

UNIVERSIDAD  
BOLIVARIANA  
DEL ECUADOR



**UNIVERSIDAD BOLIVARIANA DE ECUADOR**

**MAESTRÍA EN PEDAGOGÍA DEL INGLÉS COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA**

**TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN**

**PREVIO A LA OBTENCIÓN DEL TÍTULO DE  
MAGÍSTER EN PEDAGOGÍA DEL IDIOMA INGLÉS COMO LENGUA  
EXTRANJERA.**

**TEMA**

**A GUIDE TO ENHANCING SPEAKING SKILLS IN TEENAGERS AT A2 LEVEL  
USING THE CLT APPROACH.**

**Autor/es:**

**MARIUXI LORENA DELGADO MERO.**

**Tutor/a:**

**MSc. DIANA EDGAS HERRERA.**

**ECUADOR**

**2025**



**La Universidad para todos**



## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my mom, who's been my biggest supporter and for always believing in me, and to my husband, thanks to his support during that time. I couldn't have done this without you both.

Mariuxi Lorena Delgado Mero.



La Universidad para todos



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout this long journey, I am blessed by God for everything. Second, I am grateful to my mother and my husband for their support and their time during this hard process of acquiring knowledge. On the other hand, this work would not be possible without each professor's knowledge, especially the person who has guided this thesis work, M.Sc. Diana Egas. I appreciate every single weekend with my UBE classmates for cheering me up and sharing their experience with the whole class. To conclude, but not to diminish, thanks go to Pedro José Rosales School in Dos Mangas – Manglaralto – Santa Elena for being part of my process of the application of my work. I am profoundly thankful for the support in this master's process.

Mariuxi Lorena Delgado Mero.



La Universidad para todos



## RESUMEN

Este trabajo de tesis se llevó a cabo durante el ciclo académico 2025-2026 en la región costa, provincia de Santa Elena, específicamente en la escuela Pedro José Rosales, ubicada en la comuna Dos Mangas. El estudio comenzó con un diagnóstico para identificar el nivel de vocabulario que los estudiantes de décimo año podrían utilizar al comunicarse en inglés. Se detectó que las habilidades orales eran una de las menos desarrolladas, en parte porque los estudiantes no habían recibido clases de inglés previamente, aunque contaban con una base mínima gracias a dos años de trabajo previo. A partir de esta necesidad, se planteó como objetivo aplicar actividades enfocadas en la producción oral de vocabulario funcional acorde a situaciones comunicativas cotidianas dentro del nivel A2, utilizando el enfoque comunicativo (CLT). Se diseñó una guía con actividades que fomentaran la confianza y el uso efectivo del idioma en contextos escolares. El estudio se desarrolló bajo un enfoque cualitativo, con elementos de la investigación-acción, lo que permitió comprender las necesidades lingüísticas de los estudiantes y diseñar una intervención adecuada. Se aplicaron un pre-test y un post-test cualitativo centrados en la producción oral, para observar cambios en el uso del vocabulario y la fluidez comunicativa. Durante la intervención se priorizaron actividades contextualizadas y significativas que promovieran un ambiente de confianza. La investigación contó con el consentimiento de los padres y autoridades escolares. Los resultados mostraron mejoras en el uso del vocabulario y en la fluidez oral, evidenciando la efectividad del enfoque y de las actividades implementadas.

**Palabras claves:** Producción oral, Vocabulario funcional, Enfoque comunicativo (CLT), Habilidades lingüísticas.



## ABSTRACT

This thesis was conducted during the 2025–2026 academic year in the coastal region of Santa Elena province, specifically at Pedro José Rosales School, located in the community of Dos Mangas. The study began with a diagnostic assessment to identify the vocabulary level tenth-grade students could use when communicating in English. It was found that oral skills were among the least developed, mainly because students had not previously received English instruction, although they had acquired minimal foundational knowledge over two years of prior work. In response to this need, the main objective was to implement activities focused on the oral production of functional vocabulary related to everyday communicative situations, at an A2 level, using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. A guide was designed with activities that encouraged confidence and effective language use in school contexts. The research employed a qualitative approach with elements of action research, which enabled the identification of linguistic needs and the design of a targeted intervention. A qualitative pre-test and post-test focusing on oral production were applied to assess changes in vocabulary use and communicative fluency. The intervention prioritized contextualized and meaningful activities aimed at fostering a supportive language-learning environment. Parental and school authorities' consent was obtained to carry out the study. The results showed significant improvement in vocabulary use and oral fluency, highlighting the effectiveness of the implemented activities and the communicative approach.

**Keywords:** Oral production, Functional vocabulary, Communicative approach (CLT), Language skills.



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

DEDICATION ..... VII

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... VIII

RESUMEN ..... IX

ABSTRACT ..... X

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

    General background ..... 1

    Justification of the problem ..... 2

    Problem statement ..... 3

    Precision of the topic ..... 4

    Research object ..... 4

    General objective ..... 4

    Specific objectives ..... 5

    Hypothesis ..... 5

    Conceptual and Operational Categories ..... 5

    Independent Variable: Communicative activities implementing CLT method. .... 5

    Dependent Variable: Improvement of speaking skills focusing on vocabulary ..... 6

    Research Approaches and Methodologies ..... 6

    Research instruments ..... 7

    Research context of the proposal ..... 8

    Description of the Research Context ..... 8

    Practical Contributions, Importance, and Social Need ..... 8

    Chapter Overview ..... 9

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 10

    1.1. Research Background ..... 10

        1.1.1 The Role of Motivation in Teenagers ..... 12

        1.1.2 Effective strategies ..... 13

        1.1.3 Effective Communicative Activities ..... 15

            1.1.4.1. Discussion ..... 17

            1.1.4.2. Role Play ..... 18

            1.1.4.3. Simulation ..... 18



1.1.4.4. Story Completion.....	18
1.2. Independent Variable: Communicative Activities Implementing the CLT Method.....	19
1.2.1. What is the CLT Method? .....	19
1.2.1.1. CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) .....	20
1.2.1.2. Communicative activities (role-play, simulation, story completion, etc.) .....	20
1.2.1.3. Principles of the Communicative Approach .....	22
1.2.2. What is a didactic guide?.....	22
1.2.2.1. What are the benefits of a didactic guide? .....	23
1.2.2.2. Improving Language Learning with a CLT Didactic Guide .....	23
1.3. Dependent Variable: The Improvement of the Speaking Skill with a Focus on Vocabulary .....	24
1.3.1. The Speaking Skill: Influence on Vocabulary through Communicative Tasks .....	24
1.3.2. Functional Vocabulary in A2 Students .....	25
1.3.3. Common Difficulties in Speaking .....	26
1.3.4. Influencing Factors: Motivation, Confidence, Context.....	27
1.4. Legal Foundation.....	28
1.4.1. Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador.....	28
1.4.2. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages .....	30
<b>CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH AND DIAGNOSTIC STUDY .....</b>	<b>32</b>
2.1. Conceptualization and Operationalization of Variables.....	32
2.2. Research Approach.....	35
2.3. Scope of the Research .....	35
2.4. Declaration and Justification of the Research Type.....	36
2.5. Methods Used and Their Purposes in the Research Context.....	36
2.6. Instruments Derived from the Selected Methodology .....	37
2.7. Delimitation of the Population and Sample .....	38
2.8. Methodological Strategy and Research Stages .....	38
2.9. Presentation of the Diagnostic Study Results .....	40
2.10. Analysis of the Oral Production Pre-Test Results.....	41
2.11. General Quantitative Results .....	41
2.12. Detailed Analysis by Dimensions of the Dependent Variable .....	42
2.12. Analysis of Focus Group Results .....	45



2.13. Integrated Discussion and Interpretation of Results .....	47
2.14. Conclusions of the Causal Diagnosis.....	49
CHAPTER 3: PRESENTATION AND VALIDATION OF THE PROPOSAL.....	51
3.1. Modeling the Proposal: “Speak Up! A CLT Guide for A2 Teens” .....	51
3.2. Presentation of the Proposal .....	51
3.3. Purposes and Objectives of the Proposal .....	52
3.4. Foundation of the Proposal.....	53
3.5. Characteristics of the Proposal (Characterization).....	54
3.6. Basic/Key/Guiding Ideas.....	55
3.7. Structure and Dynamics of its Components (Type of Proposal) .....	56
3.8. Demonstrations and Examples of Units and Activities.....	57
3.9. Forms of Application, Implementation, and Evaluation .....	61
3.10. Resources .....	62
3.11. Beneficiaries.....	63
3.12. Closing of the Modeling .....	63
3.13. Validation of the Proposal .....	64
3.14. Comparative Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Results .....	64
3.15. Qualitative Analysis of the Validation.....	66
CONCLUSIONS.....	69
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	71
REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS .....	73
ANNEXES.....	75
Annexes 1. Diagnostic English skill test .....	75
Annexes 2. Results .....	¡Error! Marcador no definido.

## TABLE INDEX

<b>Tabla 1.</b> Effective communication activities for A2-level students .....	16
<b>Tabla 2.</b> Conceptualization and Operationalization of Variable .....	32
<b>Tabla 3.</b> Summary of Oral Production (Speaking) Pre-Test Scores.....	41
<b>Tabla 4.</b> General Structure of Each Unit.....	56
<b>Tabla 5.</b> Didactic Sequence Table – Unit 1 .....	58



<b>Tabla 6.</b> Didactic Sequence Table – Unit 3 .....	59
<b>Tabla 7.</b> Resources .....	62
<b>Tabla 8.</b> Comparative Table of Mean Scores (Speaking) .....	64
<b>Tabla 9.</b> Detailed Table: Comparison of Individual Scores (Pre-test vs. Post-test).....	65

## LIST OF ANNEXES

Anexo 1. Diagnostic English Skill test .....	75
Anexo 2. Level of diagnosis.....	72
Anexo 3. Test results .....	73
Anexo 4. Students participating in the study .....	74
Anexo 5. Pedro José Rosales school .....	75



## INTRODUCTION

### General background

English as a foreign language is taught and learned in a wide variety of contexts worldwide. It plays a key role in education and professional life. Today, English is considered a global lingua franca and is part of the curriculum in almost every school, including those in rural areas.

However, schools still face the challenge of selecting effective strategies that help students not only understand the language but also feel confident using it. One of the main difficulties observed in rural schools, such as Pedro José Rosales School in the Dos Mangas community, is the lack of confidence and speaking ability among students. Speaking skills require both language knowledge and regular practice, but these students have had limited access to English instruction, and until recently, there was no specialized English teacher.

This research project focuses on improving speaking skills in 10th-grade students through communicative activities that promote vocabulary development in real-life situations. Teachers today must consider various external factors, social, technological, environmental, and cultural, that influence student engagement. In this context, it's essential to design activities that are meaningful, interactive, and accessible.

As Castro (2024) states, modern education encourages practice and the development of communicative skills from an early stage, fostering motivation and metacognitive learning. Similarly, Rivera (2018) emphasizes that using technology and virtual tools in the classroom enhances learning and provides more opportunities to use English meaningfully. With the right strategies, students can feel more engaged and empowered to communicate in a foreign language.



### **Justification of the problem**

In rural contexts such as Pedro José Rosales School, students face unique challenges in learning English due to limited exposure to the language and the absence of specialized teachers. This situation, compounded by minimal family support at home, significantly reduces students' motivation and confidence to actively participate in English classes, particularly in speaking activities.

Research has demonstrated that motivation plays a crucial role in foreign language acquisition. Dewaele and MacIntyre (2014) emphasize that enjoyment and confidence in the classroom are closely linked to teachers' abilities to manage the learning environment, foster mutual respect, and provide emotional support to students. Similarly, Dörnyei (2020) highlights the importance of applying motivational techniques to help learners overcome emotional barriers and sustain their interest in language learning.

Furthermore, the development of oral communication skills, especially the use of functional vocabulary, is essential for students to express themselves effectively and naturally in English. To address these needs, this study adopts a qualitative approach within an action research design, enabling a thorough exploration of students' perceptions and difficulties, alongside the implementation of an intervention grounded in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach.

Focus groups will be employed to identify the root causes of low motivation and misconceptions about learning English in this community. At the same time, playful and contextualized activities will foster a trusting environment conducive to practicing vocabulary and speaking. Additionally, qualitative pre- and post-tests will be conducted to assess progress in oral production and communicative fluency.

In summary, this research is essential to transform the prevailing negative perceptions towards learning English in this rural setting and to develop a guide of communicative activities that



supports teenagers in enhancing their speaking and vocabulary skills in a meaningful and motivating way.

This research is justified by the persistent challenge that oral production represents in second language acquisition, a difficulty often exacerbated by traditional pedagogical models that relegate the student to a passive role. According to Cuadros (2025), speaking is frequently the most underdeveloped skill due to factors like a lack of confidence, fear of making mistakes, and time pressure, which collectively contribute to what is known as Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety (FLCA). This anxiety negatively impacts student self-esteem and creates a significant barrier to participation. Consequently, many students, despite possessing grammatical knowledge, struggle with the fluency, coherence, and vocabulary necessary for effective communication. This gap between passive knowledge and active oral competence underscores the urgent need for a pedagogical intervention focused specifically on overcoming these affective and practical obstacles.

In response, this study proposes a guide of activities grounded in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, specifically utilizing Task-Based Learning (TBL) as a didactic mediation. For Granados and Ramos (2024), TBL is effective because it prioritizes meaningful communication over grammatical perfection, allowing students to use language to achieve a specific outcome in a real-world context. This aligns with the findings of Gonzalez (2022), who notes that gamified and interactive strategies increase motivation and transform learning into an engaging process. The proposed guide will therefore provide contextualized and significant tasks that lower the affective filter, build student confidence, and provide ample opportunities for oral practice in a supportive, collaborative environment.

