

---

## Is a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning (CIMLL) possible?

**Mustapha Boughoulid**  
Kadi Ayyad University,  
Faculty of Letters & Human Sciences,  
Marrakech, Morocco.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0090>

Published: 11th January 2023

---

**Citation:** Boughoulid M. (2023) Is a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning (CIMLL) possible? *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: English Language, Teaching, Communication, Literature and Linguistics* 4(1),9-21

---

**ABSTRACT:** *For any language learning theory to be comprehensive and instructional in the field of teaching and learning, it should undergo different criteria. In terms of its universality, it should be applied to all the existing natural languages. It should take into consideration the cognitive and non-cognitive factors. It should consider the different contextual factors that should be relevant to all aspects of life. It should take into account the learning process on the basis of its quantitative and qualitative dimensions on the basis of the three learning components (input, competency building, and communicative acts) and the four corresponding evaluative dimensions (quantity, quality, manner, and relation). In fact, the learning process must be dealt with from the very beginning to the end without missing any component. The missing of one or more components in any theory of learning might confuse linguists and practitioners about what makes a theory comprehensive. For instance, we find that the contribution of Behaviourism took into consideration only behaviour. Cognitivism took into account only the cognitive aspect of the process. Constructivism took into consideration only the building up of competency. What is missing is this meaningful communicative involvement among students. On the other hand, learning has been very often reduced into a purely cognitive process, which is not just that. The non-cognitive faculties are also pertinent in such a way as to avoid any failure in the process of learning. The consideration of the students' contextual variables is another factor that should be highlighted in such a way as to define the learning of a language as being relevant to all aspects of life by relating it to the learner's context.*

**KEYWORDS:** Comprehensive, instructional, cognitive, non-cognitive, learning process, evaluative dimensions, contextual variables.

---

### INTRODUCTION

In order to talk about the possibility of the building of a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning (CIMLL)<sup>1</sup> in a teaching context, we should start by answering the four following questions:

- (1) Is a universal theory of learning possible?
- (2) Which aspects of language should be given priority in the process of teaching and learning?

(3) What is the role of non-cognitive faculties in learning a language?

(4) How is the learning of a language relevant to a certain domain?

However, the fact of finding clearly related answers to these four questions will help us identify some of the hidden aspects of a language and the different characteristics and forms that a possible Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning in a teaching context may take.

For any language learning theory to be comprehensive and instructional in the field of teaching, we should take into consideration four important criteria (Boughoulid, 2022):

- (1) The comprehensive theory of learning should be applied to all the existing languages.
- (2) It should take into account all the cognitive and non-cognitive factors.
- (3) It should consider the different contextual faculties, which should be integrational enough by defining the act of learning as relevant to all aspects of life.
- (4) It should take into consideration the learning process on the basis of its quantitative and qualitative dimensions in terms of the three learning components, namely input, competency building and communicative acts, and their corresponding evaluative values, quantity, quality, manner, and relation (Grice, 1975).

### **Is a universal theory of learning possible?**

This question is relevant to setting a criterion for the comprehensive character of a language learning theory because for every theory of learning to be universal, it should account for learning that must be applicable to all the existing languages (Chomsky, 1975). The concept of universality is stated in the sense that the more universal the theory is, the more comprehensive it becomes.

However, in the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of *The Ethnologue*, Simons (2020) assumed that there are approximately 7117 languages worldwide. In fact, there was about half a million languages most of which are extinct now. All the generalisations made about the universals of languages are based only on an approximate number of 800 languages (Chomsky, 1975). That is to say, one does not really know all the languages of the world. This is what one learns from the most dependable sources about languages such as *The Ethnologue*. Hence, how can judgement be made about all the languages of the world in spite of the fact that they are limited? Whenever a new language is studied, linguists discover some of its unknown features, which may enrich the linguistic field in terms of research and investigation.

Chomsky (2006) claimed that his “proposals concerning universal grammar are based on detailed examination of a few languages rather than the examination of many cases [and] it is only through intensive studies of particular languages that one can hope to find crucial evidence for the study of universal grammar” (p. 167). He also added that one does not really know about all the existing languages of the world, but he or she just knows about few of them. He mentioned that if one studies these languages as deep as possible, he or she would be able to learn new features about all the other languages of the world that are not known. He calls these languages the well studied languages, which include English as a natural language. Chomsky

(2006) admitted that by studying these known languages, one could learn about the properties of other unknown natural languages.

