer to be found in their teacher, and then to be receptive or defensive to that teacher. The teacher's personality factors are very important in the process of learning and teaching. Under the influence of the learner-centred approach in the recent decades, the qualities of the good language teacher have been neglected, and the interest has been directed to the qualities of the good language learner. Prodromou (1991: 2) agrees with this tendency to consider the learner's good qualities, “... This reflects the current learner-centred orthodoxy many teachers
subscribe to;...”. Then he mentions some of the learners’ characteristics such as autonomy in learning and the cognitive strategies that a learner uses to enhance learning.

It is a desirable and needed activity to have more work and study on the qualities of the good language learner, but at the same time a lot of work is also needed to know more about the qualities and characteristics of the good language teacher. According to Prodromou (1991: 2) the characteristics of the good language teacher are very essential in learner – centred approaches so as to enable us to know the skills and abilities that a teacher has for the sake of productive language learning and teaching. The skills needed in a teacher can be either personal, such as his/her cognitive, emotive, and even his/her physiological characteristics, or professional, such as his/her way of teaching, training, etc.

The studies which have been done to identify teachers’ personal characteristics are generally surveys among students to know their preferences and priorities in their teachers. Harmer (1987: 5), for instance, explains some of the teacher’s characteristics suggested by thousand students, who
range between the age of twelve to seventeen in a study conducted by “Denis Gerard in 1970”. Those students arrange their preferences in a graded order from the most important to the least, the interest that the students find in the teacher’s courses comes at the top, then other professional and personal characteristics have been listed such as the teacher’s proficiency in the language, the method used by the teacher, the distribution of fair chances and the amount of work provided, the teacher’s sympathetic feelings towards the students, and his fairness.

In another similar study Prodromou (1991) has also outlined some characteristics of the good language teacher. These characteristics have also been taken from a survey done among forty students of multiskills; they include more or less the same qualities outlined by Harmer (1987). These two studies about the characteristics of the good language teacher are not conclusive because students in different contexts express a variety of priorities and characteristics about their teachers.

The determination of the good language teacher characteristics is a subjective issue; therefore, it is impossible
to find a general agreement on it. However, it is possible to point out some principles to which the majority of the students and researchers as well may agree such as the teacher’s abilities to develop him/herself to be accepted personally and professionally by his/her students.

2. 9 Receptivity to the Teacher’s Way of Teaching

A. Importance

In (2. 8) above, receptivity to the teacher, has been classified as personal and professional. Receptivity to the teacher’s way of teaching can be classified as professional. This type of receptivity is integral to the students’ receptivity of the teacher’s personal characteristics. That is to say if the teacher is liked as a person by the learners, he/she may not be able to teach in a way that best suits the learners’ needs as Allwright and Bailey (1991: 162) express this saying that the teacher may be valued as a person and a professional, yet he/she fails to teach in a way suitable to his/her students’ needs.

The teacher’s way of teaching is generally affected by different factors either personal or professional. The personal
factors may be related to the teacher’s social, psychological or even economic status. The personal factors may have either positive or negative influences on the teacher’s professional experience to the extent that if the teacher does not find a suitable environment to feel satisfied in the personal dimension, his/her professional experience might be affected. If the teacher finds enough personal satisfaction and support, he/she will find the opportunity to develop him/herself as a person and as a professional.

On the part of the professional factors Harmer (1987), and Prodromou (1991) mention within the personal qualities of the good language teacher some of the professional qualities such as that he/she explains things clearly, makes the course interesting, and he/she makes sure that everyone understands and so on.

Teachers’ training, education and experience can develop the teacher’s professional characteristics. On this point Hill and Dobbyn (1979: 2) criticize the situation of teachers’ training by saying that a lot of time is devoted for presenting theories instead of giving the teacher practical professional
knowledge that helps him/her to be a good practitioner in the classroom. They say that the reason for this gap between theory and practice is the outcome of the trainers’ interest in theories, as they are generally specialists in literature not experts in the profession of teaching languages. Savignon (1976: 296) expresses the influence of the gap between theory and practice in ELT by saying “… There are many students today desirous of exploring another language and culture”, but they do not find any opportunity or encouragement to go on exploring these languages and cultures. That is due to the teachers’ incapability to react in such circumstances in a way that satisfies their learners needs. The teacher may be one of the causes that prevent the learner to go on learning, because he/she may lack the type of training that helps him/her to facilitate learning. If the teacher shows a little interest in his/her profession, things will go on in a good way.

Some suggestions have been proposed by some researchers to make reforms in ways of training and professional knowledge; for example Mackey (1976: 329) lists some of the processes that make the method of teaching
suitable to learners, these are based on the teacher’s willingness to develop his/her language skills, professional skills and his/her teaching load. However good the method is, it turns out to be useless in the hands of the teacher who has not got the experience and the interest to use the method effectively by developing the skills mentioned above. If the method is not suitable to the learners, the good teacher turns out to be ineffective. Therefore, the suitability of the method depends on the experience that a teacher gains through his/her knowledge of his/her students, and through the effort that he/she exerts to develop his/her language skills and teaching skills. The language skills are important for the teacher because they help him/her to be aware of them, and to be able to present them in a good way and to be a good model for his/her students. The teacher should at least know the language he/she teaches. The professional skills, according to Mackey (1976: 329) are the skills that enable the teacher to use the method flexibly so as to adapt, modify or even supplement. The teaching loads are those which affect the teacher’s time for doing different teaching activities and planning.
In another attempt to suggest some processes for improving teaching skills, Nasr (1980: 3) says that the teacher should be a good model for the students to follow his/her steps in learning the language, and to present the model of language that they actually need to use in real life situations, and should also provide the target language culture for the students. The teacher should also be a good model for all the language skills.

The suggestions, for improving teachers’ effectiveness to present in the end good models for their students, help in fact to prepare the teacher who knows his profession, his students and their needs; and all these things lead to students’ receptivity of their teachers.

2. 10 Receptivity to Fellow Learners

A. Importance

Receptivity to fellow learners is an important factor for enhancing learning and interaction among students. Thus it has a good impact on learning and teaching in a wider perspective, and on learning and teaching English in particular. For Allwright and Bailey (1991) receptivity to fellow learners is the interest that
a learner shows towards his/her fellow learners as a person willing to experience learning a second/foreign language in the company of other people who have more or less the same interest. The concept fellow learners, for Mackey (1976: 110) is the group with which the learner “continually use a language”.

The group of the learners with whom the individual experiences learning a second/foreign language has great influences on the way and proficiency with which the language is learned. Receptivity to the fellow learners, by definition, is the degree of openness that a learner has towards the group of learners that share him/her the same experience. Therefore, the greater the relations between them, the more learning is expected to take place. In this way the students may help each others to learn the language, and even to help the teacher to present his/her lessons in a more effective way.

Different researchers have studied and classified receptivity to fellow learners. According to Mackey (1976: 110) it is a social factor that affects language learning through the learner’s contacts with a group of other learners. This contact between learners is affected by different factors such as the
time that a learner spends in contact with the group learning a second/foreign language, when learning starts, and the length of time spent to learn the language. Time is known to be a very important factor in doing things in a good way. The second factor that affects the formation of the group is the number of the group with whom the student uses the language for communication, the greater the number is the better chances that a learner gets to practice using the target language for communication, and this in turn helps the learner to develop his/her communicative skills.

The status of the students with whom an individual learns the target language is also important in his/her receptivity level. The status can be social, regional or related to the cultural contexts where the language is used and affected by; that is to say regional or social dialects, a perfect or imperfect knowledge about the language. All these status variations affect second/foreign language proficiency. In any of the areas of contact with others, a variety of social pressures may influence an individual’s use of his/her second/foreign language. These pressures may be economic,
administrative, cultural, political, military, historical, or religious.

To show the importance of the learner’s company in the learning experience Harmer (1987: 2) says that there are many reasons for learning a language such as the target language community, English for specific purposes, the school curriculum, culture, advancement, and miscellaneous factors. The last factor is about the interest that a learner shows to join a class, for example, because he/she likes the group or a particular person in that group, or the atmosphere of the class is recommended by the learner. This tendency explains clearly the importance of receptivity to fellow learners in helping a learner to benefit from his/her learning experience.

In different studies, receptivity to fellow learners has been discussed within studies about learners’ autonomy. For example Dam (1995), and Lee (1998) discuss peer support as one of the factors that enhance learners’ autonomy because autonomy is not only individual, but it is also social as well. It implies an independent ability and desire to work in
collaboration with other members. Pemberton (1996) also mentions the idea of peer support saying that learning never happens in a vacuum and that self – direction does not necessarily involve learning on one’s own. There are very important factors that enhance learners’ autonomy and self – direction such as interaction, negotiation, collaboration and so on.

For Jacobth and Hall (1994) cooperative learning is an idea based on cooperation as an activity by which students work together in groups of two to six. It is also the process by which teachers use the tools and techniques of cooperative learning to encourage mutual helpfulness and the active participation of all the members of the groups of learners. Cooperative learning is emphasised by the duration of time students spend together. The idea of the duration of time the students spend together has also been expressed by Jacobth and Hall (1994: 5) who believe that the longer the time students spend together, the more comfortable they will be with each others to the extent that they will “form a group
identity and bond”. This comfort among the students helps them to overcome learning difficulties.

In another attempt to study the influence of peer support Ngeow (1998) discusses within some motivational theories, environmental support, which includes elements such as the extent of teacher and peer support. There is a great correlation between receptivity and motivation as it has been mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, and will be mentioned in chapter three.

Receptivity to fellow learners helps learners to work in a friendly atmosphere that helps students to overcome learning problems. In this respect it can be classified as one of the classroom factors, which has a great role in second or foreign language learning.

Language learning and teaching has witnessed a lot of changes and development recently. Thus learners are expected to have more lively participation in the process of language learning and teaching, and this in turn increases the importance of learners’ openness to each others. Savignon (1976: 296) expresses the influences of changes on language
learning and teaching by saying that... “There is ample research now to show that second language learning does not proceed in a lock – step, error – free, stimulus – response fashion.” That is to say learners are considered as active participants in language learning and teaching. The dominant teacher’s role, under this learner – centred approach, has now changed to be a facilitator of learning. Thus receptivity to fellow learners may help the teacher to put his/her learners in the right track as active participants, who take a lot of responsibilities in learning and teaching. This can be done through the grouping that the teacher can have in the classroom situation. The students’ class work is considered by many researchers as one of the factors that make the learning environment more interesting. The more active and receptive to each others the students are, the more pleasant and lovely the classroom is.

To emphasise the importance of receptivity to fellow learners Harmer (1987: 206) discusses the importance of pair work as an important activity to increase students’ practice of language items. He says that pair work helps students to co –
operate with each others to improve the classroom environment and increase learners’ level of motivation while working together.

We can say that openness to fellow learners is an important factor for making a good atmosphere in the classroom and increasing the degree of motivation to work with the group. In this respect group work is another type of classroom activities that gives students better chances to work together using the language with all its communicative functions.

Receptivity to fellow learners, with reference to pair and group work, might help teachers to set up the groups and pairs of students. The most important thing in the setting up of the groups is popularity by which the students choose to work with each other. However, popularity may be defective, as it may not help the teacher to have equal and homogeneous groups, as it is a psychological factor that varies from a person to another. In most cases the groups are set up according to variations in students’ abilities (weak and clever students). This policy of setting up the groups
according to students’ abilities is intended for the sake of the support that strong students are expected to give to the weak ones. The different groups, which are generally formed according to various characteristics, are expected to perform different activities at the same time. For Harmer (1987), and Byrne (1988) group work gives learners more chances to have oral language practices. Byrne (1988: 6) adds that group activities train students to be agents of their own learning.

In addition to solving learning problems receptivity to fellow learners is also a factor that enhances a lot of learning and teaching activities inside the classroom, and it facilitates the teacher’s task to put the class in order as a result of the bonds among the students. However, a lot of personality and psychological factors are needed to determine the degree of receptivity among learners. Different studies have attempted to tackle these factors. Lake (1997: 170) for example says that “… learners’ participation in learning gives them the impression that they are really learning what they would like to learn.” Oxford (1990) in another study feels that the aims of learner training are to make language learning more
meaningful through encouraging collaboration and co-operation among teachers and learners. The importance of these points mentioned by Oxford (1990), and Lake (1997) comes from the fact that they include some of the characteristics of receptivity to fellow learners, these are mainly collaboration and co-operation.

Receptivity to fellow learners helps students to create positive attitudes to the learning processes and activities with the company of other learners. Moreover, it helps the learners to have faith on each others, and this in turn will make the learning environment more interesting and encouraging.

2. 11 Receptivity to Course Content

A. Background

Receptivity to course content is another important topic in discussing the value of receptivity in language learning and teaching. It can be defined as the positive attitudes that a learner shows when a course content addresses or meets his/her needs and interest. To this definition Allwright and Bailey (1991: 162) add the following:
Language courses are not only about language..., there has to be something to talk about... There comes a point when the learners no longer wish to talk about the fictitious Robinson family that lives nowhere in particular, with a stupid dog and two boring children.

These points add more elements to the identification of receptivity to course content; such as the gradation that learners come across as a result of the developing experience; this implies that what is accepted at one stage may not be accepted at another. Learners are also running after the course content, which addresses real and authentic life needs, or that helps them to express themselves in such contexts. Relevance in designing course contents is not enough. Therefore, the identification of receptivity to course contents needs to incorporate the social, psychological, and pedagogical factors that surround the learner. These factors may include the learning contexts, professional preferences, relevance, learners’ expectations, learning and teaching traditions as it has been stated by Allwright and Bailey (1991)

In another similar study Postman and Weingartner (1969: 56) agree with Allwright and Bailey above saying that: “It is close to futile to talk of any new curriculum unless you are
talking about the possibility of getting a new kind of teacher.”

This suggests that the teacher plays a very important role in increasing students’ receptivity to the course content. Savignon (1976: 301) supports these ideas by saying that:

Those who have learned the surface structure of a language but are not communicatively competent... are not likely to be the first to herald teaching strategies which place value on creativity and spontaneity.

Receptivity to course content is a factor that affects both learners and teachers reception of a syllabus, which is the basic tool around which learning and teaching processes depend. In certain cases it is adapted to be suitable for the learners’ needs, and within time it may be totally changed to meet the current developments in methodology and curriculum development.

B. The Impact of Receptivity to Course Content on Language Learning

The course content is the essential tool in the experience of learning another language. Therefore, the course content should be designed according to learners’
objectives and needs. Gerhard (1971: 190) explains this by saying that: “the general objectives” have to be stated first, then the concentration has to be on how to specify the content that the pupils are expected to follow so as to put the intended goals into practice. “The content outline represents a sequential listing of the material to be dealt with in the unit. We arrange the content in a logical sequence.” The logical sequence stated here is about the gradation that the content is expected to be structured on.

Gradation is another factor that increases the students’ receptivity to the course content because it implies the development from the more general to the more specific, from what is known to what is unknown, and from what is simple to what is more complicated. For Gerhard (1971: 192) the “logical arrangement minimizes the need for pupil to review or relearn an earlier concept. ... Whenever possible, we employ a sequence that begins with concrete experience and moves toward the abstract level.” Corder (1973), Harmer (1987), and Byrne (1988) outline the same concepts about the psychological aspects of
grading syllabuses. Clark (1980: 338) argues that “There is a large body of studies in which psychologists have investigated the relative ease with different types of verbal material can be processed by the native speaker.” What is applicable for the native speaker can also be applicable for the second/foreign language learners. In other words gradation of course content maintains ease of learning.

Byrne (1988: 6) in discussing the process of grading a syllabus to meet the students’ needs says the syllabus should “meet the needs of the learners” which range from passing the final examinations, to get a better job, to know about other people’s civilizations and literature, etc. He also points out two possibilities to fulfill learners’ needs through a syllabus; the first is to arrange the syllabus on grammatical items followed by suitable lexical items. The learner is expected to follow these items in a textbook in a given order so as to learn the language. The second possibility is to arrange the syllabus in the form of lists of functions which the learner needs to use in real life situations such as advice, notions and meanings to express and so on. These should also be put in order; in addition to all these
the syllabus should contain situations and their activities such as telephone calls and the like.

If the syllabus is built on a combination between the above-mentioned features, it will suit the intended purposes. Byrne (1988: 7) also explains some of the disadvantages of traditional structural syllabuses saying that these syllabuses were too detailed for the sake of perfection, or to set up items in an order of smooth transition. Byrne (1988: 7) explains also the consequences of this traditional approach to design the syllabus in that the learners will not feel that they are learning something, or they are progressing. According to these points receptivity to course content can be achieved by giving the learners the impression that they will learn the language needed in as much as possible a limited content and in a variety of ways which reduce the feeling of monotony and boredom, and give the students the confidence that they are progressing. Confidence is also another important factor in increasing the students’ receptivity of the course content.

In a survey a cross the different developments of syllabus design up to the era of communicative language
teaching, Nunan (1993: 11) discusses these developments saying that up to the recent decades syllabus design has been based on arranging vocabulary, phonological, or grammatical items in lists according to difficulty level and usefulness. The learners’ tasks used to be concentrated on gaining mastery in these items. Nunan (1993: 11) also cites Richards and Rodgers (1986) who emphasise the same point of building syllabuses on lists of language items according to graded steps. The rationale behind this grading is that learning a language necessitates the importance of building blocks of language by means of specific rules.

With the advent of the communicative view of language learning and teaching in the 1970s, syllabus design was consequently greatly affected by this approach. According to Nunan (1993: 11) the interest of this new approach is in what the learner wants to do with the target language rather than in what items the learner wants to master. Thus syllabuses have begun to be designed according to a combination between language items and functions to help the learner to master and use the language successfully for communication. Brumfit
(1991: 186) in a similar survey of that done by Nunan (1993) explains the importance of designing a syllabus to overcome communication problems, to this end a profile of learners’ needs should be stated so as to be as a guideline to the needs of the real world. These points mentioned by both Brumfit (1991, and Nunan (1993) explain the importance of having course contents which appeal to the learner’s needs of a language that helps him/her to express him/herself, and to communicate in real world contexts.

The ideas of variation and communication as factors which increase the degree of receptivity to course contents were emphasised further by Gass and Schachter (1997: 46) who agree with Nunan (1993) when they maintain the importance of successful instruction that is consonant with students’ goals. The course contents are greatly affected by the contexts, expectations, and images that learners, and particularly teachers have toward them. Krasnick (1990: 40), discusses the idea of images of ELT, says:

*Images are a factor of considerable significance in ELT, as in any formal education, because the ideal or intended curriculum is never implemented – it is*
According to this point mentioned above there might be a great gap between the curriculum designed, and the actual curriculum delivered by the teacher at the classroom. The different modifications that a teacher does to make the course content suitable to his learners can be either of great value if done by a good experienced language teacher. If an unqualified and inexperienced teacher does these modifications, they may be harmful. In their discussion of the role of the classroom teacher in syllabus design Bell (1983), and Nunan (1993) say that teachers are essentially consumers of other’s plans and syllabuses, and they have to put into practice the plans of applied linguists, government agencies, etc. Some teachers are relatively free to set up their own syllabuses around which their teaching can take place. Nunan (1993: 11) has also listed some tasks which determine whether teachers have primary responsibilities to consider or not. These tasks contain learners’ language needs, content selection and gradation, and the arrangement, monitoring and assessment of students’ activities and progress. Teachers’ responses to these tasks vary from
those who believe that the teacher has to be considered as responsible for taking all these tasks, up to those who think that the responsibility has to be given to experienced people.

The general practices in ELT programmes are greatly affected, up to now in some communities, under the influence of traditional methodology, by the sentence – based grammar. This tendency has led to a great gap between the course content and the actual practices at classrooms. Wilkins (1972), Coulthard (1977), McDonough and Show (1993), and Nunan (1993) share the same ideas about the grammar – based methodology. However, the qualified teacher has the ability to modify the content of the syllabus to the extent that he/she can find ways to overcome the pressure on him, either from the institution, the other colleagues or even the students, to keep to the prescribed syllabus, in order to make the course content appropriate and fruitful for his learners. In that way the teacher will attain a great deal of students’ receptivity to course content.

Mackey (1976: 223) has outlined some of the skills required to examine the content of the syllabus. The first of these skills is specification, which is a varied process “from
few cultural objectives to detailed instructions" about the different language skills and structures. There must be a balance in the degree of specification, so as to relate the content with the skills required to practice that content. Secondly, ‘justification’ which implies the means by which the syllabus justifies its objectives, and it is also about giving reasons for the skills used to justify the objectives. “It may for example, for purely traditional reasons, require knowledge of grammar rules which may be traced back to the formal study of Latin grammar during the Renaissance.” Thirdly, ‘attainability’ which is the process by which the laid down objectives can be attained, in most cases, depends on the time devoted for practising the target language, on learners’ abilities, and on the teacher’s qualifications.

Receptivity to course content is, therefore, a very important and influential factor in language learning and teaching because the course content is the tool around which most of the activities, modifications, adaptation, evaluation and practices of language learning and teaching can be arranged.
2. 12 Receptivity to Teaching Materials

A. Classification

Receptivity to teaching materials can be classified as a very vital learning context factor that enhances learners’ achievement in second/foreign language. In their study of receptivity Allwright and Bailey (1991: 162) comment on receptivity to teaching materials by saying that everything might go well in a classroom; however, the learners can ‘switch off’ as they do not like the way by which the course contents are presented. Therefore, receptivity to teaching materials can be defined as the positive attitudes that learners have toward the teaching materials proved to be more effective in teaching second/foreign language.

Bright and McGregor (1979: 9), in a study on teaching materials, consider these materials very important tools for the teacher to plan his/her lessons and to find the materials ready when he/she needs them. This implies that the materials should be appropriate and suitable to the kind of
activity needed. They are also considered very important components of any learning and teaching programme, the suitability of which is determined by different factors. To this point Stones (1976: 244) considers learners’ age, previous experience and knowledge, and ‘sex’ as factors to be incorporated in the designing of materials.

