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Abstract

The present work spots light on a language teaching methodology that has been generating heated debates since it was first suggested by Scott Thornbury in 2000, namely, Dogme ELT (English Language Teaching), also known as Teaching Unplugged. This work is intended to have a better understanding of the goals, principles and procedures of Dogme ELT, and to investigate its practicability and suitability to the Algerian educational context. Additionally, questionnaires are designed for teachers and pupils at the secondary school level to examine their perceptions, knowledge and attitudes towards this new philosophy of language teaching / learning. Classroom observation is also resorted to find out to what extent teachers rely on coursebooks and other teaching materials in their lessons, and whether there is some space / hope for Dogme ELT to be applied in the Algerian English language class. Results to this study show that although Algerian secondary school teachers and students are not aware of Dogme ELT, they perceive it as an interesting new teaching methodology. However, only students believe in its suitability to the Algerian educational context. In the light of these findings, there seem to be some hope/space for a future-Dogme-style teaching/learning in Algeria.
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4. Research Means
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1. Statement of the Problem

Textbooks provide texts and tasks for learners and save time for teachers. This may explain why Algerian teachers heavily rely on them in their teaching of English. The surprise is that this is not bringing much (if any) progress in the learners’ level of language proficiency. As Meddings (2004) asserts: “We use coursebooks because they make it easy to get from 9 o’clock to 10 o’ clock, not because they are a good way to promote learning” (p.2). Is there any alternative?

As a reaction against this traditional way of teaching English, a new methodology known as Dogme ELT emerged in 2000. Its founders, Scott Thornbury and Luke Meddings, felt the need to rescue English Language Teaching (ELT) from this over-dependence on coursebooks. This dependence is at the expense of the learning opportunities which, as Thornbury argues, could be created simply by the content provided by the “people in the room” (Thornbury, 2001). This doesn’t mean that Dogme ELT is opposing textbooks. However, it is opposing the way how these textbooks are used and the extent to which English language teachers rely on them in their teaching route.

If current textbooks do not serve the aims of both teachers and students to really use the language inside their classrooms, could Dogme ELT be applied in the Algerian context to make that desire true?

2. Research Aim

This study aims at first having a better understanding of a new teaching methodology known as Dogme ELT. Second, it sheds light on its main principle, key tenets and procedures in classroom terms. Furthermore, the extent to which this new style of teaching might be suitable to the Algerian educational context is investigated. Finally, the current study aims at analyzing Algerian teachers’ and students’ perception of and attitudes towards Dogme ELT.

3. Research Questions and Hypotheses

In this investigational work, two main questions will be addressed:

1/ To what extent is Dogme ELT suitable to the Algerian secondary school context?
2/ What attitudes do Algerian secondary school teachers and students have towards this method?

Thus, the following hypothesis will be tested:

*Algerian secondary school teachers and students think of Dogme ELT as an ambitious and over-demanding method.*

4. Research Means

In order to achieve our aims, a questionnaire is designed for both teachers and students. Respondents to this questionnaire include 24 secondary school teachers and 30 students randomly selected from different secondary schools at the level of Oum El Bouagui city. This questionnaire is divided into four main parts/sections. The first section is devoted to some background information about teachers and students. The second section aims at knowing about teachers’ and students’ perception of Dogme ELT. The third section informs us about the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian secondary school context. The final section is devoted to teachers’ and students’ further comments and suggestions. Classroom observation is another means used in this work. It helps us discover to what extent Algerian secondary school teachers of English rely on textbooks in their lessons, whether they are incorporating some of Dogme’s principles, and whether there is some hope/space for Dogme ELT to be applied.

5. Structure of the Study

Our study is divided into three chapters: one theoretical chapter and two chapters are geared to practice. Chapter one accounts for the background of Dogme ELT: its definition, main principles and key tenets, pedagogical foundations, meaning in classroom terms and some criticisms directed to it.

Chapter two is the core of our study in the sense that it deals with our investigation. In the first section of this chapter, a detailed discussion and analysis of the findings are presented. Reference is made to the questionnaires and classroom observation.

Chapter three says the final word about the state of Dogme ELT in Algeria. It presents a discussion of the final results and informs us if there is a future Dogme-style English
teaching in Algerian foreign language classrooms. The end is devoted to some pedagogical implications of the research. These implications are for teachers to help them apply Dogme ELT in the Algerian school.
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**Introduction**

Dogme ELT, also known as “Teaching Unplugged”, was first introduced to the teaching profession in 2000, when Thornbury pointed out an analogy between the Dogme 95 film-makers collective and the current state of ELT, characterized by an over reliance on materials, aids and technology in the classroom. Thornbury (2000) notes that while EFL teaching has copious amounts of primary and supplementary resources and that Dogme ELT teaching should include the resources that teachers and students bring to the classroom.

This chapter deals with Dogme ELT in depth examining its main principles, key tenets and pedagogical foundations. Analysing Dogme’s classroom applications, reference is made to “Dogway” that is proposed as an alternative coursebook. Moreover, it presents different approaches to lesson planning directing attention to Dogme’s unique philosophy. Finally, some criticisms directed to Dogme’s ELT are discussed briefly.

### 1.1. What is Dogme ELT?

Dogme ELT is a new teaching methodology which focuses attention on students and their needs for real communication. It grows out of the beliefs that knowledge is co-constructed between students and their teacher and between students themselves rather than transmitted from teachers or textbooks to the learners. Thornbury states it explicitly in what is known as Dogme’s first commandment:

*Teaching should be done using only the resources that teachers and students bring to the classroom i.e. themselves- and whatever happens to be in the classroom, if a particular piece of material is necessary for the lesson, a location must be chosen where that material is to be found (library, resource centre, bar, students’ club ...)*

*(Thornbury, 2000 p.2)*

Instead of a pedagogy that is burdened by materials, “Teaching Unplugged” is “a pedagogy of bare essentials, that is, a pedagogy grounded in the local and relevant concerns of the people in the room’ (Thornbury, 2006 p. 70) and it can “help to maintain engagement and enjoyment through what can be a stressful and somewhat monotonous time” (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009 p.95).
This requires of the teacher the capacity to react to, and shape, the language that emerges from the shared need to communicate.

1.1.1. Principles of Dogme ELT

A long online conversation of Scott Thornbury with other supporters of Dogme-style teaching, also called Dogmetists, gave birth to ten major principles related to Dogme ELT: interactivity, engagement, dialogic processes, scaffolding conversation, emergence, affordance, learners’ voice, empowerment, relevance, and critical use.

The first principle of Dogme ELT is Interactivity which emphasises that learning should be direct through interactions between the learners and their teacher or between the learners themselves. Second, Engagement implies that students will be better engaged with the content they create themselves. Furthermore, learning is said to be triggered through dialogues and social interactions since knowledge is no more seen as transferred from textbooks/teachers to the learners. This is expressed by dialogic processes. It is also believed that conversations would lead to better learning if guided and supported (scaffolded) by the teacher. Emergence principle sheds light on the fact that language is no more acquired; it rather emerges with grammar through classroom talk. The principle of Affordance, however, suggests that the teacher’s main role is to make the best use of features of emergent language. Another main principle of Dogme ELT stresses Learners’ voice. The learners’ background, beliefs, and personal repertoire should not be ignored in classroom. This leads to an Empowerment for both learners and teachers and enables them to play their roles properly especially if supported by the exclusion of textbooks from classroom furniture. Relevance in Dogme ELT suggests that all that should be used in classroom as texts must be relevant to the learners’ needs and desires. Finally, the principle of Critical use implies that EFL materials, whenever implemented, should be used critically for a better learning to take place.

From all these principles, it is crystal clear how Dogme ELT emphasizes learners’ needs, interests and voice. What merits attention is that “learner” and “student” are the key words of Dogme’s philosophy; it is highly learner-centered. In the following section, Dogme’s key tenets are presented in a detailed explanation.
### 1.1.2. Key Tenets of Dogme ELT

Along with its ten major principles, Dogme ELT is often defined as a **conversation-driven, materials-light, and emergent-language-focus** teaching methodology. These three features are considered as the key tenets of Dogme ELT. One question that is often asked is how important is each tenet? The answer is that they are inter-related and each tenet supports the other in the sense that:

Without a conversation-driven principle, there would be little “emergent language”, without emergent language, there would be little opportunity to scaffold language and with little respect to “materials-light” classroom, authentic conversation could be impeded.

### 1.1.2.1. Conversation-Driven Teaching

The first and most important key tenet of Dogme ELT, proposed by Meddings & Thornbury (2009), is the “conversation driven” teaching. It explains the fact that conversation is central to Dogme settings. It is considered as the best way to foster language learning since it promotes social interaction inside the classroom. Following a Dogme approach to language teaching requires teachers to create a communicative atmosphere where learners can interact with each other or with their teacher, and where the teacher’s principle role is to shape and guide these interactions. This role is often referred to as “scaffolding conversations”. Tharp & Gallimore’s (1988, p.111) statement “to most truly teach, one must converse; to truly converse is to teach” may well explain Dogme’s desire to drive conversation to be the cornerstone of the language classroom. This also supports Hatch’s (1978) idea that “language learning evolves out of learning how to carry on conversations” (p. 404).

Dogme ELT also emphasises a discourse-level (rather than sentence-level) approach to language, as it is considered to better prepare learners for real-life communication, where the entire conversation is more relevant than the analysis of specific utterances. Dogme considers that the learning of a skill is co-constructed within the interaction between the learner and the teacher. In this sense, teaching is a conversation between the two parties.

The ‘conversation driven’ approach within Dogme ELT reflects several conversation characteristics: conversation is language at work; it is discourse; it is interactive, dialogic and communicative; it scaffolds learning; and it promotes socialization. First, conversation is
language at work, and is the fundamental form of language. In most classes, however, conversation is often viewed as a product of learning, and often left to last – after grammar, and is sometimes neglected. Conversation is also viewed as discourse, and discourse is the use to which language is put in order to fulfill the specific needs of its users in specific contexts. It can be argued that real-life language use is shaped as discourse, and that an instructional approach based on large stretches of language such as connected talk is likely to facilitate language learning. Dogme ELT adopts such an approach. Furthermore, conversation is interactive, dialogic and communicative in that it provides opportunities for input and output, and is meant to enable students to communicate something about themselves. It is also said to scaffold learning, in that the ‘better other’ provides interactional support for everyone to feel safe enough to take risks and extend their competence. It can be argued that classroom talk that replicates natural conversation is more effective than traditional classroom talk that is teacher-initiated. This belief is central to Dogme teaching. Finally, conversation promotes socialization, and in the real world is interactional. A conversational mode of classroom talk would better establish a ‘discourse community’, and that is why Dogme views conversation as a means of language learning, not just an end.

1.1.2.2. Materials-Light

The second key tenet related to Dogme ELT is “materials-light” teaching which clearly supports Dogme’s principle of “empowerment”. Ashton-Warner (1963) states that “the more material there is for a child, the less pull there is on his own resources” (p. 118). It is not only that, however; these materials are said to hinder language learning and to minimise learners’ opportunities to really use the language inside the classroom. Thornbury (2010) states that for real language learning opportunities to be maximised, learners must be given some control over what is happening inside the classroom. This doesn’t mean that teachers are excluded from the classroom picture. They should, however, be there to help learners make the best use of those learning opportunities.