### **The conception of a learning theory**

Chomsky (1975) tried to question the existence of any learning theory when he asked, “Is there a theory as the theory of learning, waiting to be discovered?” (p. 11). On the basis of this actual statement, it seems that Chomsky is completely denying the existence of any learning theory. He continued his inquiry by stating that “surely the answer is that there is not” (Chomsky, 1975, p. 11). According to Chomsky, we can then presuppose that there is probably no “learning theory”. On this basis, Chomsky explained that if there should be a learning theory, it should be specific in the sense that it must have a mechanism that should include an input in terms of experience and an output that represents the performance or production. However, the learning process is a controversial issue that remains undefined and ambiguous instead of all the different attempts to establish a unified and common background that determines how people learn and under which circumstances. In fact, the educational field has witnessed various reforms by adopting various theories of learning. The anxiety about the quality of learning continues because one does not touch the learner’s new millennium educational needs appropriately. In fact, what one is looking for is “a theory which will guide the teaching-learning process and which will be consistent with the aims of education” (Denton, 1966, p. 382). It is then an urgent need for the formulation of a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning in a teaching context which empowers the learners in order to take advantage of the available opportunities where they act as “active producer[s] of meaning” (Hughes, 2004, p.395). How can one then define a learning theory and is it possible to have a comprehensive one?

In the last three decades, the concept of learning has witnessed a period of reawakened curiosity among linguists and psychologists (Brown, 1980; Crawford and Reyes, 2015; Dąbrowska, 2015; Evans and Levinson, 2009, among others). Contemporary learning theorists have worked on the different facets of a learning theory through their investigation and assessment of its concepts and characteristics. According to Illeris (2003), the concept of learning should be renewed by understanding it in its wide sense and revisiting the “traditional learning theories”, so-called. It is no longer related to the acquisition of a certain content in a certain domain. “What should be learned in education as well as in working and societal life is a complex totality of traditional and up-to-date knowledge, orientation and overview, combined with professional and everyday life skills and a broad range of personal qualities such as flexibility, openness, independence, responsibility, creativity, etc.”, (Illeris, 2003, p. 3). It is a new complex, challenging status that should combine between what is theoretical, and what is practical in order to develop a comprehensive language-learning framework in its broader sense, without making any distinction between them. Illeris’ (2003) contemporary and comprehensive theory of learning model involves the combination of two different processes that should be integrated and taken into consideration in any learning context: (1) the external interaction process, and (2) the internal psychological process. In fact, some theories deal with both processes in different ways. For example, the cognitive learning theories deal with the internal psychological process. In social constructivism, the theorists deal with the external interaction process. The fact of involving these two processes in a learning theory will result in a new learning where

the learner is independent, responsible, and creative. For a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning (CIMLL) in a teaching context to be possible, it should cope with nowadays' lifelong learning through the inclusion of learning dimensions such as the emotional, social and societal dimensions, the understanding of such learning, and its thematisation (Illeris, 2003).

### **Which aspects of language learning should be given priority in the process of teaching and learning?**

This question, which is related to the different aspects of learning, should be asked because among the most relevant standards that a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning should take into consideration is that the learning process must be dealt with from the very beginning to the end without missing any learning component. It should be about all the components of this process (Bloom and Lahey, 1978; Lahey, 1988; Johnson, 1996; Pierre et al., 2014; Lipnevich et al., 2014).

However, the fact of learning a new language is considered as one of the most challenging perceptive and mental processes that any language learner can experience. When teaching a language, some of its aspects might be given some priority in comparison to other aspects. For instance, vocabulary might be given some priority because the more one learns new words and enriches his or her lexicon, the better his or her communicative abilities are. On the other hand, the fact of knowing all the grammatical rules of a language does not mean that one will be able to communicate well in this language. The argument is that with some vocabulary, one can convey some ideas even if they might be expressed inadequately.

Actually, the grammar of any natural language is constituted of a set of rules that are limited, but the learning of vocabulary is done over a period of time with the acquisition of an indefinite number of words and sentences. Hence, if all that one knows is only grammar, then he or she will not be able to express himself or herself appropriately. Therefore, to which aspects of language should one give priority in the process of teaching and learning? Are there any aspects that should be prioritized in comparison to others? And why?