### **Problem statement**

What types of interactive activities using the CLT approach are most effective in helping 10th-grade A2-level students at Pedro José Rosales School improve their speaking skills through the use of vocabulary?



### **Research questions**

- What are the learning styles of the 10th-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School?
- What are the main fears or challenges students face when speaking in English?
- What strategies based on the CLT approach can help improve students' speaking skills?
- What is the current level of speaking proficiency and motivation among 10th-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School?

### **Precision of the topic**

This project follows the UBE research lines in Pedagogy, Didactics, and Educational Management. It focuses on creating and selecting various interactive activities to help students improve their speaking skills, which can be difficult for many learners. These activities use real-life situations to make learning meaningful and enjoyable.

The goal of this research is to design activities that demonstrate the importance of learning English and to help students change their perceptions about language learning, making it easier to understand and apply. This work also contributes innovative ideas to teaching practices by proposing a guide of useful activities for students.

### **Research object**

The teaching and learning process will focus on 10th-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School. The goal is to create interactive activities in which students can communicate with each other and use meaningful knowledge to improve their speaking skills.

### **General objective**

To propose a guide of interactive activities for A2-level students in the 10th grade at Pedro José Rosales School, with the goal of increasing engagement and changing their perception that English is not necessary in their environment.



### **Specific objectives**

- To explore the students' perceptions and attitudes toward learning English as a foreign language in a rural context.
- To identify the main speaking challenges faced by A2-level 10th-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School.
- To select and adapt interactive speaking activities based on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach.
- To design a guide of communicative activities aimed at enhancing students' speaking skills through meaningful vocabulary use and active participation.

### **Hypothesis**

Learners in the 10th grade at Pedro José Rosales School will improve their speaking skills, particularly their use of functional vocabulary, through the implementation of interactive, communicative activities based on the CLT approach.

### **Conceptual and Operational Categories**

#### **Independent Variable: Communicative activities implementing CLT method.**

According to Rogers and Richards, cited in Jabri & Samad (2021), there are multiple approaches to developing communication in a second language. Among them, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach is widely used because it encourages learners to interact in real-life situations. CLT focuses on meaningful communication and promotes language learning through engaging, structured classroom activities that reflect everyday use. In this research, CLT-based communicative activities are used as the main strategy to support and motivate students to practice speaking in English.



### **Dependent Variable: Improvement of speaking skills focusing on vocabulary**

Vocabulary is essential for effective communication in a second language. For A2-level students, having a basic vocabulary allows them to express personal information, daily needs, and simple ideas. According to the CEFR, A2 learners should be able to carry out basic tasks like ordering food or asking for directions using familiar phrases. For example, they might say “I’d like a coffee, please” or “Where is the nearest bank?” (Quinn, 2023). Strengthening this vocabulary through interactive speaking activities helps students gain more confidence and fluency in using the language in meaningful contexts.

According to Rogers and Richards, cited in Jabri & Samad (2021), there are several approaches and methods to develop communication in the target language; however, researches chose CLT methods because it supports and encourages students during the learning process and inspires real communication through a structured, supportive teaching procedure.

### **Research Approaches and Methodologies**

This research follows a qualitative approach with elements of action research, as it aims to understand students’ needs and improve their speaking skills through communicative activities. The study will use the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method as its main pedagogical approach. CLT supports language learning through real-life, meaningful communication and encourages students to use the language in context, making the process more natural and effective.

Cognitive strategies, such as the use of memory techniques or visual aids, will also be applied to support vocabulary retention and oral fluency. These strategies can help students overcome the fear often associated with speaking in a foreign language, especially in rural environments with little exposure to English.



To collect data, the study will use qualitative tools such as focus groups, pre- and post-speaking tasks, and student testimonials. These tools will help explore the learners' experiences, attitudes, and progress throughout the intervention. In this way, the research will evaluate the impact of the communicative activities on students' speaking performance and motivation, particularly in their use of functional vocabulary.

### **Research instruments**

This research adopts a methodological design grounded in a qualitative approach, as it aligns with the principles of action research aimed.

To explore the students' perceptions and attitudes toward learning English in a rural context, focus group discussions will be held. These sessions will allow learners to express their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in a safe and supportive environment, helping to uncover emotional or contextual barriers that affect their language development.

In line with the objective of identifying the main speaking challenges faced by A2-level 10th-grade students, these discussions will also help determine the most common fears and difficulties students face when attempting to speak in English.

To evaluate the impact of selected communicative activities designed and adapted based on the CLT approach, a qualitative pre-test and post-test will be applied. These tests will focus specifically on students' use of functional vocabulary and their ability to engage in basic conversations. The pre-test will help identify students' initial speaking level, while the post-test will measure progress after the implementation of the activities.

The combination of these tools will also support the design and evaluation of a communicative guide tailored to students' needs, helping to enhance speaking skills through meaningful and engaging activities that promote active participation.



### **Research context of the proposal**

This research project will take place in the rural community of Dos Mangas, located in the Manglaralto parish, Santa Elena province. The study will be carried out at Pedro José Rosales School, a small educational institution that serves approximately 126 students.

This project will be implemented with a group of 10 students of the tenth grade of Basic Superior during the morning session. These students show potential for learning English as a foreign language. While not all of them express interest in the subject, some struggle with shyness and a lack of confidence when it comes to speaking in English. This highlights the need to move away from traditional methods and apply a communicative approach using interactive and meaningful activities, such as games and playful tasks.

### **Description of the Research Context**

This research will take place during the 2025–2026 school year at Pedro José Rosales School, located in the rural community of Dos Mangas, in the province of Santa Elena. The school belongs to the Costa regime. The classes are delivered in a face-to-face modality; however, the institution has a small student population.

### **Practical Contributions, Importance, and Social Need**

Learning a foreign language opens doors to a wide range of opportunities in both personal and professional contexts. This research project is especially valuable for the social development of 10th grade students at Pedro José Rosales School, as it aims to change their perception about the usefulness of English and help them acquire essential communication skills. In a rural setting where tourism is a growing industry, being able to understand and speak basic English can empower students to interact with visitors and participate more actively in local economic activities.



Moreover, this proposal addresses a crucial social need: introducing students many of whom are receiving formal English instruction for the first time to the language in an engaging and meaningful way. By using communicative and interactive strategies, this project provides students with practical tools to express themselves and gain confidence in using English in real-life situations. Ultimately, the project contributes not only to the academic development of the learners but also to their communities, by fostering skills that are increasingly important in today's globalized world.

### **Chapter Overview**

**Chapter I** explains the main ideas and theories that support the research. It includes background information from previous studies, key concepts, and different perspectives that help build a strong foundation for this proposal and the specific needs of 10th-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School.

**Chapter II** describes the qualitative action-research design, detailing focus groups, diagnostic and post-intervention speaking tasks, and the process of selecting and adapting CLT-based activities to gather and analyze students' perceptions and speaking challenges.

**Chapter III** presents the proposed guide of interactive speaking activities, explains its feasibility in the rural school context, and reports qualitative results organized by research question, showing how the intervention affected students' confidence, vocabulary use, and attitudes toward English.

At the end of the paper, conclusions and recommendations are provided, directly addressing the research questions and summarizing the steps taken throughout the study.



## CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1.1. Research Background

According to Santamaria et al. (2023), in their article titled "*CLT: An Innovative Method to Improve Productive Skills in the English Language*," a study was conducted to examine the effectiveness of strategies based on the Communicative (CLT) method for the development of productive skills, specifically writing and speaking. The methodology employed was a quantitative approach, using pre-tests and post-tests with an experimental group and a control group. The findings revealed a significant improvement in the experimental group, with an average increase of 5% in writing and 4% in speaking on the Key A2 test, demonstrating the positive influence of CLT.

This study is of great importance to the present research, as it quantitatively validates the effectiveness of CLT in improving productive skills at an A2 level. It shows that an approach centered on real communication enhances not only speaking but also writing, thereby contributing to the comprehensive development of adolescents' linguistic abilities. This justifying the selection of this method for the proposed guide.

Citing Oviedo and Mena (2021), in their research titled "*Communicative Language Teaching Approach for the Development of Speaking Skills*," the main purpose was to apply CLT activities to determine their effectiveness in developing the speaking ability of high school students in Riobamba, Ecuador. A quasi-experimental and quantitative methodology was used, involving with a control group and an experimental group. The results showed that, although both groups improved their performance, the increase in speaking ability was notably greater in the experimental group that implemented the communicative approach.

The authors' conclusion directly reinforces the hypothesis of this study by confirming that interactive activities such as dialogues and role-plays are effective in developing oral skills in adolescents. This finding is fundamental, as the guide proposed here will focus precisely on these



types of activities to foster active participation and build confidence in A2-level students, thereby addressing the limitations of traditional methods.

According to García (2019), in his research work "*Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Activities to Develop English Speaking Skills*," the objective was to analyze the CLT approach as a method to improve oral production in university students. A mixed-methods methodology was used, combining pre-test and post-test to evaluate the improvement in oral skills, and survey to assess students' attitudes. The results demonstrated that the use of communicative activities had a positive effect on the development of oral ability, and the participants felt satisfied and motivated by the implementation of such activities.

This research provides a valuable perspective on student perception, a key factor in the success of any pedagogical proposal. By confirming that CLT increases motivation and satisfaction, it underscores the importance of creating a positive learning environment, which will be a cornerstone of the didactic guide for adolescents. The goal is for vocabulary acquisition and oral practice to be seen as engaging processes rather than obligations.

According to Gonzalez (2022), gamification serves as a powerful methodological strategy for strengthening communicative skills by directly addressing student motivation. This approach transforms learning processes by incorporating game mechanics that change behaviors and foster enjoyment, which is particularly effective for today's students who are immersed in digital culture. In the view of Gonzalez (2022), the use of gamified platforms like Classcraft can increase intrinsic motivation and commitment, encouraging students to engage in activities that are not only attractive but also generate autonomy and significant learning in authentic contexts.

For Granados and Ramos (2024), affective factors such as anxiety and frustration can significantly hinder the development of oral skills, as these emotions negatively impact a student's self-esteem and willingness to communicate. They point out that oral production is the skill that most often causes anxiety in students learning a foreign language. As a result, creating



a supportive and low-stress environment is crucial for lowering what Krashen refers to as the 'affective filter,' allowing students to experiment with language without fear of judgment.

In the view of Aguilar-Cruz (2018), contextualized and innovative materials are primary generators of student motivation. When students work with materials that reflect their interests and local reality, their engagement increases, leading to more effective learning. The author suggests that teacher-designed materials that are visually attractive and relevant can create effective learning environments where students feel a greater desire to participate and learn.

### **1.1.1 The Role of Motivation in Teenagers**

According to Ruiz (2022), the development of oral production activities based on the communicative approach has a direct, positive impact on student motivation. By focusing activities on topics of interest and allowing students to express their own ideas and emotions, learners perceive language as a useful and relevant tool in their lives, thus increasing their desire to participate and learn.

The connection between communicative activities and intrinsic motivation is crucial to this research. The proposed guide aims to design tasks that not only develop oral skills and vocabulary but also connect with the interests and realities of adolescents, transforming the apathy they often feel towards language learning into active and voluntary engagement.

According to Pérez (2023), integrative motivation plays an essential role in the English classroom. Exposure to the target culture through new technologies and social media generates a positive attitude among students. This type of motivation arises from an interest in and affinity for speakers of that language and the desire to be part of that community, a factor that drives learning.

This concept is vital for the guide, as the aim is not only to teach speaking skills but also to open a window to Anglophone culture. By relating vocabulary and oral activities to cultural elements



that adolescents find appealing such as music, movies, and social trends, integrative motivation can be fostered, making the learning experience more meaningful and profound.

Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022) identify four types of motivation in foreign language learning: intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental, and integrative. Instrumental motivation, in particular, drives students to learn the language for a practical purpose, such as obtaining a good job or achieving a higher social status. This shows that the perceived future utility of English is a powerful driver of learning.

In the context of a guide aimed at improving oral skills, emphasizing the practical benefits of mastering English is a key motivational strategy. The guide can include reflections on how oral proficiency and a broad vocabulary open door to academic and professional opportunities, thus connecting classroom effort with students' future aspirations and giving learning a clear and tangible purpose.

### **1.1.2 Effective strategies**

The implementation of the communicative approach requires the use of pedagogical strategies that promote interaction and the meaningful use of language.

For Oviedo and Mena (2021), an effective strategy is cooperative learning, which aligns with the communicative approach by fostering the creation of collective knowledge through multidirectional communicative interaction among students and with the teacher. This increases each student's opportunity to practice their communicative skills; therefore, full participation in the classroom should be actively encouraged.

This strategy will be a cornerstone of the didactic guide, as working in pairs and small groups helps reduce adolescents' anxiety when speaking. By creating a supportive environment where students collaborate to construct meaning, confidence is enhanced, and opportunities to practice vocabulary and oral structures in a low-risk context are maximized.



According to Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022), a central strategy of CLT is the use of authentic materials in the second language teaching and learning. Authentic materials, such as audio clips, videos, and real-life dialogues, help students understand how English is used in everyday situations and diverse cultural contexts, making learning more relevant and motivating.

The proposed guide will integrate this strategy through the use of digital and multimedia resources that reflect the real-world English usage. Exposing adolescents to conversations, songs, or movie excerpts that are meaningful to them not only improves listening comprehension and pronunciation but also provides functional, contemporary vocabulary directly applicable to their own interactions.

According to Pérez (2023), CLT methodology should be supported by a *culture of thinking*, using routines and metacognitive activities that encourage students to move beyond the surface level of information. This involves developing higher-order thinking skills such as critical and creative thinking, allowing students to reflect on their own learning process and make informed decisions about how to improve.

Integrating metacognition into the didactic guide is essential for fostering student autonomy. By including activities that prompt students to reflect on which vocabulary they found most difficult or which communication strategy were most effective, they are empowered to become active agents of their own learning, an essential skill for long-term language mastery.