One major criticism regarding the over-dependence on materials is highlighted by Skehan (2002): “Drumming material in through practice activities runs the risk that all the compliant and talented learners will do is learn to produce what the teacher wants, under classroom conditions, and that such learning may not truly take root”. (p.290) . However,
Meddings & Thornbury (2009) suggest that they are not ‘anti-materials’ but they reject materials which appear unconventional towards the other principles of Dogme ELT. Materials which could support a ‘conversation driven’ principle, with a focus on ‘emergent language’, could include prompts, role cards or other suitable materials which promote “talk-mediated learning opportunities that are so crucial for learning” (Meddings & Thornbury 2009 p.12). When asked about what might be useful in language classrooms, Thornbury (2000) states that all what is relevant and might well serve the learners’ needs is allowed.

Nevertheless, coursebooks essentially, whether preferred or not, represent “the visible heart of any ELT program” (Sheldon 1988 p.238). It is recognized that they provide teachers with materials which can foster ‘unit-by-unit’ progression and provide materials for learners to review at a later date (Harmer 2007 p.181). Conversely, there is a number of reservations with the use of coursebooks. First, they are said to prescribe and impose specific learning styles on the students in class (Harmer 2007 p.181-182). Furthermore, coursebooks “give little opportunity or encouragement to adapt ... to the needs, wants, personalities, or styles of the learners or teachers” (Tomlinson, B, Dat, B, Masuhara, H. & Rubdy, R. 2001 p.83). Hall (2011) also notes that if decisions are solely based on coursebooks rather than the learners’ needs and interests, teachers could become ‘de-skilled’ (p.214). Thus, this raises the question: “What material supports Dogme ELT?”

In a Dogme approach to language teaching, student-produced materials are preferable and are given priority over professionally published materials and textbooks, to the extent that Dogme ELT initially invites teachers to take a ‘vow of chastity’ and not use textbooks.

1.1.2.3. Scaffolding Emergent Language

The third and final key tenet of Dogme ELT is “scaffolding emergent language”. The term emergent language refers to the language that emerges from the conversational interaction between students which, in turn, allows the learner to shape the ‘content and objectives of the language course’ (Meddings & Thornbury 2009, p.18) instead of the material/coursebook. This type of language should be, according to Dogmetists, the main content and the cornerstone on which language lessons are based and according to which they are planned. In this respect, Allwright (1990, p.134) explains:
If we define ‘content’ as the sum total of ‘what is taught’ and ‘what is available to be learned’, then it becomes clear that ‘content’ (potential intake) is not predictable. It is, rather, something that emerges because of the interactive nature of classroom events.

Language in this case is no more acquired; however, it is “an emergent phenomenon, driven by massive exposure and use” (Meddings & Thornbury 2009, p.19). Thus the teacher’s task is to create a healthy environment for this language to emerge and to shape, assess and scaffold it once it emerges. Teachers are also required to shed light on features of emergent language. Thornbury (2005, p.3) states: “The teacher’s primary function, (…), is to optimize language learning affordances by, for example, directing attention to features of emergent language”. Thornbury (2005, p.4) also writes: “The language focus should emerge from, and not determine the communicative needs of the learners”.

However, Dogme does not see the teacher’s role as merely to create the right conditions for language to emerge. Importantly, the teacher must also encourage learners to engage with this new language to ensure learning takes place. This can happen in a variety of ways, including rewarding, repeating and reviewing. As language emerges and is not acquired, there is no need to follow a syllabus that is externally set. Indeed, the content of the syllabus is covered (or ‘uncovered’) throughout the learning process.

There are two ways that language might emerge. Firstly, classroom activities lead to collaborative communication amongst the students. Secondly, learners produce language that they were not necessarily taught.

Having this in mind, teachers are required to direct classroom activities to serve the language emergence rather than to try to teach it.

1.1.3. Pedagogical Foundations of Dogme ELT

It is often stated that Dogme ELT shares some features and principles with other different approaches and methods of language teaching. First, Dogme ELT is said to be rooted in communicative language teaching (CLT); in fact, Dogme sees itself as an attempt to restore the communicative aspect to communicative approaches. It has been noted that Dogme goes in harmony with reflective teaching and intends to “humanize the classroom through a radical
pedagogy of dialogue” (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009 p. 8). It also shares many qualities with task-based language learning: it has the same underlying philosophy, but only differs in terms of methodology. Research evidence for Dogme is limited but Thornbury argues that the similarities with task-based learning suggest that Dogme is likely to lead to similar results. Indeed, Dogme learners tend to interact, produce language and collaboratively co-construct their learning when engaged in communicative tasks. Moreover, Dogme ELT is believed to be compatible to Van Lier’s (1996) AAA Curriculum and to match an Ecological perspective to language and language learning. Evidence to this will be discussed in this section.

1.1.3.1. Communicative Language Teaching

Out of a void created by dissatisfaction with the Grammar-Translation and Audio-Lingual Methods, CLT was born and it dominates the current sphere of ELT. Although the previous methods were proficient in providing students with the ability to produce accurate models of English, they were unable to assist them in generating fluent, spontaneous, native-like speech (Hall, 2011 p. 93). The purpose of the Communicative Approach is to give students the opportunity to focus on authentic language in use, and to provide them with the ability to produce ‘real’ language. Richards describes this shift as a movement away from “grammatical competence [...] to the knowledge and skills needed to use grammar and other aspects of language appropriately for different communicative purposes” (Richards, 2006 p. 9).

As summarised by Nunan, the following features characterise CLT:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language, but also on the learning process itself.
4. An enhancement of the learner’s own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activation outside the classroom. (Nunan, 1991 p. 279)

1.1.3.2. Task-Based Language Teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a method which emerged as a natural extension of the strong version of CLT. Unlike the weak version of CLT, a Task-Based syllabus is governed by a series of meaning-focused tasks – without any premeditated attention to specific language points. Rather than emphasising how to speak, the focus of TBLT is on what is to be said. Tasks become the vehicles of language development (Hall, op. cit., p. 95-96).

Over the years, there has been some variation as to what exactly or what a definition of task should be. Skehan, for example, proposes that a task is “an activity in which meaning is primary, there is a communication problem to solve, and the task is closely related to real-world activities” (Skehan, 1998, as cited in Belgar and Hunt, 2002 p.100). Ellis (2001), on the other hand, provides a more comprehensive definition:

A task is a workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills, and also various cognitive processes (p. 16).

Thornbury notes that the core principles of TBLT are closely related to Teaching Unplugged. In fact, the only point that Teaching Unplugged and TBLT seem to differ in is that the latter is a method and the former is not. In their book, Thornbury and Meddings (op. cit.) write, “where a Dogme approach parts company with a task-based approach is not in the philosophy but in the methodology” (p. 17)
1.1.3.3. Van Lier’s AAA Curriculum

Defining ‘curriculum’ as a “theory of practice” (Van Lier, 1996 p. 2), Van Lier developed the ‘AAA curriculum’ to provide guidance for teachers throughout their mission. According to Van Lier, three main principles should govern a teacher’s theory of practice; awareness, autonomy and authenticity. These three principles will be explained in further detail below.

The first principle, awareness, states that the process of language learning necessitates drawing connections between new information and that which is already known. It claims that in order for this to occur, teachers need to cultivate an awareness of the language in their learners. However, for the AAA curriculum the term awareness “implies a lot more than metalinguistic awareness” (van Lier, 1996 p. 96). It also denotes social knowledge, and knowledge of which learning strategies are best suited to learning the target language. The first principle of the AAA curriculum, thus, advocates an awareness of various aspects of the target language as well as an understanding of how to learn the language (van Lier, 1996 p.4).

The second principle, autonomy, suggests that teachers cannot ‘teach’ a language. Instead it is the learner’s motivation that controls learning. Van Lier (1996), however, feels that current attempts to promote motivation among students are unproductive and must be reassessed. He states that lots of things which are supposed to motivate learners do nothing but sidestep the issue of true motivation. Education, in other words, is heavily polluted with surrogate motivation” (van Lier, 1996 p. 121). Van Lier’s second principle, therefore, suggests that teachers must genuinely motivate their learners, if they wish to influence learner autonomy. Contrary to contemporary thinking, van Lier (1996) suggests that this is best realized by targeting a learner’s intrinsic motivation: “personal achievement, in terms of knowledge, skills, and rewarding social relationships, is tied to intrinsic motivation through the person’s self-determination and autonomy” (p. 121). Furthermore, he suggests that learner motivation can be generated by cultivating a sense of curiosity and personal achievement during classroom activities.

Concerning the final principle, authenticity, Van Lier advocates the “consideration of the social context and purposes of interactions, asserting that the process of authentication involves understanding who the participants are in the learning context (i.e., teacher and learners) and what their roles are” (Hancin-Bhatt, 1998 p. 102-103) in addition to presenting materials and tasks which emulate real life.
Like Dogme’s key tenets, Van Lier’s three principles are meant to be interpreted holistically, meaning that not one of them can exist without the others. Without autonomous learners, language awareness cannot occur, and without language awareness, authenticity cannot exist (van Lier, 1996 p. 3). Van Lier (1996) states that building and strengthening the connections between the three principles, and advancing the “AAA curriculum in its totality” (p. 145) is fundamental to the success of this framework.

Van Lier defines professionalism in the field of language teaching by classroom research (van Lier, 1996 p. 28). Involving teachers in the research process, he suggests that they can be more efficient, pragmatic and decisive in the unique context of their classrooms, allowing them to transcend the need for “authority-based” methods to language teaching (van Lier, 1996 p. 28). He encourages teachers and academics to work together in advancing the AAA curriculum, by striking a balance between research, theory, and practice.

When teachers work in this way they cannot work in isolation, but need to communicate with one another, exchange ideas, and report their work. Teacher organizations, interest groups, and networks, are thus essential to a teaching profession which is developing a theory of practice, especially since such work cannot be limited to a one teacher-one classroom research context (Van Lier, 1996 p.29). Like the other post method frameworks, the AAA curriculum is not meant to be a prescription for how to teach language. Van Liar states that since the AAA principles are universally acceptable, they act as a “liberating force, encouraging every teacher to create his or her own theory of practice” (p. 9).

1.1.3.4. The Ecological Approach

Along with input from several academics, Van Lier (2004) has also contributed to a movement in which language, language learning and language use are viewed from an ecological perspective (as cited in Kramsch, 2008 p. 389).

While traditional approaches have been criticised for viewing language learning as a process of input, output, and feedback, the ecological perspective sees language learning as the product of and contributor to its social and cultural contexts: “Just as organisms adapt to their environments, and in so doing shape their environments, so do speakers use language both to integrate into, and to influence, their discourse communities. Through this reciprocal
process of interaction and mutual adaptation, the linguistic system (both the individual’s and the community’s) evolves” (Thornbury, 2010b).