The relevance of the material to the learners’ needs and characteristics will lead to efficient learning and teaching. Moreover, the teaching materials should be structured and presented in harmony with the teaching approaches and methods as it has been mentioned by Campbell and Wales (1970), Hymes (1971), and Widdowson (1991a) when they discuss the idea of changing the teaching materials to cater for communicative rather than grammatical competence. For Widdowson (1991a: 50) the acceptance of teaching communicatively should be followed by changes in thinking of language not only as sets of sentences, but the nature of discourse should also be considered and taught. Widdowson (ibid.) explains that some changes should be applied to set up the teaching materials that enhance the teaching of
communicative competence. The aim of such changes in teaching materials is to help students develop different communicative acts and functions such as defining, classifying, generalizing, predicting, promising, describing, reporting, etc.

The teaching materials can be classified into two main types: course books and supplementary materials. Harmer (1987: 237) explains this classification saying that teachers are expected at different stages of their professional lives to be involved in the selection of materials for their students. The most important thing for such a selection is to choose the appropriate materials which suit the students’ needs. The knowledge of the students’ needs is very necessary for the teacher as it helps him/her to draw a profile of needs around which the materials can be evaluated.

There are two ways for the teacher to evaluate the suitability of the teaching materials. One way is by studying the book to see how it suits the students’ needs. The second way is to apply a pilot study on the materials among small number of students to get feedback about their suitability. The profile of the students’ needs may include some of the following
characteristics: first, the teacher should have a description of his/her students’ characteristics such as age, sex, social and cultural background, occupation, motivation and attitudes, educational background, knowledge, interests and beliefs. The second, is the description of the students’ needs such as the expected contexts in which English might be used, the language skills needed, and the time needed to practice these skills. The third component of the profile of the students’ needs is about the type of the appropriate material to the students’ needs and characteristics.

Students’ receptivity to the teaching materials is largely determined by the students’ characteristics and needs. However, any breaks in such a relationship between students’ acceptance of teaching materials on one hand, and their characteristics and needs on the other, may have drastic results and even withdrawal from the experience of learning and teaching English. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 163) discuss receptivity to teaching materials by saying the layout and design of the textbook may be “dull to look at, with crowded pages and very few illustrations to catch the eye.” Learners may be
offended by the illustrative style used in textbooks. In an experimental study by Pearson (1983), it is found that learners from various cultures reacted differently when faced by different cartoon styles illustrating ESL materials. From these points it can be said that the teaching material which suits a given age, culture and context may not be suitable for another. Prodromou (1990: 36) in a similar study says that: “When both the material we use and the way we use it are culturally alienating then, inevitably, the students switch off, retreat into their inner world, to defend their own integrity.”

The teaching materials vary in nature and structure. Therefore, receptivity to these materials can best be determined by different pedagogical and psychological factors, which in the end aid comprehension and speed the pace of learning and teaching.

B. The Structure and Importance of Teaching Materials

As it has been stated in ‘A’ above, that the teaching materials aid comprehension and speed up the pace of learning and teaching; it is very important consequently to
consider the structure, and the way of presenting these materials and their importance. It has already been stated that these materials have different types, and they include textbooks, and the different teaching aids and materials.

The emphasis of this section will be on the teaching aids and materials because (2. 11) has been devoted to course content which includes textbooks as a central issue. The discussion is mainly going to be directed to the use of authentic teaching materials and aids.

Peacock (1997: 146) in a study about teaching materials says that the authentic materials have effects on the EFL learners’ motivation. The main concern of this study is to test the commonly proposed assumption that authentic materials are more influential on students’ motivation in foreign language classrooms. First, he defines authentic materials as materials used to attain “some social purpose in the language community ... that is materials not produced for second language learners..., such as newspapers, poems, and songs.”

Peacock’s (1997) study has been conducted in a South Korean University EFL institute among 31 students with an average age
of 20; 18 of whom were males and 13 females. The main findings of this study indicate that the students’ motivation increases by the use of authentic materials. My own experience as a schoolboy, as a former teacher at secondary schools, and as a university lecturer is supportive of Peacock’s findings. That is to say, learners are more receptive and motivated to materials which help them to encounter authentic situations to be able to express themselves using the target language.

Richards and Rodgers (1997: 80) in a similar study on authentic materials say that “Many proponents of Communicative Language Teaching have advocated the use of authentic, from life materials in the classroom.” This statement explains that the use of authentic materials is essential for conducting and presenting communicative activities in the classroom. This means that students’ receptivity to communicative language teaching is largely determined by the authentic activities that students practice in the classroom because they will have a medium to approach real life situations. Hubbard et al (1986: 89) believe that the teacher can help the learners to work easily with authentic materials if he/she
explains to them from the beginning that it is better to understand something from these materials rather than to find difficulty in learning everything by means of other materials. In other words authenticity is a matter of success because it increases students' desire to learn more. This is of course a very important psychological drive which increases learners’ motivation.

The use of authentic materials in teaching a second or foreign language is very important because it helps students to be supplied by the appropriate language that is actually used by the native speakers. These materials also give the students the confidence needed to go on learning the target language because when they understand such authentic situations they feel satisfied, and they will be able to encounter similar situations in life.

The audio – visual materials are also important to help students continue learning. Wright (1981) explains the importance of visual aids by saying that they aid understanding. On the same level the audio materials can also play the same role. The audiovisual materials differ in shape and use; some of
them are common and available at different learning environments such as the blackboard and the simple sketchy drawings done by teachers; and others are expensive and not common such as electronic materials and devices. However, teachers have to be creative and inventive to set up their own materials according to the facilities available in the surrounding environment. Teachers’ creativity is one of the characteristics mentioned before for determining the factors of students’ receptivity of their teachers. Therefore, the use of the audiovisual aids increases learners’ receptivity of the learning environment. On this point Wright (1981: 1) says that the suitability of the teaching aids depend on their relevance to the learners’ characteristics, and to the ‘physical circumstances’ of their classroom. Then Wright (ibid.) explains that the teacher’s experience is his/her approach to determine the suitability of the selected material to be used. The use of the audiovisual materials is expected to create the situations which help to increase the students’ interest and to set up similar communication situations to those of native speakers. The use
of these materials is expected to enhance communicative competence.

According to Hymes (1991: 15) the children’s acquisition of native languages aims at strengthening appropriate knowledge of structures to be used communicatively in different speech acts. However, for the foreign or second language learner the aids used will be the medium through which he/she is exposed to the target language in order to develop his/her communicative competence.

Wright (1981: 86) has also outlined some of the common visual aids such as blackboards, whiteboards, overhead projectors, magnet boards, flannelgraph boards, plastigraph; (the last three are used for displaying picture and single cut out figures or objects), flashcards and so on. Then Wright says that the aids should also be suitable to the learner’s status, and they are used for teaching all the language skills.

In another study Hill and Dobbyn (1979: 133) discuss some processes that teachers should do to make the teaching materials suitable to their students; hence they can attain their learners’ receptivity to these materials. Adaptation is the central
process that a teacher should apply, and it can be done in all the
teaching aids starting with the textbook itself because it is
impossible to rewrite textbooks, nor is it possible to go all
through teaching the whole book as it is without considering the
teaching context and the learners’ needs. Then Hill and Dobbyn
(ibid.) mention the importance of the teaching materials to
guarantee clarity and comprehension, either for comprehension
passages, or difficult grammatical items. The teacher’s
experience and ability will enable him/her to use the teaching
materials in a way that makes the classroom more lively and
interesting.

Receptivity to teaching materials is, therefore, aims at
considering the factors that help the student to be more open to
the aids that enrich the learning context. At the same time it can
help in increasing the friendly relations between the teacher and
the students because these materials help the teacher to make
his/her presentation more influential and interesting if used in an
appropriate way.
2. 13 Receptivity to Success in Language Learning

A. Background

Receptivity to success in language learning, and in learning other subjects may seem to be a self-evident factor because success is the ultimate goal after which all the plans and procedures run. In discussing receptivity it is better to consider carefully all the related consequences of success whether it leads to positive or negative results (i.e. whether it is real or illusionary). According to my experience and observation as a participant in marking English language Sudanese Certificate Examinations for a number of years; and as a participant in conducting interviews with the newly accepted students in the Islamic University of Omdurman; the idea of illusive success can be confirmed because it is always the case that the students’ grades do not reflect their actual competence in English. The consequences of this phenomenon may lead to drastic results as the students come with some confidence that they have done well in their final examinations, and they have built up their choices accordingly. Therefore, those students may not be able to develop themselves and carry on with their
studies. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 163) suggest that the idea of success in foreign language is liked by many ‘school children’ as they feel that this may give them chances over the other academic subjects; then within time they may discover that achievement in language learning is not for them.

Positive success leads to actual learner’s development because it helps the learner to achieve his/her needs. Hill and Dobbyn (1979) discuss the idea of success in relation to the motivation that the teacher may give to his/her learners. They write:

... If the students feel that they are learning the language successfully, and that what they are learning is really useful (i.e. that it is enabling them to communicate on interesting relevant topics in the target language), they will be encouraged to learn more and more.

(p. 27)

Receptivity towards success in language learning can, thus, be classified into two main types, the first is permanent because it vanishes when the learner feels that success in language does not satisfy his/her needs, and this in the end leads to withdrawal from the experience of learning a second or a foreign language. The second type of receptivity to
success in learning a language is the positive one which continues all through the experience of learning a second/foreign language because the learner feels satisfied with the attained goals, and he/she is developing in language learning.

B. Receptivity to Success in Language Learning in Relation to Learners’ Attitudes

Success is an indicator of a positive attitude towards the target language. Several researchers have studied the relationship between learners’ attitudes towards the target language and proficiency or success in learning that language. For example Oller et al (1977), Chihara and Oller (1978), Oller, Baca and Vigil (1978) studied the relationship between Chinese, Japanese and Mexican students achievement in English and their attitudes toward self, the native language group, the target language group, their reasons for travelling to the United States. The main findings of these studies indicate that several attitudinal variables could be related positively with achieved proficiency in the target language. These positive
attitudes that students have toward self, the native language, and the target language group, facilitate proficiency in the target language. Brown (1994: 168) expresses this situation by saying:

*It seems intuitively clear, nevertheless, that second language learners benefit from positive attitudes and that negative attitudes may lead to decreased motivation and in all likelihood, because of decreased input and interaction, to unsuccessful attainment of proficiency.*

Brown (1994) believes that negative attitudes toward the target language and its people can be avoided by dealing with realities such as meeting people from other cultures. Positive attitudes toward success can be built, as it has been mentioned above, around whether success will lead to attaining learners’ set up needs or not. Therefore, there is no contradiction between Brown’s (1994) suggestion of avoiding negative attitudes toward the target language by bringing real people from other cultures, and the correlation between success and learners’ needs because the interaction with the people from the target language community might be one of the learners’ needs to study a second/foreign language.

In another study, Harmer (1987: 3) says that the attained success can be strengthened, to motivate the learners,
by the goals the teacher puts up to make a balanced choice of challenging and simple tasks because both challenging and simple tasks may demotivate learners. Success or failure can be considered the student’s responsibilities, but teachers may help him/her to put things in the right track by the different activities and processes that enable them to make the learning environment more interesting and encouraging. Hilleson’s (1996: 270) study has also considered the correlation between the positive attitudes and success, he says that “A more positive attitude to their language achievement can only help the students succeed in their studies.”

Achievement in language learning can not be taken in isolation from the other factors. Therefore, receptivity to success in language learning is correlated with all the previously mentioned factors such as receptivity to the target language, its people and culture, and to the teacher… etc. Different studies were conducted to find the relationship between success and other factors. For example the relationship between attitudes and success was extensively investigated. As to this relationship Al – Busairi (1990: 57) says that…“Intuitively
we believe that there is some relationship between attitudes and achievement.” He also mentions some previous studies that dealt with the relationship between attitudes and linguistic achievement in second language acquisition. Most of these studies found significant correlation between attitudes and achievement. However, some of them showed no correlation between attitudes and achievement at all. Wicker (1969), and Gliksman et al (1976) for example found a low percentage of correlation, not more than ten percent, between attitudes and the variance on overt behavioural measures. MacNamara (1973) confirms Wicker’s (1969) ideas by saying that favourable attitudes are of little importance in second language learning achievement. However, such low correlation between attitudes and achievement can not be generalised or taken seriously because the majority of the studies report strong correlation between attitudes and achievement in second language learning.

Jones (1950) found that there is a positive relation between the secondary schools students attitudes and achievement in Welsh as a second language, while Al – Busairi
(1990: 58) believes that less favourable attitudes towards the second or foreign language are shown by the students when exposure to the language begins, but an increase of significant level of correlation between attitudes and achievement is expected later. Gardner (1974) in a similar study suggests contrasting views to Al – Busairi (1990) by saying that attitudes towards the second language are very essential at the first encounter of learning, the importance decreases later; both Gardner and Jones agree that there is a positive relationship between second language learning and attitudes. Burstall (1975) finds a significant positive correlation between English and Welsh pupils attitudes towards learning French, and their success in that language all through the period of learning.

Mueller (1971) replicating Mueller and Miller’s study (1970), state that: “The student’s attitudes towards the language, towards the people whose language he is studying, influence his achievement.” (Al – Busairi, 1990: 59). Jordan also says that attitudes towards learning languages correlate more to success than to other subjects. He then says that the outstanding
students had the greatest positive attitudes towards learning French.

In all these studies a positive correlation was found between attitudes towards learning a second/foreign language and success; or between receptivity and success in second/foreign language learning. The learning that helps the students to be able to use the language communicatively for all the possible language functions.

2. 14 Receptivity to Communicating with Others

A. Background

The ability to use the target language communicatively outside the classroom is a great indicator of success. However, there are many psychological and social factors that affect the learner’s abilities to use the target language communicatively. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 164) put this as follows ... “Many people do not actually enjoy communicating, or attempting to communicate, with others, especially with people from other cultures.” Differences in cultures and the lack of the mastery of second/foreign language are the most important factors that
threaten the students’ acceptance of the idea of communicating with others. This phenomenon is known by many researchers as ‘communication apprehension’. McCroskey (1977), Friedman (1980), Duly and McCroskey (1984) believe that the influence of ‘communication apprehension’ in first language situations is perceptible in the area of speech communication. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 164) agree with Duly and McCroskey (1984) when they say that ‘communication apprehension’ is more influential in second and foreign language learning situations.

In a similar study Tsui (1996: 145) discusses this phenomenon as ‘reticence’, and she gives five reasons for the phenomenon. These, according to many teachers, are: first, the students’ reticence, is the outcome of their low English proficiency. Secondly, students’ fear of mistakes and derision let them keep silent because they lack self – confidence, and they fear making mistakes among their colleagues and being laughed at as a result. Thirdly, teachers’ intolerance of students’ silence increases teachers’ talking time and reduces learners’ talking time. Fourthly, uneven allocation of turns which gives the brighter students more chances to respond to teachers’
questions as teachers would like to avoid getting wrong responses from their students; hence the other students are going to be neglected and will not be given chances to participate in classroom interaction. Fifthly, teachers’ incomprehensible or vague input or instructions, which will not be understood by the students, will lead to learners’ reticence.

Tsui’s study (1996) was based on classroom action research project reports of thirty-eight ESL teachers at the University of Hong Kong. This indicates that students’ reticence is taken from teachers’ perspectives. Tsui (1996) concludes her study by quoting Horwiitz’s et al (1986: 132):

*If we are to improve foreign language teaching at all levels of education, we must recognize, cope with, and eventually overcome debilitating foreign language anxiety as a factor shaping students’ experience in foreign language learning.*

Allwright and Bailey (1991: 144) think that teachers should know that their “pupils’ learning strategies may not always parallel teachers’ teaching strategies, and sometimes they may even be at odds with each others.” Therefore, the teacher’s perfect knowledge of his/her students is very essential for suggesting, and introducing a suitable remedy for reticence or any other
classroom difficulties. Khanji (2000: 43) states that the identification and use of learners’ style help in creating positive context for improving performance activities. In another study Wilkins (1978: 148) believes that the difficulties of communication may be the outcome of the absence of a direct correspondence between the communication functions in the native and the target language. Widdowson (1991b: 117) agrees with Wilkins (1978) and adds that the linguistic forms should be presented in situations to make sure that their meanings are clear. Then they can be practiced as linguistic forms, and established firmly in the learner’s memory.

In his study of communication apprehension Hilleson (1996: 248) considers learners’ views and needs, and he says that “Sensitivity to the needs of the student is crucial if the curriculum is to facilitate efficient learning.” This study was conducted in Singapore on the observed behaviour of some students attending ‘United World College of South East Asia.’ Hilleson used diaries, interviews, observations, and questionnaires for collecting data. The study was divided into three categories related to learners’ language learning anxiety.
These categories also contained language shock due to students’ anxiety as a result of their feeling that their native language would no longer be the means of interaction, foreign language anxiety which would arouse as a result of the need to use an unfamiliar language to perform some functions, and classroom anxiety which came as a result of classroom activities and performance expectations. The students’ comments in Hilleson’s study confirm some of the suggested factors raised by the teachers in Tsui’s (1996) study as mentioned in (2. 14. A). For example one of the students’ comments in Hilleson’s (1996: 254) study was exactly the following: “When I met a new person I had never met before it is hard to communicate. According to Hilleson (1996: 254) the student’s comments confirm the connection between communication anxiety and foreign language anxiety as founded by Foss and Reitzel (1988) as follows: “Foreign language anxiety seems to share certain characteristics with communication anxiety, for example high feelings of self – consciousness, fear of making mistakes, and a desire to be perfect when speaking.” Other students in Hilleson’s (1996)
study expressed their frustration or fear that they may fail to express their original identity which affects in their being always serious for fear that others might not understand their jokes or funny chatting. Moreover, some of the students were anxious about losing their original characters. Such feelings lead to a loss of self – esteem. The students also showed that when they compared their performance with others they also felt frustrated. With regard to the last point Bailey’s (1983) diary study shows that comparisons with other learners are directly connected with anxiety.

At the end of his study Hilleson (1996: 271) suggested some solutions for communication apprehension; the most important of these solutions are the following: first, common and open discussions on anxiety help the students to identify their own anxiety, and to know that it is unproductive in language learning. Secondly, performance activities are more likely to be affected by increased level of anxiety; therefore, this high level of anxiety should be reduced to let students practice performance activities, as they are very important for learning a language. Thirdly, the teacher’s characteristics (i.e. humor,
patience, degree of positive feedback, etc.) are very important elements for continuing learning. Fourthly, it is very important to give the learners the confidence needed to perceive themselves positively. Fifthly, the students’ evaluation of their success in their native languages is a positive indicator that gives them the impression that things will get better. Finally, the students felt, after spending a break outside the boarding school, that some barriers have been taken away from their route of learning.

All these solutions for problems of communication apprehension confirm the importance of students’ receptivity to communication with others. Communication, as it is known, is one of the performance activities that train learners to develop their communicative abilities and competence.

B. Importance of Receptivity to Communication with Others
As it has been stated at the end of ‘A’ above that communication is a very fundamental language activity that reflects the learner’s capability of using the target language for achieving some communicative functions. On this background receptivity to communicating with others indicates that the learner has overcome a lot of the barriers that prevent him/her using the second/foreign language for communication because receptivity by definition indicates positive attitudes.

Communication is known to be a social activity that people master through social interaction with others, and it is also the central activity by means of which language is generally identified and defined. On this point Chomsky (2000: 30) says that: “As for the idea that ‘the basic function of natural languages is to mediate communication,…”

According to what is mentioned in the above paragraph receptivity to communication with others is related to the positive attitudes that a learner shows towards using language for communication with others, it is found that many researchers discuss communication with others in relation to attitudes. For example Al – Busairi (1990: 63) says that:
“Students’ attitudes toward the language and the speakers of the language may be good predictors of how much a student will actively participate in class.” This implies that the positive learner’s attitudes towards the language correlate with active participation. For Allwright (1991: 168) the positive learners’ attitudes towards communicating with others is very important because it is an activity that helps a learner to develop both linguistic and communicative competence. Widdowson (1991b: 118) also believes that it is important to practice language communicatively, and communicative teaching tries to help learners to put their linguistic competence in real language use or through social interaction. For social interaction to take place there should be acceptance from the learner to be involved in communicative activities with the members of the target language learners group or even the target language community itself. Allwright (1991: 170) believes that the value of communicative language teaching lies in the fact that “communication practice can be expected to develop linguistic skills.”
Allwright (1991: 170) also thinks that the main reason behind the students’ failure to use the language communicatively outside the classroom is their dependence on their teachers. The students, therefore, need independence to develop their communicative abilities. Students’ independence in practicing communicative abilities can be attained by their openness to communication with their fellow learners or with other members from outside the classroom. Receptivity to communicating with others gives learners more chances to practice language communicatively either inside or outside classroom settings. Harmer (1987: 37) expresses this independence in practicing communicative activities by saying “It is when students are engaged in using language for communication, in other words, that they are responsible for their own learning: the very practice of communication encourages the ability to communicate.” Then Harmer says that teachers’ roles should be changed so as to give students freedom to be responsible of their own learning and their communication strategies.
Receptivity to communicating with others is important because it gives students more relaxed and free environment to choose the communication strategies that help them to be independent from the dominant teacher’s role, and to be able at the same time to develop their communicative competence, which implies development of grammatical competence as well.

2. 15 Summary

This chapter has been divided into two parts. Part one has been devoted to the explanation of communicative language learning and teaching with emphasis on the approaches and methods that try to develop communicative language competence. A background about the nature of language learning and teaching has also been introduced. Then some of the methodological background, sources and strategies of communicative language learning and teaching have been outlined and explained in the same part. In the discussion of communicative language learning and teaching some of the strengths of the communicative approach with reference to the
positive changes that this approach has led to in both learners’ and teachers’ roles, which are believed in the present study to have a great importance in the experience of language learning and teaching. The strengths of the communicative approach have been followed by a review of some of the shortcomings of this approach. Its shortcomings have been considered as procedural, i.e. due to how the approach is actually implemented in a classroom. These procedural disadvantages may hinder the development of communicative language learning and teaching, i.e. the dominance of the traditional views among many of the practitioners may impede learning and slow it down. In addition, the complexity of human language to be taught and then learnt indicates that it is impossible for one approach to be sufficient.

Part two of this chapter considers some of the classroom factors which relate to receptivity and defensiveness. First, an introduction about receptivity and defensiveness is given, and this introduction is followed by some definitions of receptivity and defensiveness. Receptivity was defined as the positive attitudes that the learner develops towards language learning experience and environment. Defensiveness is the
negative attitude that a learner has towards the language, its people, culture, and may lead in the end to set up defences against the experience of learning other languages than the native language.