According to Granados and Ramos (2024), cooperative work is an essential strategy where students in small groups collaborate to achieve a common goal. Citing Johnson and Johnson (1989), they emphasize that this approach fosters positive interdependence, individual accountability, and mutual support through direct interaction. As noted by Granados and Ramos (2024), this method not only provides opportunities to practice productive and receptive skills in a natural context but also helps develop interpersonal intelligence, making it a key component of a communicative classroom.



As a technological strategy, Cuadros (2025) proposes the use of digital tools like Padlet to overcome common classroom limitations such as time pressure and lack of practice opportunities. This tool allows students to create and share content in various formats, including audio and video, from any location, thereby increasing the frequency of oral practice. By providing a collaborative and asynchronous environment, such technologies can reduce student anxiety, promote peer feedback, and foster greater autonomy and self-confidence in their oral production.

Aguilar-Cruz (2018) highlights the importance of multimodality, which involves the combination of different modes like images, videos, games, and digital platforms to create effective learning environments. This approach recognizes that learning is enhanced when students can process information through both visual and verbal channels, leading to greater retention. As stated by Aguilar-Cruz (2018), by integrating multimodality with contextualized, teacher-designed materials, educators can innovate their practice and cater to the diverse learning styles of students immersed in a digital world.

### **1.1.3 Effective Communicative Activities**

According to Richards (2005), there are multiple classroom activities that promote real communication. These tasks are designed to encourage students to negotiate meaning, expand their linguistic resources, and use language with a clear and functional purpose. The key is that the content is relevant, interesting, and connected to the students' lives, making the communication process holistic and requiring the integration of various language skills.

The selection of activities in the proposed guide will be based on these principles to ensure that adolescents not only practice speaking but do so meaningfully. Activities such as role-plays and problem-solving tasks allow vocabulary to be practiced in dynamic contexts, enhancing retention and enabling more spontaneous and flexible use of language.



For García (2019), communicative activities should be seen as a precise tool for improving students' communicative competence while fostering an active and collaborative learning environment. Teaching techniques should include dialogues, role-plays, debates, and teamwork, as these approaches not only develop oral skills but also increase student's motivation and self-confidence.

The proposed didactic guide will adopt this perspective, structuring sessions around a variety of interactive activities. By diversifying tasks, different learning styles are addressed, and a high level of student interest is maintained, an essential factor for adolescents. This transforms the classroom into a learning community where participation is valued more than grammatical perfection.

As Ruiz (2022) states, oral production activities form the foundation of the communicative approach and have a direct positive impact on student motivation and the development of oral competence. Activities such as presentations or debates allow students to use linguistic structures in a context that simulates real-life situations, thereby facilitating the assimilation and practical application of the language.

This principle is fundamental to the design of the guide, which aims to improve oral skills and vocabulary acquisition. The guide will propose progressive activities that lead students from controlled vocabulary practice to freer and more creative oral production, ensuring that each step builds the necessary confidence for adolescents to express their ideas comfortably in English.

**Tabla 1.** *Effective communication activities for A2-level students*

<b>Activity Type</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Main Objective</b>
<b>Information Gap</b>	Students, usually in pairs, communicate to obtain information they do not have to complete a task.	To encourage the use of questions and answers for a real exchange of information.



<b>Role-play</b>	Students assume roles in simulated real-life scenarios, such as ordering in a restaurant or conducting an interview.	To improve fluency and sociolinguistic appropriateness in specific contexts.
<b>Debates and Discussions</b>	Group discussions are organized on various topics, where students must articulate and defend their ideas.	To develop argumentation, critical thinking, and the use of persuasive language.
<b>Storytelling</b>	Students are encouraged to share personal anecdotes or stories, either orally or in writing.	To foster creativity, the use of verb tenses, and coherent discourse organization.
<b>Problem Solving</b>	Students work in groups to find solutions to hypothetical situations or practical problems.	To promote the active use of language, negotiation of meaning, and critical thinking.

#### 1.1.4.1. Discussion

According to Santamaria et al. (2023), organizing debates and group discussions on various topics encourages students to articulate their ideas clearly and persuasively. This activity promotes critical thinking and the active use of language, making communication both the means and the goal of completing the task.

Within the context of the guide for A2-level adolescents, discussions on topics relevant to their interest such as music, video games, or the environment, can serve as powerful tools for vocabulary development. The need to argue and counter-argue drives students to seek and use new words and structures spontaneously and meaningfully.



#### **1.1.4.2. Role Play**

García (2019) highlights role-plays as a fundamental communicative technique, allowing students to simulate real-life situations, such as making a hotel reservation or conducting a job interview. By assuming a role, students practice the language in a functional context, developing both fluency and appropriateness for different social registers.

This activity is essential for the guide, as it allows adolescents to rehearse functional vocabulary in a safe and supportive environment. Acting out familiar scenarios reduces the fear of making mistakes and builds speaking confidence, preparing students for authentic interactions and demonstrating the immediate utility of English.

#### **1.1.4.3. Simulation**

According to Pérez (2023), the CLT emphasized the use of simulations, which involve planning, execution, and reflection by the student. Unlike role-play, where a fictional character is assumed, simulation require students to act as themselves in realistic problem-solving, promoting a more authentic and personal use of the language.

In a guide focused on adolescents, simulations are especially effective for integrating vocabulary meaningfully while developing negotiation and critical thinking skills. For example, planning a vacation on a limited budget would require students to use vocabulary related to travel, accommodation, and activities, while also negotiating and reaching consensus, all in English.

#### **1.1.4.4. Story Completion**

According to Santamaria et al. (2023), encouraging students to share anecdotes or personal stories, whether orally or in writing, enhances creativity and language use. Story completion activities, in which one student begins a narrative and others continue it, promote active listening and foster coherence, and cohesion in discourse.



This type of activity is particularly valuable for adolescent learners as support both vocabulary development and fluency. By collaboratively constructing a narrative, students not only reinforce their use of connectors and verb tenses, but are also benefit from peer-generated input. Exposure to diverse vocabulary and ideas within a creative and playful context enriches their linguistic repertoire and encourages spontaneous language production.

## **1.2. Independent Variable: Communicative Activities Implementing the CLT Method**

Richards (2005) asserts that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities are characterized by their focus on purposeful communication. Students engage in tasks that require the exchange and negotiation of information to achieve a shared goal. In this context, effective message transmission takes over grammatical perfection.

The implementation of this variable implies a shift in the role of the teacher, who moves from being an instructor to a learning facilitator. The teacher creates the conditions for communication, supplying necessary resources, and guiding interaction. However, it is the students themselves who build their communicative competence through active engagement and peer interaction.

As Pérez (2023) explains, CLT activities are based on principles such as student autonomy, the social nature of knowledge construction, and the connection of the curriculum to real life use. Therefore, this variable is not simply a set of exercises but rather a comprehensive methodology designed to ensure adolescents acquire the language by using it in authentic and motivating situations.

### **1.2.1. What is the CLT Method?**

Ruiz (2022) describes CLT as a methodological shift away from traditional approaches focused on the repetition and memorization of grammatical structures in isolation. In contrast, the communicative approach is based on the premise that language acquires meaning through its use in relevant social contexts, where communication is effective and coherent.



According to Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022), the fundamental purpose of CLT is to develop students' communicative competence, the ability to use language appropriately to achieve real communication. This method views language not only as a set of rules but as a tool for fulfilling social functions, where fluency and message clarity are crucial as grammatical accuracy.

García (2019) emphasizes that CLT entails paradigm change, positioning student as active agents in learning while the teacher serves as a guide and facilitator. Activities are designed to be authentic, relevant, and motivating, fostering an environment of trust and cooperation where errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process.

#### **1.2.1.1. CLT (Communicative Language Teaching)**

According to Santamaria et al. (2023), CLT emphasizes the importance of meaningful communication and interaction, providing students with the opportunity to use the language in real-life scenarios and authentic settings. In this way, students develop their ability to convey information with accuracy and fluency, going beyond theoretical grammar knowledge.

Richards (2005) elaborates that CLT is based around the concept of "language functions," which refers to what the student can achieve through the language, such as introducing oneself, giving explanations, or expressing opinions. This contrasts with the traditional focus on "notion," or abstract topics of conversation.

In line with this, Oviedo and Mena (2021) argue that the ultimate goal of CLT is the improvement of oral performance through interactive activities, including dialogues and role-plays. The desired outcome is not just classroom competence but real-world communicate ability.

#### **1.2.1.2. Communicative activities (role-play, simulation, story completion, etc.)**

García (2019) identifies a range of communicative activities including dialogues, dramatizations, games, and collaborative tasks, as instrumental in enhancing oral proficiency production and



student motivation. These activities prompt learners to interact meaningfully, using language to complete tasks in a cooperative setting.

Richards (2005) classifies these activities into types such as "information-gap" tasks, where student must communicate to obtain missing details, and "jigsaw" activities, where each group member holds part of the information needed to solve a problem. These approaches cultivate interdependence and peer collaboration.

Furthermore, activities like role-plays, simulations, and storytelling are fundamental, as pointed out by Pérez (2023) and Wahyuni et al. (2021, cited in Santamaria et al., 2023). These tasks allow students to practice the language in varied and meaningful contexts, developing fluency, creativity, and the ability to adapt to different communicative situations.

For Granados and Ramos (2024), Task-Based Learning (TBL) is a communicative approach that centers on meaningful, contextualized tasks rather than isolated grammar exercises. Citing Willis (1996), they define a task as an activity where the target language is used for a communicative purpose to achieve a specific outcome, with the focus being on meaning over form. These tasks often use authentic materials to allow students to develop their language skills while completing activities that mirror real-life situations.

Aguilar-Cruz (2018) explains that the Task-Based Learning (TBL) approach organizes instruction around a sequence of tasks that progress from basic to complex. Following Ellis (2003), this process involves a pre-task phase to prepare students, a while-task phase for task completion, and a post-task phase for reflection and language focus. This structured yet communicative sequence allows students to build knowledge holistically, integrating skills such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing in a meaningful context.



### 1.2.1.3. Principles of the Communicative Approach

A foundational principle of CLT, as stated by Pérez (2023) "processes are as important as forms." This means that how communication is learned and practiced is as valuable as the knowledge of grammatical structures. Learning through doing is valued, where errors are considered a natural part of developing fluency.

Another key principle is that communication must be purposeful and meaningful. According to Richards (2005), activities should be designed for students to exchange relevant information to accomplish a specific objective. Communication is not practiced for its own sake, but as a tool to achieve something, which increases student motivation and involvement.

CLT also redefines classroom roles. Pérez (2023) states, that students are the protagonist of their learning process, while teachers serve as a facilitator who design opportunities for interaction. The classroom becomes a learning community where collaboration, support, and trust are essential for students to feel confident using the foreign language.

### 1.2.2. What is a didactic guide?

According to the proposal by Pérez (2023), a guide or "didactic proposal" for teaching English under the CLT methodology is designed to develop communicative competence by integrating curricular content with real-life language use. More than a content list, it is a structured plan that defines objectives, activities, methodologies, and evaluation systems to create a coherent and meaningful learning experience.

From the perspective of García (2019), a guide of this type is presented as an "alternative proposal" that designs and organizes communicative activities to be used as a complementary and systematic resource for classroom implementation. It provides the teacher with practical, evidence-based lesson plans that brings the communicative approach to life.



In essence, a didactic guide translates theoretical pedagogy into classroom practice. It ensures that each activity contributes to communicative goals of the curriculum while offering teachers clarity, structure, and pedagogical coherence.

#### **1.2.2.1. What are the benefits of a didactic guide?**

For teachers, a didactic guide offers a well-structured roadmap. Pérez (2023) emphasizes that it facilitates the planning of sessions, selection of methods, and alignment with curricular objectives, ensuring educational coherence and intentionality.

Furthermore, the guide promotes more meaningful and student-centered learning. By being based on principles such as cooperative learning and a culture of thinking, as mentioned by Pérez (2023), a didactic guide fosters a work environment where the student is the protagonist, feels motivated, and develops higher-order skills like critical thinking and metacognition.

Furthermore, the guide enhances assessment. Tools such as rubrics and checklists embedded in the guide allow for both teacher-and self-assessment of progress in communicative competence. This promotes transparency, reflection and data-driven instructional improvements.

#### **1.2.2.2. Improving Language Learning with a CLT Didactic Guide**

According to Pérez (2023), a didactic guide grounded in CLT places the student as the protagonist, fostering their autonomy and responsibility through cooperative learning and reflection. By using the language to perform tasks with a real purpose, such as describing, comparing, or presenting information, learning ceases to be a memorization of rules and becomes a social construction of meanings useful for daily life.

This type of guide improves motivation, a vital factor in language learning. Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022) point out that CLT, by using authentic materials and relevant activities, fosters intrinsic and integrative motivation, as students see the utility of the language and develop a



positive attitude towards the associated culture. A CLT guide systematically structures these motivating experiences.

Santamaria et al. (2023) further demonstrate that structured CLT guides productive skills, especially oral and written expression. Therefore, such guide not only make language learning more engaging but also more effective and goal-oriented.

### **1.3. Dependent Variable: The Improvement of the Speaking Skill with a Focus on Vocabulary**

According to Ruiz (2022), oral production is a basic communicative competence that involves constructing and sharing meanings through verbal and non-verbal symbols in different contexts. This skill is highly valued by students and is often the most difficult to develop, as it is influenced by factors such as lexical knowledge and speaking confidence.

This construct can be broken down into sub-skills. As detailed by González et al. (2024), oral competence encompasses indicators such as fluency, grammatical accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary competence, and discourse complexity. Therefore, "improvement" will be measured through progress in these areas.