With obvious connections to his AAA curriculum (and Teaching Unplugged), Van Lier outlines four ‘basic constructs’ in ecological linguistics:

1. Language emerges from semiotic activity.
2. Language does not emerge from input that is processed, but from affordances that are brought forth by active engagement, and which enable further action and interaction.
3. Language is not transmitted from person to person by way of monolog or dialog, but arises from indicational processes occurring in triadic interaction,
4. Linguistic activity in particular contexts can be analyzed in terms of quality. (Van Lier, 2002 p. 145)

The term emergence implies that language learning is not a gradual, linear process. In an ecological approach, language emerges “when relatively simple elements combine together to form a higher-order system” (van Liar, 2004 p. 5), a system in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. In a classroom, an ecologic approach suggests that student interlanguage is formed not directly by input, but in conjunction with gestures, semiotics, the physical surroundings, and the interlocutors, and in the context of actions intended to produce meaning. “In other words, language emerges as an embodied and situated activity” (Van Lier, 2002 p.146)

Having this in mind, input becomes affordance: “that which is offered by the linguistic environment and perceived by the learner” (Van Lier, 1996 p. 12). From an ecological perspective, when learners interact with each other there is always a third element present; that which is being spoken about. Classroom activities, therefore, provide opportunities for affordances in what Van Lier describes as triadic interaction, interaction between two individuals and a third element (Mantero, 2007 p.8).

Finally, an ecological perspective asserts that although the quantity of language learning that is done is important in some contexts, in other contexts the quality of education should also be considered (Van Lier, 2002 p. 148). This relates to the AAA curriculum’s principle of “authenticity”. It can be very frustrating for students who have an extensive
knowledge of a target language to find it difficult to produce the language effectively in “authentic triadic settings”. To improve this discourse, an ecological perspective would contend that teachers must improve the quality of language education. In other words, this would entail providing “opportunities for students to engage in interactions that will help new language emerge as activity is realized through semiotic activity not linguistic construction in artificial environments” (Mantero, 2007 p.9).

Accordingly, from an ecological perspective, “competence is not applying mental rules to situations, but aligning one’s resources with situational demands and shaping the environment to match the language resources one brings” (Canagarajah, 2007 p. 933). Rather than through “mastery of knowledge, cognition, or form” (ibid.), language acquisition is achieved by social practice.

1.1.4. Dogme ELT in Classroom Terms

Since its emergence, Dogme ELT has received lots of questions asked by both teachers and practitioners: what does Dogme ELT mean in classroom terms? If Dogme ELT is excluding textbooks and other pedagogical materials from the language classroom, what could be appropriate to use in Dogme class? How is then Dogme lesson like? Is there a unique way for lesson planning in Dogme-style teaching? Many other questions can be asked. In this section, an attempt is made to answer few of them by examining the relationship Dogme/textbook, discovering the main features of what could be like a Dogme coursebook, and finally analysing Dogme lesson planning.

1.1.4.1. Dogme and the Textbook

Dogme ELT has always been identified with its rejection of the use of materials, mainly textbooks, in language classrooms. It is undeniable that the textbooks provide structure for teachers, especially newly trained ones; they also allow learners to monitor their progress in grammar and vocabulary that are delivered in manageable “bite-sized” chunks. However, it is also believed that textbooks hinder potential, exploratory and reactive teaching. Hall (2011) also argues that the decisions based on textbooks “de-skill” teachers. This may
well explain Dogme’s objective to drive textbooks out of classroom furniture. Thornbury and Meddings argue that to use a Dogme approach to language teaching means that textbooks should not control what is happening inside language classrooms and that they “should not be allowed to become the tail that wags the dog”. (Thornbury & Meddings, 2005 p.2)

The Dogme approach is not anti-materials or anti technology per se, but rather rejects the kinds of materials that do not conform to its principles. Traditional coursebooks serve up what Thornbury calls ‘grammar Mcnuggets’, i.e. pre-graded and pre-selected items, with no concern for learner needs or relevance. These items, it can be argued, are pretexts for learning, and their ability to affectively engage learners is not the primary concern.

Scott Thornbury confesses that it is so difficult to set a fixed plan for Dogme lessons. However, Dogme-style teaching has some unique characteristics: “Punk Dogme”, “Talk Dogme”, Deep Dogme”, full Dogme”, and “Dream Dogme”.

To begin with, “Punk Dogme” means that lessons should be created by the teacher and his/her learners not just consumed from published materials. Second, “Talk Dogme” implies that teachers need to take time off from textbooks and talk to their learners. This is to support Dogme’s first and most important key tenet: “conversation-driven” teaching. Furthermore, the term “Deep Dogme” stresses the point that teachers should make Dogme time the core of all their lessons as they explore language with their learners. “The syllabus becomes the map of a journey of discovery recollected in tranquility, rather than a blueprint for a forced march through English grammar” (Thornbury op. cit). Moreover, “Full Dogme” is related to “materials-light” teaching. It reflects that Dogme lesson should be based on materials that the learners bring to the classroom: a classroom where nobody knows what will be next. This needs skillful teachers who will be able to deal with emergent language and everything that may happen in the classroom, teachers who can talk the talk and walk the walk as it were. Finally, “Dream Dogme” is about designing a future school with no levels, no materials, and lots of profits.
1.1.4.2. Dogme Coursebook: “Dogway”

In his article “Dogme: Dancing in the Dark?” Scott Thornbury (2005) asks the question that researchers and practitioners alike want to ask: if current coursebooks will not work, could there be such a thing like a Dogme coursebook? As an answer to this question, he sets up some features for a future Dogme coursebook for which he gave the name “Dogway”. Thornbury also suggests a teacher’s book which will provide guidelines for teachers to deal with features of emergent language. As Meddings (2004, p.1) states: “Dogway would in fact be a great improvement on existing coursebooks: text-lite, non-linear, (joy!) listening free. Its effectiveness, however, would be heavily dependent on the teacher’s book—or, more accurately, the teacher’s inclination to read it”.

Dogway is designed to serve Dogme’s principles and is said to be: high on interactivity, low on text, emergent, facilitative, reflective, grammar-lite, problematizing, non-incremental, self-sufficient and cheap. First, high on interactivity reflects that interactive activities should be the main feature of the book. Second, Dogway is said to be low on text in that texts should be short and are not used to develop the reading skill. Recorded listening should not be there too as recording should be live and interactive i.e. done in class. Moreover, Dogway is emergent in the sense that emergent language should be the main content of the lessons. Furthermore, it should be facilitative. Since language is seen as an emergent phenomenon, the linguistic input provided should not be taught to the learners. However, it should be there just to help them in their way of language proficiency. Being reflective, Dogway gives space to the learners’ own comments, reflections, notes… It is also grammar-lite for the grammar syllabus should not be the “tail that wags the (communicative) dog” (Thornbury, 2005 p.2). Problematizing in Dogway’s stresses the importance of raising the learners’ involvement and making them reflect and use their own data via posing some kinds of problems. It is also believed that Dogway should be designed in a way that enables both teachers and students to move freely from one part to another. That is the meaning of non-incremental. Dogway is said to be self-sufficient in the sense that teachers will not need to use any other type of material along with it. Finally, Dogway is cheap as it is designed to have the lowest possible cost.
1.5. Dogme ELT and Lesson Planning

Since Dogme ELT focuses on scaffolding emergent language, it is not an easy task for teachers to pre-plan the lessons; features of “emergent language” are most of the time unpredictable. It is often said that in Dogme ELT, teachers enter their classrooms with almost no idea about what is going to happen. In this section, we will see to what extent lesson planning is important to Dogme framework, review Scrivener’s “Jungle path” teaching and suggest some Dogme lesson plans adopted by Ruth Hamilton (2000), a teacher of English in UAE.

1.1.5.1. Importance of Lesson Planning

*In the majority of teaching situations “a lesson which is tightly planned that there is no room at all for improvisation, and conversely, a lesson which is not planned at all and therefore entirely improvised, would generally be considered unbalanced and perhaps not terribly effective”*  

(Van Lier, 1996 p.200)

According to Brown (2001, p.149), the word “lesson” refers to the set of tasks that cover a period of classroom time. The classroom time units represent “steps” along a curriculum teachers have to follow. What Brown affirms is that a lesson is a proposal for action rather than a blueprint to be followed slavishly. And once teachers put their proposal for action into action, all sorts of things might happen, quite a few of which we might not have anticipated.

For Rinvolucri (1996, P.7), a plan is a mental structure or the map teachers need initially to help them through the landscape. He argues that students like to know what their teacher has in store for them. Evidence of teacher planning helps to ensure their confidence in the person who is teaching them.

Additionally, Harmer (2007, p.365) considers that planning can be done in different ways. The first one is when teachers allow the coursebook to do the planning for them; they take in a lesson or unit and teach it exactly following the textbook instructions. This is exactly the way Algerian secondary school teachers of English plan their lessons. The second one is
when teachers write down few notes on how the lesson will be like. Perhaps these might consist of the name of an activity (e.g. different holidays – discussion), or some language structures that need to be highlighted (e.g. inviting). Sometimes the notes will be more elaborated than this. And third, teachers do some kind of “corridor planning” in their heads as they walk toward the class. Even when teachers do not make notes or write a plan, they generally have ideas in their head anyway.

Several scholars (Harmer 2005, p.367; Brown 2001, p.152; and Woodward 2001, p.1; 2002, p.25) agree that English teachers need to consider some important aspects before planning, such as:

a. familiarity with the curriculum the students will be following.
b. gathering ideas, material and possible starting-off points.
c. determination of the purpose of the lesson and the general objective.
d. consideration of the students’ needs and personalities as individuals and as a group.
e. in case of using a textbook, decision of which exercises to develop, change, or delete and add to, all based on the objectives that have been drafted.
f. prevention of classroom pitfalls by writing a script of the lesson plan in which they anticipate words students will say in return. It helps teachers to be more specific in the planning.

1.5.1. The Jungle Path Lesson

Scrivener, (2005, p.132) presents as a type of lessons the “jungle path lesson”, where English teachers do not follow a curriculum and do not worry about what to teach. It means teachers are not pre-prepared with a topic, objectives, procedures, materials, and alternatives to assess students’ knowledge, and as a result the teaching and learning process is going to be improvised in every class. Scrivener, also, states some aspects that teachers need to consider:

- As soon as teachers start drafting procedures, they should visualize how the plan will hold together as a whole and consider if there is sufficient variety in the techniques to keep the lesson lively and interesting.

- Teachers need to anticipate how well activities flow together and how much time students need to develop each one. Timing is one of the most difficult aspects of lesson planning to control, so, the author recommends not to worry too much about it. Instead, they should feel happy if pupils have sufficient time for genuine interaction.
and creative use of language. If a planned lesson ends early, have some extra activities ready to include, but if the lesson is not completed as planned, teachers should be ready to gracefully end a class on time and, on the next day, pick up where they left off.

- Into the class, it is necessary for teachers to account for individual differences by designing techniques with easy and difficult items. These techniques should involve all actively, forming small groups that have either a deliberately heterogeneous range of ability, or, a homogeneous range to encourage equal participation using small groups and pair work gives them time to walk around and give extra attention to those below or above the norm.

- While teachers plan the lesson, they may consider if there is a balance between student talk and teacher talk because teachers’ natural inclination is to talk too much. Consequently, when planning, ensure that all students have a chance to talk, to produce language, and even to initiate their own ideas.