In the light of a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning, there should be a distinction between two crucial issues: the components of a language that have been answered in the literature, and the components of the process of language learning that are not answered. For instance, the relevance of the input is one component of the process of language learning. In the input, there is form, content, and use. For a language learning theory to be comprehensive, all the components should be properly considered. Hence, all the components of language should be taught and all the components of the process of language learning should be taken into account in this teaching/learning model. The fact of integrating the three aspects (form, content, and use) may help in studying all the aspects of language. On the other hand, when one talks about the components such as Competency Building or Energeia (Humboldt, 1988), these are components of language learning which are, in fact, missed out in the theory of learning and this is why some linguists are confused about what makes a theory comprehensive. That is why we find that the contribution of Behaviourism took into consideration only behaviour. Cognitivism took into account only the cognitive character of the process.

Constructivism took into consideration only the building up of competency. What is missing is this *Energeia* or the conversational engagement that brings together the elements of freedom, the involvement of the students into communicative acts and their adaptation in one meaningful picture (El Haloui, personal communication).

However, in an attempt to define language, Bloom and Lahey (1978) presented a model in which they managed to divide language into three different learning aspects: form, content, and use.

### **The form of language learning**

The form (or shape) of language learning includes the language grammatical inflections (or morphology), the language rules (or syntax) that help in the arrangement of morphemes in such a way as to make them meaningful to the speakers of the same language, and the language sound patterns (or phonology).

### **The content of language learning**

The content of language learning is an aspect of learning that includes the language meaning conveyed by the use of vocabulary and other linguistic constituents or semantic categories. According to Lahey (1988), these semantic categories include, but not limited to, recurrence, causality, quantity, rejection, denial, attribution, possession, action, state, specification, and communication.

### **The use of language learning**

The third aspect of language learning is the use. The aspect of use is mainly related to the pragmatics area and the social use of the language in terms of its functions, contextual, and environmental uses. The use, as a main aspect of language, is composed of two different dimensions: the functional aspect of language learning and the contextual aspect of language learning.

### **The functional aspect of language learning**

According to Johnson (1996), the functional categories of a natural language “indicate that language may be used to comment, protest, reject, emote, regulate conversation, carry out a routine, report information, pretend, and accomplish discourses” (p. 12).

### **The contextual aspect of language learning**

For the contextual aspect of language learning, which is the second element of the language learning use, it is mainly related to the domain in which the target language is used and the circumstances that are surrounding its use in different contexts.

However, “in the context of real language, content and form are rarely separated. Apparently, language form is the vehicle by which meaning (i.e., content) is customarily conveyed” (Johnson, 1996, p. 11). For instance, in order to express an idea that happened in real life, the past tense morphological markers are used to convey the real meaning of the situation where the content and form of the language interact freely.

Within the general context of language learning, form, content and use are three important aspects that are separably inherent in any language, but at the same time contribute in the clarification and understanding of the whole process. "Each dimension affects, and is affected by the other two. By successfully integrating the three, a language is competent to communicate with fellow communicators effectively, speaking and interpreting ideas accurately according to his or her intention" (Johnson, 1996, p. 13).

Therefore, the fact of integrating these three important dimensions in a linguistic discourse will enable the speaker to communicate efficiently and achieve his or her language competence by using the target language.

### **What is the role of non-cognitive faculties in learning a language?**

The question related to the role of non-cognitive faculties in learning a language should be dealt with because a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning in a teaching context must be cognitively adequate by taking into consideration all factors and variables including both cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of learning. In fact, learning has been very often reduced into a purely cognitive process, which is, but not just that. The other factors such as the affective factors, the attitudinal factors, and the social factors are also relevant in the process of learning. For example, teachers do not really know whether the learning problems of their students are purely cognitive problems or impairment related problems. However, in case one finds that one of the students has a learning disability such as dyslexia and the teacher did not notice it or did not give it much importance, his or her evaluation of the whole process of learning would be a total failure.