Some related factors to receptivity and defensiveness have been discussed respectively; first, receptivity to the target language has been introduced, and its importance in the experience of learning a second/foreign language has also been explained with reference to success in learning a second/foreign language. Then in the subsequent sections receptivity to the teacher as a person, then to his/her way of teaching has been introduced as an important factor that increases students’ receptivity of the learning/teaching experience. After discussing receptivity to the teacher receptivity to fellow learners has been discussed considering the students’ preferences of their fellow learners because the student’s company is a very influential factor that facilitates learning, and makes the classroom an interesting place to study in. Moreover, in communicative language learning and teaching the community feeling that a learner develops is a very fundamental factor for success.
Other pedagogical factors have also been considered such as receptivity to the course content by both students and teachers as an important element in the processes of learning and teaching. The course content has been considered as the medium through which learning and teaching can be conducted.

The discussion of the pedagogical factors is then directed to receptivity to teaching materials as additional factors that enhance and facilitate more chances of learning. The teaching materials, if prepared and presented carefully by the teacher, will make the classroom a suitable and interesting place to study in.

The rest of the chapter has been devoted to the discussion of receptivity to success in language learning, and receptivity to the idea of communicating with others. For the former success in language learning indicates positive attitudes developed by learners toward self, the target language and its people, and may be toward all the classroom factors discussed in this chapter. On the part of receptivity to communicating with others, and its importance as an indicator of developing both communicative and linguistic competence, and some of the
previous studies have been cited for more emphasis. The discussion was also directed to communication apprehension as a related factor.

All these discussed environmental issues are believed to be prerequisite factors for a successful experience in second/foreign language learning and teaching. By discussing these factors we believe that it is logical to proceed in this discussion to consider learners’ affective and attitudinal factors that are closely related to receptivity and defensiveness. Therefore, chapter three will be devoted to this end.
CHAPTER THREE

RECEPTIVITY AND DEFENSIVENESS IN RELATION TO SOME RELATED FACTORS

Second/foreign language learning is an integrated process in which several factors should be taken into account. A lot of the research in this area is concentrated on either learners’ or teachers’ factors in relation to some classroom factors. The central aim of this study is to incorporate the three factors together, and then to equate them with receptivity and defensiveness.

In order to incorporate learners’ and teachers’ factors, and then to equate them with the concepts of receptivity and defensiveness, chapter two has been devoted to the explanation of receptivity and defensiveness in relation to some classroom factors, the acceptance of which leads to success in second/foreign language learning. The main interest of chapter three is to consider receptivity and defensiveness in relation to a number of topics, which are clearly related to each others. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 169) say that these topics are studied in different research projects under separate headings. The first related topic is attention, which is assumed to be an indicator of receptivity, will be considered in (3. 1.). Different studies have considered the topic of attention with varying views, some consider it as a very important factor for language learning, for
example Newmark (1972), and others consider it as a less effective factor for second language acquisition, for example Krashen (1982). Secondly the relationship between receptivity and defensiveness and the different types of anxiety will also be discussed in (3. 2.) as either facilitating or debilitating of the learning process. Thirdly receptivity in relation to self – esteem is going to be explained in (3. 3) as a further dimension in the correlation between receptivity and success in language learning. Finally the correlation between receptivity and motivation is going to be discussed in (3. 4.) in the light of the extensive research in the areas of affective and attitudinal variables in second/foreign language learning headed by Gardner and Lambert. In the end the hypotheses of this study will be stated on the background of the theoretical framework, and literature review in chapters two and three.

3. 1 Receptivity in Relation to Attention

A. Introduction
To explain the impact of receptivity on attention or vice versa, it is better to start with the following actual personal experiences. The first was my own experience as an intermediate school student. Although it was not related to English, some implications could be taken from it to explain the importance of attention as an indicator of receptivity in language learning. That experience was in a geography lesson taught by a teacher who came back from a training course. That teacher managed to hold the students’ attention by his interesting way of explaining the lesson, and the use of several realia and aids. The second experience was told by one of my colleagues who said that when they were students at the faculty of agriculture, one of the lecturers, on a very heavy day, asked the students to close all the doors and windows and switch on the air coolers to refresh air in the lecture room. The lecture went on for a long time with a great attention from all the students. These two experiences explain clearly that some factors such as the classroom environment, the teacher himself as a person and his/her way of teaching, the lesson itself, the students’ needs, etc. help students to be attentive. Moreover, they explain the importance of attention in learning different subjects. Attention in learning languages is more influential than in other fields of study as it is going to be explained below.

It is very important in discussing receptivity in relation to attention to consider the gradual development of a human being’s cognition and consciousness. Stones (1976: 30) expresses this gradual development of consciousness in children by saying that young babies are nearly unaware of their ‘surroundings’. He then says that “consciousness is built up gradually in the child”, this gradation prevents the baby from any organic defects. Stones (1976: 74) also believes that the:

*Homeostasis leaves the higher centres of the brain free to develop functions of adaptation which result in the achievement of...*
consciousness and the complex behaviour which we see built up in the intricacies of learning.

Stones’ central ideas can be the gradual development of human consciousness, and the connection between consciousness and learning.

Hill and Dobbyn (1979: 16) in another study explain the capacity of the brain, which can be refreshed from one activity to another to absorb things according to certain duration of time. This statement emphasises the importance of gradation in holding learners’ attention for more successful language learning and teaching. Gradation implies that the learning and teaching process consider the learners’ mental capacities.

The importance of attention in language learning can not be denied; hence, its relevance to receptivity can strongly be established with reference to different views mentioned by many researchers.

B. Classification and Importance of Attention

Attention has been classified differently by different researchers. Some of them classify it as conscious learning.
Henceforth the two terms attention and conscious learning will be considered as synonymous terms. Attention as consciousness has been discussed for example by Krashen (1987: 19) when he considers conscious learning in relation to the monitor theory saying that: “The optimal user is able to fill part of the gap with conscious learning, but not all of it.” The optimal monitor user for him is the performer who uses “the monitor when it is appropriate and when it does not interfere with communication.” He also emphasises the importance of subconscious learning by saying that some items, which are subconsciously learned, will be established more firmly than those consciously learned. However, Krashen does not deny the importance of conscious learning, but he gives greater emphasis to subconscious learning, and for this reason other researchers have criticized him. We believe that subconsciousness is a later development of conscious learning in which the learner succeeds to internalise the learnt language items and use them subconsciously whenever he/she needs to practice the language communicatively or to perform any
language function. This means that subconscious learning is a conscious process to which we do not pay great attention,

In response to Krashen’s (1987) distinction between conscious and subconscious learning, Brown (1994: 281) cites McLaughlin’s (1990) comments about this distinction saying that:

"My own bias ... is to avoid use of the terms conscious and unconscious in second language theory. I believe that these terms are too laden with surplus meaning and too difficult to define empirically to be useful theoretically. Hence, my critique of Krashen’s distinction between learning and acquisition – a distinction that assumes that it is possible to differentiate what is conscious from what is unconscious."

McLaughlin (1990) finds that the literature in experimental psychology shows that awareness is a must in long-term learning. Brown (1994: 281) has also pointed out Schmidt’s (1990) observation about the distinction between conscious and subconscious learning in the following points: first "no input becomes intake without what we loosely understand as conscious awareness, and that language acquisition theories that appeal to conscious/subconscious distinctions are highly suspect."

Brown (1994: 283) concludes his criticism of Krashen’s (1987) distinction between conscious and subconscious learning by offering McLaughlin’s (1990) and Schmidt’s (1990)
views about this distinction saying that “awareness and consciousness are tricky terms: therefore, in order to form a sound theory of second language acquisition, we are better off not appealing to the conscious/unconscious continuum.” Then Brown (ibid.) starts to list some of the models suggested by McLaughlin and others. Within these models he explains the use of the concepts ‘focal’ and ‘peripheral’ attention as suggested by McLaughlin et al (1983). The former refers to the central attention that an individual gives to things in the centre of his/her attention, and the latter refers to things outside the centre of attention. However, the two are expected to be within the individual’s conscious awareness. This suggests that the individual has focal or central attention which is directed towards something, and other peripheral types of attention outside the centre to which awareness is also given. The ultimate communicative goal for language learners is, therefore, to develop peripheral and automatic attention of the bits and pieces of language to internalise the system of the target language.
McLaughlin’s (1983) criticism of Krashen’s distinction between conscious and subconscious learning, has also been taken by Ellis (1990: 234) who studies this within the interface position which implies the different types of knowledge second language learners possess; and they are not entirely separate. Ellis (1990: 234) cites Sharwood – Smith’s interface model, which is built on the work of Bialystok and McLaughlin. This model seeks to account for the second language acquisition formal instruction which serves as the means of conscious – raising processing, and it is also the means by which the resulting explicit knowledge is practiced and finally is automatized. Ellis (1990: 235) believes that the connection between acquired and learnt, or between conscious and subconscious learning, can be through automaticity. Automaticity is originally developed by McLaughlin (1978) who in turn refers to Schneider and Shriiffin’s (1977) distinction between controlled and automatic processing; the former requires active attention while the latter requires no active control or attention. Therefore, second language acquisition entails going from the controlled to the automatic processing.
The automatic processing of the language system mentioned above, has been considered by some researchers as a process which reflects individual differences among learners. Harmer (1987: 33) for example believes that it is not easy to predict exactly when language acquisition happens consciously or subconsciously because this process is a matter of individual differences. Harmer (1987) maintains his ideas by saying that: “A student who receives roughly – tuned input may make a conscious attempt to learn the new language: another may not do so.” Conscious language learning is very essential mainly in the case of adult language learning. Harmer (1987: 34) states clearly the importance of attention or conscious learning which is considered a part of the methodological process that aims at developing communicative activities by exposure to enough input. These ideas emphasise what has been mentioned before at the beginning of this chapter about the nature of language learning and teaching, which has been classified as an integrated process which needs a lot of factors. That is to say attention is one of these factors. Attention in this section of the study is considered in relation to receptivity, which we believe to
be a suitable term to be used in discussing language learning factors. Therefore, the correlation between receptivity and attention can be explained on the background of the above mentioned factors.

The correlation between receptivity and attention can be emphasised by mentioning some of the empirical studies on the importance of attention in language learning and teaching. Although Allwright and Bailey (1991: 169), who agree with Cohen (1981), think that it is difficult to measure attention validly and reliably, it is very helpful in learning a language to the extent that it can be equated with receptivity. They also think that learners should be attracted to the activity at hand and not to wander away by other distracters. These views about attention confirm the importance of the classroom physical environment, the teacher as a person and his way of teaching, etc. in holding learners’ attention.

To overcome the difficulty of measuring attention, Cohen (1981), cited in Allwright and Bailey (1991: 170), for example finds that, after getting permission from teachers to ask students at a particular time about their attention, about eighty-two percent of the students in one class are attentive to the lesson, and the overall percentage of all the classes is fifty percent. The final result of Cohen’s study is that about half of any class are expected to be attentive. According to Allwright and Bailey (1991: 170) Cohen’s percentage may not be representative of his selected classes and even for other classes
in other learning/teaching contexts because the students may either give positive response so as to please the researcher, or may sometimes give negative response. We believe that personal experience and diary studies are very helpful in measuring students’ attention and hence its relation to receptivity.

The diary study is known as a first personal encounter with learning or teaching experience in which the researcher/writer is often the subject. In similar diary studies by John and Francine Schumann (1977) the ideas of receptivity to teaching materials, course content, teacher’s way of teaching, communicating with others, and to the target language have been highlighted. In another diary study by Bailey (1980) about her experience in learning French, another receptivity issue has been tackled, that is receptivity to fellow learners. Therefore, the same approach is followed in the present study to prove the connection between receptivity and attention, that is to say my own experience as English and other languages student can be used to explain the correlation between receptivity and attention. In language
lessons my attention increases, and this is a good indicator of the correlation between attention and receptivity.

In another empirical study conducted in Pakistan by Shamim (1996) in large ESL classes, the following findings, about attention in relation to what is called the action zone, have been drawn: first the action or attention zone according to Shamim (1996: 134) is the area which receives more attention from the teacher, mainly the front of the class. This area helps the teacher to follow “what the students in the front are doing.” The ongoing monitoring by the teacher is a source of motivation for the students in this area to do their best. Secondly some of the students in Shamim’s study say that the increased attention from the teacher is associated with benefits that let them sit in the front to enjoy this advantage. Nunan (1996: 41) believes that the teacher’s ability to draw his/her students’ attention is a matter of experience that helps them to modify their lessons according to their students’ continuous feedback, and to be comfortable in following their students’ behaviour. This implies that the experienced teacher has the ability to make all the class an action or attention zone. A third
point that has been mentioned by Shamim (1996: 138) is the association between the action zone, motivation and self-esteem. That is to say highly motivated students, with high self-esteem prefer to sit in the front of the class, and this gives them the privilege of learning better than the other students. Therefore, they perform in the classroom better than the students who are seated in the back of the class, and they show a high level of motivation.

The good reputation that students in the action zone or attention zone acquire is accepted to a great extent, but it is not likely the case in all circumstances because sometimes students may not have the right to choose their locations in the classroom, either because teachers arrange them, or students may come late at the beginning of the academic year, thus they are seated in the back zone. Moreover, students at the back zone, away of any physiological deficiencies, may perform better in the classroom, and they show high motivation than those who are seated in the attention zone.

Shamim (1996: 138) considers also the relationship between students’ motivation and performance on one hand,
and their location away of the attention zone on the other. She finds that students who are seated in the back have low motivation, and limited opportunities of learning. This is because they will have difficulties to see the blackboard clearly, or to get attention from the teacher. Shamim (1996: 138) concludes by saying that:

... *The students in the back are unable to understand the lesson or participate in classroom activities; therefore, they are perceived as ‘dull’ by the teacher and other students. This leads to a further decrease in their motivation level.*

It seems that all the ideas mentioned above agree on the importance of attention in language learning and teaching. Therefore, the relationship between attention and receptivity can also be determined on the background of this importance. Rivers (1986: 127) for example finds that there is a great relation between what is kept in memory and taken in, and both attention and motivation. Rivers’ ideas indicate that relevance of contents and materials to the set up goals of language learning and teaching is a very important factor for holding and increasing students’ attention and motivation which are in turn fundamental components of receptivity.
In conclusion, it is better to consider Katz’s (1996: 78) study because he considers that the teacher’s central duty is to hold his/her students’ attention in order to teach them, and to make what has been taught memorable.

Katz (1996) and Rivers (1986) agree on the importance of attention to memory. Katz (1996: 78) considers holding learners’ attention a very important teachers’ activity for aiding learning. Hence, attention can be considered one of the factors, which determine students’ receptivity. In a similar study by Gass (1997: 194) the idea of selective attention has been explained as first noticing “the importance of an element” then it is going to be stored to its details, and this process of learning is related to conscious learning or attention.

3.2. Anxiety in relation to receptivity and defensiveness

A. Definition and classification

Although it is difficult to define anxiety, its significance in language learning can not be denied as many researchers have proved this in different studies. With regard to the definition of anxiety, Al – Busairi (1990: 49) says that it is not an easy task to define anxiety like all the other affective factors. This indicates that anxiety is one of the
affective factors. However, Al–Busairi (1990: 49) cites a definition by Hilgard, Atkinson, and Atkinson (1971) cited in Scovel (1978: 134) as follows: “Anxiety is commonly described by psychologists as a state of apprehension, a vague fear that is only indirectly associated with an object.” In another similar definition Powell (1983: 32) puts anxiety as an “uneasiness, apprehension, or tension.” This feeling is experienced as “an inner physical discomfort ... Usually it is a reaction to threat or conflict.” Anxiety can be the product of external or internal, known or unknown sources. Out of these definitions it seems that anxiety is an affective factor that has a great role in preventing a second language learner from learning in a relaxed or an easy situation, but many researchers have proved that anxiety can also facilitate learning. Therefore, anxiety has been classified into two types debilitating on one hand, and facilitating on the other.

With reference to the above mentioned distinction of anxiety as debilitating and facilitating Scovel (1978: 139) explains these two types as follows: Facilitating anxiety motivates the learner to “fight” the new learning task; it gears the learner emotionally for approach behaviour. Debilitating anxiety in contrast, motivates the learner to “flee” the new learning task; it stimulates the individual emotionally to adopt avoidance behaviour.

It seems from this definition that anxiety has connections with the other affective factors such as motivation and self – esteem
which will be discussed in 3.3 and 3.4 in details. In a similar
classification of anxiety Stones (1976: 382) says that: “... slight
anxiety in the classroom is useful in motivating learning.”
Stones (1976: 382) believes that the use of the concept anxiety
as mentioned above refers to the type of anxiety that is raised as
a result of unfulfilling a set up task by the teacher. This
unfulfilled task “upsets a state of psychological equilibrium. To
restore that equilibrium the children have to solve the problem.”
So, continuity of anxiety according to this statement depends on
whether the problem is solved or not. Stones (1976: 393)
considers that “negative affect inhibits learning.” This is greatly
connected with debilitating anxiety. Stones (ibid.) concludes by
saying “... anxiety should be specific to the task and in a
general atmosphere of positive affect.”

The stated types of anxiety, debilitating and facilitating, are
also classified by Scovel (1978) cited in Allwright and Bailey
(1991: 173) as subdivisions of trait and state anxiety. The former
refers to a permanent personality feature, and the latter to a less
stable or stage fright as a result of temporary circumstances.
From all the stated classifications and definitions we believe that
anxiety is an indicator of interest or attention to some object. That is to say the individual will not feel such anxiety unless he/she is interested in something, and from this perspective anxiety is going to be explained below in relation to receptivity as facilitating anxiety, and to defensiveness as debilitating one.

The connection between anxiety and both receptivity and defensiveness has been stated for example by Allwright and Bailey (1991: 177) and Stevick (1996: 195). The former discuss anxiety in relation to receptivity and some relevant research believing that a slight anxiety may spur learners to go on. Stevick (1996: 195) discusses anxiety in relation to receptive and defensive learning by suggesting that we should not put learners on the defensive. This is considered one of the central teacher’s duties, that is to minimise the sources of debilitating anxiety so as to be more receptive to the input to strike deeper in them. Stones (1976: 383) explains the teacher’s role with reference to anxiety by saying that the teacher should know carefully his/her students’ emotional situations so as to help them go on learning; this is done by keeping to the positive encouraging emotional situations such as confidence, and
avoiding the negative ones such as nervous temperament.

Gerhard (1971: 36) agrees with Stones saying that a pupil should be eased and encouraged to overcome anxiety in new experience situations.

Anxiety has also been discussed by some researchers in relation to competitiveness in classroom language learning, which by itself is one of the factors that affects students’ receptivity and defensiveness of language learning. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 176) for example discuss this issue of competitiveness in relation to anxiety, with reference to Bailey’s (1983) diary studies, by saying that a number of the ‘diarists’ consider themselves as strongly competitive in language learning, and this in turn is a source of anxiety to these language learners. Some of these diarists appear to be preoccupied ‘with the strain of wanting to be the best,’ and others to be among the ‘worst.’ In both cases the anxiety noticed is debilitating rather than facilitating. For example Schumann (1980: 53) explains her condition of competitiveness with reference to her husband considering this as guilt when she says that:

This guilt was a result of my competitive feeling that if I didn’t work as much as he did, he would get further ahead… Instead of causing me to work harder, this competitiveness resulted in my feeling frustrated and led to a reduced effort.

In another similar study Al – Busairi (1990:71) cites Bailey’s (1983) personal account of her experience of learning French as follows:

French Classroom Anxiety definitely interfered with language learning (at least in the short – term perspective) when I temporarily withdrew from the instructional setting.

Therefore, Schumann’s reduced effort and Bailey’s withdrawal explain obviously the influence of debilitating anxiety in language learning. In contrast to these views taken from diary studies Allwright and Bailey (1991: 176) believe that such diaries might be misleading because they have been written by experienced teachers not by ordinary learners. They explain this by saying that teaching is a profession that increases anxiety, and when a teacher feels that he/she is put in a position of a learner more tension is expected from him/her because the teacher might be worried about his/her performance. What is got from such studies might be in spite of all these caveats, Allwright surrounded with feelings of "self flattery factor". and Bailey (1991: 176) do not deny the importance of such diary studies in linking classroom anxiety with competitiveness.
We believe that competitiveness is a normal human characteristic by which an individual
tries to improve his/her surroundings, and definitely such a feeling raises anxiety.

B. Anxiety and Success in Language Learning

Different studies have proved that a positive correlation is found between a low
level of anxiety and success in language learning. Al – Busairi (1990: 71) for example finds
that his most anxious daughter usually gets lower marks in English tests than her brother and
two sisters. This indicates that she suffers trait-debilitating anxiety which does not prevent
learning, but it makes it somewhat difficult; hence, it affects negatively on the final grades in
tests. Twyford (2000: 8) in another similar study about "Age – Related Factors in Second
Language Acquisition" finds that "ease in acquiring a second language" is linked to "a low level
of anxiety." This means that ease or success in second language learning has a contrasting
relation with debilitating anxiety. Similarly Stones (1976: 382) agrees with Green (1993: 3)
believing that the teacher's role is very essential in reducing the level of anxiety so as to help
learners attain progress in their language learning programmes.

In all the above mentioned studies a low level of anxiety is related to success, and an
increase in the level of anxiety is related to lower grades or even failure in language tests in
particular. Therefore, a lower level of anxiety or facilitating anxiety is an indicator of learners’
receptivity, and an increase of debilitating anxiety may lead eventually to defensive feeling and
reduction of effort to go on learning a second or foreign language.

To emphasise the connections between receptivity and facilitating anxiety on one hand,
and defensiveness and debilitating anxiety on the other, it is better to go on mentioning other
studies on anxiety and success. Brown (1994: 141) for example agrees with Macintyre and
Gardner (1991) saying that:

Trait anxiety, because of its global and
somewhat ambiguously defined nature, has not proved
to be useful in predicting second language
achievement… Foreign language anxiety can be
distinguished from other types of anxiety and that it can
have a negative effect on the language learning
process.