The focus on vocabulary is crucial, as Ruiz (2022) explains, limited lexis poses a direct obstacle to oral production; students may know the structure but not have the words to communicate. Improvement, then, involves not only speaking more but speaking with a broader and more precise lexical range, using words effectively to define concepts and express complex ideas.

#### **1.3.1. The Speaking Skill: Influence on Vocabulary through Communicative Tasks**

Citing Ruiz (2022), speaking a language is considered by many to be the most important skill, as it is the most evident manifestation of language mastery. It is not just about knowing rules, but about being able to use that knowledge in interaction, which involves complex cognitive



processes such as selecting appropriate vocabulary and correctly articulating sounds and grammatical structures.

Communicative tasks directly influence the acquisition and use of vocabulary. As Pérez (2023) explains, when students focus on using the language to achieve a concrete objective, such as in information-transfer activities or role-plays, vocabulary acquires a functional and contextual meaning. Learning becomes inductive; students discover and assimilate words through their practical application.

This interaction between the communicative task and lexis is a positive feedback loop. According to García (2019), oral practice in engaging and realistic activities not only improves fluency but also increases students' confidence, which in turn encourages them to experiment with new vocabulary. When students have opportunities to apply words in context, vocabulary is internalized more effectively than through rote memorization.

### **1.3.2. Functional Vocabulary in A2 Students**

Functional vocabulary for A2-level students, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), comprises the words and expressions necessary to handle simple, everyday tasks and to describe aspects of the immediate environment.

According to the CEFR (2002), an A2-level student is capable of understanding frequently used sentences and expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance, such as basic personal and family information, shopping, places of interest, and occupations. Their vocabulary, therefore, must be grounded in these familiar, high-frequency contexts to be functional.

For Ruiz (2022), this functional vocabulary allows sixth-grade students (a level comparable to A2) to answer personal questions, make simple descriptions of objects and people, and express their basic feelings or needs. It is not an extensive or abstract lexicon, but a practical and concrete repertoire that allows for communicative survival in predictable situations.



Considering García (2019), teaching at this level should focus on vocabulary that students can use immediately in communicative activities, as the lack of relevant words is a major impediment to oral expression. Therefore, the functional vocabulary for an A2 student includes terms to talk about family, clothes, food, leisure time, and other daily routines, which together form the foundation for more advanced language use.

### **1.3.3. Common Difficulties in Speaking**

According to Ruiz (2022), one of the most significant shortcomings is the fear of making mistakes, particularly in pronunciation, which generates a fear of ridicule from peers and apathy towards oral participation. This lack of confidence is a psychological block that prevents students from taking risks to use the language, even if they possess the grammatical knowledge.

For Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022), another difficulty arises from traditional teaching methods, which emphasize grammar and memorization instead of real communication, leaving students with a passive knowledge of the language. This practice results in a lack of fluency and the inability to organize ideas to express them coherently in a spontaneous, real-time conversation.

From the perspective of García (2019), the scarcity of vocabulary and the lack of exposure to authentic language are fundamental barriers. Students fail to communicate effectively because they do not know the necessary words or are not familiar with how they are used in real contexts. This, combined with the lack of meaningful oral practice in the classroom, perpetuates a cycle of poor performance and reduced motivation.

According to Cuadros (2025), a significant barrier to the development of oral skills is Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety (FLCA), a concept introduced by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986). This anxiety is characterized by the pressure and nervousness students feel when they have to express themselves orally in a non-native language, often stemming from a fear of making mistakes in front of peers or the teacher. As stated by Cuadros (2025), factors such as time



constraints for preparing responses and a lack of confidence in their own communicative abilities can exacerbate this anxiety, leading to a negative effect on their performance and participation.

Granados and Ramos (2024) identify several key difficulties that affect students' oral production, including a limited vocabulary, poor pronunciation, and trouble with auditory comprehension. These issues directly impact their security when speaking, the fluency of their messages, and their ability to communicate assertively. Furthermore, they note that students often struggle with coherence due to a lack of pertinent vocabulary like conjunctions, leading to discourse marked by hesitation, pauses, and repetition.

#### **1.3.4. Influencing Factors: Motivation, Confidence, Context**

The development of oral skills is a complex process influenced by an interaction of affective, cognitive, and contextual factors that can facilitate or inhibit a student's ability to communicate.

Motivation is a vital factor, as Pérez (2023) points out, as it is the will and interest that drives the student to learn and participate in communicative activities. Motivation can be intrinsic (pleasure of learning) or instrumental (achieving a practical goal), and an effective teacher must create conditions that foster both types, making learning relevant and meaningful.

Confidence, or the lack thereof, is another crucial element. Ruiz (2022) highlights that the fear of making mistakes, especially in pronunciation, and inhibition in front of peers are significant barriers that prevent students from participating orally. A positive classroom environment, where errors are seen as a natural part of learning, is fundamental for developing students' willingness to speak.

Finally, the learning context plays a decisive role. García (2019) and Al-Khamisi (2022) note that the lack of practice in realistic situations and the use of non-authentic materials limit the development of communicative skills applicable outside the classroom. A teaching context that



uses the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach and promotes interaction in real-life scenarios is more conducive to building lasting oral competence.

In the view of Javier (2024), communication skills are fundamental for students' well-being, academic success, and personal growth. The development of these skills is significantly influenced by contextual and educational factors, such as the social environment of the classroom and the teaching strategies employed. A positive and interactive context, where collaboration is encouraged and students feel supported, is crucial for fostering the confidence needed for effective oral communication.

According to Ortega and Muñoz (2021), a key influencing factor is the pedagogical strategy's ability to connect with students' reality and interests. They propose that using Transmedia Narratives, which allows students to explore and expand stories across multiple platforms, can create a more engaging and significant learning experience. This approach taps into students' existing media consumption habits and transforms them into active creators of content, thereby strengthening their communicative skills in a context that is both motivating and culturally relevant.

For Peña-Ledesma (2024), the affective filter, as theorized by Krashen, is a critical factor influencing language acquisition. The author states that learners with low motivation or high anxiety have a strong affective filter that can prevent them from acquiring the language, even when exposed to comprehensible input. Consequently, creating a positive and low-anxiety classroom environment where students have high self-confidence is essential for lowering this filter and facilitating the development of oral skills.

#### **1.4. Legal Foundation**

##### **1.4.1. Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador**

The 2008 Constitution of Ecuador establishes a framework of rights that supports comprehensive, intercultural, and quality education, reinforcing the relevance of this research.



Article 26 of the Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador (2008) establishes education as a right of individuals and an inescapable duty of the State, guaranteeing social equality and inclusion as a condition for "good living." This principle obliges the educational system to seek the most effective methodologies for the holistic development of students, including their communicative competencies.

The application of a didactic guide based on CLT aligns with this mandate by seeking to improve the quality of English teaching and, therefore, the opportunities for adolescents in a globalized society, promoting an education that is both a right and a means to achieve equity.

According to Article 27 of the Constitution (2008), education "shall focus on the human being and guarantee their holistic development... it will be participatory, compulsory, intercultural, democratic, inclusive, and diverse, of quality and warmth." This article promotes the development of skills and abilities to create and work, which is directly related to the enhancement of communicative competencies.

The focus of this research, by centering on improving oral ability, directly responds to the need to develop practical and transferable language skills, not just theoretical knowledge. The implementation of CLT fosters a participatory and intercultural classroom environment, respecting the diversity of students and preparing them to interact in a pluralistic world.

Article 347, numeral 9, of the Constitution (2008) guarantees the "intercultural bilingual education system, in which the primary language of education will be that of the respective nationality and Spanish as the language of intercultural relations." Although it focuses on ancestral languages, it establishes the principle of bilingualism and interculturality as core elements of the national education system.

This principle of bilingualism and interculturality can be extended to the teaching of English as a foreign language. The proposed guide, by using a communicative approach, not only teaches



the language but also serves as a platform for intercultural exchange, allowing Ecuadorian adolescents to communicate with and understand other world perspectives.

#### **1.4.2. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages**

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is the international standard that defines linguistic competencies, providing a solid basis for curriculum planning, assessment and language instruction.

According to the CEFR (2002), the goal of language education is not simply the isolated mastery of a language, but "the development of a linguistic repertoire in which all linguistic capacities have their place." This plurilingual and pluricultural approach values partial competencies and the development of the student's motivation, skill, and confidence.

This research aligns with this vision by proposing a guide that not only seeks to improve oral ability but also to strengthen adolescents' communicative confidence and intrinsic motivation. By focusing on the A2 level, a specific stage in the development of plurilingual competence is recognized and valued, seeking to enrich it in a meaningful way.

The CEFR (2002) defines the A2 level (Waystage) as the point at which the user can understand frequently used sentences and expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance, and can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information.

This study focuses on A2-level students because it represents a fundamental base in language proficiency. The didactic guide will be designed to consolidate and expand these basic competencies, using CLT to ensure that the learning of vocabulary and oral structures is contextually meaningful and applicable to the real-life communication.

According to the CEFR (2002), the approach adopted for teaching and learning should be action-oriented, considering language users as "social agents" who perform tasks. Language activities,



such as speaking, are part of a broader social context that gives them full meaning, and the goal is to develop the communicative competencies to act effectively in that context.

The proposed guide is based on this action-oriented approach. The selected communicative activities will not be mere repetition exercises, but authentic, purposeful tasks, where adolescents use English to solve problems, share opinions, or create something collaboratively, mirroring the actual use of language in real-life interactions.



## CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH AND DIAGNOSTIC STUDY

This chapter details the methodological framework that supports this research. It describes the adopted research approach, the scope of the study, and the methods and types of research selected to answer the research questions. Additionally, it presents the conceptualization and operationalization of the variables, the delimitation of the population and sample, and describes the four key stages that structured the research process, from the theoretical foundation to the validation of the proposal.

### 2.1. Conceptualization and Operationalization of Variables

To ensure clarity and precision in measuring the central constructs of this research, the dependent and independent variables have been conceptualized and operationalized. The following table breaks down each variable into its dimensions, indicators, the instruments that will be used for its measurement, and the corresponding scoring scales.

**Tabla 2.** *Conceptualization and Operationalization of Variable*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data Collection Instruments</b>	<b>Scoring Scales Employed</b>
<b>Independent Variable: Guide of communicative activities under the CLT approach.</b>	A pedagogical strategy designed to improve speaking skills, consisting of the systematic application of	<b>1. Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of active participation.</li> <li>• Quality of arguments.</li> <li>• Use of relevant vocabulary.</li> </ul>	Activity Observation Rubric.	Rating Scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor).



<p>four communicative activities: Discussion, Role Play, Simulation, and Story Completion.</p>				
	<p><b>2. Role Play</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creativity in role interpretation.</li> <li>• Coherence in dialogue.</li> <li>• Interaction with other participants.</li> </ul>	<p>Activity Observation Rubric.</p>	<p>Rating Scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor).</p>
	<p><b>3. Simulation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptation to the simulated situation.</li> <li>• Use of appropriate functional language.</li> <li>• Resolution of the communicative task.</li> </ul>	<p>Activity Observation Rubric.</p>	<p>Rating Scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor).</p>
	<p><b>4. Story Completion</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative coherence.</li> <li>• Creativity in the outcome.</li> <li>• Correct use of verb tenses.</li> </ul>	<p>Activity Observation Rubric.</p>	<p>Rating Scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor).</p>

<b>Dependent Variable: A2 Level English Speaking Skills.</b>	The student's ability to communicate orally in an effective and understandable manner at an A2 proficiency level, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).	<b>1. Fluency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuity in speech.</li> <li>• Speech rate.</li> <li>• Use of appropriate pauses.</li> </ul>	Oral Pre-test and Post-test (audio/video recorded). Oral Assessment Rubric.	Numerical scale (1-5, where 1 is "Very Poor" and 5 is "Excellent").
		<b>2. Grammatical Accuracy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct use of A2 grammatical structures.</li> <li>• Minimal errors in verb conjugation.</li> <li>• Subject-verb agreement.</li> </ul>	Oral Pre-test and Post-test (audio/video recorded). Oral Assessment Rubric.	Numerical scale (1-5).
		<b>3. Pronunciation and Vocabulary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity in the articulation of sounds.</li> <li>• Appropriate intonation.</li> <li>• Range of vocabulary used.</li> </ul>	Oral Pre-test and Post-test (audio/video recorded). Oral Assessment Rubric.	Numerical scale (1-5).



## 2.2. Research Approach

According to Hernandez et al. (2010), mixed methods represent a set of systematic, empirical, and critical research processes that involve the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, as well as their integration and joint discussion, to make inferences from all the collected information (meta-inferences) and achieve a greater understanding of the phenomenon under study.

This research will adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative elements to obtain a more complete and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon. The quantitative component will focus on measuring the improvement of speaking skills through pre-tests and post-tests, the results of which will be statistically analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the activity guide. The qualitative component will be used to observe and describe the adolescents' performance during the communicative activities (Discussion, Role Play, etc.) using rubrics, which will allow for the analysis of the richness and quality of their interactions and oral productions in a natural classroom context. The integration of both approaches will not only allow for the quantification of improvement but also for understanding how and why these changes occur.

## 2.3. Scope of the Research

According to Hernandez et al. (2010), descriptive studies aim to specify the properties, characteristics, and profiles of people, groups, communities, processes, objects, or any other phenomenon subjected to analysis. On the other hand, explanatory studies "are aimed at answering the causes of physical or social events and phenomena."

The scope of this research is primarily **descriptive and correlational-explanatory**, with an **applied** character. It is **descriptive** because it will seek to detail the level of the adolescents' speaking skills before and after the intervention. It is **correlational-explanatory** because it aims to establish the relationship between the use of the activity guide (independent variable) and the improvement in speaking skills (dependent variable), seeking to explain how the former



influences the latter. Finally, it is **applied** research, as its purpose is to solve a practical and concrete problem: improving the English communication skills of A2 level adolescents, generating a useful tool for teachers and students.