According to Pierre et al. (2014), in terms of the cognitive faculties of language learning, one can state two different categories. The first category includes the ability of understanding, learning from previous experiences, thinking critically, and engaging in different forms of thought. The second category includes the patterns of thought, emotions and behaviours. In fact, research has shown the significance of non-cognitive faculties in learning a language. These faculties do not differ from the common cognitive constructs such as knowledge, skills, and abilities, which are no longer enough for students to succeed and enhance their learning potentials. According to Burrus et al. (2011), the most important faculties that are associated with the educational process and influence it are conscientiousness, academic discipline, social skills, emotional control, study habits, and attitudes. These constructs play a relevant role in helping students succeed academically and in developing their life skills as well.

However, Lipnevich et al. (2014) developed a new taxonomy of non-cognitive factors that they were able to divide into four different, but possible, categories that may vary according to the domain in which they are used: attitudes and beliefs, social and emotional qualities, learning processes, and personality traits.

### **Attitudes and beliefs**

According to Lipnevich et al. (2014), researchers have concluded that the learners' attitudes and self-belief characteristics influence their behaviour as well as their academic performance. In fact, this change in attitudes and beliefs depends on the kind of discipline or context to which

they are attributed. For instance, in a teaching context, the students' attitudes and beliefs foreshadow the quality of their engagement in the process of learning and whether or not their feelings towards their schools are positive or negative. These constructs can be used as an adequate measurement tool, which may enable us to predict students' determination in the domain of education.

### **Social and emotional qualities**

The fact of dealing with students' social and emotional qualities vis-à-vis other people in society is another category of non-cognitive factors that should be taken into account. Different researchers studied the relationship between academic emotions and achievement and how students are emotionally influenced in the light of their engagement and performance in class and through the use of different learning skills. Lipnevich et al. (2014) introduced different researchers who worked on students' academic emotions in different contexts. Among these studies we can mention an approach where Denham et al. (2012) tried to develop the social and emotional learning profiles of pre-schoolers' early school success. The experimentation involved three and four years old children. The researchers assessed their emotion knowledge and self-regulation, and put their social-emotional behaviour under observation for a period of five months. After the five months of investigation and observation, they evaluated these children in terms of different criteria, namely their social competence, their school attitudes, and their engagement in the classroom. The results they obtained under this study were looked at as promising and thought-provoking in terms of the students' social and emotional qualities and their impact on their integration as well as their performance at school.

### **Learning processes**

The third non-cognitive category is related to the main characteristics of the learning process in which students are involved while they are implicated in class activities. This category includes different constructs such as "the organizational skills, study habits, and learning and test-taking strategies" (Lipnevich et al., 2014, p. 176). Polychroni and Hatzichriston (2012) conducted a research in which they explored the personal and contextual goals of some Greece middle school students and how they managed to explain social relationships such as peer, teacher-student, and home-school. Through this study, these researchers employed "non-cognitive characteristics as both predictors and outcomes in their investigation" (Lipnevich et al., 2014, p. 176), which shows the influence of such constructs on students during the learning process in the academic domains.

### **Personality traits**

The personality traits represent the fourth category in Lipnevich et al.'s (2014) taxonomy of non-cognitive faculties. The authors of the taxonomy stated five factors, which they consider as the source of prediction of the students' academic performance. The first factor is the openness to previous experience in terms of feelings, thoughts and values. The second factor is the conscientiousness in terms of organization, achievement, and discipline. The third factor is the extraversion that is expressed in terms of friendliness, cheerfulness and sociability. The fourth factor is the agreeableness in terms of sympathy, kindness, trustworthiness and

cooperation. The last factor is the emotional stability in terms of resilience vis-à-vis the negative emotions such as the learners' anxiety and depression.

Therefore, the use of such non-cognitive factors in association with the students' academic achievement helped them to perform well at school and in their life as well. They are also used to enhance their learning interests through the development of social relationships, personality and emotional qualities. The focus on the non-cognitive faculties will pave the way for the discovery of the students' vicissitudes in terms of the learning styles and their preparation for life.

### **How is the learning of a language relevant to a certain domain?**

The question of the relevance of the learning of a language to a certain domain should be asked and dealt with in a pertinent way. In fact, for a language learning theory to be comprehensive, it should be integrational and the learning should be done for a purpose in the sense that it is measurable in terms of what the learned language will be intended for. In this case, the learning of a language should be defined as being relevant to all aspects of life by relating its process to the context of the learner. Among the contextual variables that should be taken into consideration, one can mention school environment, family status and circumstances, students' health, the cultural aspect, the use of the target language versus the use of the mother tongue, etc.