Brown (1994: 141) considers foreign language anxiety with reference to
three factors; which are namely: "(1) communication apprehension" which will be considered
in (C) below "(2) fear of negative social evaluation." “(3) test anxiety." However, Brown (1994:
141) believes that facilitative anxiety is a positive factor in language learning,

Krashen (1987: 31) has also mentioned the relationship
between anxiety and success within a variety of affective factors
which are related to success in second language acquisition.

These factors include motivation, self – confidence and anxiety.
The anxiety intended here according to Krashen (1987) is a low anxiety which “appears to be conductive to second language acquisition, whether measured as personal or classroom anxiety.” He has also suggested some processes to be followed to reduce the pressure on the learner, this can be done by focusing on the message not the form, and by presenting an interesting and comprehensible input. In other words the learners should be supplied with the language that helps them to fulfil their language learning needs, and the language that is actually used in authentic situations. All these processes help in lowering students’ personal or classroom anxiety. Hence, they increase students’ receptivity of the input. Wilkins (1991: 92) explains the type of input that is learned as follows: “Greater concern should be given to seeing that what is learned has communicative value and that what has communicative value is learned, whether or not occupies an important place in the grammatical system.”

Wilkins’ views in the above quotation give greater concern to the communicative value of the input. The communicative value of the input is of great importance to anxiety because a lot of the studies on the issue of anxiety concentrate on performance activities and on communication in particular.
Therefore, ‘C’ below will be devoted to anxiety in relation to ‘communication apprehension’.

**C. Anxiety and Communication Apprehension**

As it has been stated in (B) above performance and communication activities in particular are greatly influenced by the arousal of anxiety, it is better; therefore, to discuss anxiety with reference to communication apprehension. Apprehension, itself, is one of the characteristics by which anxiety is generally defined. The connection between anxiety and communication apprehension has been studied by several researchers.

In discussing the idea of receptivity to communicating with others in chapter two communication apprehension and reticence have been mentioned as related factors, but in (C) here the reference will be to anxiety. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 174) for example explain this connection between anxiety and performance activities by saying “performing in a foreign language class is in itself potentially somehow more stressful than performing in other subject classes.” The reason for this is the varied sources of errors in pronunciation of either individual sounds, or wrong word or sentence stress and so on. The
feeling that a learner may get in such conditions is related to fear of making a fool of him/herself.

Allwright and Bailey (1991) as stated above point out to the possible connections that can be found between anxiety and performance activities in foreign language classes where the student is normally deprived of the means by which he/she behaves normally, that is the mother tongue. To confirm this connection between anxiety and performance activities, some of the empirical studies will be cited below.

Holbrook (2002: 1) for example presents a digest study which examines some causes and consequences of communication apprehension and how it can be diminished. First of all he cites McCroskey’s (1977) definition of communication apprehension as an “individual level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons.” In another similar study at the United States of America Palmerton (2002: 1) explains the kind of situations where communication apprehension can be seen; these are public speaking, interpersonal, a group discussion, uncertainty about the demands of the situation, or generalized
anxiety settings. Then Palmerton (2002: 1) says that people may differ in their experiences of communication apprehension some for example suffer public speaking and others interpersonal and so on.

It seems that individuals differ with regard to the type of setting they experience, and the arousal of anxiety is generally due to difficulties individuals expect to encounter about what to do in a certain situation, or how other people are likely to respond to them. Then Palmerton (2002: 4) suggests some activities for remedy such as using multiple experiences with public speaking to reduce public speaking anxiety or experiences with different kinds of oral communication situations for the same end. He also believes that problems of communication apprehension can be avoided by practices related to the situations where this phenomenon is felt in order to develop coping with mechanisms. This means that the student should develop gradually the skills needed for interaction in each setting. Bostrom (1984: 25) expresses the same idea of developing suitable mechanisms to deal with each type of setting by suggesting the term ‘Communication
Competence’ which is “the knowledge of and ability to use appropriate communication patterns effectively in an interaction.” In a similar way Oxford (1994: 1) says:

Because of language anxiety, many potentially excellent L2 learners are naturally inhibited; they combat inhibition by using positive self-talk, by extensive use of practising in private, and by putting themselves in situations where they have to participate communicatively.

In conclusion anxiety in language learning and teaching is an affective factor which could be related to receptivity on one hand in the case of low level anxiety as a normal phenomenon in search of success, and to defensiveness on the other in the case of high level anxiety which may finally lead to failure or withdrawal from second or foreign language learning experience.

3. 3. Self – esteem and Receptivity in Language Learning

A. Definition and Classification

To define self – esteem it is appropriate to mention a definition on which some consensus can be found. Coopersmith’s (1967) definition for example has been cited by Heyde (1979: 229); Brown (1994: 137); Al – Busairi (1990: 52) as follows:

By self – esteem, we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily
maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy. In short, self-esteem is personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitude that the individual holds towards himself. It is a subjective experience which the individual conveys to others by verbal reports and other overt expressive behaviour.

According to this definition the individual tries to give some indications about this positive evaluation of self through either a verbal or any other observed behaviour. This behaviour is expected to be consistent with the assumptions about the individual’s evaluation of self as it has been stated by Rogers (1951: 191). Rogers (1951: 136) has also defined self-esteem or self-concept as:

The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perception of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perception of one’s characteristics and abilities; the precepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having a positive or negative valence.

Rogers’ (1951) definition relates self-esteem to other individuals, to the environment and all the surroundings, which may have positive or negative power on one’s self. This indicates that self-esteem can be considered as the individual’s way to overcome difficulty and hindrances. We believe that, and in the light of the present study of receptivity
and defensiveness, self – esteem is receptivity to one’s characteristics, abilities and to the surroundings so as to build the learning experience on what is positive and to try to avoid or even change what is negative.

With reference to the last point mentioned above Brown (1994: 136) says:

*Self – esteem is probably the most pervasive aspect of any human behaviour. It could easily be claimed that no successful cognitive or affective activity can be carried out without some degree of self – esteem, self – confidence, knowledge of yourself, and belief in your own capabilities for that activity.*

Brown’s ideas as stated above maintain the importance of the consistency between self-evaluation and capabilities, and that self – esteem is a must in all successful activities. It is obvious from all the stated definitions that self – esteem is not only a matter of self evaluation, but it is also a consideration of other surrounding factors. Therefore, researchers have given a lot of classifications to self – esteem. Al – Busairi (1990: 52) for instance explains that researchers consider “three levels of self – esteem: ‘general’ or ‘global’” which is the evaluation that an individual directs to self – worth; ‘situational’ or ‘specific’ is the self – esteem which is directed to self – concept in a particular life situation such as
second/foreign language learning in a general perspective; on the other hand task self – esteem is the self evaluation which is directed to specific task situations such as developing an aspect of second language learning like speaking or writing.

The three levels of self – esteem imply that the individual’s evaluation of self may differ from a task to another. It seems also from the definitions and classifications that self – esteem is a factor of success.

B. The Importance of Self – esteem in Second /Foreign Language Learning Achievement

In one of the definitions mentioned above Brown (1994) states clearly the importance of self – esteem in any successful cognitive or affective activity. Language learning in general can be considered as a process of both cognitive and affective domains. Hence, success in language learning is greatly affected by some degree of self – concept.

To explain the importance of self – esteem as an internal attitude Heyde (1979: 227) mentions a lot of ideas about self – esteem which prove the value of self – esteem as a precursor to
motivation as stated by Barksdale (1872); Bills (1951); Miskimins (1973). Then she says that “the level of self – esteem may either block or facilitate the cognitive domain in its application of the rules, and thereby affect the second language output.” This means that individuals with high self – esteem are expected to be more successful than those with low self – esteem.

The mentioning of blocking or facilitating the cognitive domain in its application above reminds us with facilitating and debilitating anxiety as mentioned in 3. 2. This means that all the affective factors share more or less some common properties. For this reason Allwright and Bailey (1991: 178) say, “Both competitiveness and anxiety relate to a further factor – self – esteem. Language learning poses a threat to a person’s self – esteem, as would any task where success was not guaranteed...” Allwright and Bailey (1991: 179) think that learners with high self – esteem have confidence in themselves, and they always correct themselves without a lot of promotion from others. The teachers’ interaction with such learners is expected to increase their scores of self – esteem. In other words the teachers’ respect and evaluation of their learners’ self
– esteem can be positive influences for increasing self–esteem scores; hence, they enhance learners’ success.

Gerhard (1971: 55) has also considered the importance of teachers’ evaluation of their students, as mentioned above by Allwright and Bailey (1991). First Gerhard believes that self–concept is an ability of remaining “an individual in a mass society”, and to have the freedom to be oneself, is a source of winning. This means that Gerhard emphasises the importance of self–esteem in success. Then she mentions the importance of the school’s environment and the curriculum in developing pupils’ positive self–concept. The student’s positive self–concept can be guaranteed by letting him/her have active participation in the process of learning and teaching. Moreover, he/she should be involved in setting up his/her educational goals through a co–operative work with the teacher, and by being involved in all the activity of learning and teaching. “The learning environment should be open and threat–free.” The curriculum should also enhance success so as to let the cycle continue.
Gerhard’s (1971) ideas prove the great correlation between self – esteem and receptivity as mentioned in chapter two with regard to the teacher, fellow learners, course content, teaching materials, success in language learning, and communication with other learners. Moreover, Gerhard (1971: 55) has also mentioned the idea of openness to the learning environment. Then she mentions the importance of teachers’ evaluation of their students, and the students’ evaluation of self as a shared process to develop positive self – concept. The teachers’ evaluation should be carefully processed away of excessive use of praise or criticism.

It is likely the case that all researchers agree on the importance of self – esteem in success in second/foreign language learning. For example Bley – Vroman (1997: 58) thinks that adult language learners are more affected by affective factors such as ‘motivation, attitudes, socialization, self – image,’ etc., Then he mentions Heyde’s (1983) correlation between proficiency and self – esteem in adult learners. He also mentions Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco’s (1978) report about a clear absence of self – confidence among ‘less successful second language learners’. Which, in turn, implies increased self – confidence among successful second language learners. Heyde (1979: 227) in the same way believes that our evaluation of self can be reflected in our language behaviour, then she cites Fitts (1965); Miskimins (1973) who express the same ideas by saying that the feeling we have towards our abilities and ourselves is directly reflected in our language behaviour and language output.

As it has been mentioned in the above paragraph that self – concept is reflected in an observable language behaviour, which implies that the study of self – esteem should be based on such observable activities. For the same reason Heyde (1979: 228) thinks that it is better to focus on oral production skills rather than on the other skills in studying learners’ self – esteem for the following reasons: first the current research proves that affective factors are closely related to oral production and listening than to reading and writing as studied by Richard Tucker. Gardner and Lambert (1972) in the same direction of interest find a correlation between integrative motivation and second language proficiency. Heyde (1979: 228) believes that such a correlation is normal because oral production, such as speaking, is surrounded with risks due to the evaluation of the speaker’s grammar or pronunciation. Secondly, Heyde believes that “a student's evaluation of himself and his speech has an effect on his oral performance.” We also believe that, writing as a productive skill, needs such a type of self – evaluation. The correlation between self – evaluation and oral language production is a normal process in language learning because language is known as a natural discipline which is mastered through intensive practice.
To study the correlation between self-esteem and the oral production of a second language learner, Heyde (1979: 229) mentions the gradual interest in the study of self-esteem in the area of ‘psychotherapy’ of cases of clients’ self-esteem before and after treatment, and also in cases of studying and classifying normal and abnormal behaviour. Then research is directed to study self-esteem in learning and education, such as the study of self-esteem in relation to the prediction of future performance, to academic performance, and its relation to motivation and attitudes. Fitts (1972) for example, as cited in Heyde’s (1979: 229) study of self-esteem, has developed a measure called “Tennessee Self-concept Scale” with other colleagues to do extensive research for predicting future performance of a varied population. The main results of this study explain that self-concept ‘predicts’ who will get on with training programmes and who will do better on the job after the completion of training programmes. Brodkey and Shore (1976) also cited by Heyde (1979: 230) have found that test of self-esteem through Q-sort technique is predictive of good and poor language performance measured by teachers. In other studies by Fitts (1972) the correlation between self-esteem and academic performance, and that certain self-evaluations are better predictors of grades and achievement test scores. Fitts (1972) also finds a relationship between self-esteem and factors influencing academic performance such as different types of attitude and motivation. Heyde (1979: 230) cites Fitts’ (1972: 43) comments as follows:

… a person with a healthy concept is ‘apt to use his intellectual resources more efficiently and this may be a critical factor in his achievement if his intellectual resources or educational background are borderline. Otherwise his self-concept seems to be more closely related to the noncognitive aspects within the academic setting.’

Heyde’s (1979: 232) pilot study, to explore the “relationship between global and specific self-esteem and the oral production of English as a second language”, is also one of the famous studies. The subjects of this pilot study were students enrolled in high levels at the “English Language Institute” so as to be able to read the scale with no need for translation, which may affect the validity of the scale. The results showed that global and specific levels of self-esteem are related; however, there is a tendency “for specific self-esteem to be more closely related to oral performance than global self-esteem.” It was also proved that subjects with high self-esteem got ‘higher oral production ratings from themselves and their teachers’ than those with low self-esteem. Specific self-esteem was also found to be more predictive of oral performance than global self-esteem.

Heyde’s study receives a lot of interest from several researchers; for example Allwright and Bailey (1991: 179) comment on Heyde’s study by pointing out the importance of her study in forming a general picture for the correlation between self-esteem and language behaviour in general, and to their own study “of receptivity in relation to language classroom interaction” in particular. Heyde’s work is also very useful for our study of receptivity and defensiveness because we expect that a great correlation exists between subjects with high self-esteem and receptivity, while subjects with low self-esteem are expected to be more defensive.

In another similar study by Al-Busairi (1990: 171) self-esteem has been studied in the context of learners’ needs, attitudes and motivation in second/foreign language learning. In the pilot study he uses five questions to measure specific self-esteem. These questions tackle the areas of students’ evaluation of their overall proficiency, the expected final semester grades in English, the average in all courses, and the students’ evaluation of their English speaking ability inside and outside the classroom. Al-Busairi (1990: 171) adds that the same measure is used in his main study. Then he says that the subjects of his study respond positively to self-esteem scale with high means for the groups of the study.

Self-esteem as an affective factor has also been studied by Abu-Nawwas (1998) in relation to communication strategies. The questions of this study are slightly adapted from Al-
Busairi’s self- esteem scale. The main findings of Abu- Nawwas’ study on the part of self-esteem are: students with high self-esteem rarely use semantic avoidance strategy, a strong correlation is found between high levels of self-esteem and achievement strategies. With regard to self-esteem scale the study reveals the following results: first the highest mean value is for the students’ evaluation of their educational and academic abilities, followed by the evaluation of the intellectual abilities, the ability to learn English, rating self when speaking English in the classroom, the overall proficiency, and finally about the feeling when speaking English outside the classroom. The final results of Abu- Nawwas’ study indicate that students have high self-esteem towards themselves and their abilities.

Most of the previous studies attested to the importance of self-esteem in achievement in general, and in second/foreign language learning in particular. Krashen (1987: 31), for example, states clearly the importance of self-esteem as an affective factor in second language acquisition by saying “Performers with self-confidence and a good self-image tend to do better in second language acquisition.” The importance of self-esteem has also been stated by Collier’s (1995: 2). In the study Collier has a figure which shows the components that help a student to acquire a second language. These components are namely: language cognitive, and academic development; and in the centre of the figure sociocultural processes. These social and cultural processes are central for a student’s second language acquisition because they are found in everyday situations all through the student’s academic and social life. Of great importance in these processes to our study, the individual student variables which include self-esteem and the other affective factors such as anxiety. Collier’s (1995) study maintains the importance of the socioculturally supportive context; this in turn emphasises the great correlation between receptivity and all the surroundings, the students’ factors whether affective or cognitive, and the other individual student’s factors.

Collier’s, stated above, study is a good conclusion for the discussion of receptivity and self-esteem because she believes that self-esteem is one of the individual learner factors that helps to save a positive supporting environment for second language acquisition.

3.4 Motivation and Receptivity in Language Learning

A. Definition and classification

Motivation is one of the affective factors that has been studied extensively by researchers to the extent that some of the types of motivation, such as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, according to Conner (2002: 2), are now considered traditional concepts. Moreover, this extensive exploration of motivation makes confusion among researchers on what to accept as a comprehensive definition of motivation. Dornyei (1998: 118) explains this problem of definition by saying, “It is not the lack but rather the abundance of motivation theories which confuse the scene.”

In another statement about the difficulty of defining motivation Stones (1976: 97) thinks that motivation is the “obverse of reinforcement”. Then he adds that motivation is involved in the operation of “incentives or drives” on which a lot of the definitions are based. However, Stones (1976: 97) suggests that “The great danger in discussion of motivation is the tendency to suggest mechanisms which act as prime movers of behaviour....” These mechanisms include instincts as suggested by ‘the psychologist, McDougall, drives, urges, forces and needs.’ Stones (1976: 98) says that the danger of using these mechanisms can be felt in the demonstration of such mechanisms as they are generally hypothesized. Ellis (1990: 116) agrees with Stones when he says:

The problems of defining attitudes and motivation are considerable. A common – sense view is that a person’s behaviour is governed by certain needs and interests which influence how he actually performs. However, these can not be directly observed. They have to be inferred from what he actually does.
Although it is not easy to define all the affective factors, the following definitions of motivation will be explained. First Stones (1976: 97) defines motivation “as the tendency of the organism to reduce its needs or to return to its state of equilibrium.” The most important components of this definition are needs and equilibrium, that is to say motivation is directed towards the individual’s needs to attain a state of equilibrium.

A more detailed definition has been mentioned in ‘Encyclopedia Britannica’ (1977: 556) as “The term motivation popularly refers to the causes of behaviour; i.e., whatever it is within the individual that incites action.” The most important components of this definition are based on the fact that motivation is related to individuals’ observed behaviour as a result of internal or external stimuli. Brown (1994: 152) has also used the idea of internal stimuli when he defines motivation as:

Motivation is commonly thought of as an inner drive, impulse, emotion or desire that moves one to a particular action. Or, in more technical terms, motivation refers to “the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect.”

(Keller 1983: 389)

In another attempt to define motivation Norris – Holt (2002: 1) follows the same ideas stated by Gardner and Lambert (1972), Ellis (1990) when he says “Motivation is the learner’s orientation with regard to the goal of learning a second language.”

It seems from all the stated definitions that motivation is a reflection of an inner drive that affects an individual’s behaviour towards performing a certain task. Therefore, a lot of studies have shown different classifications of motivation mainly instrumental and integrative motivation as will be explained in ‘B’ and ‘C’ below.

**B. Instrumental Motivation**

Instrumental motivation is one of the common types of motivation discussed in relation to second language learning. According to Brown (1994: 153) instrumental motivation “refers to motivation to acquire a language as means for attaining instrumental goals, furthering a career, reading technical material, translation,…” Ellis (1990: 117) in another definition of instrumental motivation agrees with Brown’s (1994) definition saying that the learner’s goals in such types of motivation are functional. Wilkins (1978: 184) states the same perspective of instrumental motivation outlining the main reasons which lead to diversity in learning a language such as passing examinations, using a language for a job or ‘on holiday in the country’, or because learning a language is a requirement of the educational system. These stated reasons differentiate between instrumental and integrative motivation because the latter requires learning a language so as to be in contact with the target language group, or even to live in their country.

For the sake of the present study, instrumental motivation as stated above can be seen greatly connected with the environmental factors stated in 2. 11 receptivity to course content, 2. 12 receptivity to teaching materials, 2. 13 receptivity to success in language learning, and finally in 2. 14 receptivity to communicating with others. Instrumental motivation, in this sense, can be considered as receptivity to all these mentioned factors.

With reference to all the stated above ideas about instrumental motivation, it can be emphasised that in most cases language learning will only go on until the required objectives are attained. Al – Busairi (1990: 35), and Krashen (1981: 22) have also agreed with this idea by saying that by instrumental motivation the learner may just learn the relevant elements that help him/her to attain the goals of learning a second/foreign language. After this accomplishment second/foreign language learning may stop.

In conclusion, instrumental motivation can be considered one of the factors which helps learners to achieve their intended needs of learning a language; it may go on for sometime
so as to attain these needs, or it may continue in other cases to be developed to integrative motivation, and to go beyond the instrumental needs.

**C. Integrative Motivation**

Integrative motivation may seem to be the reverse of instrumental motivation, as it is generally identified as the drive which activates learners to study language as an end, not as only a means, to be associated with the target language community. This type of motivation should better be classified as an extension to instrumental motivation because it helps to achieve additional needs over the needs of instrumental motivation. Wilkins (1978: 184) for example explains them by saying that they include knowledge of target language values and culture, making ‘contacts’ with the target language members, and living in the concerned country. Then he mentions that the instrumental and integrative reasons for learning language in addition to attitudes can be seen as in a continuum “… at the extremes we have instrumental motivation, where learning is strictly utilitarian and attitudes are intolerant, and integrative motivation, where the learner sees himself as a potential member of the second language group and has liberal attitudes.”

These first ideas about integrative motivation may give the impression that a lot of consensus exists on what it means, but its value in successful language learning, or even its continuity may not have the same weight. Therefore, some definitions will be cited below to complete the picture of integrative motivation, then in ‘E’ below the importance of motivation in general will be discussed with reference to its different types, and all this will be correlated with receptivity.

Brown (1994: 154) defines integrative motivation as a motive by which learners “wish to integrate themselves within the culture of the second language group, to identify themselves with and become a part of that society.” Lambert (1967: 102) as cited in Al – Busairi (1990: 33) agrees with Brown’s (1994) ideas about integrative motivation. In a later definition of integrative motivation the learners’ desire to be identified with the second language community has been replaced by the desire to communicate with them. Al – Busairi (1990) cites this revised definition of integrative motivation, by (Gardner et al, 1974: 7), as follows:

> An integrative motive reflects a strong motive to learn the language of another cultural group because of a desire to communicate with members of that community. Implicit in this definition is a positive affect toward that community. The focus, however, is on wanting to communicate directly with valued members of second language community. In the extreme case, it might be suggested that the individual wants actually to become a member of that group. (p. 34)

In another revision of the definition of integrative motivation according to Brown (1994: 155) “Graham (1984) claimed that integrative motivation had been too hardly defined in previous research. He made a distinction between integrative and assimilative motivation.” The first is about the learner’s desire to communicate or know about the target language group and culture without need for contact with them. The latter implies the learner’s motive to be classified as a member of the community of the second language, and even to be in direct contact with them.