#### **2.4. Declaration and Justification of the Research Type**

Baena (2014) defines field research as that which is conducted "on the reality being studied" and documentary research as the "inquiry of documents." These types of research allow for a direct and contextualized approach to the phenomenon of interest, as well as the necessary theoretical foundation.

This research is classified as field and documentary research. It is field research because it will be conducted directly with the subjects of study (A2 level adolescents) in their natural learning environment, the classroom. The instruments will be applied and observations will be made in this context to ensure the validity of the data. In turn, it is documentary research because an exhaustive review of bibliographic and theoretical sources on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, English teaching strategies, and the development of speaking skills in adolescents will be carried out to build the theoretical framework that supports the proposal.

Regarding its temporal dimension, it is considered a **cross-sectional** study, as data collection will be carried out in a specific and determined period before and after the application of the guide to measure the change in the variables, without long-term follow-up.

#### **2.5. Methods Used and Their Purposes in the Research Context**

For mixed-methods research, methods must be selected that allow for the collection of both numerical and descriptive data, ensuring a comprehensive view of the problem. The choice of the right methods is crucial for the validity of the results.

The methods that will be used in this study are:



1. **Quasi-Experimental Method:** A pre-test and post-test design with a control group will be used for the quantitative part.
  - **Purpose:** To evaluate the impact of the activity guide. The level of speaking skills will be measured before the intervention (pre-test) and after it (post-test) in an experimental group that will use the guide and in a control group that will continue with the traditional methodology. This will allow for the comparison of results and determination of whether there is a significant improvement attributable to the guide.
  
2. **Participant Observation Method:** The researcher will actively observe the development of the activities (Discussion, Role Play, Simulation, Story Completion) in the experimental group.
  - **Purpose:** To collect qualitative data on how students interact, use language, face communicative challenges, and apply the proposed strategies. This observation will allow for understanding the process of improvement and not just the final result.

## 2.6. Instruments Derived from the Selected Methodology

The selection of instruments must be consistent with the defined methods and variables. Baena (2014) points out that instruments are the supports that enable techniques to fulfill their purpose.

The instruments that will be used for data collection are:

1. **Oral Tests (Pre-test and Post-test):** These will consist of a series of standardized communicative tasks, recorded on audio and/or video, designed to assess the A2 proficiency level. These tests will measure the three dimensions of the dependent variable: fluency, grammatical accuracy, and pronunciation/vocabulary.
  
2. **Assessment Rubrics:**



- **Oral Assessment Rubric:** This will be used to objectively score the oral tests. It will contain numerical scales for each indicator (continuity, speed, use of structures, etc.).
- **Activity Observation Rubrics:** A rubric will be designed for each of the four activities in the guide. These rubrics will allow the researcher to record and assess the qualitative performance of the students during each activity (level of participation, coherence, creativity, etc.).

**Researcher's Field Journal:** A detailed record of observations, reflections, incidents, and perceptions of the researcher will be kept during the sessions, which will enrich the qualitative analysis.

## 2.7. Delimitation of the Population and Sample

The population of this study is composed of all tenth-grade students of Higher Basic General Education at the Pedro José Rosales School, located in the Dos Mangas community.

For the selection of the sample, a non-probabilistic convenience sampling method was used. This method was chosen because the researcher had direct access to the study group in its natural learning context, which is a common and feasible practice in action-research designs. The sample consisted of 13 students between the ages of 14 and 15, whose English proficiency level was diagnosed as A2 according to the CEFR.

The **inclusion criteria** for participating in the study were: a) being an enrolled tenth-grade student at the institution, b) having an A2 English level, and c) having the informed consent of their legal guardians to participate in the research. Students who did not meet these criteria were excluded.

## 2.8. Methodological Strategy and Research Stages



The research was structured into four sequential stages, designed to ensure a logical and rigorous process, from the theoretical foundation to the evaluation of the proposal.

### **1. Theoretical Study Stage**

This first phase, the result of which is consolidated in Chapter 1, focused on conducting a comprehensive literature review. The purpose was to build a solid theoretical framework to define and conceptualize the research variables. The foundations of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Approach, strategies for developing oral skills, the role of functional vocabulary at the A2 level, and affective factors such as motivation and confidence in teenagers were analyzed. This critical analysis of the literature provided the basis for selecting the communicative activities and the overall design of the proposal.

### **2. Initial Diagnostic Stage**

The objective of this stage was to collect data to establish a baseline of the students' oral skills and perceptions before the intervention. For this purpose, an expert-validated qualitative pre-test, consisting of a recorded oral production task, was administered to the sample of 13 students. This instrument allowed for the measurement of the dependent variable's indicators: fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary use. Additionally, focus groups were conducted to explore **in depth** the students' attitudes toward learning English and to identify the main challenges and fears they face when speaking the language.

### **3. Proposal Modeling Stage**

In this phase, the independent variable was designed: the guide of communicative activities. Based on the findings from the theoretical stage and the needs identified in the initial diagnosis, the proposal was structured. Four types of activities based on the CLT approach were selected and adapted: discussions, role-plays, simulations, and story completion. Each activity was designed to be interactive, meaningful, and contextualized in real-life situations to foster active participation, develop functional vocabulary, and build student confidence.



#### 4. Final Diagnostic and Validation Stage

The final stage involved implementing the guide of activities with the group of 13 students and subsequently evaluating its effectiveness. During the intervention, observation rubrics were used to qualitatively record student performance in each activity. At the end of the application period, an expert-validated qualitative post-test, parallel to the pre-test, was administered to measure progress in oral expression skills. Finally, a comparative analysis was conducted between the pre-test and post-test results to validate the impact of the guide and to determine whether the research hypothesis was supported.

#### 2.9. Presentation of the Diagnostic Study Results

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the findings gathered during the initial diagnostic stage. The fundamental purpose of this phase, as established in the methodological strategy, was to establish a clear and detailed baseline of the current state of the English oral production skills of the tenth-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School, as well as to explore in depth their perceptions, attitudes, and the challenges they face in learning the language.

To achieve this objective, two key instruments aligned with the mixed-methods approach of the research were used:

1. A **qualitative pre-test of oral production**, consisting of a recorded communicative task, designed to objectively measure the indicators of the dependent variable (fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary) according to the descriptors of the A2 level of the CEFR.
2. **Focus groups**, conducted to gather qualitative data on affective and contextual barriers, directly addressing the specific objectives of exploring student perceptions and identifying their main challenges when speaking.

The triangulation of the quantitative data obtained from the pre-test rubrics and the qualitative data from the focus groups allows not only for a description of the students' proficiency level but



also for an understanding of the underlying causes of their difficulties. The results from each instrument are detailed below, followed by an integrated discussion and the conclusions of the causal diagnosis that justify the need for and design of the intervention proposal.

### 2.10. Analysis of the Oral Production Pre-Test Results

The pre-test was designed as a standardized oral task administered to a sample of 9 students' representative of the study group. The task consisted of answering a series of basic personal questions ("What's your name?", "Can you spell your name?", "Where do you come from?") and an open-ended question that required a more elaborate production ("Tell me about your favorite day of the weekend?"). This last question was crucial for assessing the students' ability to organize a brief discourse and use functional vocabulary beyond basic personal information.

Each performance was evaluated using an analytical rubric with a scale of 1 (Very Limited) to 5 (Excellent), focusing on the four language skills, but with a primary emphasis on **oral production (Speaking)**, which is the core of this research.

### 2.11. General Quantitative Results

The numerical results reveal a concerning picture of the group's oral proficiency. The overall mean score in the **Speaking** skill was **1.78 out of 5**, which places the group at an average between the "Very Limited" and "Limited" levels. No student reached the "Good" (4) or "Excellent" (5) categories, and only one student achieved a "Satisfactory" (3) rating.

For a clearer visualization, the following table summarizes the scores obtained by the 9 participants in the oral production assessment.

**Tabla 3.** *Summary of Oral Production (Speaking) Pre-Test Scores*

Student	Score (1-5)	Level Descriptor	Qualitative Rubric Descriptor (Observed)
---------	----------------	------------------	---



<b>Student 1 (H. Tigreiro)</b>	3	Satisfactory	"Can speak with pauses; makes some grammar or vocabulary errors."
<b>Student 2 (J. de los Santos)</b>	1	Very Limited	"Cannot express ideas or answer basic questions."
<b>Student 3</b>	1	Very Limited	"Cannot express ideas or answer basic questions."
<b>Student 4</b>	2	Limited	"Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences."
<b>Student 5</b>	2	Limited	"Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences."
<b>Student 6</b>	2	Limited	"Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences."
<b>Student 7</b>	2	Limited	"Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences."
<b>Student 8</b>	2	Limited	"Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences."
<b>Student 9</b>	1	Very Limited	"Cannot express ideas or answer basic questions."
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>Limited / Very Limited</b>	

The distribution of scores, as shown in the following chart, is even more revealing. 89% of the students (8 out of 9) are in the two lowest levels of the scale.

## 2.12. Detailed Analysis by Dimensions of the Dependent Variable

Below is an analysis of the students' performance based on the three key dimensions of the dependent variable "A2 Level English Speaking Skills," as operationalized in the methodology.



## 1. Dimension: Fluency

The indicators for this dimension were continuity in speech, speech rate, and the use of appropriate pauses. The pre-test results indicate that a lack of fluency is the most widespread and visible problem in the group.

- 56% of the students (5 students) were rated with the descriptor "Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences." In practice, this manifested as halting speech, with long pauses while searching for words and an inability to connect ideas. Their answers to the question about their favorite weekend day were often limited to one or two words (e.g., "Sunday... play") without being able to form a complete sentence.
- 33% (3 students) were at the lowest level, where fluency is virtually non-existent, as they could not "express ideas or answer basic questions." In these cases, communication broke down completely.
- Even the only student at the "Satisfactory" level was described as someone who "speaks with pauses," indicating that despite being able to communicate, their speech lacks the naturalness and rhythm expected of a consolidated A2 level.

These findings demonstrate that students have not developed the necessary automaticity for speech. Their cognitive processing is so focused on recalling words and grammatical rules that fluid production is severely hindered, a classic symptom of anxiety and lack of communicative practice.

## 2. Dimension: Grammatical Accuracy

This dimension assesses the correct use of A2-level grammatical structures, verb conjugation, and subject-verb agreement. Although the rubric does not detail specific errors, the overall performance points to significant deficiencies.



- For the 8 students at the "Limited" and "Very Limited" levels, the inability to form "complete sentences" is in itself evidence of very poor grammatical control. The basic sentence structure in English (Subject-Verb-Object) does not seem to be internalized for spontaneous production.
- The student at the "Satisfactory" level was explicitly noted for making "some grammatical errors." This suggests that while they can construct phrases, their accuracy is inconsistent.
- The difficulty in answering the question about the weekend demonstrates a lack of mastery of basic tenses like the present simple to describe routines or preferences.

This deficit in active grammatical accuracy (in speech) contrasts with the passive knowledge that many students may have. As the literature points out, traditional pedagogical models often result in students who "know" the grammar but cannot "use" it in real-time communication.

### **3. Dimension: Pronunciation and Vocabulary**

The indicators for this dimension are clarity in sound articulation, intonation, and the range of vocabulary used. The results show that functional vocabulary is a critical barrier.

- The descriptor "Cannot express ideas" (applied to 33% of students) is a clear indication of an insufficient lexicon. The students simply do not have the necessary words to talk about a topic as common as their weekend activities.
- The "Satisfactory" student was also marked for making "vocabulary errors," which implies that although they have a larger repertoire, it is still limited or used inaccurately.
- The general failure in the extended production task ("Tell me about your favorite day...") suggests that their vocabulary is limited to isolated words and not to functional "chunks" or phrases that would allow them to talk about routines, likes, and leisure activities—an essential component of the A2 level according to the CEFR.



- Regarding pronunciation, although it was not the main focus of the rubric, observations during the pre-test indicated that many pronunciation errors hindered comprehension, which in turn is related to a lack of confidence and fear of speaking.

In summary, the oral production pre-test reveals that the majority of students do not possess the functional communicative skills expected for the A2 level. Their ability to speak is severely limited by a combination of a lack of fluency, grammatical inaccuracies, and, most critically, a deficit in functional vocabulary that prevents them from expressing simple personal ideas.

## 2.12. Analysis of Focus Group Results

To complement the quantitative data and address the research objectives regarding student perceptions and challenges, focus group sessions were conducted. These discussions allowed students to express their feelings, beliefs, and experiences about learning English in a trustworthy environment. The analysis of these conversations revealed several recurring themes that explain the deep-rooted causes of the low performance observed in the pre-test.

### Theme 1: Low Perception of Utility and Instrumental Motivation

One of the first perceptions that consistently emerged was the belief that English has little or no practical application in their daily lives. In the context of the rural community of Dos Mangas, students expressed difficulty in seeing the relevance of the language.

- **Recurring phrases:** "Nobody speaks English here," "I don't need it for anything in the village," "What's the point of this if I'm not going to travel?"
- **Analysis:** This perception demonstrates a lack of instrumental motivation, which, as Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022) point out, is the desire to learn a language for a practical purpose such as getting a better job. Although tourism is an economic activity in the region, students have not connected learning English with this tangible opportunity. Their vision is immediate and geographically limited, resulting in an attitude of apathy towards



the classes. This finding confirms the need raised in the general objective to "change their perception that English is not necessary in their environment."

### **Theme 2: Fear as the Main Barrier (High Affective Filter)**

The most dominant and emotionally charged theme was fear. Students described a paralyzing anxiety specifically associated with the act of speaking English in class, which aligns perfectly with the concept of *Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety* (FLCA) described in the literature.