In fact, when some scholars talk about learning a language, they do it as if it was the same regardless of its functionality and utility. Hence, all the aspects of learning should be taken into consideration without missing any component. For instance, if one is learning the English language in order to use it for business, the evaluation of learning should not be the same as for one who would like to become a tourist agent or an intern in an English-speaking country. What is meant by the relevance of language learning in a certain domain is when it takes its cultural form on the basis of those aspects of life such as the academic level, the touristic domain, business, arts, education, etc.

However, there are two possible ways of reflecting on the learning of a specific language such as English. The first one is that teachers should test students in such a way as to see to what extent they learn, for instance, the wh-words, the grammar of the English language, the pronunciation of the rhotic sounds of the English language, etc. The second possibility is that one would like to see to what extent students are competent in using English in the field of tourism where they communicate with tourists, in doing well with their Maths or other school subjects and domains, etc. There are two possible ways of talking about the learning of a language, learning it per se and learning it to do something with it. That is the difference between a pragmatic theory of learning and a non-pragmatic theory of learning. The pragmatic theory of learning would be mainly concerned with the learning of those aspects of learning. That is why there is English for Specific Purposes (ESP), The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Multiple Intelligences (MI) Theory, etc. The founders of these theories wanted to know how students learn a language that would be useful for them in a certain domain, such as the domain of



tourism, and not just to learn it per se. Two related approaches can be mentioned in this case, the Workplace-Based Approach and the Standard-Based Approach.

### **The Workplace-Based Approach**

The Workplace-Based Approach is considered as one of the theories that define the context of learning a language and would opt for the workplace as the best place for doing it. “This nexus of theory with practice, extends the learning space to authentic work environments” (Scholtz, 2020, p. 2). The theory’s results are based on a qualitative study in which the expert trainers’ observations are considered as a means that conveys information about the learners’ performance. The learners, on the other hand, receive feedback as a kind of response to the difficulties they have encountered in different settings in order to enhance their performance and make better use of it in such a way as to connect it with their learning objectives. According to Scholtz (2020), the Workplace-Based learning’s main goal is the focus on the application of knowledge, skills, and attributes, which are considered as the exclusive features of the eligibility of any official certification in different countries around the world. It is a context where theory and practice are integrated by bringing together the pedagogical performances such as Project-Based Learning and Problem-Based Learning. Therefore, the Workplace-Based Approach is based on observation and practice that helps individuals produce knowledge and use it appropriately.

### **The Standard-Based Approach**

The Standard-Based Approach looks at learning as a mechanism and not as a modality of integrating oneself optimally in a certain context or domain. Its main philosophy is to work on the improvement of the students’ learning by making important changes in the teacher’s role and classroom practices, especially when it has to do with the choice of the instructions and methodology to adopt and where and how to conceptualize the process of teaching that is mainly based on observation, experience, and data. The Standard-Based Approach is an approach, which states what the learners are supposed to know and how to demonstrate the knowledge they acquired during the process of learning. These standards are comprehensive in the sense that they determine the learners’ proficiency during the process of their education. Richards and Schmidt (2010) focused in their research on the influence of the standards-based concepts and their impact on the teacher’s performance. They stated that the use of such concepts has affected the students’ language learning performance by defining the things they should teach and the kind of learning they are supposed to achieve.

However, the question of relevance of learning a language is related to the pedagogical practice and its useful realization in a learning domain. “There is no reason to suppose that what goes on in one domain is necessarily relevant to what goes on in another domain. Relevance is a matter of significance to one’s own concerns” (Widdowson, 1990, p. 29). In order to set up a schema for language teaching education, establish relevance to a certain domain, and maintain the relationship between theory and practice, Widdowson (1990) stated that pedagogy is the teacher’s concern, as they have to ascertain the relevance of the learning. “It is they who have to act as mediators between theory and practice, between the domain of disciplinary research and pedagogy” (Widdowson, 1990, p. 29).