These revisions in the definitions of integrative motivation may inform about the great interest that is paid to this type of motivation and its importance in language learning. Motivation itself is a complex affective factor as it has been stated by Conner (2002: 1) who says, "Motivation is a very complex and multifaceted construct which researchers have approached from a number of diverse perspectives."
D. The Other Types of Motivation

Instrumental and integrative motivation, as discussed in ‘B’ and ‘C’ above, are the most important types of motivation which researchers have given a lot of interest. However, there are other types of motivation, which can generally be considered as consequences of the extensive research, and the several revisions of its definitions in language learning.

As a first encounter with these types of motivation it will be helpful to start with Ngeow’s (2000: 2) remarks about motivation, within which motivation is considered as ‘a multi-factorial’ entity as studied by Oxford and Shearin (1994) who analysed about twelve theories of motivation which include aspects from “socio – psychology, cognitive development, and socio – cultural psychology.” Then they identified six motivational factors in the area of language learning as follows: attitudes either towards the learning community or the target language; beliefs about self – concept, success and anxiety; clarity and relevance of learning goals; learners’ active involvement and participation in learning processes; inside and outside environmental support of learning experience; and finally personal traits such as “aptitude, age, sex, and previous language learning experience.”

For all these stated points about motivation, the other types of motivation can be explained although they have not received similar attention from researchers in the same rate of instrumental and integrative motives. First motivation is generally classified into intrinsic and extrinsic, which are now considered as traditional terms according to Conner (2002) as stated in ‘A’ above. However, intrinsic motivation is generally defined as the desire to learn the language for its own sake, or for factors found in the language itself. Al – Busairi (1990: 30) explains these factors as pleasurable, and they include the pleasure to listen to the language, the intellectual and emotional satisfaction that learning another language may bring to the learner to ‘break the code’ and to communicate through it; in addition to this the learner’s interest in the language and what the language “embodies or symbolizes to him/her”.

In a similar explanation of intrinsic motivation Conner (2002: 2) says that intrinsic motivation is the evaluation of task completion for its own sake and the possible rewards gained from it with no reference to external factors. Taguchi (2002: 7) in another attempt considers intrinsic motivation as “task motivation” which is directed to the performance of the various “learning tasks”. Another comprehensive definition for intrinsic motivation has been developed by Deci (1975) cited by Brown (1994: 155) as follows:

Intrinsically motivated activities are ones for which there is no apparent reward except the activity itself. People seem to engage in the activities for their own sake and not because they lead to an extrinsic reward. … Intrinsically motivated behaviours are aimed at bringing about certain internally rewarding consequences, namely, feelings of competence and self – determination.

In the light of these definitions, intrinsic motivation, can be seen as receptivity to the language itself and to all the tasks and activities that aim at learning language.

Extrinsic motivation on the other hand can be classified as the desire to get rewards from outside the language as it has been stated by Brown (1994: 156) in the following lines:

Extrinsically motivated behaviours.... are carried out in anticipation of reward from outside and beyond the self. Typical extrinsic rewards are money, prizes, grades, and even certain types of positive feedback. Behaviours initiated solely to avoid punishment are also extrinsically motivated, even though numerous intrinsic benefits can ultimately accrue to those who,
instead, view punishment avoidance as a challenge that can build their sense of competence and self-determination.

Brown’s definition implies that some extrinsic behaviours may be useful for intrinsic behaviours as they aim at developing competence. According to these stated elements of extrinsic motivation, its significance in the study of receptivity can be explained with regard to receptivity to success in language learning and to all the possible rewards that a learner may get from learning other languages over his native language. The involvement in such language activities may lead to further changes in motivation, in other words extrinsic motivation may turn out to be intrinsic. In this respect Al–Busairi (1990: 31) says that as a result of achievement or positive teacher’s behaviour towards learners, extrinsic motivation will turn out to be intrinsic. This point is also very important in the study of receptivity, as we believe that the teacher’s encouragement and pleasant character are very important elements in increasing learners’ receptivity and attention.

It seems from all the stated ideas about these types of motivation that they may be integrated according to changes in learners’ interests, preferences and priorities. Assimilative motivation in this respect, and as it has been mentioned in ‘C’ above, is another type of motivation which is generally discussed in relation to integrative motivation. For its definition Al–Busairi (1990: 41) and Brown (1994: 155) consider Graham’s (1984) definition as follows:

**Assimilative motivation is:** (1) an essential part of normal language acquisition and, like the capacity for language acquisition itself, a consequence of species membership, (2) largely a peer group phenomenon, (3) the primary impetus for developing native–like speech in a second language, (4) strongest during infancy and childhood, gradually becoming weaker through adolescence and into adulthood, (5) capable of becoming disrupted even during childhood by certain external social factors.

(Graham, 1984: 77)

Assimilative motivation as it is seen in the above quotation is the desire that a second language learner has so as to be identified as a member of the target language group, and to be in continuous contact with this group. That is to say assimilative motivation is the extremist type of motivation in favour of contacts with the target language community. This idea of extremism in motivation has been explained by Al–Busairi (1990: 47) when he compares between the extremes of both instrumental and integrative motivation considering Machiavellian or manipulative motivation as an extreme of instrumental motivation, and assimilative motivation as the extreme of integrative motivation. The former is the extreme in which learners of a second language reflect negative attitudes toward the community of the second language, or the attitudes that the target language learner shows to surpass the target language culture for the sake of proficiency in that language; while the latter is the extreme in which the target language learner would like to be identified as an indistinguishable member of the target language community.

Within the discussion of assimilative motivation in the above paragraph, Machiavellian motivation has been mentioned as negative attitudes toward the target language community. This type of motivation, according to Al–Busairi (1990: 130), is connected with colonial periods as people fight the colonists to free their countries. Although those people show negative attitudes to the colonists’ communities, culture, and language, they master their language believing that the rulers’ language is one of the best weapons in the struggle against the colonists.

All these stated types of motivation lead to one conclusion that motivation is a very essential factor in language learning and teaching. Still in some other cases it is found that some
types of motivation can be mixed up, and they need further characteristics so as to be distinguished from each others. For example Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982), cited in Al–Busairi (1990: 42), have made “a distinction between integrative motivation” and what is called “social group identification motivation” which is the learner’s desire to be identified with the social group of the language. Dulay et al (1982) state this comparison between integrative motivation and social group identification motivation as follows:

*The social group identification motive is similar to the integrative but goes beyond it. Learners with an integrative motive for learning a new language would wish to participate in the social or cultural life of the target language speakers while retaining their identification with their own native language group. Learners who have social group identification motive would want social and cultural participation, but they would also want to become members of the group that speaks the new language or language variety.*

(p. 50)

It seems from this quotation that the difference between integrative motivation and social group identification motivation is the learners’ desire in the latter to be identified as members of the social group of the target language community.

In a similar study Al–Busairi (1990: 45) suggests “that in foreign language learning (FLL) situations – especially with an international target language there may be no integrative motivation by itself to acquire English, but a great deal of instrumental motivation.” A mixture of the two is, then, found to be called “integrative–instrumental motivation.” This type of motivation seems to be more practical than considering only single types of motivation, and as a result of the different needs that a learner would like to attain, such as getting a job or education or any kind of contact with the target language community. We believe that motivation can also be instru–integrative when a learner starts learning the target language for instrumental reasons, and as a result of being engaged in the experience of language learning, he/she may go on to develop additional integrative reasons.

In conclusion, it is worthwhile to mention Stevick’s (1996) types of motivation, which are academic and life motivation. The former goes back to the type of motivation, which helps one to get the right answer, to keep the teacher happy, and to enhance one’s standing in the class. For the latter Stevick (1996) says:

*Life motivations on the other hand, are virtually inexhaustible. I have sometimes heard teachers discussing how best they might “motivate” their students. A better question, I think, would be how to identify our students’ particular combinations of existing “life motivations,” and how to harness those motivations for the work at hand.*

(p. 8)

Then Stevick goes on listing some of the needs involved in life motivations, the central part of these needs is the need for security which is attained through predictability; success is one of the
components of predictability as the learner wants to feel secure when dealing with the learning/teaching experience.

Motivation according to all the mentioned types seems to be a prerequisite drive in learning and teaching languages. Therefore, in ‘E’ below the importance of motivation, as a component of receptivity in language learning success, is going to be considered, and some of the major studies in this field will be cited.

E. The Importance of Motivation, as a component of Receptivity, in Success

As it has been stated in 3. 4. A. above that motivation as a concept is well defined and classified by different researchers. However, different views have been expressed about the most influential type of motivation in language achievement. Some researchers believe that it is integrative motivation that plays the greater role in success. While others believe that it is instrumental motivation that plays the greatest part in achievement. Still others believe that a mixture of the two is the most determining factor in language attainment in particular and in any other learning and teaching contexts with other subjects than language. To prove the importance of motivation in language success some of the previous studies in this field will be discussed and correlated, then their relevance to the present study of receptivity and defensiveness will be explained.

As an initial account in the discussion of the importance of motivation in language achievement, it is logical to start with the factors that lead to success in a general perspective. Bialystok and Frohlich (1978: 327) for example have pointed out two main types of factors which are ‘hypothesized’ to be related to variations in achieved proficiency in second language. The first type of factors is related to learners’ cognitive variables such as aptitude and intelligence. The second type of factors is affective factors such as attitudes and motivation. This implies that motivation, as an affective factor is a central component of any study aims at studying success in language learning. However, the main interest of this chapter is to study the impact of the affective factors on second and foreign language learning. In 3. 2. and 3. 3. above the impact of both anxiety and self – esteem on success has been studied, and in 3. 4. E. the impact of motivation is going to be studied.

To study the impact of motivation on language achievement, bearing in mind that a lot of interest is found among researchers about which type of motivation, mainly integrative and instrumental, is more influential, some of the previous studies in this field will be stated and analysed below.

As a first encounter with studies of motivation and achievement, it is appropriate to start with one of the comprehensive studies in this area presented by Al – Busairi (1990: 101). First of all he starts with integrative motivation mentioning several studies which give the primacy to this type of motivation over instrumental motivation. As a first example he mentions Gardner and Lambert (1959) who tried to answer the question how it is possible for some people to learn a second or a foreign language while it is not possible for others to do so although they have the same chances. The researchers designed a questionnaire, which was administered to a number of subjects studying French in Montreal. The findings of this study show that it is integrative motivation that is the greatest predictor of success in French. Gardner (1960) confirmed these findings by administering the questionnaire to other subjects. Anisfield and Lambert (1961) also did the same confirmation of the findings, but it was on Jewish studying Hebrew in Montreal. In another similar study by Lambert, Gardner, Barik and Tunstall (1963) it was found that students with integrative rather than instrumental orientation in the study of French in the United States of America were more successful.

All these stated studies by Al – Busairi (1990) show the importance of integrative motivation in success in second or foreign language learning. However, Al – Busairi (1990: 109) argues that ... “it is difficult to say with confidence whether integrative motivation facilitates achievement or achievement in a second language results in the development of an integrative motivation.” We believe that success has the primacy in this respect, and to this end we have suggested, in ‘D’ above, instru – integrative motivation as another type of motivation. This implies
that the consequences of the learning experience, mainly of success, will have a great impact on the type of motivation. Al – Busairi himself (1990: 132) states this idea by saying that “Variation in attainment of proficiency/achievement in a second – language may produce change in students’ attitudes toward learning the language.”

In a similar survey across several studies of instrumental motivation Al – Busairi (1990) has cited a number of studies which support this type of motivation. For example Burstall (1974) explained her doubts about Gardner and Lambert’s results about the primacy of integrative motivation over instrumental by saying that these results could be accepted in the Canadian context where French is valued as a language and culture. Lukmani (1972) on the other hand found that female Marathi with instrumental motivation got high scores in English proficiency tests. The same result was also expressed by Kachru (1976) who said that instrumental motivation led to the international status of Indian English, and success in acquiring English. Mulla (1979) in Saudi Arabia and England (1984) at the University of Illinois came with the same result that instrumental motivation could be correlated with success in English as a foreign language.

These studies explain clearly that the two major types of motivation have been reported to be influential in success in language learning. It seems that the status of the language, second or foreign, is the most important determining factor whether integrative or instrumental motivation has the primacy in language achievement over the other. It is also obvious from the review of the previous studies that no study denies the importance of motivation in language learning success. On this point Bialystok and Frohlich (1978) say that:

*Although much of the evidence indicates a positive relationship between attitude and attained proficiency, the strength of this relationship fluctuates depending on factors relating to the learning context, for example the correlation between attitude variables and achievement tends to be higher in cases where the environment provides many opportunities to communicate with the target language group.*

(Brown 1994: 154)

Brown (1994: 154) agrees with Bialystok and Frohlich by saying that the findings of the studies validate the importance of the constructs of motivation as integrative and instrumental. Then he adds that in second language learning a monodirectional process towards either instrumental or integrative motivation is not recommended; instead, a mixture of the two seems to be appropriate. For example learning English for a ‘Chinese’ living in the United States may be a different process to that learning English in China itself. To justify this point Brown (1994: 154) says that “… *some learners in some contexts are more successful in learning a language if they are integratively oriented, and others in different contexts benefit from an instrumental orientation.*”

Al – Busairi (1990: 115) agrees with Brown (1994) on the importance of considering a mixture of integrative and instrumental motives. Then he emphasises this point by mentioning some of the studies in this field such as Anisfeld and Lambert (1961) who came out with the result that the two components of motivation, instrumental and integrative, are effective in foreign language learning due to the situation in question. Brown (1994: 154) has also mentioned that Au (1988) reported ‘twenty - seven’ studies on this mixture of integrative and instrumental motives.

The point which has been mentioned above, about the difficulty of taking just one direction in second/foreign language learning, is a good reminder of the importance of receptivity and defensiveness because all the mentioned ideas lead directly to the great correlation between receptivity and the environmental, academic, and social factors which have been mentioned in chapters two and three. However, in this section, 3. 4. E., the correlation is considered between receptivity and motivation, and the great consideration that is directed to this end is that by Allwright and Bailey (1991: 182) who state this directly when they say “It seems entirely
reasonable to suggest that motivation matters in classroom, that the most motivated learners are likely to be the most receptive ones, at least as long as the teaching meets their needs.” Then they mention the studies, which tackle both integrative, and instrumental motivation. Although they give primacy to integrative motivation, they suggest that the findings of research are very mixed with regard to the benefits of being integratively or instrumentally motivated in language learning.

It seems that integrative motivation contains more factors of receptivity, by virtue of its definition. That is to say integrative motivation involves a wider perspective of positive attitudes towards the target language, its people, culture, and the rewards that a learner gains as a result of being identified with the community of the target language. Instrumental motivation on the other hand can not be excluded because it implies that learners are receptive to the target language as it enables them to fulfill some instrumental needs.

The correlation between motivation and receptivity can also be confirmed by the empirical studies which consider the correlation between affective factors and second or foreign language achievement. For example Gardner (1980: 257) discusses the relationship between ‘affective variables and second language achievement,’ and in particular ‘attitudinal/motivational variables.’ Within this discussion he mentions the measure developed by Gardner et al (1979) for attitudes and motivation. The main components of this index contain receptivity factors such as ‘attitudes toward French Canadian, toward European French people,’ to foreign language, integrative factors to use French to communicate with the French community in Canada, motivational intensity or exerted effort to acquire the target language, the desire to learn the language, towards learning the target language, reaction to teachers, the French course, and also some instrumental factors for learning French.

A lot of the studies in the area of attitudinal/motivational variables depend greatly on Gardner’s measure. For example Al – Busairi (1990), Abu – Nawwas (1998) and Bakheit (1999) develop similar measures to study attitudes and motivation. The main findings of the studies are in favour of a mixture of both integrative and instrumental orientations; and to this end Al – Busairi (1990) has suggested “integra – instrumental” motivation.

In conclusion motivation is an important component of receptivity in second or foreign language learning. To confirm this importance it is necessary to point out that motivation is an individual learner’s drive that the teacher is expected to look forward to explore and use it in the process of second/foreign language learning. This idea has been stated clearly by Gardner (1980: 263) and Rivers (1986: 147). The former says that differences in students’ affective variables should lead to differences in treatment, in other words those who are highly motivated and those with low level of motivation. Rivers (1986: 147) believes that:

… motivation is the private domain of the learner. As educators, it is not for us to attempt to manipulate it, even for what we see as the good of the consumer. Our role is to seek to understand it. We then try to meet the needs and wants of our students with the best we can provide, thus channeling their motivation in directions that are satisfying to them. (p. 147)

It is obvious from these points mentioned by Gardner and Rivers above that teachers should do their best so as to understand their students’ motivation, and then put this understanding into practice to fulfill their learners’ needs.

From all the stated ideas about motivation, its relevance to receptivity, and its importance in second/foreign language learning, it can be emphasised that this affective factor is central in the study of second/foreign language learning. Therefore, a lot of the studies in this area have proved that motivation is an indicator of success in second/foreign language learning. However, the findings of these studies vary, from those giving primacy to integrative motivation, to those giving the primacy to instrumental motivation. It also seems that the variation in the findings is the outcome of differences in the status of the language, whether it is second or foreign, the subjects of the study and their priorities and preferences for studying other languages.
than their first language; and the variations may also be related to the tools used for collecting data.

3.5. Hypotheses

With reference to the ideas discussed in chapter two about the environmental factors which affect ‘receptivity and defensiveness’ in language learning, and the review of the related literature in this chapter; the following hypotheses are set up:

Hypothesis 1: Students who have positive attitudes toward the English language speakers, the English language classroom, and the English language teachers are expected to be more receptive than those with negative attitudes.

Hypothesis 2: Highly motivated students are more receptive than students with low level of motivation.

Hypothesis 3: Students who have high self-esteem are more receptive than students who have low self-esteem.

Hypothesis 4: Students who have a low level of anxiety are more receptive than students who have a high level of anxiety.

Hypotheses 5: Attentive students are more receptive than inattentive students.

3.6. Summary

Chapter three has been devoted for the review of the related literature in the area of affective factors such as motivation, self-esteem, and anxiety. In addition to these factors, attention has also been included. To discuss all these, the chapter has been divided into four main sections, and each section has been subdivided into other subsections.

Attention has been discussed as an indicator of receptivity. At the beginning of the section the idea of the gradual development of attention or consciousness has been discussed. The first part of section one leads to one conclusion that attention is very central in success in language learning. Therefore, it can be correlated with receptivity. Then attention has been classified according to the ideas expressed by different researchers, mainly in terms of conscious and subconscious learning. The discussion in this respect has come out with the suggestion that subconscious learning is an extremist point in conscious learning when the learner starts to internalise the system of the learnt language. Within this discussion some of the empirical studies in the area of attention have been mentioned such as Cohen’s (1981) who tried to ask students directly about their attention; and Shamim (1996) who studied attention with regard to what she called ‘the action zone’. The most important point discussed about attention is that it is expected to be related to receptivity, and that attentive learners are expected to be more receptive than inattentive learners.

The discussion has been extended to include anxiety, and the emphasis has been on the relationship between anxiety and both receptivity and defensiveness. For this end anxiety has been defined and classified mainly into two types; one is ‘facilitating’ anxiety which motivates the learner to develop an approach behaviour to the learning experience; and the second is ‘debilitating’ anxiety which in contrary lets a learner adopt an avoidance behaviour. Hence, the first can be correlated with receptivity, and the latter with defensiveness. Then trait and state anxieties have been discussed. The former implies a personal stable feature, and the latter is a less stable fright as a result of some surrounding circumstances.

In addition to the definition and classification of anxiety and its correlation with receptivity and defensiveness, anxiety has also been discussed in relation to success as a very essential component of receptivity. Some studies in the field of anxiety and success have been cited to prove the importance of anxiety in language learning success. A lot of the studies in this area have proved the great connection between a low level of anxiety and success; while a high level of anxiety is related to failure. These ideas have been mentioned by Stones (1976), Al-Busairi (1990), Greens (1993), and Twyford (2000).

Another important environmental factor of receptivity, which is communication with the members of the target language group, or with fellow learners, has been discussed in relation to anxiety in terms of communication apprehension. On this point Allwright and Bailey (1991) say
that performance activities are surrounded with stress and anxiety. Communication apprehension and its relation to anxiety has been studied by different researchers such as McCroskey (1977) who defines it as the fear which results from communicating with another person. Different studies in communication apprehension have also been discussed, and some suggestions for solving this fear of communication have also been mentioned. In the end of this section a brief conclusion has been written to maintain the assumption that anxiety is an affective factor in language learning as it leads to success in the case of facilitating anxiety, which by itself is relevant to receptivity; and anxiety may lead to failure in the case of debilitating anxiety which is expected to be related to defensiveness.

Self-esteem as an affective factor, related to receptivity, has also been discussed. First, some definitions and classifications of self-esteem have been mentioned. One of the famous definitions in this respect is that given by Coopersmith (1967) who based his definition on the evaluation that an individual gives to himself, and always tries to maintain it, it is also considered as a personal judgement of the person’s abilities and worthiness which will be shown in either verbal or expressive behaviour. Self-esteem is also a matter of evaluating the surroundings. Hence, it has been classified into several types such as general or global self-esteem which is directed to self-worth; situational or specific which is directed to particular life situations; and task self-esteem which is directed to specific task situations. All these classes of self-esteem maintain the connection between self-esteem and receptivity. Therefore, self-esteem is an element of success. Then some studies have been mentioned to prove the importance of self-esteem in language learning and teaching, and a lot of the researchers believe that self-esteem is influential in language achievement and success. One of the famous studies in this field is that done by Heyde (1979). As a conclusion for self-esteem and its relation to receptivity Collier’s (1995) ideas about self-esteem have been mentioned to prove this connection; the central point of these ideas is that self-esteem is one of the factors that help to set up a positive supporting environment for second language acquisition.