- It is believed that teachers will not write a new curriculum, but will follow an established one and adapt it in terms of their particular group of students, their needs, and their goals, as well as the educator’s philosophy of teaching. They should first decide how each class hour will contribute to the goals that the curriculum is designed to achieve.

As to the type of lesson planning, the Dogme teacher seems to follow a different philosophy.

1.5.2. Dogme Lesson Plan

Scott
Posted May 30, 2012 at 6:46 AM

Somebody once said: it’s not about preparing, it’s about ‘being prepared’ — that is to say, you have to be alert to your students’ evolving needs, and you have to have the requisite skills and knowledge to deal with them spontaneously.

**Figure1**: Scott Thornbury Talks about Lesson Planning in iTDi Blog

In a Dogme lesson plan, it should be respected that whatever language work will be done during class, it will be based on what emerges from the students as the outcome of the following three key factors:
• Topics – language is always about something. Students will be engaged in a topic to which they all can relate and have experience of. The interest in this topic will be raised utilizing one of Dogme ELT techniques, i.e. a teacher anecdote at the beginning of the lesson.

• Texts – real language always takes the form of texts. The students will exploit the features of spoken dialogue in the activities including class survey, class discussion, reaching a consensus, and role plays. They might also explore other forms of texts.

• Tasks – the successful management of learning involves providing a sense of purpose in classroom activities. The tasks students will be involved in are either life-like (role play) or real-life (searching for information, discussions and surveys). The tasks will be set, monitored and checked by the teacher to ensure their efficient and successful accomplishment, and to capture any other emerging language.

Dogme ELT’s humanistic principles combined with learner-centered techniques must lead to creating a classroom in which:

• A focus is placed on learner’s interest, experiences, beliefs and desires. This is achieved in the Dogme lesson by letting the students contribute and lead classroom discussions, and validating their opinions and utilizing the language they will provide.

• Language is an emergent phenomenon; coming from the inside of the learner, rather than external to the user. In the Dogme lesson, as much input, output and feedback as possible needs to be student-driven. It facilitates the discussion or task achievement by scaffolding it with required language.

• A positive affective learning environment is created that enhances learners’ confidence, self-esteem and motivation. This can be achieved through activities set in the environment they feel secure in, interacting with people they are familiar with, with a lot of encouragement from the teacher, and due time given to praise good language production. Teachers need to lower their profile in the classroom and let the students take the ownership of learning by bringing in suggestions, contributing language and activity ideas. Error correction is done with the whole class, rather than individually, in a form of a student-centered summarizing activity at the end of the lesson.
• Cooperative and interactive learning takes place. The activities in the lesson foster cooperation (class discussions and surveys) and a lot of interaction (role plays, discussions).

• Language is produced for genuine, meaningful communication or social interaction. The content of the lesson and the activities being student-driven are particularly meaningful for the students, putting the emergent language in immediate use in a variety of contexts.

• Materials are not consumed, they are created. If there is a need for a specific type of material, it will be created by the learners (e.g. a questionnaire) or the resources available in the library will be used. Anything ‘live’ and local is likely to be more relevant and memorable than published materials.

**Sample Dogme Lesson plan:** this lesson was presented by Ruth Hamilton (2000), a teacher of English at a school in the United Arab Emirates (UAE)

**Procedure:**

Keeping in mind the Dogme principle of ‘participant-generated input’, I went into the first class with no prepared plan and an open mind. We sat around the table and started talking. The students expressed their concern about their upcoming exams, particularly with the written component. Some had to write a comparison, discussing advantages and disadvantages and others had to write a description of a place. They asked if they could practice this. Together they decided on a country they would like to know more about and chose Brazil. Fortunately, I had lived in Brazil so could give them information. Otherwise they would have to go to the Internet to search for this. They thought about what information they needed and prepared headings and questions to ask. I explained that I would only answer grammatically correct questions. The students then asked questions and took notes. If I refused to answer a question, they reformulated it together until it was accepted. When they had the information they needed, we discussed the organization of their writing and I asked them to write up their text for homework. In the next lesson the students’ texts were exchanged, commented on and corrected.

**Emergent language/skills focus:** vocabulary used to describe a country, question formation, note-taking, writing skills.
Reflection and feedback:

By reducing my role as a teacher, the students were allowed to guide the direction of the lesson. They relied on each other to reformulate questions, thus reducing their reliance on the teacher and encouraging group collaboration. In their feedback they expressed the desire to “listen and talk to the teacher about things that are relevant to us” and so still saw the teacher as the focus of the group.

It was particularly interesting to see individual interests emerging. One student wanted to collect factual information about Brazil, another wanted to know about crime and violence, another was more interested in the people and culture, and the fourth wanted to know about tourist attractions and climate.

Ruth Hamilton’s experience did so much to clarify what a Dogme lesson might be like. Creating conversations in class and using no materials, he succeeded in providing the healthy environment for learners’ language to emerge. Additionally, students’ control over classroom talk was clear in the sense that they were allowed to choose the topic of the lesson and even generate questions for their teacher to answer. This reduces the teachers’ role in class. It is proved, now, that leading language lessons following Dogme’s philosophy of language teaching/learning is possible. (Other lessons following the same method are presented in Appendix3).

1.6. Reflections on Criticisms Directed to Dogme ELT

Since its emergence, Dogme ELT “seems to provoke excitement and derision in equal measure” (Meddings & Thornbury, 2003 p.1). Its main principles and key tenets have been hotly debated. Many teachers and educators criticize Dogme’s rejection of both published textbooks and modern technology in language classroom. However, Thornbury and Meddings (2003, p.1) state it clearly that: “A “Dogme’ approach does not necessarily exclude the use of a coursebook”. They add:

It is not books that we oppose. It is the prevailing culture of mass-produced, shrink-wrapped lessons, delivered in an anodyne in-flight-magazine style. Worse, in their syllabuses these in-flight courses peddle the idea that the learning of a language runs along a
Another criticism directed to Dogme ELT is that this approach lacks structure, and is unable to cover items on a syllabus, and is concerned that students will not learn anything. However, advocates of Dogme argue that language is not fixed, but is dynamic; it evolves and changes. They also affirm that learning is an emergent process, driven by exposure and use. They assert that if learners are given opportunities to use language, their inherent learning abilities will be activated, and language will emerge rather than be acquired. This principle is echoed by the work of Krashen’s comprehensible input model (1980), where learning ‘takes care of itself’ (Krashen, 1985 p.2). The Dogme view is that grammar and lexis syllabi should emerge; they should respond to (rather than predict) learners’ needs.

Other critics raise concerns with ‘emergent language’ based upon an apparent lack of structure or predictable language learning (Meddings & Thornbury p.18). However, EFL teachers should note that traditional language lessons, which follow a grammar-based syllabus, are not sufficient enough for language learners to gain appropriate proficiency in English (van Lier, 1996 p.42). There is a suggestion by Meddings & Thornbury (2009) that responsive teaching, during natural classroom interaction, provides further opportunities for teachers to scaffold ‘emergent language’ as well as offers possibilities for learners to ‘notice’ language. With this in mind, we can see how ‘emergent language’ and a ‘conversation driven’ approach to Dogme ELT are closely related, with both basic principles complementing one another.

**Conclusion**

We cannot deny that Dogme ELT shares some characteristics with other language teaching approaches and methods, however; it does bring new concepts to the field of language teaching. Although it has succeeded in giving classroom procedures a new interactive meaning and brought back the main character (the learner) to the scene of teaching, Dogme ELT did not escape criticisms concerning each of its key tenets and principles. With its unique principles and key tenets, Dogme ELT has saved its proper place in the history of language teaching.
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Introduction

Questionnaires and classroom observation are two main techniques used in this study in order to examine Algerian secondary school teachers’ and students’ perceptions, knowledge and attitudes towards this new philosophy of language teaching/learning and to test our hypothesis whether Algerian secondary school teachers and students think of Dogme ELT as an ambitious and over-demanding method. Collected data and analysis of the findings will be presented in this chapter.

2.1. Teachers’ Questionnaire

2.1.1. Sample

The participants of this questionnaire survey are Algerian teachers of English as a Foreign Language at the secondary school level. The sample comprises 24 randomly selected teachers from different secondary schools of the province (wilaya) of O.E.B.

2.1.2. Description of Teachers’ Questionnaire

Teachers’ questionnaire comprises 18 questions and is divided into four sections: background information; perception of Dogme ELT and its principles; suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context; and further suggestions. The questions included are related to Dogme’s key tenets: “materials-light”, “conversation-driven” teaching, and “scaffolding emergent language”.

The first section (questions 1 to 3) attempts to find out the following information:

Teachers’ Questionnaire- section 1

1. Teachers’ gender.
2. Teachers’ highest professional degree.
3. Length of teaching experience at the secondary school.
The second section entitled: Perception of Dogme ELT and its main Principles is designed to know how Algerian secondary school teachers view Dogme ELT. This section includes questions from Q4 to Q11 which are based around the three key tenets of Dogme ELT: “materials-light”, “conversation-driven”, and “emergent language”. Thus, Q4 to Q8 are related to the first key tenet: “materials-light”, Q9 is related to the second key tenet: “conversation-driven” and both Q10 and Q11 are about the third key tenet: “scaffolding emergent language”.

The third 6-item section is devoted to investigate the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context. Q12, for example, aims at identifying the extent to which Algerian teachers are ready to get rid of textbooks in their teaching and, therefore, respond to Dogme’s call for textbook-free-classroom’s creation. Through Q13, however, we want to know whether Algerian teachers still believe in the traditional “authoritative” role assigned to them in classroom. Q14 is related to the learners’ role. It seeks to know whether Algerian teachers believe in the learners’ ability to take control over language lessons, which is the new role given to them in Dogme ELT’s framework. Q15 investigates the suitable conditions for the application of Dogme ELT in Algeria. It asks teachers whether they think Dogme ELT demands skillful teachers to be successfully applied. The last two questions in this section (Q16 and Q17) are about the suitability of Dogme ELT as a new methodology to the Algerian context. Q17 is for teachers to justify their responses to Q16.

The last section of the questionnaire Q18 is for teachers’ additional comments and further suggestions concerning the research topic.

2.1.3. Interpretation of the Findings

Section one: Background Information

Q1: Please specify your gender.

Table 1 shows that 14 teachers are male and 10 teachers are female.
Table 1: Teachers’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Number of teachers

Q2: What highest degree do you currently possess?

Answers to this question show that 22 teachers of our sample indicate that they have a Licence degree in English. Only 2 teachers possess a Master degree.

Table 2: Teachers’ Professional Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magister</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3: How long have you been teaching English at the secondary school?

Table 3: Length of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1 to 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 10 to 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that most of the teachers of our sample are experienced in that 45.83% of them have been teaching English for more than 15 years. 33.33% of teachers said they have been teaching English from 1 to 5 years. 4 teachers have experienced teaching English at the secondary school for a period from 10 to 15 years. Only one teacher said he is in his first year teaching English at the secondary school. (See figure 2)

Section two: Perception of Dogme ELT and its Main Principles

Q4: Have you ever taught without a textbook?