- **Sub-theme 2.1: Fear of making mistakes and ridicule.** Students expressed an overwhelming fear of being wrong, especially with pronunciation. Phrases like "I'm embarrassed to speak because they'll laugh at me," "I know I'll say it wrong," or "I'd rather say nothing than have the teacher correct me in front of everyone" were common. This fear, as Ruiz (2022) notes, generates an aversion to oral participation.
- **Sub-theme 2.2: Lack of confidence.** As a direct consequence of fear, students reported a profound lack of confidence in their own abilities. They expressed beliefs such as "I'm not good at English," "It's too hard for me," or "I'll never be able to speak it well." This low self-efficacy creates a vicious cycle: they do not participate due to a lack of confidence, and by not participating, they do not develop competence, which reinforces their belief that they are incapable.

These affective findings are crucial. Krashen's "affective filter," mentioned by Peña-Ledesma (2024), is clearly high in these students. Anxiety and low self-esteem act as a block that prevents knowledge (even the little they possess) from being converted into oral production.

### **Theme 3: Vocabulary Deficit as a Practical Obstacle**

Beyond fears, students identified a very concrete barrier: a lack of words.



- **Recurring phrases:** "I want to say something, but I don't know the word," "I understand the question, but I don't know how to answer," "I only know single words, I can't form an idea."
- **Analysis:** This confirms that the vocabulary problem detected in the pre-test is a difficulty consciously perceived by the students themselves. They feel a real frustration at not having the necessary lexicon to express their thoughts. This corroborates the statements by García (2019) and Ruiz (2022) about how a scarcity of vocabulary is a fundamental barrier to oral communication.

#### **Theme 4: Traditional Pedagogy and Lack of Communicative Practice**

Finally, it was inferred from the discussions that previous learning experiences had focused on traditional methods, which contributed to their current lack of communicative ability.

- **Student comments:** "Before, we just filled out worksheets," "We used to copy the rules from the board," "We hardly ever spoke in class, we just read or wrote."
- **Analysis:** These descriptions point to a pedagogical model that relegated the student to a passive role, as criticized in the problem justification. The lack of interactive and meaningful activities has resulted in a gap between passive knowledge of the language and active oral competence. They have not had enough opportunities to practice speaking in real contexts, which has prevented the development of fluency and confidence.

#### **2.13. Integrated Discussion and Interpretation of Results**

The true strength of this diagnosis lies in the triangulation of the findings from the pre-test and the focus groups. The quantitative and qualitative data not only complement each other but also explain each other, offering a holistic and profound view of the problem.

The mean Speaking score of 1.78 on the pre-test is the numerical reflection of the affective and pedagogical barriers described in the focus groups. It is not simply a "low grade"; it is the



quantifiable evidence of the silence imposed by fear. When a student "cannot express ideas or answer basic questions," it is not necessarily due to a cognitive inability, but because the fear of ridicule and lack of confidence, as they themselves expressed, create an insurmountable block. The affective filter is so high that oral production becomes impossible.

Similarly, the descriptor "very limited fluency" and the production of "short or incomplete sentences" observed in 56% of the sample are the direct result of two factors identified in the focus groups: the lack of functional vocabulary and the lack of communicative practice. Students cannot speak fluently because, as they say, "they don't know the words" and because their previous learning experiences have not given them the opportunity to automate speech through interaction. A pedagogy focused on grammar and writing has failed to prepare them for the real-time demands of oral communication.

The low instrumental motivation, linked to the perception that English is useless in their context, acts as the backdrop that exacerbates all other problems. If a student sees no clear purpose for learning ("What's the use?"), their investment of effort will be minimal, and their resilience to overcome anxiety and frustration will be almost nil.

Therefore, the diagnostic situation is that of a group of students trapped in a negative cycle:

1. Low motivation and the perception of uselessness decrease their engagement.
2. Traditional pedagogies and a lack of practice have left them with deficient vocabulary and fluency.
3. This skill deficit, combined with the fear of error, generates extreme anxiety (FLCA) and a lack of confidence.
4. Anxiety and self-doubt prevent oral participation, which in turn prevents skill improvement.



5. The stagnation in their skills reinforces their belief that they are incapable and that English is "too hard," completing the cycle.

#### 2.14. Conclusions of the Causal Diagnosis

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, it can be concluded that the low level of oral production proficiency among the tenth-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School is not a single-cause problem, but the result of the interaction of affective, pedagogical, and contextual factors. The root causes of the problem are:

1. **Primary Cause: Affective and Psychological Barriers.** The most significant and immediate cause is the existence of an extremely high affective filter. This filter manifests as severe Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety (FLCA), fueled by a paralyzing fear of making mistakes and being ridiculed, resulting in virtually non-existent self-confidence. These psychological barriers are the main impediment preventing students from daring to participate and practice.
2. **Secondary Cause: Pedagogical and Exposure Deficits.** The affective problem is exacerbated by pedagogical deficiencies. A lack of exposure to a communicative methodology (CLT) has deprived students of opportunities to use the language meaningfully and interactively. Traditional instruction has generated passive, inert knowledge and has failed to develop either the fluency or the functional vocabulary necessary for real communication.
3. **Tertiary Cause: Contextual and Motivational Factors.** The rural environment and the perception that English is irrelevant to their immediate lives create a significant lack of motivation, especially instrumental motivation. Without a clear and tangible purpose, the students' willingness to invest the necessary effort to overcome **affective** and skill barriers is minimal.



In conclusion, the diagnosis overwhelmingly reveals that any intervention seeking to be effective cannot be limited to teaching vocabulary or grammar. A change in approach is imperative. The proposal must be, first and foremost, an intervention on the affective filter. It must focus on creating a safe and supportive learning environment that reduces anxiety, builds confidence, and fosters motivation.

This diagnosis fully validates the relevance of the proposed solution: "A guide of interactive communicative activities using the CLT approach." The CLT approach, with its principles of meaningful communication, collaborative work, and tolerance for error, is precisely designed to address the identified root causes. Playful, contextualized, and student-centered activities are the strategic tool to dismantle affective barriers, make learning relevant, and finally, allow students to develop their oral production skills in an environment where they feel safe to speak.



### CHAPTER 3: PRESENTATION AND VALIDATION OF THE PROPOSAL

This chapter is dedicated to the modeling, presentation, and validation of the scientific solution designed to address the problem identified in the diagnosis: the low level of English oral production competence among the tenth-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School. The proposal consists of a didactic guide of communicative activities, based on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, aiming to transform the teaching-learning process into an interactive, motivating, and affectively safe environment that allows A2-level adolescents to improve their fluency, grammatical accuracy, and, crucially, their functional vocabulary.

The structure of the proposal is detailed below, from its conception and theoretical foundation to its empirical validation, demonstrating its relevance, originality, and feasibility in the specific rural context of the research.

#### 3.1. Modeling the Proposal: "Speak Up! A CLT Guide for A2 Teens"

The proposal materializes as a didactic guide titled "**Speak Up! A CLT Guide for A2 Teens.**" This resource is not a mere compendium of activities, but a comprehensive methodological system designed for implementation by the English teacher to create a learning ecosystem that directly responds to the root causes of the problem identified in Chapter 2: the high affective filter (fear and lack of confidence), the deficit in functional vocabulary, and low instrumental motivation.

#### 3.2. Presentation of the Proposal

The "Speak Up!" guide emerges as a direct and contextualized response to the findings of the diagnostic study. The diagnosis revealed a concerning reality: a group of students with an average oral production level of **1.78 out of 5**, trapped in a cycle of silence imposed by fear of making mistakes, lack of confidence, and the perception that English is irrelevant in their community. Their passive knowledge of the language fails to translate into active communication due to affective barriers and a traditional pedagogy that has not provided them with the tools or opportunities to practice.



"Speak Up!" is a solution of a **psychopedagogical and didactic** nature. It is *psychopedagogical* because its primary objective is to intervene on the affective filter, creating a safe and supportive classroom climate that reduces anxiety (FLCA) and builds students' self-confidence. It is *didactic* because it is based on the principles of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach and Task-Based Learning (TBL), providing a sequence of interactive and meaningful activities that promote the real use of language to fulfill communicative purposes.

The originality of the proposal lies not in the invention of entirely new activities, but in their **adaptation, sequencing, and contextualization** for the specific study group. It focuses on functional A2-level vocabulary directly applicable to the lives and interests of the adolescents in Dos Mangas, connecting learning with their reality and future opportunities such as local tourism. The guide, therefore, is a practical and flexible tool for the teacher to orchestrate a learning experience that is both affectively positive and communicatively effective.

### 3.3. Purposes and Objectives of the Proposal

#### General Objective:

- To implement a didactic guide of communicative activities ("Speak Up!") based on the CLT approach to significantly reduce affective barriers and improve the oral production competence (fluency, accuracy, and functional vocabulary) of the A2-level tenth-grade students at Pedro José Rosales School.

#### Specific Objectives:

1. **Create a Low Affective Filter Learning Environment:** To establish a classroom climate based on trust, respect, and collaboration, where students feel safe to experiment with the language without fear of ridicule for their mistakes.
2. **Increase Intrinsic and Instrumental Motivation:** To design and apply activities that are intrinsically interesting and playful for adolescents, and that simultaneously



demonstrate the practical and tangible utility of English in their local context and future aspirations.

3. **Develop Active Functional Vocabulary:** To facilitate the acquisition and spontaneous use of a repertoire of A2-level vocabulary and phrases related to topics of immediate relevance to the students, through authentic communicative tasks.
4. **Improve Speech Fluency and Coherence:** To provide constant and structured opportunities for oral practice that allow students to move from producing isolated words or short phrases to constructing more continuous and coherent discourse in simple communication tasks.

### 3.4. Foundation of the Proposal

The "Speak Up!" guide is supported by a solid theoretical framework that integrates key concepts from second language acquisition, educational psychology, and English language teaching didactics.

- **Communicative Language Teaching (CLT):** The cornerstone of the proposal is CLT. As stated by Richards (2005) and Ruiz (2022), language is acquired through its use for a real purpose. The guide abandons the focus on grammar as an end in itself and replaces it with tasks where effective communication is the goal. Activities are designed for students to negotiate meaning and focus on the message, not just the form, which reduces pressure and fosters fluency.
- **Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis:** The diagnosis showed that the main obstacle is a high affective filter. Following Krashen, as cited by Peña-Ledesma (2024) and Granados and Ramos (2024), a student with high anxiety and low self-confidence will not be able to acquire the language, even when exposed to it. Therefore, every activity in the guide is designed to be "low-anxiety." Working in pairs and small groups, using



games, and validating errors as part of the process are deliberate strategies to "lower the filter" and allow learning to occur.

- **Task-Based Learning (TBL):** The guide adopts the TBL structure as a practical manifestation of CLT. As defined by Granados and Ramos (2024) and Aguilar-Cruz (2018), TBL organizes learning around the completion of a task with a concrete outcome. The activities in the guide (discussions, simulations, etc.) are "tasks" that have a clear objective beyond practicing a grammatical structure. This makes learning more meaningful and motivating.
- **Motivation Theories:** The proposal directly addresses the lack of motivation detected. It relies on the idea that motivation can be cultivated. By using materials and topics relevant to adolescents (music, social media, weekend plans), **intrinsic motivation** is fostered. By connecting activities to real situations (e.g., assisting a tourist in Dos Mangas), **instrumental motivation** is built, demonstrating the utility of English as suggested by Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022).
- **Lexical Approach and Functional Vocabulary:** Recognizing that the vocabulary deficit is a concrete barrier, the guide focuses on teaching and practicing vocabulary in "chunks" or functional phrases, not in isolated word lists. According to the CEFR (2002), an A2 student needs a repertoire for everyday tasks. The guide provides this vocabulary in the context of the tasks, ensuring that students not only "know" the words but can "use" them to communicate.

### 3.5. Characteristics of the Proposal (Characterization)

The "Speak Up!" guide is defined by the following essential characteristics:

- **Student-Centered:** It shifts the focus from the teacher as a mere transmitter of information to the student as the active protagonist of their learning, as promoted by Pérez (2023).



- **Interactive and Collaborative:** It prioritizes work in pairs and small groups to maximize each student's speaking time (Student Talking Time) and create a peer support network, fostering positive interdependence.
- **Contextualized and Meaningful:** Activities and topics are anchored in the reality and interests of A2-level adolescents, using authentic or semi-authentic materials whenever possible to make learning relevant.
- **Progressive and Scaffolded:** Activities are logically sequenced, starting with more controlled and structured tasks that provide high support (scaffolding) before moving on to freer and more creative productions, building confidence step-by-step.
- **Playful and Motivating:** It incorporates elements of gaming (gamification), healthy competition, and creativity to transform the perception of learning English from an obligation to an enjoyable and engaging experience.
- **Process-Oriented and Error-Tolerant:** It values the communication process over grammatical perfection. Errors are treated as learning opportunities, not failures, creating a safe environment for linguistic experimentation.
- **Integrated:** Although the main focus is on the speaking skill, the activities naturally integrate other skills such as listening (to interact), reading (instructions or input), and writing (notes for a presentation).

### 3.6. Basic/Key/Guiding Ideas

The philosophy of the guide can be summarized in the following guiding ideas:

1. **To speak, you have to speak:** Oral competence only develops through constant and meaningful practice.
2. **Confidence comes first:** Before they can learn, students must feel safe. Lowering the affective filter is the number one priority.



3. **Language is a tool, not an object of study:** English acquires value when it is used to do things: share, negotiate, create, solve.
4. **Relevance sparks interest:** Learning is deepened when students can connect what they learn with their own lives and interests.
5. **Together is better:** Learning is a social act. Collaboration among peers reduces anxiety and enriches the learning experience.

### 3.7. Structure and Dynamics of its Components (Type of Proposal)

"Speak Up!" is a didactic guide structured into **5 thematic units**, each designed to be developed over a period of 2 to 3 weeks. Each unit follows a coherent structure based on TBL principles and is designed to address different aspects of oral production.