### **The applicability of a language learning theory and its relevance in the process of learning**

Among the main properties of a language learning theory, there is that aspect of scientificity and objectivity. However, there is another aspect that is very specific to a language learning theory, which is applicability. What is then meant by the applicability of a language learning idea? Is it something that one can translate into a class practice? Some language learning ideas are very exciting, but are they applicable? The question is whether they potentially have a classroom reflex or not? In fact, they may not, but potentially they can. For instance, if one goes back to the idea that there is a Universal Grammar (UG), what should be done? Moreover, what is the applicability of the idea itself?

However, when one talks about Universal Grammar (UG), he or she assumes that there is something that he or she should take for granted and that one does not need to teach. It is known because all the rules or principles that Chomsky (1975) has been able to discover are negative in their nature in the sense that they tell us what one should not do, not what he or she should do. In fact, what Noam Chomsky (1975) means by rules is those principles that would set a general framework for language that would distinguish between what is a language and what is not a language. What one is trying to discover in the linguistic theory, especially the Chomskyan one, is what makes some languages impossible. In this context, Chomsky (1986) defines grammar as “an intricate and highly constrained structure” (p.148). When one states that grammar is a “constraint structure”, it means that language is a system that would prevent individuals from expressing themselves in so many ways. In another context, Chomsky (2007) assumed that it is the “genetic endowment, which sets limits on the attainable languages, hereby making language acquisition possible” (p. 3).

Actually, teachers do not need to teach their students that there is something called a subject in a sentence because they already know it. The point is that the Universal Grammar as such states what not to do, not what to do. As a teacher, you do not need to teach your students about the subject and be explicit about that. This is called negative determination because it tells the instructor what not to do and not what to do. Hence, an applicable language theory is always positive. It tells you what one should do and not what he or she does not have to do. For example, in the case filter, every noun must have a case, either structural or inherent morphologically. It demonstrates that it is impossible to have a noun without case. That is to say, it teaches what not to do and not what to do. Another example in generative grammar is about the formal device for representing syntactic argument structure or what is called the Theta Criterion (Chomsky, 1981). It specifies the number and type of noun phrases (NPs) which are required syntactically by a particular verb. It states that it is impossible for a noun phrase not to have a theta role, which is a negative determination. In this case, UG guides us to what not to do, and not what to do, which leads us to the question of applicability. Sometimes some ideas are good for studying and understanding, but due to their negative determination, they become difficult in terms of applicability. Among the examples of a positive determination, one can state the case of the American “flap”, which is a kind of challenge for some students in terms of pronunciation. There is also the use of “th” in words such as “think” and “three”, which is dental, and that some Moroccan students pronounce it as alveolar because they are confused with the classical Arabic “ث”. In this case, the teacher should give students the measurement of

the part of the tongue he or she wants to see as a positive determination. There is also the case of the English voiceless /h/ as in “hope” that most Moroccans pronounce like the voiced Arabic “ه”. Hence, the English /h/ is voiceless and it is closer to the classical Arabic “ح” than it is to “ه”. The learning of vocabulary is also implemental. If one learns one or two words every day, his or her vocabulary will improve because he or she uses contextualisation, enhancement, summary, etc. These are some examples of the positive cases that can be taught.

Therefore, the concept of applicability means the translatability of the ideas into practices. That is to say, the possibility of translating theoretical ideas into classroom practices, methods of teaching, choices, parameters, etc., through the adoption of a Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning (CIMLL) in a teaching context which is able to activate the learners’ expressivity and engagement in a meaningful and comprehensible dialogic context.

## CONCLUSION

The Comprehensive Instructional model of Language Learning (CIMLL) in a teaching context is a comprehensive and instructional scientifically based framework. By “comprehensive”, we mean in the sense that all the aspects of learning are taken into consideration in the process of learning from its very beginning to the end without missing any one of them. The process starts by exposing the students to a rich input, by helping them build their competencies & construct the grammar of the target language, & by engaging them into different meaningful communicative acts. By “instructional”, we mean that it is evaluative in the sense that it adopts an evaluative matrix on the basis of four evaluative dimensions, quantity, quality, manner, and relation. The CIMLL is a new comprehensive model, which is able to detect the pitfalls in the learning process of any language learning theory and provide adequate solutions to overcome them. It is a teaching/learning model that helps teachers self-evaluate their work without adopting any new methodology or giving up their teaching strategies.

.....