Table 4: Experience of Teaching without textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aim of asking this question is to investigate teachers’ perception of Dogme’s key tenet of “materials-light” teaching. Responses to this question show that 20 teachers of our sample claim they have experienced teaching without textbooks. However, they relied on other materials and resources when necessary. 4 teachers admit that they always follow the textbook instructions. Their excuse is that they have a fixed program to follow and that it is not that easy to go through that program without the guidance of textbooks. (See figure 3)

This clearly shows that Algerian secondary school teachers (at least teachers of our sample) are not implementing this Dogme principle in their teaching of English.

Q5: Please, justify your answer.

When asked to justify their answers, some teachers argue that they are not natives to teach without the textbook restricting the question to a matter of language proficiency only which is not the case. The extent to which textbooks are relied on is a matter of a certain teaching strategy and methodology that the teacher is adopting. Other teachers stated that they have to follow and go through the units of the program set by the official syllabus designers. One teacher said: he does use the textbook “simply because of the overloaded program, not enough time and luck of interest in learning on the students’ part”. This shows that even
students are blamed for why teachers’ overreliance on textbooks instructions in their teaching route.

However, teachers who have experiencing teaching without textbooks support their view by arguing that textbooks may sometimes contain irrelevant texts or exercises that need to be adapted to the learners’ concerns and needs. Some teachers even prefer to use some texts found on the net rather than those provided in the textbook. It is very important that some teachers consider learners’ needs and interests as this may mean some hope for Dogme’s future application.

One teacher said: “textbooks are not always a good way to promote learning. Inputs are far beyond the students’ language needs and interests”. On the other hand, other teachers claimed that the language input provided in the current Algerian English textbooks is not enough for their students in the sense that it does not really meet their needs for real communication.

Q6: How important is the textbook to your English class?

a. Very important
b. Important
c. Neither important nor unimportant
d. Unimportant

Table 5: Importance of the Textbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important nor unimportant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question is also related to Dogme’s key tenet: “materials-light” teaching. All 23 teachers of our sample believe in the importance of textbooks to the English classroom.

This shows a clear rejection to Dogme’s call for excluding textbooks from language classrooms. However, 1 teacher said that textbooks are unimportant in the English class and he argues that it is just because he masters the English language. Here again, teachers are relating the use of textbooks to a matter of language proficiency.

Q7: Do you think that teaching without the textbook may:

a. Raise interest in class
b. Encourage students to talk
c. Add more novelty and variety during the lesson
d. Enable the students to lead the lesson in their own way
e. Other (please specify)
Table 6: Advantages of Teaching without Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Raise interest in class</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Encourage students to talk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Add more novelty and variety during the lesson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Enable the students to lead the lesson in their own way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Advantages of Teaching without Textbooks

“To raise interest in class” is the most selected answer by 79.16% of teachers. 20.83% of them believe that excluding the textbook from the language classroom may “encourage students to talk”. One teacher added that teaching without the textbook helps teachers to “stop being slaves of the book”. What is paradoxical is that although all of these teachers are conscious about and believe in the advantages that textbook-free teaching might bring to the classroom, they still rely on textbooks with no attempt to open some space for classroom interaction and real communicative activities.
Q8: Have you heard about Dogme ELT that encourages teaching without instructional materials?

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 6: Teachers’ Awareness of Dogme ELT**

As shown in figure 5, the answer to this question is 100% NO. All teachers have never heard about this new teaching methodology. This may explain the absence of Dogme-style teaching in Algeria. The question that we should ask is: are Algerian teachers following the TEFL updates? Or are they satisfied with what they already know and with the traditional methodologies they are currently using in their teaching?

Q9: To what extent do you agree with Dogme’s philosophy that learning can be mediated through talk?

a. Strongly agree  b. agree  c. undecided  d. disagree  e. strongly disagree
Table 7: Teachers’ Perception of Dogme’s Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Teachers’ Perception of Dogme’s Philosophy

In this question, we come to investigate about teachers’ perception of key tenet of Dogme ELT, that is, “conversation-driven” teaching. Here again appears a great hope for Dogme ELT to be applied in Algeria in the future since 19 teachers agree that conversation and interaction inside the classroom foster language learning. However, 3 teachers disagree with this philosophy and two (2) others left their opinion undecided.

Q10: To what extent do you agree with Dogme’s principle that language is not necessarily taught but rather emerges while learning?
Table 8: Teachers’ Perception of Dogme’s Third Key Tenet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question is related to Dogme’s key tenet of “scaffolding emergent language”. Twenty (20) teachers agree that language is an “emergent” phenomenon. One teacher says: “teachers cannot teach a language to anyone”. Only 3 teachers disagree and one did not answer the question.

The results show that most teachers are aware of and agree with that language emerges while learning. The question that we have to ask is: does this belief mean that they know how to deal with features of emergent language? Are they able to scaffold emergent language? This opens another window on the investigation of Dogme ELT in Algeria.
Q11: Have you ever dealt with any type of “emergent language” during a lesson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Teachers’ Experiences of Dealing with “Emergent Language”

Through this question, we wanted to know whether teachers who agreed previously that language is not necessarily taught but rather emerges while learning (see figure 8) have dealt with any type of emergent language in their lessons.

The paradox in this question is that the 3 teachers who didn’t believe previously (See figure 8) that language is an emergent phenomenon claim that they did sometimes deal with some of its types in their lessons. Even the teacher who did not answer this question said that he often dealt with emergent language. However, 13 of the teachers who agreed said that they have never dealt with any type of emergent language, 3 said they often did and 4 teachers said that they only sometimes experienced that. Does this mean that these teachers ignore instances of emergent language in class? Do they actually understand the concept of emergent language?

Section three: Suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian Educational Context

Q12: Would you teach without the textbook if you were allowed to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Teachers’ Choice of Teaching Methodology
Figure 9: Teachers’ Choice of Teaching Methodology

Since some teachers argue that they are obliged to follow the official program and follow the textbook units in their teaching of English, the aim of asking such question is to know teachers’ readiness to create free-textbook language classrooms. Almost all teachers choose to take the risk. However 3 teachers, even if given the choice, refuse to accept the idea of teaching without the textbook. Their reason is always that they “cannot but follow the program”. They also argued that “it is not that easy” to walk along the teaching route without the guidance of the textbook. It is so clear from teachers’ responses that they are ready to teach without the textbook. However, is readiness enough for Dogme to be successfully applied in our secondary schools?

Q13: Do you think that Dogme’s call for learners to provide the learning content themselves may threaten the traditional “authority” of the teacher?
Table 11: Perception of Dogme’s Call for Learners’ Leadership in Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Perception of Dogme’s Call for Learners’ Leadership in Class

Almost all of the teachers of our sample answered positively. Ten (10) teachers strongly agree, eight (8) said they agree, and only four (4) teachers disagree. Two (2) other teachers’ did not answer this question. (See figure 10)

The results clearly show that Algerian teachers still believe in the traditional role teachers used to take in language classroom. Thus, it is uneasy for the to accept the Dogme’s new philosophy and make the learner the center of the classroom.

Q14: Do you believe your students are able to lead the lesson in their own way?
Table 12: Teachers’ Belief in Learners’ Capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of asking question 14 is to know whether teachers trust their learners and believe in their capacities to lead English lessons in their own way. Only 3 teachers believe so. The other teachers of our sample (21 teachers) argue that it is almost impossible for students at this level to lead the lesson and that it is their (as teachers) mission. One teacher state clearly: “if students are to lead the lesson, why is there a teacher in each class?”

It is clear again that teachers’ belief in their “authoritative” role prevents the application of Dogme ELT in Algeria and the acceptance of its new concept of learners’ “leadership” in class.

Thornbury (2012) states:

“(…)if, having developed a set of effective management skills and teaching routines, having experienced what it’s like to think on your
feet, having learned how to be resourceful with very little, and above all, having learned to trust your learners, you are ready to fly on your own(...)”  

(Thornbury, 2012 p.1)

This may be one aspect Algerian teachers lack to use Dogme in their classrooms.

Q15: Do you think Dogme ELT demands skillful teachers to be successfully applied?

This question is about the importance of training for teachers to successfully apply Dogme ELT. All our 24 sample teachers answered “yes”. They have all agreed that it is not easy or even possible for any teacher, especially novice teachers, to follow the Dogme-style teaching.  

This is clearly stated by Thornbury when he said:

(...) this kind of 'high-risk' strategy requires a degree of experience, and a sound knowledge of language systems, so as to be able to deal with language issues as they arise — probably not for beginner teachers!

(Thornbury, ibid)

Q16: Do you think Dogme ELT is suitable to the Algerian context?

![Figure 12: Suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian Context](image)

The pie chart shows that 88% of participants believe Dogme ELT is suitable to the Algerian context, while 12% do not.
We wanted to know about the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context. Twenty one (21) teachers of our sample assert that Dogme ELT is not suitable to the Algerian educational context. Their justification is that “the present teaching circumstances are not appropriate mainly in terms of level, number of students we have in class...” one teacher said. Other explanations for their answer are that “Algerian teachers are not well trained to apply this kind of teaching” and that “Algerian students are not capable to learn by themselves”.

Only 3 teachers of our sample believe in the probable suitability of Dogme-style teaching to the Algerian schools. When asked to justify their answer, one teacher said: “it will be suitable just in case the teachers are skillful enough to provide the healthy environment for language to emerge and to encourage learners to take part in classroom talk”. It is encouraging that some teachers are aware of their role to help the learners to be productive in class.

**Section 4: Further Suggestions**

This section is devoted to teachers’ comments and further suggestions concerning Dogme ELT in general. It was not a surprise to find a “No, that’s all”, “no, I haven’t” or just a slash in the space provided since teachers are not aware of this new methodology (as shown in the results of Q8). However, four (4) teachers added some comments about Dogme ELT. The first teacher wrote: “Dogme ELT is really a great new teaching methodology which needs to be applied in Algerian schools”. The second teacher said that “teachers need to use Dogme ELT to motivate their learners and get rid of the traditional teacher-centered approach”. The third teacher added that “this kind of teaching would give very nice results concerning language learning if teachers were well trained to apply it successfully”. The last word was that “Algerian teachers must be well-trained to adopt this new teaching methodology”.

To sum up, although most teachers show acceptance vis-à-vis two key tenets of Dogme ELT, conversation-driven teaching and scaffolding emergent language, 88% do not believe in its suitability to the Algerian educational context. Even the 12% of teachers who do so state that there are conditions for it to be successfully applied; they make reference to teachers’ competence. They suggest that training programs must be designed for Algerian teachers to help them adopt Dogme–style teaching with a special focus on how to deal with features of emergent language in class.
2.2. Students’ Questionnaire

2.2.1. Sample

Respondents to this questionnaire are Algerian secondary school students. The sample chosen includes third year students randomly selected from different secondary schools in O.E.B. The reason of choosing third year students is that we assume they are more aware of the English language having studying it for 7 years (4 years at the middle school and 3 years at the secondary school). At first, we wanted to deal only with students of the literary stream since they are more concerned with languages than students in the other streams. Administrative and time constraints, however, made this choice impossible. The sample, therefore, contains students of both the literary and the scientific branches.

