

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia/Jijel
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Language and Literature



EFL Grammar Learning at Higher Education: Objectives and Evaluations

The Case of Second Year Students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia
University, Jijel

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of master in
didactics of foreign languages

Candidates

- Fadila BOUFERS
- Wafia BENAZIZA

Supervisor

-Dr.Slimane BOUKHENTACHE

Board of Examiners

- **Chairperson:** A. Kebieche University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia/Jijel
- **Supervisor:** S. BOUKHENTACHE University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia/Jijel
- **Examiner:** I. Melit University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia/Jijel

2022-2023

Dedication

In the name of Allah, the most Merciful, the most Gracious

I dedicate this work to:

My beloved parents for their support, unconditional love, and encouragement.

My precious sisters Fatima, Yamina and Moufida.

My brothers Yazid and Hassan.

My lovely nephews Ayoub and Douaa.

My wonderful and faithful friends Ikram, Loubna and Khouloud.

Thank you for your encouragement, support, and motivation during the preparation of this
work.

Fadila

Dedication

In the name of Allah, the most Merciful, the most Gracious

I dedicate this work to:

Myself for pursuing my dream and not giving up.

My dearest father and my beloved mother for their love and support.

My sisters Nassira, Salima, and Abla who have encouraged me to achieve my dream.

My brothers Ismain, Ibrahim, Fouad, and Hakim who have provided me with their help
and support.

My Friends Meriem and Imen for their encouragement.

My nephews Ayoub, Khalil, Anfal, and Meriem.

Wafia

Acknowledgements

Praise to Allah for giving us the ability to complete this work.

We would like to express our special thanks and gratitude to our supervisor, Dr. Boukhentache Slimane who gave us the golden opportunity to do this research work, and who also helped us in completing it. Thank you for your support, guidance, and advice during the preparation of this dissertation.

Our sincere thanks also go to the board of examiners namely Ms. Melit and Mr. Kebieche for the time they devoted to evaluate this work.

Finally, we should not forget to thank second year Licence students for their participation in achieving this work.

Abstract

This study aims to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives. A questionnaire was administered to a sample of 50 second year Licence students at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia-Jijel. The findings showed that students' major objectives for learning grammar are to become a successful communicator, to construct grammatically correct sentences and to write correctly. In addition to this, the results revealed that a highest number of students did not fulfil the objectives of the course. Consequently, the current study recommends teaching grammar in both speaking and writing classes for students to master language form and language use.

Key Words: Students' Objectives

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

ALM: Audio-lingual Method

CBA: Competency Based Approach

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

DM: Direct Method

GTM: Grammar Translation Method

OM: Oral Method

?: Percentage

List of Tables

Table 01: Learners' Evaluation of their Grammar Level	33
Table 02: Students' Objectives of Learning Grammar.....	33
Table 03: Students' Views regarding the Grammar Lessons.....	34
Table 04: Learners' Views about the Lessons in the Syllabus.....	35
Table 05: Students' Views about the Proposed Activities.....	35
Table 06: The Scheduled Grammar Sessions	36
Table 07: Students' Opinions about the Teacher Methodology of Teaching	36
Table 08: The Way Grammar is Taught.....	37
Table 09: Teachers' Types of Assessment	37
Table 10: Achievement of Learning Objectives	38

List of Figures

Figure 1: The Characteristics of the Grammar Translation Method.....	12
Figure2 The Principles of the Direct Method in the Classroom Practice.....	13
Figure 3: The Main Characteristics of the Oral Approach.....	14
Figure4: The Characteristics of the Audio-Lingual Method.....	15

Table of Content

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgement.....	III
Abstract.....	IV
List of Abbreviation and Symbols.....	V
List of Tables	VI
List of figures	VII
Table of Content.....	VIII
General Introduction.....	1
1. Background of the Study.....	1
2. Statement of Problem.....	3
3. Research Questions.....	3
4. Hypotheses.....	3
5. Aims of the Study.....	3
6. Significance of the Study.....	4
7. Research Design.....	4
8. Organization of the Study.....	4
Chapter One: Theoretical Perspectives on Grammar Instruction: Objectives and Evaluation	5
Introduction.....	5
Section One: Grammar Instruction	5
1.1. Definition of Grammar.....	5
1.2. Types of Grammar	6