**Tabla 4.** *General Structure of Each Unit*

Phase	Title	Purpose	Example Activities
<b>1. Spark</b>	<b>"The Spark"</b>	To activate prior knowledge, introduce the topic and key vocabulary in a playful, low-pressure way. To lower the affective filter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brainstorming on the board.</li> <li>- Vocabulary games (Pictionary, Charades).</li> <li>- Short videos or songs related to the topic.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Build</b>	<b>"Building"</b>	To provide controlled and guided practice of functional vocabulary and structures in clear contexts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Information Gap" activities in pairs.</li> <li>- Guided mini-dialogues.</li> <li>- Matching or classification tasks.</li> </ul>



<b>3. Create</b>	<b>"Creating"</b>	To apply the language in a main, freer, and more creative communicative task where the focus is on the message.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Role-plays.</li> <li>- Simulations.</li> <li>- Group discussions or debates.</li> <li>- Story Completion.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Share</b>	<b>"Sharing"</b>	To present the outcome of the main task to the rest of the class, fostering confidence and active listening among peers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Short presentations.</li> <li>- Sharing solutions from a simulation.</li> <li>- Performing the role-plays.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Reflect</b>	<b>"Reflecting"</b>	To encourage metacognition. Students reflect on their own learning, difficulties, and achievements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-assessment with a simple rubric.</li> <li>- Group discussion: "What was the easiest part? What was the hardest?".</li> <li>- Setting personal goals for the next unit.</li> </ul>

### 3.8. Demonstrations and Examples of Units and Activities

Below is a detailed example of a unit from the guide to illustrate its practical application.

#### Unit 1: "My Weekend, My World"

**Topic:** Free time activities, likes, and dislikes. **Unit Objective:** By the end of the unit, students will be able to describe their weekend activities, express likes and dislikes, and invite a friend to do an activity, using the present simple and related vocabulary. **Key Vocabulary:** *go to the*



*beach, play soccer, watch movies, listen to music, visit my family, hang out with friends, I like..., I love..., I don't like..., I hate..., Do you want to...?*

**Tabla 5.** *Didactic Sequence Table - Unit 1*

Phase	Detailed Activity	Materials	Dynamics	Linguistic Focus
<b>Spark</b>	<b>"Weekend Pictionary":</b> The teacher draws weekend activities on the board, and students guess. Then, in teams, one student from each team comes up to draw a card given by the teacher.	Board, markers, cards with activities (e.g., "play videogames").	Small groups.	Vocabulary activation.
<b>Build</b>	<b>"Find Someone Who...":</b> Each student receives a worksheet with phrases like "Find someone who likes to play soccer on Saturdays." They must walk around the classroom and ask their peers questions ("Do you like to play soccer?") to complete their sheet.	Worksheets for each student.	Whole class, interacting in pairs.	Controlled practice of present simple questions and short answers.
<b>Create</b>	<b>Role-Play: "Making Weekend Plans":</b> In pairs, students receive role cards. <b>Student A:</b> You want to invite your friend to do something on Saturday, but you don't know what they like. <b>Student B:</b> You have some plans but are open to suggestions. They must	Role cards.	Pairs.	Free use of vocabulary for likes, expressions for inviting, and negotiation.

---

	create a short dialogue to make a plan.			
<b>Share</b>	<b>"Present Your Plan"</b> : Each pair presents their dialogue to another small group (of 4 people). This is less intimidating than presenting to the whole class.	None.	Small groups (2 pairs).	Fluency, pronunciation, confidence in presenting.
<b>Reflect</b>	<b>"Exit Ticket"</b> : On a post-it note, each student anonymously answers: 1. A new word I learned today. 2. How confident (1-5) did you feel speaking today?	Post-it notes, pens.	Individual.	Metacognition, feedback for the teacher.

---

### Unit 3: "Welcome to Dos Mangas!"

**Topic:** Local tourism, giving directions and recommendations. **Unit Objective:** By the end of the unit, students will be able to welcome a tourist, describe points of interest in their community, and give simple directions. **Key Vocabulary:** *welcome to..., this is..., you can visit..., the tagua workshop, the waterfalls, go straight, turn left/right, it's next to..., it's on the corner.*

**Tabla 6.** *Didactic Sequence Table - Unit 3*

Phase	Detailed Activity	Materials	Dynamics	Linguistic Focus
<b>Spark</b>	<b>"Community Map"</b> : On the board, the teacher draws a simple map of Dos Mangas. They ask students to name important places and draw them on the map.	Board, markers.	Whole class.	Vocabulary of places.

---



<b>Build</b>	<b>"Direction Maze":</b> In pairs, students receive a map with a maze. Student A must guide Student B through the maze using only English instructions ("Go straight, turn right at the church..."). Student B draws the route.	Worksheets with maze maps.	Pairs.	Controlled practice of imperatives for giving directions.
<b>Create</b>	<b>Simulation: "I'm a Tourist Guide!":</b> In groups of three. <b>Student A:</b> Is a tourist who has just arrived in Dos Mangas. They want to know what they can do. <b>Students B and C:</b> Are local guides. They must welcome the tourist, recommend 2 places to visit, and explain how to get to the first one.	Community map (could be the one on the board), simple tourist brochures (created by the teacher or students).	Groups of three.	Integration of vocabulary, recommendation phrases, and directions in a fluid conversation.
<b>Share</b>	<b>"Video Tour":</b> Each group records a short video (30-60 seconds) with a cellphone, simulating their conversation with the tourist. The videos are then shown to the class.	Cellphone, projector (optional).	Groups of three, then whole class.	Oral production practice without the pressure of a live audience. Increases motivation.
<b>Reflect</b>	<b>"Peer Feedback":</b> After watching the videos, students (in their groups) comment on another video: "What did they do well?"	None.	Groups, then sharing with the class.	Fostering constructive feedback and active listening.

---

What idea was interesting?".

---

### 3.9. Forms of Application, Implementation, and Evaluation

#### Implementation:

1. **Teacher Training:** Before starting, the teacher must become fully familiar with the principles of CLT and the structure of the guide.
2. **Session Zero:** The first session with the students will be dedicated to establishing the "golden rules" of the communicative classroom: "We respect everyone," "Mistakes are our friends," "Here, we all participate." This is crucial for laying the foundation for a low affective filter.
3. **Sequential Application:** The teacher will apply the units in the proposed order, adapting the pace according to the group's response and progress. Flexibility is key. The teacher is not a slave to the guide but a facilitator who uses it as a tool.

#### Evaluation:

The evaluation is continuous, formative, and aligns with the instruments from Chapter 2.

- **Diagnostic Evaluation:** The pre-test and focus groups already conducted.
- **Formative Evaluation (During the Process):**
  - **Activity Observation Rubrics:** The teacher will use the designed rubrics during the "Create" and "Share" phases to record students' qualitative performance in dimensions such as participation, coherence, and use of vocabulary.



- **Researcher's Field Journal:** The teacher will keep a journal to note observations, reflections on class dynamics, energy levels, recurring difficulties, and anecdotes that reveal changes in students' attitudes and confidence.
- **Self-assessment and Peer-assessment:** The activities in the "Reflect" phase (like exit tickets and peer feedback) provide valuable information about the students' own perceptions.
- **Summative Evaluation (At the End):**
  - **Oral Post-test:** An oral post-test, with a parallel format and difficulty level to the pre-test, will be administered to quantitatively measure progress in the dimensions of fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary. The results will be compared with the pre-test results to validate the guide's effectiveness.

### 3.10. Resources

**Tabla 7. Resources**

Resource Type	Description
<b>Human</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>English Teacher:</b> Trained in the CLT approach and with a facilitative, empathetic, and patient attitude.</li> <li>- <b>Students:</b> Committed to participating and respecting the learning environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Materials</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>"Speak Up!" Didactic Guide:</b> Printed or in digital format for the teacher.</li> <li>- <b>Basic Classroom Materials:</b> Board, markers, pens, paper.</li> <li>- <b>Photocopiable Materials:</b> Worksheets, role cards, maps (provided in the guide).</li> <li>- <b>Realia:</b> Post-it notes, magazines, tourist brochures (if available).</li> </ul>



---

**Technological** - **Optional but recommended:** Projector, speakers (for videos/songs), cellphone with video recording capability. The use of tools like Padlet, as suggested by Cuadros (2025), could be an extension for asynchronous practice.

---

### 3.11. Beneficiaries

- **Direct Beneficiaries:** The **13 tenth-grade students** at Pedro José Rosales School, who will improve their communicative competence in English, increase their confidence and motivation, and acquire a relevant skill for their future.
- **Indirect Beneficiaries:**
  - **The English teacher**, who will have a structured and effective methodological tool that facilitates planning and improves their pedagogical practice.
  - **The educational institution**, which will be able to show tangible improvement in its students' English level and offer a more innovative pedagogy.
  - **The community of Dos Mangas**, as in the long term, having young people capable of communicating in English can strengthen the local tourism industry.

### 3.12. Closing of the Modeling

The "Speak Up! A CLT Guide for A2 Teens" represents a comprehensive and multidimensional educational intervention. It is not limited to teaching linguistic content; it actively seeks to heal the students' relationship with the English language, transforming fear into confidence, apathy into motivation, and passive knowledge into active competence. Its structure, foundation, and contextualized approach make it a viable and relevant solution to the diagnosed problem, with the potential to generate a lasting impact on the students' skills and attitudes. The following section will be dedicated to empirically validating these claims.



### 3.13. Validation of the Proposal

The validation of the "Speak Up!" guide is conducted **empirically**, through a quasi-experimental design with a pre-test and post-test. The objective is to demonstrate that the application of the guide (the independent variable) produces a statistically and qualitatively significant improvement in the oral production competence (the dependent variable) of the study group. The validation is based on the triangulation of quantitative data (post-test results) and qualitative data (teacher's observations and student perceptions).

### 3.14. Comparative Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Results

After the implementation of the "Speak Up!" guide for the established period, the oral post-test was administered to the same 9 students who took the pre-test. The test maintained an equivalent format and difficulty level to ensure a valid comparison. The oral productions were evaluated using the same analytical rubric.

**Tabla 8.** *Comparative Table of Mean Scores (Speaking)*

Evaluation Moment	Mean Score (out of 5)	Average Level Descriptor
Pre-Test (Initial Diagnosis)	1.78	Limited / Very Limited
Post-Test (After Intervention)	3.67	Satisfactory / Good

**Quantitative Analysis:** The results show an **increase of 1.89 points** in the group's mean score, representing a **106% improvement** over the initial score. This quantitative leap is statistically significant and allows us to reject the null hypothesis (that the guide has no effect) and accept the research hypothesis: the implementation of CLT-based communicative activities improves students' oral skills. The group moved from an average level between "Limited" and "Very Limited" to a level between "Satisfactory" and "Good," an advance of almost two full levels on the rubric's scale.



### Detailed Table: Comparison of Individual Scores (Pre-test vs. Post-test)

**Tabla 9.** *Detailed Table: Comparison of Individual Scores (Pre-test vs. Post-test)*

<b>Student</b>	<b>Pre-Test Score</b>	<b>Pre-Test Descriptor</b>	<b>Post-Test Score</b>	<b>Post-Test Descriptor</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	3	Satisfactory	5	Excellent	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 2</b>	1	Very Limited	3	Satisfactory	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 3</b>	1	Very Limited	3	Satisfactory	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 4</b>	2	Limited	4	Good	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 5</b>	2	Limited	4	Good	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 6</b>	2	Limited	3	Satisfactory	<b>+1</b>
<b>Student 7</b>	2	Limited	4	Good	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 8</b>	2	Limited	4	Good	<b>+2</b>
<b>Student 9</b>	1	Very Limited	3	Satisfactory	<b>+2</b>
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.78</b>		<b>3.67</b>		<b>+1.89</b>

#### Analysis by Dimensions of the Dependent Variable:

- Fluency Dimension:** In the post-test, a drastic reduction in long pauses and hesitation was observed. 89% of the students (8 out of 9) are now able to construct complete sentences and connect ideas, albeit sometimes with some slowness ("Satisfactory" or "Good" level). The descriptor "Speaks with some hesitation but communicates well" became the norm, in contrast to the "Responds with short or incomplete sentences" of the pre-test. This demonstrates that constant practice in low-anxiety communicative tasks helped to automate language production.



- **Grammatical Accuracy Dimension:** While grammatical errors did not disappear completely, their nature changed. Instead of basic structural errors (e.g., absence of a verb), the errors in the post-test were mostly related to present simple conjugation or the use of prepositions. Student 1, who went from "some grammar... errors" to "Excellent," demonstrated almost total control of A2 structures. The rest of the group reached a level where "minor" errors did not impede effective communication, a key objective of CLT.
- **Pronunciation and Vocabulary Dimension:** This was the most noticeable change. In the post-test, all students were able to use a range of functional vocabulary to talk about their weekends, likes, and community. Phrases like "On Saturday, I like to hang out with my friends" or "To go to the waterfall, you go straight" were produced spontaneously. The students' own perception that they "didn't know the words" was directly addressed and overcome. The improvement in pronunciation was a natural consequence of the increased speaking time and confidence.

### 3.15. Qualitative Analysis of the Validation

The quantitative data are compelling, but the qualitative data collected through the **field journal** and **observation rubrics** reveal the "why" behind this improvement.

**Theme 1: Dismantling Fear (Lowering the Affective Filter)** The field journal entries during the first few weeks documented resistance and silence. However, starting from Unit 2, changes began to appear.

- *Field Journal Extract (Week 4):* "Today, during the role-play, J. (Student 2) made a mistake and said, 'I like play soccer.' Before, he would have gone silent, but his partner smiled and said, 'I like TO play.' J. repeated the sentence correctly, and they continued. Nobody laughed. There was a palpable change in the air. Mistakes are no longer catastrophic." This anecdote illustrates how the guide's focus on collaboration and error tolerance succeeded in breaking the cycle of fear of ridicule that students expressed in the focus groups. Active participation, as measured in the observation rubrics, went from



"poor" in the initial sessions to "good" or "excellent" for the majority by the end of the intervention.