2.2.2. Description of the Questionnaire

In order to achieve more reliability in our research, it was necessary to design a questionnaire for Algerian secondary school students. It aims at investigating their perception of teaching without textbooks and other pedagogical materials, the extent to which they think this kind of teaching might be suitable to the Algerian educational context and whether they are ready to study English applying Dogme-style teaching or they are “more conservative than their teachers and can resist new methods, especially methods which require more active involvement, more commitment, more responsibility and more openness” (Gibbs, 1988 p.62).

The questionnaire comprises 16 questions related to Dogme and its philosophy of language learning/teaching. Like teachers’ questionnaire, it is divided into 4 sections: background information, attitudes towards teaching English without textbooks, suitability of teaching English without textbooks to the Algerian context, and further suggestions. The first section of the questionnaire (questions 1 to 4) is devoted to some background information related to students’ age, gender, branch of study and attitudes towards the English language.

The second section entitled: Attitudes towards Teaching English without Textbooks is devoted to students’ opinions about Dogme ELT. This section contains questions from Q5 to Q11. These questions also shed light on Dogme’s key tenets. Thus, questions 5 to 10 are

The third section (questions 12 to 15) investigates students’ perception of the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian school under the title: Suitability of Teaching without Textbooks to the Algerian Context. Q12 and Q13 investigate about “materials-light” teaching. Q12, for instance, aims at investigating the extent to which Algerian secondary school students believe in the possibility of learning English without the use of textbooks while Q13 asks them whether they need to refer to the textbook in their revision. Q14, however, is related to the principle of engagement which supports Dogme’s key tenet of “emergent language”. It asks students whether they believe in their ability to lead the lessons the way they like (that is through the language they produce to be the main content of the lesson). Justifications for their answers are given space in Q15.

The last section of this questionnaire Q16 is for students’ voice. Students are invited to write their comments and express their opinions about this new teaching/learning methodology.

2.2.3. Interpretations of the Findings

Section one: Background Information

Q1: How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Years old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Years old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N’: Number of students
Although our sample students are all third year students, their age differs slightly; it ranges from 17 to 19 years old. Table 13 shows that 14 students are 18 years old, 10 students are 19 years old and 6 students are 17 years old.

Q2: You are:

[ ] Female

[ ] Male

Results to this question show that 25 students are females and only 5 students are males.

Table 14: Students’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14: Students’ Gender

Q3: In which stream are you studying?

- [ ] Scientific
- [ ] Literary

Figure 15 shows that 17 students of our sample are studying in the scientific stream and 13 students are studying in the literary one.

Table 15: Students’ Branch of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific stream</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary stream</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4: Do you like the English language?

Yes □          No □

Table 16: Students’ Attitude towards the English Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 clearly shows that 93.33% of students indicate that they like the English language and only 6.66% of them do not. This may reflect the fact that students are not obliged to study it just because it is part of their official program. It may also show that students are motivated to some extent to learn English which facilitates teachers’ mission.

Section 2: Attitudes towards Teaching English without Textbooks

Q5: Have you ever attended a session in which your teacher didn’t use the textbook?

- [] Yes
- [] No

Table 17: Sessions without Textbooks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 17: Sessions without Textbooks?

While 16 students state that they have experienced studying English without the use of textbooks in their classrooms, 14 others said they have never been in a free-textbook class. Answers to this question show that there is a kind of agreement between students’ and teachers’ view since 20 teachers stated previously (See figure 3) that they have experienced teaching English without relying on textbook instructions.

Q6: If yes, what did s/he do?

In this question, students are asked to give their explanation of what was the alternative method used by their teacher instead of relying on the textbook. One student states: “he just explains the lesson orally and if everything is clear we don’t write anything so we learn more”. Another student adds that “he starts by giving us a general idea about the lesson then he writes all the points concerning the topic on the board and then he starts to explain each point orally and he lets us participate with our point of view. I really think that it is an interesting method”. Although teaching like this is not Dogme ELT, but it is encouraging that, at least, it shares some of its characteristics.

Q7: Which of the following lessons would you prefer to study without the textbook?

a. Grammar
b. Vocabulary
c. Speaking  

d. Reading  

e. Writing  

f. Other (please specify)  

**Q8: Why?**  

**Table 18: Students’ Lesson Preferences**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18: Students’ Lesson Preferences**  

Through this question, we wanted to know which type of English lessons students prefer to study without the use of textbooks. Grammar, vocabulary, speaking, reading, and
writing were the options given to students. Q8 is for students to justify their choices. Not all the students justified their answers, only 21 students did so.

Only 6 students said that they like to study grammar without the textbook and argue that in grammar “we need just tell the rule and apply it”. The other 14 students argue that grammar is very difficult the reason why textbooks are necessary to facilitate it. Six (6) other students said that they prefer to study English vocabulary without the use of textbooks arguing that “when we talk in the classroom we learn new vocabulary”. However, most students agree upon the importance of learning speaking without the use of textbooks. One student says: “I want to study without the textbook so that I can express my ideas with my friends”. Another student adds: “this makes me adopt with the new language faster because I am using it instead of just seeing it”. “I think they (teachers) have to give us some freedom to express ourselves” one student asserts “I enjoy better (the lesson) when I just listen to what the teacher says without using the textbook” “if we depend on the textbook always, we never learn” “learning without the textbook helps me memorise the lesson better” were other students’ comments. This clearly shows students’ agreement with Dogme’s principle that learning can be mediated through talk and their support to its key tenet of “conversation-driven” teaching/learning. However, when the focus of the lesson is related to reading and writing, students prefer structured lessons.

Q9: Do you think it is possible to learn English without textbooks?

☐ Yes          ☐ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students’ answers to this question need to be justified in Q10. However, 7 students did not justify their answers. Twenty (20) students believe it is possible to learn English without the use of textbooks. One student argues that “if the teacher has capacities, the textbook is not important”. This shows a second agreement between students and teachers’ views in the sense that even students believe that excluding the textbook from the language classroom requires skillful teachers. Another student says: “it is possible (to learn English without textbooks) because it makes you practice the language more and use it”. One student adds: “(it is possible) because for me the textbook is confusing me so I prefer to learn English orally with my teacher”. This shows that students need language for communication. Another student states it like this: “Of course yes, if the students rely on themselves and the only reference of knowledge is their teacher, they will do their best to learn the language”.

Q11: Which activity is more beneficial to learn English?

a. To engage in life-like conversations with the teacher and classmates
b. To follow the textbook activities
c. Others (please specify)
Table 20: Students’ Preferable Activity to Learn English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. To engage in life-like conversations with the teacher and classmates.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To follow the textbook activities.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Students’ Preferable Activity to Learn English

Twenty three (23) students of our sample prefer to “engage in life-like conversations with their teacher and classmates” for a better learning of English. This shows students’ support to the first and most important key tenet of Dogme ELT that is “conversation-driven teaching”. Only 7 students prefer to follow the textbook activities as their best way to learn English. For other activities, one student says: “to read (in English) and do researches and be concerned with everything that includes English”. Another suggested activity is “to listen to English songs”.
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Section 3: Suitability of Teaching English without Textbooks to the Algerian Context

Q12: According to you, to learn English, the textbook is:

- a. Very important
- b. Important
- c. Not important

Table 21: Textbook Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Very important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Important</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. unimportant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Textbook Importance

Table 21 shows that 53.33% of our sample students believe that textbooks are important to the language classroom, 36.66% of them state that they are unimportant and thus show their agreement with Dogme’s key tenet of “materials-light” teaching/learning and only 10% of students believe that textbooks are very important to learn English. What is paradoxical in this question is that 10 of the students who believe in the importance of
textbooks to learn English stated previously (see figure19) that it is possible to exclude them from the language classroom. This may imply that being important to the language classroom does not necessarily mean that textbooks are the best way to learn English and their instructions must be blindly followed.

Since we asked teachers the same question, we attempt to make a comparison to compare their responses and see to what extent they match together. Students seem to agree with their teachers in the sense that 23 teachers and 19 students strongly believe in the importance of textbooks for a better learning of English to take place.

Q13: Do you need to refer to textbooks while revising?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Students’ Need for Textbooks while Revising

Figure 22: Students’ Need for Textbooks while Revising
The aim of asking this question is that some teachers argued that the reason why they are relying on textbooks is that students need them when they revise for exams. However, only 8 students confirm that. Fifteen (15) students said that they sometimes need to refer to the textbook for some information only. Seven (7) students state that they do not need textbooks at all in their revision. This shows that the textbook is not that important to language classrooms.

**Q14:** Do you think that it is possible for students at your level to lead English lessons the way they like?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N’</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question investigates whether students believe in Dogme’s key tenet of “emergent language”; but since they don’t know about this principle we made it simpler by asking the question as it is mentioned. Whether the answer was positive or negative, they are asked to give an explanation in the space provided in Q15. Only 5 students answered negatively. One of them argues: “I think it is not allowed for students to lead the English lessons”. The word “allowed” here clearly explains that it is not a matter of competence but it is a matter of control and “authority” in class. If teachers are giving the students this opportunity, they will take it for sure. Another student adds: “it will be a mess, especially in Algeria”.

On the contrary, 13 students believe they can lead the lesson the way they like. To justify his answer, one student states: “when we choose what to study, we will enjoy studying more than when being obliged to study what the teacher gives us”. Another student declares: “if they (students) can do that and know how, why not?” This is a direct call for teachers to trust their students and give them the chance to learn the way they prefer. The other 12
students believe that it can be feasible but not always. One student argues that “it depends on how easy the lesson is” while another believes “it is up to the teacher if he allows the students to propose the topics and even explain the lessons”. We can see that the word “allow” is present again.

Q15: Please, justify your answer.

For this question, 25 students answered. Five (5) students, however, left their answers unjustified.

Section 4: Further Suggestions

Q16: Do you have any further suggestions or comments?

Only 21 students responded to this question. “As a student, I think that studying English without a textbook will be more interesting because the students will focus more on what the teacher says” one student declares. A second student adds: “I think that this way of learning is better for students and I hope that Dogme ELT will be applied”. Another student states: “I see that this is a great idea and it can lead teaching to another level and I support it and wish it will be applied in Algeria”.

Results to this questionnaire show a clear acceptance on the part of students of this new style of teaching, as they demonstrate some readiness to study English via applying Dogme’s principles and classroom procedures.
2.3. Classroom Observation

2.3.1. Description

In order for our research study to be more reliable, a second technique, classroom observation, is used along with the questionnaires. The aim of using this technique is to investigate the extent to which Algerian secondary school teachers rely on textbooks in their teaching of English. Furthermore, it helps us discover whether they are, knowingly or otherwise, incorporating any of Dogme’s principles in their classrooms. Four classrooms, randomly chosen, from a secondary school in Ain El Beida city, were observed for a four-session period.

The observed classes are of first year students in the literary stream. During the four-session period of our classroom observation, they were dealing with a unit entitled: “Once upon a time”. After a short introduction explaining the title of the unit, students went through the sequences of the textbook following its instructions. Almost all activities offered in the textbook in each rubric of the four rubrics included in each sequence were followed with no improvisation from the part of the teacher. What merits more attention is that even sentences provided in the grammar exercises were taken just as they are with no attempt to adjust them to the students’ level.