Then a discussion about motivation, its importance, and its relation, as one of the affective factors, to receptivity is outlined. Some definitions and classifications of motivation have been stated. The most important thing to be mentioned about these definitions is that the difficulty of defining motivation is the outcome of the great number of definitions rather than the lack of them. This leads to confusion in defining motivation. However, some of the famous definitions in the area of motivation have been mentioned, such as Brown’s (1994) definition, which is based on that motivation is an inner drive to approach or to avoid a certain experience. Then the different types of motivation have been mentioned, such as instrumental motivation which is developed to acquire a language for instrumental goals; integrative motivation which is the drive to learn language to be identified with the target language group. The other types of motivation are in fact revisions of the main definitions of motivation, namely instrumental and integrative, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The last two are now considered as traditional terms. The first refers to motivation to learn the language for something inherent in the language itself; while the latter is the motive to learn the language for something outside the language. The other types of motivation can be seen as extremes of instrumental and integrative motivation. For example assimilative motivation is an extreme of integrative motivation which is generally defined as the drive, a second language learner shows to be identified, and also to be in continuous contact with the target language group. Machiavellian or manipulative motivation, on the other hand, is the extreme of instrumental motivation whereby the learners show negative attitudes toward the target language group, but at the same time try to gain proficiency in the target language.

In addition to these definitions and classifications of motivation some studies on motivation have been mentioned to establish the correlation between receptivity and motivation. A lot of the studies show that integrative motivation is the most influential element in second/foreign language learning. While some other studies explain that it is instrumental motivation which has the greatest role in second/foreign language learning. However, it seems that the differences in the results go back to the nature of the study, its tools, population and the status of the language whether second or foreign. It seems that the two types of motivation are related to receptivity because receptivity is a concept that covers a wider perspective of factors, which range from the language itself, its people, and all the environmental factors that surround the language.
Finally the chapter has been concluded by setting up some hypotheses which are based on the need and the objectives stated in chapter one, the theoretical framework in chapter two, and the review of the related literature in this chapter.

After setting the theoretical framework, and reviewing the related literature to the present study; chapters four and five will be devoted to the description of the methodology, and the analysis and discussion of the main findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

4.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology that was used to explore the role of receptivity, and defensiveness in communicative language learning and teaching. First, description of the subjects (section 4.1.1), and the students’ questionnaire as the only data gathering instrument used (section 4.1.2.) are presented. Second, the procedures for data collection are outlined (section 4.1.3). Third the estimation of the reliability of the measuring instrument is explained (section 4.2.1). Fourth validity is explained (section 4.2.2.). Finally, techniques of data analysis and discussion are outlined (section 4.2.3).
4. 1. Methods

4. 1. 1. Subjects

The subjects of this study, were 210 of both sexes, as shown in table (4. 1) below. They are university students majoring in English language at the Faculties of Arts and Education at the Omdurman Islamic University and the Faculty of Education at the University of Khartoum.

Table (4. 1.)

The distribution of the subjects according to university, faculty, year and sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Omdurman Islamic University</td>
<td>Education Arts</td>
<td>Fourth = Fifth</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our choice of students enrolled in final classes and majoring in English was mainly based on their level of proficiency, that is they are perceived as advanced English learners who suffer no great communicative problems in English language. The results obtained from such students may provide useful insights that can be applied on students in other lower levels of proficiency.

4. 1. 2. Measuring Instruments

This section describes the measuring instrument that was developed for the purpose of the main study. The students’ questionnaire was slightly adapted from Al – Busairi’s (1990) Self – esteem, Anxiety, and Motivational Intensity Scales (See Appendix I A, I B and I C), and the items related to Attention and Receptivity Scales were developed by the researcher from some suggested questions by Allwright and Bailey (1991), and Shamim (1996).
The modified questionnaire, ‘Receptivity Index’ (Appendix I), consists of 35 questions. However, the following questions are subdivided as follows: 30 (a, b, c, d, e, f), 33 (a, b, c), 34 (a, b), and 35 (a, b, c, d). By these sub-questions the total of all the questions becomes 46. The questionnaire is subdivided into five scales. The first scale which was adapted from Al-Busairi (1990) (Appendix I A), is made of four questions (1 – 4) which are devoted to Self-esteem Scale. The questions are assigned numerical values ranging from 5, for the greatest value, to 1 for the least value.

Secondly, the Anxiety Scale, which was also adapted from Al-Busairi (1990) (Appendix I B) consists of five statements (items 5 – 9). These statements are also given five-point scales with 5 as the greatest value to indicate a high level of anxiety, and 1 as the lowest value to indicate a low level of anxiety.

The Motivational Intensity Scale is the third part which was also adapted from Al-Busairi (1990) (Appendix I C) (Items 10 – 20). This scale is made of 11 statements, which are
followed by five options for each with 5 for the highest motivational value and 1 for the lowest value.

For the measurement of attention, five items have been developed by the researcher from some suggested questions given by Allwright and Bailey (1991), and Shamim (1996) (items 21 – 25). The Attention Scale has also been given five – point scales with 5 as the highest value to indicate a high level of attention, and 1 to indicate a low level of attention.

Finally, the last part of the questionnaire is the Receptivity Scale, which consists of 10 items (26 – 35). Items 30, 33, 34, and 35 have been further divided into the subdivisions, a, b, c, d, e, f and, a, b, c and, a, b, and a, b, c, d respectively. The items of this scale were adapted from Allwright and Bailey’s study (1991) and Shamim’s study (1996). Each item is followed by five – point scales, the highest of which is 5 to indicate a high level of receptivity, while 1 indicates the lowest level of receptivity.

These five scales of the questionnaire have been adapted from the different studies reviewed in chapters two and three because of their discriminatory power in these studies, and for their relevance to the present study, and because they are direct measures. The value of the direct measures is that they are powerful predictors, and they help the researcher to reach to the same respondents’ interpretations Pierson et al. (1980); Gardner and Lambert (1972); Lambert (1978); and Al – Busairi (1990). For these five scales a full description is found below:

A. Self – esteem Scale

The Self – esteem Scale is made up of four questions (1 – 4, Appendix I A), rated according to five – point scale with 5 for the highest value and 1 for the lowest one. The maximum score for all the items in this scale is 20 to indicate a high level of self – esteem, and the minimum score is 4 to indicate a low level of self – esteem. The questions ask about the student’s overall
English proficiency, the expected grade in the final examinations, and the student’s speaking ability of English inside and outside the classroom with English – speaking friends or foreigners. The students were asked to rate their responses on a Likert Scale running from (excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, fair = 2, and bad = 1).

B. Anxiety Scale

The Anxiety Scale is made up of five statements (Items 5 to 9, Appendix I B). The statements are assigned numerical values, which range from 5, to indicate a high level of anxiety, to 1, which indicates a low level of anxiety. A maximum of 25 points indicates a high level of anxiety, and five points, on the other hand, indicate a low level of anxiety. The items of this scale ask about if the student feels more anxious than others in the English lesson, more anxious in English lessons than other subjects, if he/she feels funny if he/she has to speak up in front of class, and if he is afraid of making mistakes when answering the teacher’s questions. The subjects were asked to rate their feeling by putting a tick against one of the options which run
from (definitely my feeling = 5, pretty much my feeling = 4, slightly my feeling = 3, not very much my feeling = 2, and definitely not my feeling = 1).

C. Motivational Intensity Scale

The Motivational Intensity Scale consists of 11 multiple-choice questions (Items 10 up to 20, Appendix I C), each followed by five options for each. The questions are assigned five-point numerical values, which range from 5 as the highest value to 1 as the lowest value. A maximum of 55 indicates a high level of motivational intensity, and 11 indicates a low level of motivational intensity in studying and learning English. The questions were intended to ask the students about their likes and dislikes of English language, and the ease or difficulty in comparison with other subjects (Items 10, 11). Item number 12 is about how frequent the student speaks English. Items 13 and 14 ask about the student’s attendance of English lessons, and his/her interest in studying English. Item 15 asks about the effort the student exerts in studying English somewhere if it is not a recommended subject at school. Items 16 and 17 are about the
student’s interest in what is taught in class and how he/she studies English. Items 18, 19 and 20 ask about the student’s reaction toward doing English assignments, his/her reaction towards English lessons, and to what extent the student is ready for class.

Attention Scale

The Attention Scale is made up of five statements (Items 21 - 25, Appendix I D), arranged in a five-point scale ranging from 5 as the highest value to 1 as the lowest value. A maximum of 25 scores indicate a high level of attention, and 5 indicates a low level of attention. The options run from (definitely my feeling = 5, pretty much my feeling = 4, slightly my feeling = 3, not very much my feeling = 2. And definitely not my feeling = 1). Item 21 asks about the influence of the teacher’s increased attention on his/her students. Item number 22 is about the student’s distraction inside the classroom, items 23, 24 are about the student’s location in the classroom and its influence on his/her attention and on the teacher’s attention of the
student. Finally item 25 is about the teacher’s pleasant character and its influence on the student’s attention.

E. Receptivity Scale

The Receptivity Scale consists of 10 main items (Items 26 – 35, Appendix I E). However, item 30 is further divided into a, b, c, d, and e, 33 into a, b, 34 into a, b, and 35 into a, b, c, and d. The options run from (absolutely agree = 5, agree = 4, disagree = 3, absolutely disagree = 2, and no opinion = 1). A maximum of 105 points indicates a high level of receptivity, and a minimum of 21 the lowest level. Items 26, 27, 28, 29 elicit if students find learning English attractive, if they feel at ease when speaking with native speakers, if they find the life of native speakers attractive, if they enjoy speaking with nonnative speakers, respectively. Item 30 and its subdivisions a, b, c, d, e, and f ask about what increases the learner’s enthusiasm to learn English when he/she gets positive teacher’s behaviour and attitudes; when the course contents and materials satisfy his/her language needs; when he/she obtains high scores in English language tests; when he/she finds him/herself able to
communicate fluently with native speakers; when his/her fellow learners make the classroom an interesting place to study in; and finally when the classroom environment is encouraging. Item 31 asks if a good language learner finds difficulty to get along with others, and item 32 asks if one does better when the way of teaching matches his/her learning style. Item 33 asks about what prevents the learner from working with other learners because of their low proficiency, because he/she gains nothing from interacting with them, or because he/she feels demoralised by their performance. Item 34 a and b response to the teacher’s characteristics that may have negative impact on the learning experience such as the teacher’s talking time, and whether the learner learns from him/her at all. Item 35 and its subdivisions a, b, c, and d are concerned with the reasons for not liking the course contents either because they are not relevant, do not match the learner’s expectation, presented in the teaching process in a way that the learner does not like, or because they do not include explanations or illustrations.

4. 2. Procedures
The final copies of the 35-item questionnaire which was designed for the purpose of this study were distributed (November 2002) by the researcher and his colleagues at the Faculties of Education and Arts at Omdurman Islamic University, and by the head of the Department of English Language at the Faculty of Education at the University of Khartoum so as to be on the same day to all students enrolled in the fourth and fifth years majoring in English Language. The students were told to complete the questionnaire in about 30 minutes of the class time. They were also told verbally that the questionnaire constitutes an important part of a study by the present researcher hoping that it may project some indicators for improving learning and teaching English communicatively, and that their answers would be given complete confidentiality and no one except the researcher would have access to their answers.

The subjects were told to choose only one option by putting a tick on the option margin that best represents their opinions. Of these distributed copies of the questionnaire a total of 210 were collected because the lecturers failed to meet with
their students, and other students did not complete the questionnaire (mainly fourth year students at the Faculty of Education at the University of Khartoum), because the academic year was suspended at that time for some security processes.

When the data were collected, they were statistically processed, tabulated and appended to this thesis. The raw data are available on a file kept by the researcher.

4. 3. Reliability

Reliability is known as the extent to which the obtained results can be considered consistent or stable. The reliability of any test can generally be estimated by three ways: Test – retest reliability by which the same test is administered twice to the same group of subjects, then the scores obtained in the two administrations of the test will be correlated. The correlation coefficient obtained is the reliability.

The second method for estimating reliability is called equivalent forms reliability by which two equivalent tests will be administered to the same group of subjects, and then the
correlation coefficient between the two tests will be calculated to get reliability.

The third method is internal consistency reliability in which the estimation of reliability is based on the same test by administering its items to two separate groups. There are many ways for estimating reliability. However, the easiest and most common one is the split – half method, in which the questions are split in two halves. The even and the odd numbers of the items constitute the two halves of the test. Then each half is administered to two equal groups of subjects.

To estimate reliability in the present study, a pilot study was run on a sample of 30 female students majoring in English in the fourth year in the Faculty of Arts at Omdurman Islamic University. The students were divided into two equal groups, 15 of them responded to the 23 odd numbers of the items of the questionnaire, and 15 of them to the 23 even items. After administering the questionnaire the scores obtained by the students were computed to get the correlation coefficient between these two sets of scores using Pearson’s correlation coefficient formula. The obtained reliability was .91.
4. 4. Statistical Methods of Analysis

For data analysis and discussion the package of statistical analysis, mainly frequency, percentage, means, and formulae of correlation coefficient among the scales of the questionnaire will be used.

4. 5. Summary

This chapter presented the methodology of the present research. To this end the chapter has been divided to five sections. The methods of the study have been introduced at the beginning. A description of the subjects of the study, followed by a description of the measuring instruments, and after this a full description of the instruments: self – esteem, anxiety, motivational intensity, attention, and receptivity scales respectively. The discussion of the procedures of the questionnaire has also been explained. The third section has been devoted to the explanation of the estimation of reliability. The last section has been devoted to the explanation of the
statistical methods used for analysing and discussing data.

Finally chapter four has been concluded by a summary.

After presenting the methodology on which the study will proceed, chapter five will come next for the analysis, discussion, and interpretation of the main findings of the present study.
CHAPTER FIVE

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS, AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will be devoted to the analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire, presentation and discussion of the main findings. First, the analysis and the results on self-esteem and its correlation with receptivity and defensiveness were discussed (Section 5.1.1). The main findings of anxiety, with reference to facilitating anxiety as related to receptivity, and debilitating anxiety related to defensiveness, is outlined (Section 5.1.2). The analysis and discussion of motivational intensity as an affective factor, and a component of receptivity, is presented, with regard to the positive attitudes that learners may have toward English as their target language (Section 5.1.3). The analysis and discussion of attention and its relevance to receptivity is outlined (Section 5.1.4). The analysis and discussion of receptivity scale, concerning the learner’s positive attitudes toward some of the related factors to the learning
environment and all the surrounding factors, which are believed to be of great importance to the learner’s receptivity to the experience of learning English as a second/foreign language, are presented (Section 5.1.5.). In section two the main findings of the analysis and discussion of the correlation coefficient between the scales of the questionnaire are presented in statistical terms (Section 5.2). The results will be discussed in terms of the hypotheses of the study (Section 5.3). The chapter ends with a summary (Section 5.4).

5. 1. Results, Analysis and Discussion

5. 1. 1. Self – esteem

The Self – esteem scale was, as a whole, assigned high scores. Table (5.1) and Ordinal scale 1 below give a summary of the questions and answers in terms of means, rank, frequency and percentage.

From the ratings stated in ordinal scale 1 it is clear that the students responded positively to all the items of this scale (Mean above 3.00). The highest rank is assigned to item number 2 which asks about the grades expected by the students
at the final examinations (M = 3.886). 42 respondents expected to get excellent (20%), 109 (51.90%) very good, 53 (25.24%) good, 5 (2.38) fair, and only 1 student (.48%) expected to get a bad grade.

The second rank is assigned to item number 1, which asks about the student’s rating of his/her overall English proficiency (M =3.381). 21 of the students (10%) said that their English proficiency is excellent. 58 (27.62%) said that their English proficiency is very good. 111 students (52.86%) said that their overall English proficiency is good. Only 20 students (9.52%) said that their overall English proficiency is fair, and no one of the students said that his/her English proficiency is bad.

The obtained results from this item reveal that the greatest number of the students rated their English proficiency mainly as good. This indicates that they have a high level of self-confidence concerning their English proficiency.

The third rank in the self–esteem scale is assigned to item number 3 ‘ rating one’s speaking ability of English in the classroom’ (M = 3.3). 17 students
### Table (5.1)

**Frequency and Percentage of Self – Esteem Scale (Questions 1-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rating overall English proficiency.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The expected final examinations grade.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rating speaking ability inside the classroom.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rating speaking ability outside the classroom.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent  
4 = Very good  
3 = Good  
2 = Fair  
1 = Bad

### Ordinal Scale 1 (Derived from Table 5.1 above)

**Means, and Ranks of Self - Esteem Scale (questions 1-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>The questions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rating overall English proficiency.</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The expected final examinations grade.</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rating speaking ability inside the classroom.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rating speaking ability outside the classroom.</td>
<td>3.176</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(8.10%) said that their speaking ability of English inside the classroom is excellent. 67 students (31.90%) said their speaking ability is very good. 93 students (44.29%) said it is good. 28 (13.33%) said that their speaking ability is fair. 5 students (2.38%) said it is bad. This result indicates that the students’ self-esteem about their speaking ability inside the classroom is high.

The last rank position is assigned to the last item, which asks about the ‘student’s speaking ability outside the classroom if they ever have had the chance to speak with either English – speaking friends, or with foreigners (M = 3.176). 16 students (7.62%) said that their speaking ability outside the classroom is excellent. 55 students (26.19%) said it is very good, 101 (48.10%) said it is good. 26 students (12.38%) said it is fair, and 12 (5.71%) of them said it is bad. It is understandable why this item is ranked the lowest. Students in Sudan have hardly the chance to speak in English outside the classroom (except perhaps with VSO or with some English teachers at some universities or at the British Council).
It is obvious from rating the mean scores assigned to the self–esteem items that the students rated themselves as having high self–esteem.

5.1.2. Anxiety

The Anxiety scale was, as the whole, assigned low scores. A summary of the statements and responses relevant to this scale is presented in Table (5.2) and Ordinal Scale 2 below.

Item number 8 ‘I feel funny inside if I have to stand up and speak in front of class’ was assigned the first rank (M = 2.9). 63 (30%) students said that statement ‘8’ represents definitely their feeling. 23 (10.95%) said the statement represents pretty much their feeling. 21 (10%) students said the statement represents slightly their feeling. 36 (17.14%) students said the statement does not represent very much their feeling. The last option, definitely not my feeling, was chosen by 67 (31.91%) students. This result can be interpreted in the light of the structure of the Sudanese society,
Table (5.2)

Frequency and Percentage of Anxiety Scale (Questions 5 – 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I worry when my teacher asks questions.</td>
<td>35 16.67</td>
<td>36 17.14</td>
<td>34 16.19</td>
<td>55 26.19</td>
<td>50 23.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I worry about English than other students.</td>
<td>20 9.52</td>
<td>19 9.05</td>
<td>27 12.86</td>
<td>53 25.24</td>
<td>91 43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I worry about English lessons.</td>
<td>21 10</td>
<td>19 9.05</td>
<td>21 10</td>
<td>50 23.81</td>
<td>99 47.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel funny.</td>
<td>63 30</td>
<td>23 10.95</td>
<td>21 10</td>
<td>36 17.14</td>
<td>67 31.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Definitely my feeling
4 = Pretty much my feeling
3 = Slightly my feeling
2 = Not very much my feeling
1 = Definitely not my feeling.

Ordinal Scale 2 (derived from Table 5.2 above)

Means, and Ranks of Anxiety Scale (Questions 5 – 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>The statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I worry when my teacher asks questions.</td>
<td>2.767</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I worry about English than other students.</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I worry more about English lessons.</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I feel funny.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I dread making mistakes.</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in which feeling funny in cases of addressing people is a common phenomenon, and the Sudanese society is generally known as serious in such situations; moreover, the fun expected of such situations is due to fear of making mistakes or not to be able to select the appropriate forms of address for the context at hand. This result can also be correlated with the reasons that lead to communication apprehension as mentioned in chapters two and three.

Item number 5 ‘I worry when my English teacher says he/she is going to ask us questions to find how much we know’ was assigned the second rank (M = 2.767). 35 (16.67%) students chose definitely my feeling; 36 (17.14%) pretty much my feeling; and the majority of the students chose the last three options, slightly my feeling, not very much my feeling and definitely not my feeling. The result reveals that some students (33.81%) feel worried when the teacher asks them, on the other hand other students (66.19%) do not have a low level of anxiety.

The last three ranks were assigned to items 9 ‘I dread making mistakes’, 6 ‘I worry more about English lessons than other students’, and item number 7, ‘I worry more about English lessons than about other subjects’. The results obtained from these items indicate a low level of anxiety because the majority of the students said that the statements do not represent their
feelings. For example the students’ responses for item number 7 as 21 (10%) of the students said that the statement represents definitely their feeling of anxiety; 19 (9.05%) of them chose pretty much my feeling; slightly my feeling was chosen by 21 (10%); the rest of the students (149 = 70.95%) chose not very much my feeling, and definitely not my feeling.

The responses to the anxiety scale as a whole indicate that the level of this sample of students’ anxiety is low, except for item number 8 about ‘the student’s feeling of fun if he has to stand up and speak in front of the class’. This item received the highest mean (2.9), and option number 1 ‘definitely my feeling’ was chosen by most of the students 63 (30%) compared with 35 (16.67%), 27 (12.86%), 20 (9.52%), and 21 (10%) for the rest of the statements; and this is natural in a society such as the Sudanese society in as we have said at the outset of this section.

5. 1. 3. Motivational Intensity

The motivational intensity scale consists of 11 statements each followed by five options from which students were asked to choose the best option that best completes the statement. Table (5. 3) and Ordinal Scale 3 below provide a summary of the students’ responses to all the statements. The
means for the items (18, 10, 19, 17, 20, and 16), which were
assigned the first six ranks, are above 4, and for the next four
ranks (items 11, 12, 13, and 14) above 3; and for the last rank
item number 15 it is 2.829..

The first rank is assigned to item number 18, which
asks about 'the student’s reaction towards doing his/her English
assignment' (M = 4.571). 146 of the students (69.52%) said they
do it immediately when they start their work. This high
frequency of responses reveals the students’ interest in doing
their assignments immediately, which is also an indication of
their interest in the language. However, 45 (21.43%) students
said that they would put their assignments off until they finish
other homework. Only 15 (7.14%) students said ‘they would
become completely bored’. Only 4 (1.91-%) students chose the
last two options ’ask a friend to do it’, and ’forget all about it’.
The result reveals that the majority of the students who
constituted the sample of the study would do their assignments
either immediately after the lesson, or after finishing the
assignments of the other subjects.
The second rank was assigned to item number 10 which is about ‘the student’s likeness of English compared with the other subjects’ (M = 4.410). The majority of the students, 115 (54.76%) said that they like English more than all other subjects. 66 (31.43%), of the students said they like English more than most other subjects. The rest of the students, 29 (13.81%), said they like English as much as other subjects. On the other hand no one chose the last two options, ’dislike English more than other subjects’, or ’don’t like English at all’. The result reveals that the students like English more than other subjects.