**Theme 2: The Awakening of Motivation** Connecting the activities to the students' reality was a key driver.

- *Field Journal Extract (Unit 3 - "Welcome to Dos Mangas!")*: "The tourist guide simulation was a total success. The students took their roles very seriously. They were genuinely proud to describe their community. M. (Student 5) even brought a tagua handicraft from home to show the 'tourist.' The phrase 'What's the point of this?' which I heard so much at the beginning, has disappeared."

This change demonstrates how the guide managed to build both **instrumental and integrative motivation**. Students began to see English not just as a school subject but as a tool to share their own culture and connect with others.

**Theme 3: From Passive Receivers to Active Creators of Meaning** The structure of the guide transformed the student's role.

- *Observation (Unit 5 - Story Completion)*: During the story completion activity, the groups created comical and unexpected narratives. There was laughter and creative use of the learned vocabulary. The students were not just "using" English; they were "playing" with it. They stopped being the passive recipients of the "worksheets" they described in the diagnosis and became co-creators of their own learning.

### **Conclusion of the Validation**

The triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data robustly validates the effectiveness of the "Speak Up!" proposal. The 106% improvement in the post-test scores is not an accident; it is the direct result of an intervention that addressed the root causes of the problem. The guide proved to be an effective tool for:



1. **Reducing the affective filter:** By creating a safe classroom environment that encouraged participation and risk-taking.
2. **Increasing motivation:** By making learning relevant, practical, and enjoyable.
3. **Developing oral competence:** By providing structured, meaningful, and constant practice that improved fluency, accuracy, and, crucially, the active use of functional vocabulary.



## CONCLUSIONS

It was determined that the perceptions and attitudes of the tenth-grade students in the rural context of Pedro José Rosales School towards learning English were marked by low instrumental motivation and a widespread perception of the language's uselessness in their immediate environment. The initial diagnosis revealed that previous pedagogical experiences, centered on traditional methods, contributed to an apathetic and passive attitude toward oral participation.

The primary challenges students faced in developing oral skills were not exclusively cognitive, but predominantly affective. The existence of high Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety (FLCA) was identified, manifesting as a paralyzing fear of making mistakes, especially in pronunciation, and of ridicule from peers. This anxiety, combined with a profound lack of confidence, acted as the main barrier to participation.

The initial quantitative diagnosis corroborated the severity of the identified challenges, showing an average oral competence level of 1.78 out of 5 on the assessment scale. This low performance was characterized by nearly non-existent fluency, with most students responding with incomplete sentences or single words, poor grammatical control forming basic structures in real-time, and a critical deficit in functional vocabulary for expressing personal ideas.

The implementation of the "Speak Up!" didactic guide, based on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach and Task-Based Learning (TBL), proved to be a highly effective intervention for improving oral competence. The research hypothesis was empirically validated by a 106% increase in the group's average score, rising from 1.78 in the pre-test to 3.67 in the post-test. This significant progress demonstrates that prioritizing meaningful communicative practice over grammatical perfection fosters the development of fluency and functional accuracy.

The design of the pedagogical proposal successfully achieved the objective of reducing the students' affective filter. By creating a collaborative, playful, and error-tolerant learning



environment, the cycle of fear of ridicule documented in the diagnosis was dismantled. Qualitative observations recorded a transformation in the students' role, shifting from passive receiver to active creator of meaning, which was fundamental in increasing confidence and voluntary participation.

The strategy of contextualizing communicative activities to the students' immediate reality, such as simulating tourist interactions in the Dos Mangas community, was decisive in transforming motivation. It successfully changed the initial perception of English's irrelevance by demonstrating its practical and tangible utility, thereby fostering instrumental motivation and pride in sharing their own culture through the language.

It is concluded that the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach is particularly suitable for A2 level students in rural contexts, as its focus on functional language use allows for the integrated development of vocabulary and fluency. Activities such as role-plays and simulations provide the necessary scaffolding for students to progressively build confidence, demonstrating that affective and motivational factors are as crucial as linguistic input for successful second language acquisition in adolescents.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Pedagogical Implementation and Sustainability:** It is recommended that Pedro José Rosales School formally adopt the "Speak Up!" didactic guide as supplementary material for English instruction in the Upper Basic level. To ensure sustainability, it is suggested that the institution promote the CLT methodology as a teaching standard, prioritizing the creation of low affective filter environments and continuous formative assessment over punitive summative evaluation, thus replicating the conditions that led to the intervention's success.

**Teacher Training and Facilitator Role:** It is recommended that the academic coordination or educational district implement professional development workshops for English teachers in the area. This training should focus on the practical application of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, Task-Based Learning (TBL), and fundamentally, strategies for managing classroom anxiety (FLCA). It is crucial to prepare teachers to assume a facilitative role that encourages confidence and collaboration, rather than an instructor role focused on error correction.

**Curricular Contextualization and Extension:** It is suggested to expand the contextualization of activities to strengthen the instrumental motivation identified as key. It is recommended to design interdisciplinary projects that directly link English learning with local economic activities, such as tourism and tagua handicraft in Dos Mangas. This could include creating actual tourist brochures, local mini-guides, or simulated interactions with visitors to reinforce the perceived utility of the language.

**Longitudinal Research and Sample Expansion:** For future research, it is recommended to conduct a longitudinal study to follow up with the intervention group over a longer period (e.g., a full academic year). This would allow for the assessment of long-term retention of oral skills and the consolidation of attitudinal changes. Furthermore, replicating the study in other rural educational institutions with similar socioeconomic characteristics is suggested to validate the guide's effectiveness on a larger scale.



**Asynchronous Technology Integration:** Given that the current research focused on face-to-face interactions and low technological resources, it is recommended to explore the integration of asynchronous digital tools in future applications of the guide. Using platforms like Padlet would allow students to practice speaking in a private environment before sharing, which could further reduce anxiety and increase effective practice time outside the classroom.

**Focus on Vocabulary and Pronunciation:** Although the intervention significantly improved the use of functional vocabulary, it is recommended that future iterations of the guide include more explicit modules on lexical acquisition strategies and pronunciation. While the CLT approach prioritizes fluency, instruction focused on language "chunks" and addressing problematic sounds (detected in the pre-test) could accelerate the accuracy and intelligibility of A2 level students.



## REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- Aguilar-Cruz, P. J. (2018). *Task-based multimodal tool for English learning in the sixth grade of basic secondary education at the I.E. Jorge Eliécer Gaitán in Florencia, Caquetá* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universidad de Medellín.
- Al-Khamisi, K. M., & Sinha, Y. K. (2022). Communicative Language Teaching Methodologies in Omani EFL Context. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12(4), 481-503. <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=119170>
- Asamblea Nacional Constituyente. (2008). *Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador*. Registro Oficial 449. [https://www.oas.org/juridico/pdfs/mesicic4\\_ecu\\_const.pdf](https://www.oas.org/juridico/pdfs/mesicic4_ecu_const.pdf)
- Charry, J. D., & Navarro Parra, S. (Eds.). (2018). *Research Methodology and Principles in Scientific Publication Manual*. Editorial Uninavarra.
- Consejo de Europa. (2002). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Secretaría General Técnica del MECD, Subdirección General de Cooperación Internacional y Grupo Anaya, S.A. [https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca\\_ele/marco/cvc\\_mer.pdf](https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca_ele/marco/cvc_mer.pdf)
- Cuadros Puertas, M. (2025). *The use of Padlet for the development of oral skills in the language classroom* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universitat Oberta de Catalunya.
- García León, E. P. (2019). *Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities to develop English speaking skills* [Unpublished master's thesis, Universidad Técnica de Ambato]. Repositorio Institucional de la Universidad Técnica de Ambato. <https://repositorio.uta.edu.ec/jspui/handle/123456789/29267>
- González, N., Villao, R., Del Rosario, Á., & Alvarado, D. (2024). Enhancing A2 learners' speaking skills using ChatGPT web tool. *RES NON VERBA Revista Científica*, 14(2). <https://revistas.ecotec.edu.ec/index.php/rnv/article/view/921>
- González Estrada, O. L., & León Muñoz, Y. (2022). *Classcraft: Gamified methodological strategy to strengthen the communicative skills of 5th-grade students in the English language at IED Nueva Granada in the city of Barranquilla, Atlántico* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universidad Sergio Arboleda.
- Granados Barceló, N. E., & Ramos Olivares, R. A. (2024). *"Task-Based Learning" as a didactic mediation to strengthen oral expression in English* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universidad de la Costa.
- Hernández Sampieri, R., Fernández Collado, C., & Baptista Lucio, P. (1991). *Research methodology*. McGraw-Hill.



Javier Rios, J. E. (2025). Communication skills in basic education students: a systematic review. *REVISTA INVECOM*, 5(3). <https://www.revistainvecom.org>

Ordoñez-Pacheco, A. F. (2025). Academic methodology with application to social research: approaches, types, methods, and designs. *Revista Sociedad & Tecnología*, 8(2), 335–357. <https://doi.org/10.51247/st.v8i2.484>

Ortega Paternina, K., & Muñoz Uchuvo, D. P. (2021). *Pedagogical strategy to strengthen English communicative skills based on Transmedia Storytelling in cycle 3 students, "back to school" program at the Simón Bolívar philharmonic school using the MICEA methodology* [Unpublished specialization thesis]. Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia.

Oviedo Guado, N. G., & Mena Mayorga, J. I. (2021). Communicative language teaching approach in the development of speaking skill. *Ciencia Digital*, 5(4), 6–26. <https://doi.org/10.33262/cienciadigital.v5i4.1865>

Peña Ledesma, V. L. (2024). Teaching English as a foreign language and development of linguistic skills. *Journal Scientific MQRInvestigar*, 8(1), 6067–6100. <https://doi.org/10.56048/MQR20225.8.1.2024.6067-6100>

Pérez, A. J. (2023). *Communicative Language Teaching in the Primary Education English classroom. A didactic proposal* [Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Universidad de Valladolid]. Repositorio de la Universidad de Valladolid. <https://uvadoc.uva.es/handle/10324/60566>

Ruiz Rey, J. A. (2022). *Oral comprehension and production in English through the communicative approach in sixth-grade students at Jaime Garzón school* [Unpublished master's thesis, Universidad de Pamplona]. Repositorio Hualago Universidad de Pamplona. <http://repositoriodspace.unipamplona.edu.co/jspui/handle/20.500.12744/9462>

Santamaria-Serrano, J. S., Guambo-Yerovi, E. J., Carrillo-Rodríguez, M. A., & Mantilla-Cabrera, L. F. (2023). CLT an innovative method to improve productive skills in the English language. *Polo del Conocimiento*, 8(8), 245-260. <https://polodelconocimiento.com/ojs/index.php/es/article/view/5845>



## ANNEXES

### Anexo 1. Diagnostic English Skill test

Tema de tesis: A Guide to Enhancing Speaking Skills in Teenagers at A2 Level Using the CLT Approach

Objetivo del test: Evaluar de forma inicial el dominio de las 4 habilidades del idioma inglés (Reading, Listening, Speaking y Writing), con énfasis en las sub-destrezas comunicativas del nivel A2 del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCER), a fin de identificar las áreas que requieren refuerzo.

Full name: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 1. Read this email and answer the question.

Hi Julia,

I'm so excited! Next weekend, we're going to the mountains. We will stay in a small cabin and go hiking with my cousins. Don't forget your boots and warm clothes! See you soon!

Love, Anna

#### - Question:

**Where is Anna going next weekend ?**

---



---



---

#### 2. Listening for specific information - Listening for keywords and important ideas. Students focus more on the main points and should be ready to note down answers.

Megan is \_\_\_\_\_ years old has an \_\_\_\_\_ innovation. she designs \_\_\_\_\_ for the robot help you when you have problems in class.

Grace is \_\_\_\_\_ years old inverter or robot that helps with \_\_\_\_\_ and others homework.

interesting - test \_ homework \_ test.

#### 3. Write 3–5 sentences about what you do on Saturdays."

You can include:

- What time you wake up
- What you eat?



La Universidad para todos

- Where you go?

#### **4. Of speaking.**

- Answer the question about yourself.

What's your name?

Spell your name?

Where do you come from?

Tell me about your favorite day on the weekend?



La Universidad para todos



## Anexo 2. Level of diagnosis

<b>Skill</b>	<b>5 – Excellent</b>	<b>4 – Good</b>	<b>3 – Satisfactory</b>	<b>2 – Limited</b>	<b>1 – Very Limited</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Reading</b>	Clearly understands the main idea and all key details from the text.	Understands the main idea and most key details.	Understands the general meaning but misses some details.	Understands little; needs support to complete the task.	Does not understand the text or question.	
<b>Listening</b>	Understands the full message and answers correctly with relevant information.	Understands most of the recording and gives mostly correct answers.	Understands the main idea but struggles with specific details.	Understands only a few words or isolated ideas.	Cannot understand the audio or respond appropriately.	
<b>Speaking</b>	Speaks clearly, with good vocabulary, fluency, and accurate grammar.	Speaks with some hesitation but communicates well; few errors.	Can speak with pauses; makes some grammar or vocabulary errors.	Very limited fluency; responds with short or incomplete sentences.	Cannot express ideas or answer basic questions.	
<b>Writing</b>	Writes 3–5 clear, well-structured sentences with correct grammar and vocabulary.	Writes full sentences with minor grammar or vocabulary mistakes.	Writes basic sentences, some errors affect meaning.	Struggles to write full sentences; many errors.	Writes few or no complete sentences; lacks structure or clarity.	

You can see the diagnosis of skills applied to students