2.3.2. Interpretation of the findings

The findings show that teachers heavily rely on the textbook content and instructions in almost every stage of the lesson. Moreover, they use other materials, such as handouts, along with the textbook with no attempt to create real conversation inside the classroom. The teacher’s voice is prevailing and no authentic communicative activities are designed. Students are obliged to follow their teacher and to do just what he asks them to do. The teachers’ lesson plans seem to be organized according to the textbook texts, instructions and activities. Unfortunately, none of Dogme’s principles or key tenets is implemented in the observed classrooms.
Conclusion

Algerian teachers of English need to re-consider their teaching strategies and give more attention and value to the learners’ interests and needs for communication. Furthermore, they need to accept that the teacher is no more the only and the one decision-maker in class; it is the learner’s turn, now, to lead the classroom. However, teachers need not to feel excluded under Dogme ELT framework; language is there to be used and practised but it is their role to provide the healthy environment for learning to take place.
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Introduction

The present chapter presents a review of Dogme ELT and discusses the final results with reference to teachers’ and students’ attitudes and perceptions of its key tenets. Additionally, it says the final word about the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context. Finally, it suggests some pedagogical implications and possible recommendations for English language teachers.

3.1. Review of Dogme ELT

Dogme ELT appears to incorporate selective methods, approaches and techniques such as CLT, TBLT or Learner-Based Teaching, Van Lier’s AAA Curriculum, and aspects of the Ecological Approach to language teaching with an emphasis on interaction and communication. Meddings & Thornbury (2009) suggest that Dogme ELT “have antecedents in other educational traditions” (p.21) which supports the assertion that Dogme ELT incorporates the ‘best bits’ of other traditional methods, approaches and techniques and is regarded as ‘Eclectic Teaching’. Meddings & Thornbury (2009) propose Dogme ELT as “an alternative to transmission-type, teacher-led teaching” (ibid). Naturally, the three tenets of Dogme ELT are complementary whereby a ‘conversation driven’ lesson could develop and assist ‘emergent language’ and the emphasis of a ‘materials light’ classroom may provide teachers and learners the opportunity to focus more on responsive and emergent conversation. Essentially, Dogme ELT is “both a way of teaching and an overt attitude to teaching” (Hall 2011 p.40).

“Teaching Unplugged” is closely related to a book published “Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy & Authenticity” by Leo van Lier (1996) whereby the AAA (Awareness, Autonomy & Authenticity) curriculum “allows language education to unfold in a regulated yet creative manner” (p.5). Van Lier (1996) encourages teachers to adopt less emphasis on premanufactured material and coursebooks and respond to and scaffold learning based upon the learners within the classroom (p.181-183). Essentially, Meddings & Thornbury (2009) have developed van Lier’s (1996) assertion of an AAA curriculum with the development of “Teaching Unplugged” and various ideas for lessons. When comparing both books by Meddings & Thornbury (2009) with van Lier (1996), they appear very similar and initially it appears that “Teaching Unplugged” has been written in an ‘easy to digest’ format for English language teachers to complement the book published by
van Lier (1996). When approaching Scott Thornbury via Twitter (www.twitter.com), he suggested that “van Lier’s book was an important influence” (Thornbury 2011) in the development of Dogme ELT. Nonetheless, it is beyond the scope of this study to expand on “Teaching Unplugged” (2009) reinventing van Lier’s (1996) suggestion for an AAA curriculum, as this study has focused solely on the three underlying principles of Dogme ELT. However, it appears from the Literature Review and the similarity with the book published by van Lier (1996) that Dogme ELT has reinvented the ‘pedagogical wheel’. Essentially, it is regarded that Dogme ELT “is a moveable feast: difficult to pin down, endlessly adaptive” (Thornbury & Meddings 2003 p.18).

3.2. Discussion of the Final Results

3.2.1. Materials light: Teachers’ and Students’ Attitudes

Analysis of the teachers’ responses to the questions included in the questionnaire section devoted to perception of Dogme ELT and its main principles shows that “materials-light” teaching does not match teachers’ views in that 95% of them believe in the importance of textbooks to the language classroom and argue that it is difficult, especially for novice teachers, to teach without the guidance of the textbook instructions.

Concerning the students’ attitudes towards teaching English without textbooks and other pedagogical materials, the results show a clear acceptance on the part of the students of this new learning/teaching methodology and its principles and procedures. 53% of the sample students report that they like it when their teacher does not use the textbook.

3.2.2. Conversation Driven: Teachers’ and Students’ Attitudes

Investigating teachers’ and students’ perceptions of “conversation-driven” teaching, results show that 79.16% of them agree that conversation and interaction inside the classroom foster language learning and 76% of students prefer to engage in life-like conversations with their teacher and classmates for better learning of English.
3.2.3. Emergent Language: Teachers’ and Students’ Attitudes

Concerning the third key tenet of Dogem ELT, results show that the majority of teachers (83.33%) concede that language is an emergent phenomenon. 74.99% of teachers believe in the learners’ capacity to provide the learning content and 45.82% of them have experienced dealing with features of emergent language during their lessons. Most students (83.33%) also believe that they are able to lead language lessons via the language they produce.

3.3. Dogme ELT in Algeria:

As to the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context, results show that only 12% of the respondents have an affirmative answer. They do believe in their students’ ability to lead the lessons in their own way. On the other hand, three quarters of the teachers (88%) argue that Dogme is not applicable in their secondary schools. According to them, Dogme’s call for students to provide the learning content by themselves may threaten the “authority” of the teacher and “won’t lead anywhere”.

When asked about the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context, 83% of the students believe that they can lead English lessons the way. They believe that this will make learning more enjoyable. Results also show that 66% of the respondents state that it is possible to learn English without relying on textbook instructions. This implies that, unlike teachers, they believe more in the suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian educational context, and they even show excitement to study English in a materials-free-zone.

3.4. Pedagogical Implications of the Research

As the results of this study show, Algerian secondary school teachers of English are unaware of Dogme ELT. It is suggested that they should read more about this new teaching methodology and discover how unplugged they currently are-and are prepared to be. Moreover, they need to follow all that is new in the EFL profession to learn new ways of teaching and, thus, new ways of being a teacher.
However, teachers only cannot make Dogme ELT happen just like this. There must be some specific training programs that aim at helping Algerian teachers to get rid of their over-reliance on textbooks and other materials, training them to be able to deal with “emergent language” inside the classroom, and making them believe that sometimes teaching can be more effective and more engaging without a piece of paper.

Just as we moved on from the blackboard, it is perhaps now time to move from the whiteboard to talk to the learners. Learners’ voice need to be prevailing and their language needs to be welcomed and encouraged to emerge given the right conditions. Van Lier (2000, p.260) tells us “perhaps, after all, we “learn” language the same way that an animal “learns” the forest, or a plant “learns” the soil”. Having this mind, it is suggested that the teacher’s role is to help his/her learners find their niches by providing them opportunities for real language use.

Concerning lesson planning, it is suggested that rather than planning and preparing lessons and taking the learners through a list of items on the set plan, teachers should be prepared for the lesson that will be co-written by the people in the room.

Martin Sketchley (2012) in his dissertation “An investigation into teacher and student perception of the key tenets of Dogme ELT” suggested what he calls “Balanced Teaching”. This approach is in a middle position between the full Dogme ELT and the “Structured teaching” used in the Algerian schools. This new way of teaching may serve Algerian teachers of English especially in their first steps to a full Dogme ELT.

Algerian teachers of English should bear in mind that a Dogme classroom is similar to an informal education classroom where the teacher’s goal is to facilitate learning, a classroom where materials are locally generated and the source of all language that emerges are the learners’ themselves. They should also know that Dogme teacher is skilled, caring observer, and an activist.

**3.5. Limitations of the Study:**

As the research progressed during the end of the year, various limitations run counter to the fulfillment of its initial ambitions. The first and the “most frequently reported problem from researchers” (Nunan, 1992 p.219) is related to time constraints which resulted in many other problems and limitations of this project.
First, data collection was confined to only few secondary schools at the level of the wilaya (province) of Oum El Bouaghi. The replication of this study at different regions of Algeria would enable better generalization of the findings.

Second, because of many constraints, including time and administrative ones, this research targeted only a small size of population. Therefore, to generalize the results for larger groups, the study should have involved more participants at different levels.

Third, classroom observation was restricted to observing one classroom for only a four-session period. It would have been possible to come up with more details concerning teachers’ and students’ experiences during language lessons if the observation took a longer period of time and targeted a large number of classes.

Finally, lacking prior research studies on the topic is another limitation for this project. Interesting finding would have been revealed if this research was based on previous works dealing with Dogme ELT.
CONCLUSION

On the basis of the findings of this work, it appears that Algerian secondary school teachers of English think of Dogme ELT as an ambitious and over-demanding method. Unlike teachers, students seem to accept more the idea of studying English following the Dogme methodology.

It is possible to state that Dogme ELT might be suitable to the Algerian secondary school context if Algerian teachers are trained to think outside “the textbook box”, to consider materials in terms of the language that is available in the classroom (emergent language) and to teach English accordingly. Otherwise, Dogme ELT would be a fairy-tale method in Algeria.
APPENDICES

-Appendix 1: Teachers’ Questionnaire.

-Appendix 2: Students’ Questionnaire.

-Appendix 3: Samples of Dogme Lesson Plan.
Dear teachers,

This questionnaire is part of a study investigating a new English teaching methodology, known as Dogme ELT, and its suitability to the Algerian educational context. It aims at knowing about Algerian teachers’ perception of this new methodology and whether there is some space for a future Dogme-style English teaching in Algerian secondary schools. We would be so grateful if you answer these few questions. Please tick the appropriate box or boxes and make full statements when needed.

Designed by: Siham Bouchene

Supervisor: Dr. Sarah Merrouche

2012-2013
Section 1: Background Information

1- Please specify your gender.
   □ Female □ Male

2- What highest degree do you currently possess?
   a. Licence  □
   b. Master  □
   c. Magister □
   d. Other (please specify)
      ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3- How long have you been teaching English at the secondary school?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Section 2: Perception of Dogme ELT and its Principles

4- Have you ever taught without a textbook?
   □ Yes □ No

5- Please justify your answer………………………………………………………………………..
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6- How important is the textbook to your English class?
   a. Very important
   b. Important
   c. Neither important nor unimportant
   d. Unimportant

7- Do you think that teaching without the textbook may:
   a. Raise interest in class
   b. Encourage students to talk
   c. Add more novelty and variety during the lesson
   d. Enable the students to lead the lesson in their own way
   e. Other (please specify)………………………………………………………………………..
      ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8- Have you heard about Dogme ELT that encourages teaching without instructional materials?
   □ Yes □ No

9- To what extent do you agree with Dogme’s philosophy that learning can be mediated through talk?
   a- strongly agree □   b- agree □   c- undecided □   d- disagree □   e- strongly disagree □
10- To what extent do you agree with Dogme’s principle that language is not necessarily taught but rather “emerges” while learning?

a- strongly agree ☐  b- agree ☐  c- undecided ☐  d- disagree ☐  e- strongly disagree ☐

11- Have you ever dealt with any type of “emergent language” during a lesson?

Never ☐  Once ☐  Sometimes ☐  Often ☐

Section 2: Suitability of Dogme ELT to the Algerian Educational Context

12- Would you teach without textbooks if you were allowed to?