The third rank in Ordinal scale 3 was assigned to item number 19, which is about ‘the student’s behaviour during English classes’ (M = 4.386). The greatest number of the students, a total of 128 (60.95%) said ‘they become completely absorbed in the subject matter during English classes’. 48 (22.86%) chose the second option ‘sometimes have a tendency to daydreams’. 21 (10%) chose ‘always have a tendency to daydreams’. Finally 13 (6.19%) of them said that ‘they sometimes become bored’ (Item 19, option d). On the other hand no one chose the last option (Item 19, option e), ‘become completely bored’. The
obtained results reveal that the majority of the students behave in a positive way during English classes, and in most cases they become completely absorbed in the subject matter of the class.

Items number 17, 20, 16, 11, 12, 13, and 14 are assigned the ranks 4 to 10, respectively with high mean values and positive students’ responses which reveal students’ interest in English, and positive attitudes toward learning it. However, item number 15, which asks about ‘the student’s opinions if English were not taught at schools’, is assigned the bottom rank ($M = 2.829$). The greatest number of the students, 107 (50.95%), chose the first option (Item 15,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10- Compared to other subjects, I ----</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Compared to other subjects, English is ----</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- I try to speak in English ----</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- When I miss an English lesson, it is</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>66.19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>The questions</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Compared to other subjects, I---</td>
<td>4.410</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Compared to other subjects English is.......</td>
<td>3.871</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I try to speak in English ...</td>
<td>3.871</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>When I miss an English lesson, it is because.....</td>
<td>3.776</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Compared to other students in my class, I think I ---</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinal Scale 3 (derived from Table 5.3 above)
Means, and Ranks of Motivational Intensity Scale (items 10 - 20)
option a) 'try to obtain English lessons somewhere else such as night schools'. 61 (29.05%) of them said that 'they would study English at home from books' (15 b). For 'picking up English in everyday situations' (15 c), 32 of the students (15.24%) agreed with this statement. Only 9 (4.28%) said 'they would pick up English from time to time only when the need arouse' (15 d). Only one student said he 'would be happy if English were not taught at school'. The results of this item reveal clearly the overall students' interest in English language,
and the effort that they would do to learn it if it were not a subject at school.

All the obtained results from the motivational intensity scale show that the students who participated in this study have positive attitudes toward English, and willing to exert considerable effort in learning it.

5. 1. 4. Attention Scale

The Attention scale consists of five statements (Items, 21 – 25), which are rated in a five – point Likert Scale running from 5 for definitely my feeling, 4 pretty much my feeling, slightly my feeling, 2 not very much my feeling, and 1 definitely not my feeling. The attention scale was, as a whole, assigned high scores (means above 3 except for item number 24, mean 2.129). Table (5. 4) and Ordinal scale number 4 present a summary of the answers to five items, and their ratings.

The first rank is assigned to item number 21 (M = 4.048). This item is about ‘the impact of the increased teacher’s attention on the learner whether it increases his/her attention or
not’. In response to this item 112 students (53.33%) agreed that the statement ‘the increased teacher’s attention on them increases their own attention’ expresses definitely their feeling. As to the second option, 42 (20%) that ‘the increased teacher’s attention for them increases their own attention’ is pretty much their feeling. The third option, ‘slightly my feeling’, was chosen by 22 (10.48%). The last two options, not very much my feeling, definitely not my feeling were chosen by 34 (16.19%). These results indicate that the majority of the students feel that the increased teacher’s attention increases their own attention.

The second rank is assigned to item number 23, which is about the students’ preference of sitting at the front row in the classroom because it makes them feel more attentive than sitting at the back (M = 3.871).106 (50.48%) said that this statement ‘represents definitely their feeling’, 39 (18.57%) ‘pretty much my feeling’. ‘Slightly my feeling’, was chosen by 20 students (9.52%). ‘Not very much my feeling’ was chosen by 22 students (10.48%), and ‘definitely not my feeling’ was chosen by 23 (10.95%). This result confirms the view which says that the student’s location at the front of the classroom allows him/her to be more attentive than at the back of the class. For one reason, this
location keeps the student away from all the physiological deficiencies such as of sight or hearing, and for another, the student will be under direct control by the teacher. The influence of the student’s location at the front of the class, on his/her attention, seems to come only from the physical aspect that this place gives the student a better chance to see and to hear in a proper way as it will be clear from the discussion of the other items relevant to the location of the student.

### Table (5. 4)

**Frequency and Percentage of Attention Scale**

(Items 21 – 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- The increased teacher’s attention for me increases my own attention.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Nothing distracts me from learning.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I sit at the front row to be attentive.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50.48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. I sit at the front row because teachers do not take care of students at the back.

25. The teacher’s pleasant personality increases my attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>The Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The increased teacher’s attention for me increases my own attention.</td>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nothing distracts me from learning.</td>
<td>3.443</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I sit at the front row to be attentive.</td>
<td>3.871</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I always sit at the front row because teachers do not take care of students at the back.</td>
<td>2.129</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Definitely my feeling
4 = Pretty much my feeling
3 = Slightly my feeling
2 = Not very much my feeling
1 = Definitely not my feeling
The third rank is assigned to item number 25, which is about the teacher’s pleasant personality in increasing the learner’s attention, (M = 3.833). 99 (47.14%) students chose the first option, ‘definitely my feeling’. That is to say in this view the ‘teacher’s pleasant personality increases their attention. 39 of them (18.57%) said the statement ‘the teacher’s pleasant personality increases their attention’ represents pretty much their feeling. ’Slightly my feeling’ was chosen by 29 (13.81%). 24 (11.43%) chose the fourth option, ‘not very much my feeling’; and 19 of them (9.05%) chose the last option ‘definitely not my feeling’. Therefore, the overall obtained responses confirm the importance of the teacher’s pleasant personality in increasing the learners’ attention.

The fourth rank is assigned to item number 22, ‘nothing distracts me from learning in a good way’ (M = 3.443). The responses to this statement were: 68 (32.38%) students chose ‘definitely my feeling’. 50 (23.81) students chose the
second option 'pretty much my feeling'. 'Slightly my feeling'
was chosen by 31 (14.76%) of the students. The last two options,
'not very much my feeling, and definitely not my feeling', were
chosen by 61 (29.05%) of the students. Therefore, a greater
number of the students agreed with the statement, 'nothing
distracts me from learning in a good way', and this indicates that
the students' attention is a very essential component for
learning in a good way.

The last rank is assigned to item number 24 (M = 2.129),
'I always sit at the front row because teachers do not take care
of students at the back of the class'. At the outset this item is
closely related to item number 23, which has been assigned the
second rank in the scale; that is the students prefer to sit at the
front row as a result of the privilege provided by this location as
a place where students can see and hear in a good way, and
their choice of this place is not affected by other factors. The
responses for this statement were: only 16 (7.62%) of the
students chose 'definitely my feeling'. 27 and 12.86% of them
chose the second option, 'pretty much my feeling'. 'Slightly my
feeling' was chosen by 28 (13.33%) of the students. The last two
options, ‘not very much my feeling and definitely not my feeling’, were chosen by the majority of the students, 139 (66.19%). This result indicates that the students choose to sit at the front row not because teachers take care of the students at that place, but because the place itself is a good place for following lessons and activities without any physiological deficiency that may affect, for example hearing and sight.

The results obtained from the Attention Scale reveal that attention is very important in language learning and teaching, and the students’ responses to all the statements were high (Means over 3.00). Some of the responses seem to complete each others, mainly in the case of items 23, and 24 which ask about the ‘influence of the student’s location at the front row on attention, and whether it is affected by the teacher’s behaviour or not’. The obtained results to these two statements reveal that the importance of this location comes from its physical advantage as a good place for seeing and hearing.

5. 1. 5. Receptivity Scale
The Receptivity Scale consists of 21 statements (Items 26 – 35). Items 30, 33, 34 and 35 are subdivided to a, b, ... etc. The statements are followed by a five – point Likert Scale running from 5 absolutely agree, 4 agree, 3 disagree, 2 absolutely disagree, to 1 no opinion. Table (5. 5) and Ordinal scale 5 above present a summary of answers to the statements and their ratings. The receptivity scale was, a whole, assigned high scores (Means above 3 except for the items 35 – b, 34 – b, 35 – c & d, 33 – b, a & c, means above 2.5).

The first rank is assigned to item number 26, which asks 'whether English is attractive for the student or not' (M = 4.505). The students' responses were: 127 (60.48%) of them chose 'absolutely agree'; 74 (36.24%) 'agree', only 3 students (1.43%) chose 'disagree', and 6 of them (2.85%) chose the last option, 'no opinion'. The results obtained from this item reveal that learning English is attractive for almost all the respondents who participated in this study.

The second rank is assigned to item number 32, 'I do better in classes where the way of teaching matches my own learning style' (M = 4.071). 78 of the students (37.14%) said that
they ‘absolutely agree’ with the view that ‘they do better in classes where the way of teaching matches their own learning style’. 98 (46.67%) chose the second option ‘agree’. Only 19 (9.05%) of the students said they ‘disagree’ with the statement, 1 (.48%) student chose ‘absolutely disagree’, and 14 (6.66%) said they have no opinion. The overall obtained results confirm the importance of the correlation between the way of teaching and the learner’s learning style.

Item number 28 is assigned the third rank (M = 4.014). This item is concerned with ‘the attraction that a learner feels towards the life of English – speaking people’. 82 (39.05%) of the students chose the first option ‘absolutely agree’. 85 (40.48%) of them chose ‘agree’. 21 (19%) of the students said they ‘disagree’. Only 8 (3.81%) students said they ‘absolutely disagree’. 14 (6.66%) students chose ‘No opinion’. From all these obtained results, it is obvious that the majority of the students agreed that the statement ‘the life of English – speaking people is attractive to them’ represents their feeling.
The fourth rank is assigned to item number 29, which is about ‘the enjoyment that learners find in communicating with others, for example nonnative speakers, in English’ (M = 3.962). The first option, ‘absolutely agree’, was chosen by 72 (34.28%) of the students. The greatest number of the students, 93 (44.29%) accepted the second option ‘agree’. 22 (10.48%) chose ‘disagree’. Only 11 (5.24%) of them said they ‘absolutely disagree’, and 12 (5.71%) said they have no opinion. From the results mentioned it is obvious that the majority of the students agreed with the statement that they enjoy communicating with others in English.

Item number 30 – ‘a’, which is about ‘the student’s increase of enthusiasm when the teacher’s behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. I find learning English attractive.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>60.48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am at ease with speakers of English.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The life of English speaking people is attractive to me.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I enjoy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
communicating with others in English.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. a. My enthusiasm increases when the teacher's behaviour and attitudes are positive towards me.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. b. The course contents and materials satisfy my language needs.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. c. I get high scores in English language tests.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. d. I find myself able to communicate fluently with native speakers.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. e. My fellow learners make the classroom an interesting place to study in.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. f. Classroom environment is encouraging.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am a good language learner, yet I find it difficult to get along with other people.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I do better in classes where the</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
way of teaching matches my own learning style.

33. a. I may not work with other students because: they are less proficient than I am.

33. b. I have nothing to gain from interacting with them.

33. c. I feel demoralised by their performance.

34. The teacher may have negative impact if: a. he/she speaks all the time.

34. b. I learn very little from him.

35. a. I don’t like the course contents because they: are not relevant to my needs.

35. b. do not match my expectation.
35. c. are presented in the teaching process in a way that I don't like.

35. d. do not include explanations or illustrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>The Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I find learning English attractive.</td>
<td>4.505</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am at ease with speakers of English.</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The life of English – speaking people is attractive to me.</td>
<td>4.014</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I enjoy communicating with others (nonnative speakers) in English.</td>
<td>3.962</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – a</td>
<td>My enthusiasm to learn English increases when the</td>
<td>3.919</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's behaviour and attitudes are positive towards me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course contents and materials satisfy my language needs.</td>
<td>3.719</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get high scores in English language tests.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself able to communicate fluently with native speakers.</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow learners make the classroom an interesting place to study in.</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment is encouraging.</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a good language learner, yet I find it difficult to get along with other people.</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do better in classes where the way of teaching matches my own learning style.</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may not work with other students because: they are less proficient than I am.</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have nothing to gain from interacting with them.</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>IXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel demoralised by their performance.</td>
<td>2.514</td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher may have negative impact if: he/she speaks all the time.</td>
<td>3.548</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn very little from him.</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the course contents because they: are not relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>3.014</td>
<td>IVX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not match my expectation.</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are presented in the teaching</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and attitudes are positive towards him/her’, is assigned the fifth rank ($M = 3.919$). The students’ responses were: 100 (47.62%) students chose ‘absolutely agree’. ‘Agree’ was chosen by 54 (25.72%). 18 (8.57%) of them chose ‘disagree’. 15 (7.14%) students said they ‘absolutely disagree’, and 23 (10.95%) of them chose ‘no opinion’. The results obtained from this item reveal that a lot of the students accepted the statement that their enthusiasm increases with the teacher’s positive behaviour and attitudes towards them.

The sixth rank is assigned to item number 30 – ‘e’ ($M = 3.819$). It is about ‘the learner’s increased enthusiasm when his/her fellow learners make the classroom an interesting place to study in’. The responses were: 155 (73.81%) students chose the first two options, ‘absolutely agree and agree’. 25 (11.90%) of them said they ‘disagree’. Only 3 (1.43%) of the students said they ‘absolutely disagree’, and 27 (12.36%) chose ‘no opinion’. The results reveal that the class fellow learners have a great impact on increasing the learner’s enthusiasm to learn.
The seventh rank is assigned to item number 30 – ‘d’, ‘I find myself able to communicate fluently with native speakers’, \((M = 3.786)\). The students’ responses were: the first option, ‘absolutely agree’, was chosen by 53 (25.23%) students. The greater number of the students, 108 (51.43%) chose ‘agree’. 22 (10.48%) students chose ‘disagree’. Only 5 (2.38%) students chose ‘absolutely disagree’. No opinion was chosen by 22 (10.48%) of the students. It is obvious that the majority of the students chose the first two options, ‘absolutely agree and agree’, to say that the statement indicates that their enthusiasm to learn English increases when they find themselves able to communicate fluently with native speakers.

The eighth rank is assigned to item number 27, I am at ease with speakers of English, \((M = 3.729)\). The students’ responses were: 56 (26.67%) of them said they ‘absolutely agree’ that the statement ‘they are at ease with speakers of English’, represents actually their feeling. The greater number of the students, 101 (48.09%) said they ’agree’, 22 (10.48%) ’disagree’, and for the last two options, only 2 (.95%) of the students chose they ‘absolutely disagree’, and 29 (13.81%) of
them chose no opinion. The overall results reveal that the students agreed with the statement that 'they are at ease with speakers of English'.

Item number 30 – ‘b’ is assigned the ninth rank ($M = 3.719$). This item is about 'the influence of the course contents and materials, which satisfy the student’s language needs, on increasing his/her enthusiasm to learn English’. 62 (29.52%) of the students agreed with the first option, 'absolutely agree'. The second option, 'agree', was chosen by 88 (41.90%) students. The third option, 'disagree', was chosen by 24 (11.43%) students. Only 11 (5.24%) students said they 'absolutely disagree' with the statement. No opinion was chosen by 25 (11.91%) of the students. At the outset the results reveal that the students’ enthusiasm to learn English increases when the course contents and materials satisfy their language needs.

The tenth rank is assigned to item number 30 – ‘c’ ($M = 3.6$). This item is about 'the influence of getting high scores, in tests, on increasing the student’s enthusiasm in learning English. The results obtained from the students’ responses were: 57 (27.14%) of the students said they 'absolutely agree’
with the statement. 88 (41.90%) of them said they 'agree' with the statement. 26 (12.39%) said they 'disagree'. The last two options, 'absolutely disagree and no opinion', only 2 (.95%) of the students chose the former, and 37 (17.62%) of them chose the latter. This result indicates that the greater number of the students agree with the statement that their enthusiasm to learn English increases when they get high scores in English language tests.

The eleventh rank is assigned to item number 30 – ‘f’ (M = 3.567). The item is about 'the impact of the encouraging classroom environment on the student’s enthusiasm to learn English'. The students’ responses indicate that a great number of the students agreed with this statement because 137 (65.24%) of them chose the first two options, 'absolutely agree' and 'agree', 56 students for the first option and 81 for the second. 39 (18.57%) students chose the third and fourth options, 'disagree' and 'absolutely disagree', 35 students for the former and 4 for the latter. 34 (16.19%) students chose 'no opinion'.

Item number 34 – ‘a’ is assigned the twelfth rank (M = 3.548). This item is about 'the impact of the teacher’s talking
time on the learner’. The students’ responses were: 48 (22.86%) students said they ‘absolutely agree’ with the statement, 71 (33.81%) of them said they ‘agree’. On the other hand 73 (34.76%) of the students chose ‘disagree’ and ‘absolutely disagree’, to express their opinion about the statement, and 18 (8.57%) chose no opinion. It seems from this result that 56.67% of the students agree with the statement, but this percentage is not as great as the percentages obtained from the other items mentioned above in receptivity scale; we think that, and although the result is in favour of accepting the statement, the students’ opinions are affected by the teacher’s status, which is valued and respected, and that they do not like to degrade him/her in any way.

Item number 31 is assigned the thirteenth rank (M = 3.324). This item considers ‘the possible difficulty that a good language learner may find to get along with other people’. 108 (51.42%) accepted the statement, with 25 for ‘absolutely agree’ and 83 students for ‘agree’. This result implies that a great number of the students disagree with the statement by choosing the last three options ‘disagree’ 59 students, ‘absolutely
disagree’ 21 students, and 22 of the students chose ’no opinion’, the general percentage for these three options is 48.58%. Therefore, the obtained results at the outset indicate that there is a very slight difference in favour of accepting the statement that ’the good language learner may find difficulty to get along with other people’.

Item number 35 – ‘a’ is assigned the fourteenth rank (M = 3.014). This item is about ’the reasons for which the student may not like the course contents if they are not relevant to his her needs’. 79 (37.62%) of the students said they ’absolutely agree’ and ’agree’ with the statement. This result indicates that the greater number of the students, 131 (62.38%) chose the last three options to reject the statement, 70 of them chose ‘disagree’, 18 ’absolutely disagree’, and 43 for ’no opinion’. The obtained results reveal that a lot of the students disagree with the statement, that is the course contents may not be disliked by the student only because they are not relevant to his/her needs.

Item number 35 – ‘b’, ’which is about the student’s dislike of the course contents because they do not match his/her expectation’, is assigned the fifteenth rank (M =
2.976). 81 (38.57%) students chose ’absolutely agree’ and ’agree’ to accept the statement. 129 (61.43%) students, on the other hand, did not accept the statement, 64 of them chose ’disagree’, 15 ’absolutely disagree’, and 50 ’no opinion’. The obtained results indicate that the majority of the students, the sample of the present study, do not agree that they do not like the course contents just because they do not match their expectation.

Item number 34 – ‘b’ is assigned the sixteenth rank (M = 2.867). This item considers ’the student’s reaction towards the teacher if he/she learns very little from him/her’. 78 (37.14%), said they ’absolutely agree’ or ’agree’. 132 (62.86%) students chose the last three options, 57 of them ’disagree’, 21 ’absolutely disagree’, and 54 ’no opinion’. This result can be interpreted in the light of the great respect and evaluation that students have towards their teachers and to this end they did not accept the statement that is ’one of the teacher’s characteristics that may have negative impact on their learning experience is that they learn very little from him/her.

Item number 35 – ‘c’ is assigned the seventeenth rank (M = 2.857). It is about ’the student’s dislike of the course
contents and materials as a result of being presented in the teaching process in a way that the student does not like’. 72 (34.29%) of the students said they absolutely agree or agree with the statement. On the other hand 138 (65.71%) students disagreed with the statement by choosing the last three options, 58 students chose 'disagree’, 28 'absolutely disagree’, and 52 'no opinion’. The overall result indicates that the presentation of the course contents and materials in the teaching process in a way that the student does not like, is not a reason for which the student dislikes these contents and materials.

Item number 35 – ‘d’ is assigned the eighteenth rank (M = 2.748). The item is about 'the fourth characteristic by which the student may dislike the course contents and materials, that is they do not include explanation or illustrations’. 77 (36.67%) of the students chose 'absolutely agree’ and 'agree’ in response to the statement that 'they dislike the course contents and materials because they do not include explanations or illustrations’. The greatest number of the students; i. e. 133 (63.33%) do not agree with the statement. Only 42 of them chose 'disagree’, 22 'absolutely disagree’, and 69 'no
opinion’. The result shows that the explanations and illustrations found in the course contents do not affect the student’s like or dislike of these contents and materials.

Item number 33 – ‘b’ is assigned the nineteenth rank \(M = 2.667\). This item ‘is about the reasons why the student may not work with other students. That is the learner has nothing to gain from interacting with them’. The students’ responses to this item indicate that the statement is not accepted by the majority of the students. Only 50 (23.81\%) students accepted the statement by choosing ’absolutely agree’ and ’agree’. On the other hand 160 (76.19\%) of them did not accept the statement by choosing the last three options, 76 of them chose ’disagree’, 35 ’absolutely disagree’, and 49 chose ’no opinion’. Therefore, gaining something from the other learners through interaction is not one of the characteristics by which the student determines whether to work or not with other students.

The twentieth rank is assigned to item number 33 – ‘a’, ’I may not work with other students because they are less proficient than I am’ \(M = 2.662\). 52 (24.76\%) students accepted the statement, 23 of them chose ’absolutely agree’, and 29
’agree’. The last three options were rated as follows: 65 (30.95%) students chose ‘disagree’, 40 (19.05%) ’absolutely disagree’, and 53 (25.24%) chose ‘no opinion’. The majority of the students did not agree with the statement ’that the student’s level of proficiency is not a characteristic for accepting or rejecting interaction or work with him/her’.