I hereby admit and declare that the model, everywhere in the present article referred to “Comprehensive Instructional Model of Language Learning (CIMLL)”, is originally conceptualized, designed and suggested by Dr Abdellah EL HALOUI – Cadi Ayyad University. I, thus, include this statement here in recognition of the intellectual property of this model, including the concept of “learning sequence”, and the concept that “teaching is discursive and is to be evaluated as such using the Gricean Maxims”, and the concept that “language learning can be made comprehensive if the learning sequence and the discursive character of teaching are taken into consideration”.

## References

- Bloom, L, and Lahey, M. (1978). Language development and language disorders. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Boughoulid, M. (2022). The building of a new language learning model based on the Chomskyan concept. International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research, vol. 9, No 8, pp. 234–250.
- Brown, H. D. (1980). Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

- Burrus, J., MacCann, C., Kyllonen, P., & Roberts, R. D. (2011). Non-cognitive constructs in K–16: Assessments, interventions, educational and policy implications. In P. J. Bowman & E. P. St John (Eds.), *Diversity, merit, and higher education: Toward a comprehensive agenda for the twenty-first century* (pp. 233–274). Ann Arbor, MI: AMS Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2007). Approaching language from below in interfaces recursion language. Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics. Ed. By Uli Sauerland Hans. Martin Gartner.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Cambridge University Press. eBook., Base de données: eBook Academic Collection Trial.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin and use*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures in Government and Binding Theory*. (Studies in general grammar 9). Dordrecht Foris Publication.
- Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language*. Pantheon Books, a division of Random House, Inc., New York.
- Crawford, J., & Reyes, S. A. (2015). *The trouble with SIOP: How a behaviourist framework, flawed research, and clever marketing have come to define – and diminish – sheltered instruction for English language learners*. Portland, OR: Institute for Language and Education Policy.
- Dąbrowska, E. (2015). What exactly is Universal Grammar, and has anyone seen it? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. Doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852. Retrieved from [sci-hub.tw/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852)
- Denham, S. A., Bassett, H. H., Mincic, M., Kalb, S. C., Way, E., Wyatt, T., & Segal, Y. (2012). Social—emotional learning profiles of preschoolers' early school success: A personcentered approach. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22, 178–189.
- Denton, W. H. (1966). Problem-solving as a theory of learning and teaching. *The High School Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 8 (May, 1966), pp. 382-390. University of North Carolina Press. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40366239>
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(05), 429. Doi:10.1017/s0140525x0999094x. Retrieved from [sci-hub.tw/10.1017/S0140525X0999094X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999094X)
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Hughes, A. (2004). New Times? New Learners? New Voices? Towards a Contemporary Social Theory of Learning. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Jul., 2004), pp. 395-408. Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4128697>
- Lipnevich, A. A., Krumm, & Roberts, R. D. (2014). Noncognitive skills in education: Emerging research and applications in a variety of international contexts. *Learning and Individual Differences* 22 (2014) 173–177.

- Illeris, K. (2003). Towards a contemporary and comprehensive theory of learning, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 22:4, 396-406, DOI: 10.1080/02601370304837
- Johnson, B. A. (1996). *Language disorders in children: An introductory clinical perspective*. New York, NY: Delmar Publishers.
- Lahey, M. (1988). *Language disorders and language development* (Rev. ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Lipnevich, A. A., Krumm, & Roberts, R. D. (2014). Noncognitive skills in education: Emerging research and applications in a variety of international contexts. *Learning and Individual Differences* 22 (2014) 173–177.
- Pierre, G., Sanchez Puerta, M. L., Valerio, A., and Rajadel, T. (2014). STEP skills measurement surveys: innovative tools for assessing skills.
- Polychroni, F., & Hatzichristou, C. (2012). The role of goal orientations and goal structures in explaining classroom social and affective characteristics. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22, 207–217.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London, England: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Scholtz, D. (2020). Assessing workplace-based learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 21(1), 25-35. ResearchGate. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339612946\\_Assessing\\_workplace-based\\_learning/link/5e5c0a9d4585152ce8ff1352/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339612946_Assessing_workplace-based_learning/link/5e5c0a9d4585152ce8ff1352/download)
- Simons, G. (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (23<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Retrieved from <https://www.ethnologue.com/ethnologueblog/gary-simons/welcome-23rd-edition>
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.