Yes ☐  No ☐

13- Do you think Dogme’s call for learners to provide the learning content themselves may threaten the traditional “authority” of the teacher?

a- strongly agree ☐  b- agree ☐  c- undecided ☐  d- disagree ☐  e- strongly disagree ☐

14- Do you believe your students are able to lead the lesson in their own way?

Yes ☐  No ☐

15- Do you think Dogme ELT demands skillful teachers to be successfully applied?

Yes ☐  No ☐

16- Do you think Dogme ELT is suitable to the Algerian context?

Yes ☐  No ☐
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L’ARBI BEN M’HIDI UNIVERSITY – OUM EL BOUAGUI
FACULTY OF LETTERS LANGUAGES AND HUMAN SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF English

Students’ Questionnaire

Dear students,

This questionnaire is part of a study investigating a new teaching methodology, known as Dogme ELT, and its suitability to the Algerian educational context. This methodology encourages teaching without textbooks and other pedagogical materials. We would be so grateful if you answer these few questions. Please tick the appropriate box or boxes and make full statements when needed.

Designed by: Siham Bouchene
Supervisor: Dr. Sarah Merrouche

2012-2013
Section 1: Background Information

1- How old are you?

..........................................................................................................................

2- You are:

☐ Female

☐ Male

3- In which stream are you studying?

☐ Scientific

☐ Literary

4- Do you like the English language?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Section 2: Attitudes towards Teaching English without Textbooks

5- Have you ever attended a session in which your teacher didn’t use the textbook?

☐ Yes

☐ No

6- If yes, what did s/he do? ................................................................................................

..........................................................................................................................

..........................................................................................................................

7- Which of the following lessons would you prefer to study without the textbook?

a. Grammar

☐

b. Vocabulary

☐

c. Speaking

☐

d. Reading

☐

e. Writing

☐

f. Other (please specify)

..........................................................................................................................

8- Why?

..........................................................................................................................

..........................................................................................................................

9- Do you think it is possible to learn English without textbooks?

☐ Yes

☐ No

10- Please justify your answer..................................................................................

..........................................................................................................................
11- Which activity is more beneficial to learn English:
   d. To engage in life-like conversations with the teacher and classmates ☐
   e. To follow the textbook activities ☐
   f. Others (please specify) .................................................................

Section 3: Suitability of Teaching English without Textbooks to the Algerian Context

12- According to you, to learn English, the textbook is:
   d. Very important ☐
   e. Important ☐
   f. Not important ☐

13- Do you need to refer to textbooks while revising?
   ☐ Yes ☐ Sometimes ☐ No

14- Do you think that it is possible for students at your level to lead English lessons the way they like?
   ☐ Yes ☐ Sometimes ☐ No

15- Please, justify your previous answer.
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................

Section 4: Further Suggestions

16- Do you have any further suggestions or comments?
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................

Thanks a lot for your participation
Appendix 3: Samples of Dogme Lesson Plan

Lessons 2 and 3

Procedure:

One of the students told us he had found an interesting website on robots, a topic he was interested in. Another student asked him to show it to us. As all students have to bring their laptops to college every day and Khalifa had his with him, he showed us some internet sites on robots produced in Japan and talked about what they could do. Another student then talked about a TV programme he had seen on robots used in hospitals. We then discussed the development of technology in the future, a topic which all the students were very enthusiastic about. Khalifa said he would love to design robots and had already mentioned he was good at drawing, so I asked him to ‘design’ a robot for the next class. He did this and presented his robot to us in the following class. This led to further questions, discussion and ideas from other students, a review of language used for future predictions, and finally the group wrote a short article on the future of technology for their student magazine. During his presentation the listeners made a note of good language he used.

Emergent language/skills focus: language for discussing future prediction, speaking, listening and writing skills.

Reflection and feedback:

This time the students said” “It’s great to talk about things we are interested in ..It’s a good idea to give short presentations on a topic to the other students... we can learn things from other students too... we are interested so we listen to each other, not just the teacher.” They said this was a more useful way to practise than doing grammar exercises, “..that’s not how we use language .. today we were using language to talk about a topic and our grammar was better.. maybe because we were not thinking about grammar.”
The students’ comments on the importance of listening to and learning from each other showed a growing awareness of group interaction and collaboration. It was interesting to hear the students’ accurate use of ‘could’ and ‘might’ for future predictions. Arabic learners tend to overuse ‘will’ when talking about the future, especially as they have only one form of the future in their own language.

The students liked the fact that we had noted and commented on Khalifa’s good use of language during his presentation rather than on the errors. One student said: “It was different... usually the teacher writes down our mistakes and corrects us, but you wrote the good things .. that makes us more confident.”

As a follow-up to this, two other students also asked to give presentations on areas of interest to them, which were done over the next two lessons.

Lessons 4 and 5:

Procedure:

One student began the lesson by asking if we had seen the news the evening before, in which the ‘largest human flag’ event in Abu Dhabi had been reported. As we held the classes in the library, a student got the newspaper and found the report on this event. Another student got a different newspaper and compared the report in that paper.

I then asked the students whether they read the newspaper and which topics interested them. As we had newspapers on the table, I asked the students to find an article that interested them and write down all the lexis in the article associated with the topic. Rather than writing down the vocabulary item in isolation, they wrote the lexical ‘chunk’, i.e. 2 or 3 words surrounding the item, to show how it is used. Students then shared their vocabulary with the rest of the class and explained any unknown words. They also produced other sentences using these items in different contexts.

Emergent language/skills focus: vocabulary on various topics.
Reflection and Feedback:

The students found this very useful: “We did a lot of vocabulary today ... it was very useful ... fun... enjoyable.....interesting... we are learning a lot in a short time.”

They really seemed to enjoy the lesson, becoming absorbed in their articles and were able to produce their own sentences using the vocabulary they had listed. In this way vocabulary is recorded in lexical chunks so that students learn not only the meaning of the isolated word, but also how to use it in at least two different contexts. As mentioned by a student in the feedback, this seems to give them the feeling that they are learning more in a shorter time.

I pointed out that this could be done in the students’ own time, either with an article in a newspaper or magazine, or a reader from the library shelves. When I said that this could also be done with other language, such as prepositions or adjectives, they asked me to show them how to do it with prepositions, which is an area they often make many mistakes in. We therefore agreed to do this in the next class.

The next lesson was therefore an extension of this one, focusing this time on the prepositions ‘in’, ‘on’ and ‘at’, an area with which these students have a lot of difficulty.

We followed the same procedure as above: each student found an article he was interested in and wrote a list of phrases containing the preposition. The students wanted to write these on transparencies this time, so I provided these and when they had finished we went into a small study room in the library where there was a projector and displayed the transparencies, one by one. The students read through the list of phrases looking for and commenting on patterns in the use of the prepositions.

Emergent language/skills focus: different uses/occurrences of the prepositions ‘on’, ‘in’ and ‘at’.

Reflection and feedback:

Students said: “It’s really a better way of learning – it’s more interesting and fun – it makes learning come from you, I mean you want to do it inside you, not the teacher putting it on you.” This was the first time the students had commented on learning coming from within themselves rather than being something imposed by the teacher, which shows that the
students too are aware that language is an emergent phenomenon, and shows an increase in the students’ intrinsic motivation.

My main observation in this class was the enthusiasm with which the students made their lists. The student finding examples of ‘in’ finished a whole page first, so I asked the others to finish off. One student did not want to stop until he had finished the whole article and found a page of examples. They seemed to treat the activity as a contest to see who could finish first and who had the longest list.

The observations made by the students on the uses of the prepositions were very interesting and again they discussed this with enthusiasm. Questions arose, such as why we said ‘at the front of’, but ‘on the political front’. Students became aware of the extension of simple phrases like ‘in the morning’ to ‘in the early morning attack’, and ‘in + country/city’ to ‘in the agricultural area around …’ and ‘in the suburbs of…’. The students themselves gave different examples, such as ‘in the late morning’, ‘in the industrial area around Dubai’ and ‘we are studying at an intermediate level’. The students were also exposed to idiomatic language, e.g. ‘its charms may be lost on its residents’, and ‘tourists were in no doubt that ..’ It was also impressive how many of these uses the students could still remember and get right weeks later.

Lesson 6

Procedure:

In this class the students were asked to think of a person they would like to be for a period of time (day, week, month or year) and why they would like to be that person. They then described the person and his/her life and the others guessed who it was. This emerged from a general chat about the Middle East situation and Bush’s foreign policy. Students were then asked to write down the three things they would do first if they were this person and why. Again, they shared their ideas. Students then wrote down three questions they would ask each of the other people in the group if they were invited to visit the College. They then conducted mini-interviews with each person. As in lesson 1 above, questions were only answered if they were grammatically correct, which was decided by the rest of the group who helped reformulate questions as necessary.
As a follow-up activity, the students were asked to select one of the interviews and write up a short report of the interview for their student magazine.

**Emergent language/skills focus:** language to describe people and their lives/daily routine, achievements, as well as future plans and ambitions, question formation (past, present and future tenses) plus speaking, listening and writing skills.

**Feedback and reflection:**

The students enjoyed this a lot. “*It was really interesting because we are interested in the people we chose ....it was nice to be the person ....Salem was a Bush who told the truth, he gave an honest version.*” “*We learned some useful vocabulary and you gave us words we needed.*”

It was also interesting that the students’ choice of person clearly reflected their personal interests, for example George Bush (the student interested in politics), the Manager of Sony (technology, robots), Bill Gates (technology and computers).

As before, it was interesting to note the students’ good and accurate use of language in this activity, for example: ‘*If you were offered twice what you get in 10 years, would you sell your company?*’

All the students wrote up their articles for the follow-up activity, and these were read out and commented on in the next class.
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RESUME

Le travail actuel repère la lumière sur une méthodologie de l'enseignement des langues qui avait produit des discussions houleuses depuis qu'elle a été suggérée la première fois par Scott Thornbury en 2000, à savoir, Dogme ELT (enseignement d'anglais), également connues sous le nom d'enseignement débranché. Ce travail est prévu pour avoir une meilleure compréhension des buts, des principes et des procédures de Dogme ELT, et pour étudier sa praticabilité et convenance au contexte éducatif Algérien. En plus, des questionnaires sont conçus pour des professeurs et des élèves au niveau d'école secondaire pour examiner leurs perceptions, connaissance et attitudes envers cette nouvelle philosophie de l'enseignement des langues. L'observation de salle de classe est également recourue pour découvrir dans quelle mesure les professeurs comptent sur les coursebooks et tout autre matériel didactique dans leurs leçons, et s'il y a un certains espace/espoir pour Dogme ELT d'être appliqué dans la classe Algérienne d'anglais. Les résultats à cette étude prouvent que bien que les professeurs algériens et les étudiants d'école secondaire ne se rendent pas compte de Dogme ELT, ils le perçoivent comme nouvelle méthodologie d'enseignement intéressante. Cependant, seulement les étudiants croient à sa convenance au contexte éducatif Algérien. À la lumière de ces résultats, il semble y avoir un espace/espoir pour un futur-Dogme-modèle enseignement en Algérie.