The last rank in receptivity scale is assigned to item number 33 – ‘c’, which is ‘ I may not work with other students because I feel demoralised by their performance’ (M = 2.514). The students’ responses to this item confirm the results obtained from items 33 – ‘a’ and ‘b’ because the majority of the students did not agree with the statement. The responses were: 21 (10%) of the students chose ‘absolutely agree’, and 27 (12.86%) agree with the statement. 58 (27.62%) students chose ‘disagree’, 37 (17.62%) ’absolutely disagree’, and 67 (31.90%) of them chose ‘no opinion’. The overall obtained results indicate that ’the student’s evaluation of other students’ performance has nothing to do with his/her demoralization or enthusiasm, and then on accepting or rejecting interaction with them’.
The Receptivity Scale was, on the whole, highly scored (Means above 3.00 in most cases). These results show that the students are receptive to all the components of the learning experience from the language itself, up to the teacher, the course contents and materials, the learning environment, and the fellow learners. The students who participated in this study have great respect for their teachers, and for their fellow learners as they did not agree with the statements that try to find the characteristics by which the student may not work or even dislike teachers or fellow learners as can be seen in statements ’34 – b, 33 – b, 33 – a and 33 – c (See Ordinal Scale 5). These statements have been assigned the lowest ranks (16, 19, 20 and 21 respectively) (Means below 3).

5. 2. The Correlation between the Scales of the Questionnaire

After ordering the scales of the questionnaire Pearson’s correlation coefficients were computed for each mean scale and subscales raw scores. The results of the correlation analyses are presented in Table 5. 6 below. The correlations
show that: the self-esteem scale correlated highly with the receptivity, the anxiety, the motivational intensity, and the attention scales (p < .05).

Scores on anxiety correlated significantly with scores on receptivity, motivational intensity, and attention scales (p < .05).

Scores on the motivational intensity scale correlated highly with attention, and receptivity scales (p < .05).

Table (5.6)
The Correlation Coefficients of the Scales of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Motivational intensity</th>
<th>Attention</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational intensity</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Results in Terms of the Hypotheses

The purpose of this section is to discuss the statistical results as they pertain to the hypotheses stated in
chapter three. Each hypothesis is restated and discussed according to its statistical results.

**Hypothesis 1:** Students who have positive attitudes toward the English Language speakers, the English language classroom, and the English language teachers are expected to be more receptive than those with negative attitudes.

The Receptivity Scale (Table 5.5 and Ordinal Scale 5) was highly scored. The average mean for all the items was above 3. The highest rank was assigned to item number 26, 'I find learning English attractive (M = 4.505). The lowest rank was assigned to item number 33 – c, 'I feel demoralised by the students’ performance’ (M = 2.514).

The results obtained from Receptivity Scale, on the whole, and the correlation between this scale and the other scales of the questionnaire, which was significant (p < .05), confirm hypothesis 1.

**Hypothesis 2:** Highly motivated students are more receptive than students with low level of motivation.

The Motivational Intensity Scale (Ordinal Scale 3 and table 5.3) was, on the whole, highly scored. The average mean
scored by the students was above 3 out of the maximum mean score 5. The highest rank was assigned to item number 18, the students’ reaction towards doing their English assignments (M = 4.571. The lowest rank was assigned to item number 15, the student’s attempts to study English somewhere if it were not taught at school (M = 2.829).

In summary, Motivational intensity of the subjects of this study was high. Motivational Intensity correlated positively with Receptivity at .05 level of significance (correlation coefficient = .910). Hypothesis 2 is confirmed by this finding.

**Hypothesis 3:** Students who have high self – esteem are more receptive than students who have low self – esteem.

The self – esteem scale was highly scored by the students. The average mean for all the items is above 3 (see Table 5. 1 and Ordinal Scale 1). The highest rank was assigned to item number 2, ’the grade expected at the final examinations’ (M = 3.886). The lowest rank was assigned to item number 4, ’the student’s evaluation of his/her speaking ability outside the
classroom if he/she has ever had the chance to use English’ \( (M = 3.176) \).

The high scores obtained from the students’ responses and the significant correlation coefficient between self – esteem and receptivity \( (.871 \quad p < .05) \) confirm hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4: Students who have a low level of anxiety are more receptive than students who have a high level of anxiety.

The students’ responses for the anxiety scale (Ordinal Scale 2 and Table 5. 2) were assigned the lowest ranks and means as a whole. The average mean value for the whole scale is below 3. Item number 8; I feel funny inside if I have to stand up and speak in front of class was assigned the first rank \( (M = 2.9) \) (See Ordinal Scale 2). This result was interpreted in the light of the Sudanese society in which such a feeling is a common phenomenon nearly among all the Sudanese.

Low level anxiety correlates with the other affective variables especially with motivation and self – esteem. Therefore, hypothesis 4 is confirmed. The correlations among all the scales of the questionnaire were significant at \( (p < .05) \).
Hypothesis 5: Attentive students are more receptive than inattentive students.

The scores obtained from the attention scale were high. The average mean value is above 3. The highest rank (see Table 5. 4 and Ordinal Scale 4) was assigned to item number 21; ’the increased teacher’s attention for me increases my own attention’ (M = 4.048). On the other hand, item number 24 ’I always sit at the front row because teachers do not take care of students at the back of the class’ was underscored. This result can be interpreted with reference to the fact that students prefer this location because it is a good physical place for hearing and seeing, not because teachers differentiate between students at the front or at the back.

The obtained results from the Attention Scale, and the significant correlation (Table 5. 6) between attention and receptivity and the other variables tested by the questionnaire confirm hypothesis 5 ’attentive students are more receptive than inattentive students’.

5. 4. Summary
Chapter five has presented the analysis of the data obtained by the questionnaire, and the discussion of the main findings. The main findings of the data analysis were stated.

The results of the Self – esteem Scale were tabulated and discussed. The findings of the Anxiety Scale were also presented and discussed. Then all the results related to the Motivational Intensity Scale, Attention Scale, and the Receptivity Scale were stated.

The students’ responses for all the scales have been positive and provided evidence for confirming the hypotheses stated at the end of Chapter Three. The hypotheses have been confirmed further by the correlations between the scales, which have been significant and high, for all variables at (p < .05).

Finally the results were discussed in terms of the hypotheses of the study.

Having tabulated, analysing the data, stating and discussing the findings in the light of which the hypotheses were confirmed, let us now turn to Chapter Six which is the concluding chapter containing implications and recommendations.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study proposed to investigate the relationship of receptivity and defensiveness to learning English communicatively through the equation of some related factors such as self-esteem, motivation, anxiety, attention, and other learners’ and classroom factors such as the English language teacher, the course content and materials, the fellow learners, and attitudes toward learning English and achievement in English.

Two hundred and ten students of the Islamic University of Omdurman, and the University of Khartoum majoring in English constituted the final population sample of this study. 71 students were from fourth year, Faculty of Education, 77 from fourth year, Faculty of Arts, and 31 from fifth year at the
Islamic University of Omdurman; 31 students were from fifth year, Faculty of Education University of Khartoum. All the subjects who constituted the final sample completed the questionnaire concerning their self-esteem, level of classroom anxiety, desire to study English (i.e. motivational intensity), attention, and receptivity to the teacher, the fellow learners, the course content and materials, success and communication in English, English language and its speakers, and the classroom physical environment.

The data presented in Chapter 5 necessarily involved a great deal of discussion. Thus, in this concluding chapter we shall summarise the major findings and present a list of implications and recommendations.

We have tabulated and examined the responses by 210 final university students majoring in English at Omdurman Area to a 46-item five-part questionnaire (Appendix I A, B, C, D, E).

The data analysis presented in Chapter 5 revealed that the sample of students who constituted the subjects of this study have a high level of self-esteem (Means over 3) (Table 5.1 and Ordinal Scale 1 p. 207), and a low level of classroom anxiety. The scores on the items of the anxiety scale were low (M = below 3) item number 8, ‘I feel funny inside if I have to stand up and speak in front of class’, was assigned the first rank (M = 2.9). This relatively high score for the item is interpreted as natural with most Sudanese, that is they feel worried in such situations.
The students have the desire to learn English and expend considerable effort to learn it. Their scores on the Motivational Intensity Scale were above the midpoint on all items (M above 4 and 3 in most cases, and 2.829 for item 15) (See Table 5.3 and Ordinal Scale 3 pp. 216 - 17).

The students’ enthusiasm and attention to learn English also received high scores above the midpoint (M above 3 as can be seen in Table 5.4 and Ordinal Scale 4 pp. 220 - 21). The only item scored below 3 was item 24 ‘I always sit at the front row because teachers do not take care of students at the back of the class’. This low level of scores can be explained by the fact that all students prefer to sit at the front row because of the physical privilege of hearing or seeing that the place provides for them.

The students’ responses to the Receptivity Scale as a whole reveal that the subjects of the present study are receptive to their teachers, fellow learners, English language and its speakers, success and communication in English, and the classroom environment. Their scores were above the midpoint on all items (M above 3) except for the items that received the
seven lower ranks (M = above 2.5) (see Table 5.5 and Ordinal Scale 5 pp. 226 - 230).

It should generally be noted that the results obtained from all the scales had significant values. That is the students’ responses were high on the scales of 'Self – esteem, Motivational intensity, Attention and Receptivity’. On the other hand their scores on 'the Anxiety Scale’ were low. Therefore, we can say that the subjects of this study are characterized by a high level of self – esteem, desire to learn English, attention and receptivity; and a low level of anxiety which are prerequisite learners’ variables for learning English communicatively, and they are in possession of reasonable competence since communicative language learning and teaching does not only develop learners’ communicative competence, but also it develops linguistic competence.

In the light of the results obtained the hypotheses stated in chapter 3 (pp. 180 - 81) were discussed in chapter five. The first hypothesis tested by this study is that highly motivated students are more receptive than students with low level of motivation. The findings of the study suggest that the subjects
who constitute the sample of this study were highly motivated (See the Motivational Intensity Scale Appendix I C). All the students scored above the midpoint on all the items of the motivational intensity scale (Ordinal Scale 3 p. 217).

The second hypothesis was that students who have positive attitudes toward the English language speakers, the English language classroom, and the English language teachers are expected to be more receptive than those with negative attitudes. The students’ responses to the receptivity scale were assigned high scores (See Ordinal Scale 5 p. 228).

The third hypothesis tested by this study is that students who have high self-esteem are more receptive than students who have low self-esteem. The scores obtained by the subjects of this study reveal a high level of self-esteem (above the midpoint, See Ordinal Scale 1 p. 207).

It was also hypothesized that students who have a low level of anxiety are more receptive than students who have a high level of anxiety. Students’ scores on the anxiety scale as a whole were low (See Ordinal Scale 2 p. 210).
It was finally hypothesized that attentive students are more receptive than inattentive students. The students’ scores on the attention scale were high and above the midpoint (See Ordinal Scale 4 p. 221).

Based on the results of the data analysis, it seems reasonable to conclude that:

1. The subjects of this study have a high level of desire to learn English and exert a considerable effort to learn it either inside or outside schools. This is in line with previous studies’ findings about the role of motivation in second and foreign language.
2. The subjects of this study have positive attitudes toward the language itself and its speakers, the classroom physical environment, the English language teacher, success and communication in English, and toward the social factors related to the fellow learners. Positive attitudes towards the language, its people and culture have also been proved in previous studies as predictors of achievement.
3. A low level of anxiety is correlated with a high level of self-esteem and receptivity. Anxiety was proved in previous studies
to be “related to self – esteem but not to aspects of achievement” (Al – Busairi, 1990: 307).

4. Attention is an indicator of increased students’ enthusiasm and interest to learn language.

6.2 Results of the Study and their Implications

The results of this study have implications for research on receptivity and defensiveness in language learning and teaching.

1. This study has filled a gap in the literature because, to the best of my knowledge, the instrument adapted is used in this study to test and equate a composite of variables, i. e. motivation, self – esteem, anxiety, attitudes and attention, that will otherwise be studied separately.

2. The extensive literature review of the equated factors in this study as mentioned above may encourage further
equations and empirical studies on receptivity and defensiveness in language learning and teaching.

3. This study has also given direction to subsequent research by alerting researchers and teachers to the importance of investigating students' receptivity factors which are considered as determiners of successful language learning and teaching.

4. The study has also directed attention to the importance of considering learners' factors and teachers factors. That is the characteristics needed in both teachers and learners to develop a receptive learning environment.

   The results also have some implications for improving language instruction. These are:

1. The students desire to learn English, and the considerable effort they exert in learning English can only be found in a receptive learning environment in which teachers and learners interact aided by learning materials and course content that satisfy the learners' needs for learning English (motivational intensity correlated highly with receptivity at p < .05) (Table 5 – 6 p. 244).
2. Attention and self-esteem increase the students’ enthusiasm and desire to learn the language in a receptive learning environment where the students’ achievement, the teacher’s positive attitudes towards his/her learners, and the classroom physical environment enhance learning. Attention and self-esteem correlated highly with each other and with receptivity ($p < .05$) (Table 5–6 p. 244).

3. The students’ positive attitudes toward English language, teachers, success and communication in English, fellow learners, and teaching materials and contents are very essential for creating a receptive learning environment.

4. A low-level anxiety is an indicator of interest and desire to learn a language. This low level of anxiety can be enhanced by improving the learning context through the classroom physical environment, course contents and materials that address students’ needs, and through teachers’ positive and receptive attitudes toward their students.

These findings suggest that teachers who wish to teach language communicatively should consider a composite of factors that help in creating a receptive learning environment.
The equation that this study tried to consider includes both learners’ and teachers’ factors. The learners’ factors are partly affective such as motivation, self–esteem and anxiety; social and pedagogical such as factors related to the classroom physical environment, the students’ relations with other learners, and the acceptance of other learning components such as course contents and teaching materials. The teachers’ factors are those of their characteristics as good language teachers who have the ability to create a receptive learning and teaching context through which they interact and help their students to learn English communicatively.

Another important factor that has been considered in this study is attention. The findings revealed that attention increases learners’ enthusiasm to learn. The attentive and receptive students can evaluate the materials and the learning tools that help them to succeed in learning a language better than the inattentive. The teacher’s respect and positive behaviour towards his/her students help them to be more attentive and enthusiastic in their learning experience.
As a final comment on the study’s findings, it should be noted that it is important for educators to consider the learners’ factors and the other pedagogical factors that help in setting up a receptive learning context namely those of motivation, self – esteem, a low – level anxiety, attention, and all the positive attitudes toward English and toward the context in which English is taught.

6. 3. Recommendations

In concluding this sixth chapter, we recommend that the correlations, which have not been incorporated in this study, should be investigated by future studies. These are:

1- The relationship between receptivity and defensiveness and other factors that have not been tackled in the present study mainly with regard to learners’ needs (general, academic and job needs) and orientation.

2- The relationship between receptivity and defensiveness and learners’ cognitive factors such as aptitude and intelligence.
3- The relationship between receptivity and defensiveness and competitiveness.

4- Receptivity and defensiveness and their relationship with facilitating and debilitating anxiety.

6.4 Conclusions

The contributory value of this study lies in its projection of receptivity and defensiveness as influential factors in learning English language communicatively. There is evidence that receptivity in communicative language learning and teaching may be associated with a composite of factors social, pedagogical and affective. Students who are highly motivated, with a high level of self – esteem, a low level of anxiety, and who have positive attitudes toward English language, its speakers and culture, their teachers and fellow learners, and toward their learning context are more receptive than those with low levels of self – esteem, a high level of anxiety, and positive educational and social attitudes.
Therefore, research which attempts to investigate the relationship between receptivity and defensiveness and language learning should provide further evidence to the extent to which learners affective and pedagogical factors affect their receptivity and defensiveness of the learning experience and context. The students who constituted the sample of subjects in this study showed a high level of motivation, self – esteem, attention, and positive attitudes to the experience of learning English language. In addition they showed a low level of anxiety except for those factors which are related to the nature of the Sudanese society; that is their high level of anxiety when they speak in front of others.

The five hypotheses formulated in chapter 3 and discussed in chapter 5 revealed that: first there is a high correlation between motivation and receptivity as the students investigated in this study showed a high level of desire to learn English and willingness to exert considerable effort to learn it. The findings revealed that the students investigated showed positive attitudes toward English language speakers, teachers and the English language classroom (Hypothesis 2).
The findings revealed that the students had a high level of self-esteem, and a low level of anxiety. These findings have also been confirmed by the literature reviewed in chapter 3; that is a high level of self-esteem and a low level of anxiety are predictors of achievement (Hypothesis 3 & 4).

The findings confirmed that attention is positively correlated with receptivity, and that attentive students are more receptive than inattentive ones. Attention has been considered in this study as one of the student’s factors that makes him/her enthusiastic. Attention is greatly connected with the student’s level of attained success, the teacher’s behaviour, and the teacher’s characteristics.

To sum up, we have found that the composite of the affective factors of self-esteem, motivation, and anxiety are relevant to the investigation of receptivity and defensiveness in communicative language learning and teaching, and they have been considered as prerequisite and supportive factors for teaching and learning language communicatively. In addition attention and positive students’ attitudes toward English, the speakers of English, the English language teacher, and the
English language classroom, are also important factors in learning and teaching language.
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## Questionnaire

### Receptivity Index

1-Name:  

2-University:  

3-Year:  

---

### I A Self – esteem Scale

Part I: For each of the following questions indicate your answer by putting a tick (✔️) in the column that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>v.good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-How do you rate your overall English proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-What grade do you expect to get at the final examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-How do you rate your speaking ability of English inside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-How do you rate your speaking ability outside the classroom? (i.e. with English-speaking friends, with foreigners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Anxiety Scale

**Part ii:** Below are five statements. Please read each carefully and rate it indicating how much it describes your feeling. Put a tick \( \checkmark \) in the column that best represents your feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definitely my feeling</th>
<th>Pretty much my feeling</th>
<th>Slightly my feeling</th>
<th>Not very much my feeling</th>
<th>Definitely not my feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5- I worry when my English teacher says he/she is going to ask us questions to find how much we know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- I worry more about English lessons than other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I worry more about English lessons than about other subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I feel funny inside if I have to stand up and speak in front of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- I dread making mistakes when answering the teacher’s questions or when reading aloud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I C
Motivational Intensity Scale
Part iii: Read each of the following statements below and for each place a check mark (✓) on the space to the left of the alternative which seems to best complete the statement:

10-Compared to other subjects-----------------------------------------------

_________ a) like English more than all other subjects.
_________ b) like English more than most other subjects.
_________ c) like English as much as other subjects.
_________ d) dislike English more than other subjects.
_________ e) don’t like English at all.

11-Compared to other subjects, English is-----------------------------------------------

_________ a) the easiest subject.
_________ b) easier than most other subjects.
_________ c) as difficult as other subjects.
_________ d) more difficult than most other subjects.
_________ e) the most difficult subject.

12-I try to speak in English---------------------------------------------------------------

_________ a) always.
_________ b) frequently.
_________ c)sometimes.
_________ d)rarely.
_________ e)never.
13-When I miss an English lesson, it is because
-----------------------------------
_________ a) I didn't feel like it.
_________ b) I have an important excuse.
_________ c) I haven't prepared for the lesson. (i.e. didn't do my homework)
_________ d) I spent the night watching TV. Programmes, etc.
Or none of the above because
_________ e) I am never absent.
14-Compared to other students in my class think I
-----------------------------------
_________ a) am the most hard worker in the class.
_________ b) study more than most of them.
_________ c) study as much as most of them.
_________ d) do less studying than most of them.
_________ e) don't really study at all.
15-If English were not taught at school would
-----------------------------------
_________ a) try to obtain English lessons somewhere else, i.e. (night school)
_________ b) study English at home from books.
_________ c) pick up English in everyday situations.
d) pick up English from time to time only when the need arouse.
e) be happy.

16-I actually think about what I have learned in my class-

a) almost.
b) frequently.
c) sometimes.
d) rarely.
e) never.

17-Considering how I study English can say that I do- 

a) try hard all the time.
b) sometimes try hard.
c) just enough work to get along.
d) very little work.
e) not really do any work.

18-When I have an assignment in English-

a) do it immediately when I start my work.
b) put it off until my other homework is finished.
c) become completely bored.
d) ask a friend to do it for me.
e) forget all about it immediately after the lesson ends.

19- During English classes:

a) become completely absorbed in the subject matter.

b) sometimes have a tendency to daydream.

c) always have a tendency to daydream.

d) sometimes become bored.

e) become completely bored.

20- In my English class I am:

a) always prepared.

b) often prepared.

c) sometimes prepared.

d) hardly prepared.

e) never prepared.
### ID

#### Attention Scale

Part iv: Below are five statements. Please read each carefully and rate it indicating how much it describes your feeling. Put a tick (✔️) in the column that best represents your feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely my feeling</th>
<th>Pretty much my feeling</th>
<th>Slightly my feeling</th>
<th>Not very much my feeling</th>
<th>Definitely not my feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-</td>
<td>The increased teacher’s attention for me increases my own attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-</td>
<td>Nothing distracts me from learning in a good way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-</td>
<td>I always sit at the front row in the class because I feel more attentive than at the back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-</td>
<td>I always sit at the front row because teachers do not take care of students at the back of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-</td>
<td>The teacher's pleasant personality increases my attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Receptivity Scale
Part v: Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? Please indicate by putting a tick (✓) in the column that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Absolutely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Absolutely disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26- I find learning English attractive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27- I am at ease with speakers of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28- The life of English-speaking people is attractive to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29- I enjoy communicating with others (non-native speakers) in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- My enthusiasm to learn English increases when:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) the teacher's behaviour and attitudes are positive towards me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the course contents and materials satisfy my language needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I get high scores in English language tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) I find myself able to communicate fluently with native speakers.

e) My fellow learners make the classroom an interesting place to study in.

f) Classroom environment is encouraging.

31) I am a good language learner, yet I find it difficult to get along with other people.

32) I do better in classes where the way of teaching matches my own learning style.

33) I may not work with other students because:

   a) they are less proficient than I am.

   b) I have nothing to gain from interacting with them.

   c) I feel demoralised by their performance.

34) The following teacher’s characteristics may have negative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>impact on my learning experience:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) he/she speaks all the time and rarely gives chances to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I learn very little from him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- I don't like the course contents because they- -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) are not relevant to my needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) do not match my expectation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) are presented in the teaching process in a way that I don't like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) do not include explanations or illustrations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>