1.2.1. Traditional Grammar.....	6
1.2.2. Structural Grammar.....	7
1.2.3. Descriptive Grammar.....	7
1.2.4. Prescriptive Grammar.....	8
1.2.5. Pedagogical Grammar.....	8
1.3. Approaches to Teaching Grammar	9
1.3.1. Deductive Approach.....	9
1.3.2. Inductive Approach	10
1.4. Grammar Learning in Language Teaching Methods and Approaches.....	11
1.4.1 Grammar Translation Method	11
1.4.2. The Direct Method.....	13
1.4. 3. The Oral Method	14
1.4.4. The Audio-Lingual Method.....	15
1.4.5. The Communicative Language Teaching	16
1.4.6. The Competency Based Approach.....	17
1.5. Aspects Influencing Grammar Teaching.....	17
1.5.1. Language Acquisition.....	17
1.5:2. Rule Presentation and Explanation.....	18
1.5.3. Pragmatics and Discourse.....	19
1.6. The Objectives of Learning Grammar.....	20
1.7. The Importance of Grammar Teaching and Learning.....	20
Conclusion	21
Section Two: Objectives of Teaching and Evaluation	22
1.8. Objectives of Grammar Teaching.....	22
1.8.1. Definition of Objectives.....	22

1.8.1.1 Learners’ Objectives.....	22
1.8.1.2. Teachers’ Objectives.....	23
1.8.1.3. Syllabus’ Objectives.....	24
1.9.1. Definition of Evaluation.....	25
1.9.2. Types of Evaluation	26
1.9.2.1. Formative Evaluation.....	26
1.9.2.2. Summative Evaluation.....	26
1.9.2.3. Process Evaluation	27
1.9.3. The Importance of Evaluation.....	27
Conclusion.....	28
Chapter Two: Field Work	29
Introduction	30
Section One: Research Methodology	30
2.1. Research Methodology.....	30
2.1.1. Research Paradigm.....	30
2.1.2. Setting.....	31
2.1.3. Research Design	31
2.1.3.1. Sample of the Study	31
2.1.3.2. Data-gathering Instrument	32
2.1.3.3. Data Collection Procedure.....	32
Section Two: Data Analysis	32
2.2.1. Analysis of Students’ Questionnaire.....	33
Section Three: Data Discussion.....	39
2.3.1. Second Year Students’ Objectives for Learning Grammar.....	39
2.3.2. Second Year Students Fulfilment of Learning Objectives.....	41

2.4. Limitation of the Study.....	43
2.5. Recommendations.....	43
Conclusion.....	44
General Conclusion.....	45
References.....	46

Appendices

Appendix A

Résumé

ملخص

General Introduction

Introduction

Learning objectives are brief statements that describe what students will be expected to achieve as a result of instruction. In educational setting, identifying learners' objectives for learning grammar is important because objectives articulate the knowledge and skills we want the learner to acquire by the end of the course. Besides, evaluation attempts to gather information about a specific program in order to major its value, appropriateness or whether it needs modification to improve that program. Therefore, EFL learners might have different learning objectives for learning grammar, because grammar is an essential part of the language. It helps learners improve language proficiency. This study looks at the students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives.

1. Background of the Study

Many studies have looked at the way grammar has been taught. For example, Bouyakoub (2005) conducted a study about an Investigation into the Teaching of Grammar at the University of Tlemcen. The results showed that the majority of students reported that grammar helps them write and speak correctly and fluently, improve their language proficiency and overcome the difficulties encountered when writing and speaking. Likewise, Makhloufi and Hammam (2018) conducted a study about investigating the importance of grammar rules in students' writing productions at the University of Bejaia. The findings showed that most of students recognize the importance of grammar in developing their writing skills.

Another study conducted by Oumsalem and Djabarni (2012) about the effectiveness of teaching EFL grammar showed that both teachers and learners consider grammar as an important aspect of learning English as a foreign language, and it insisted on relating grammar instruction to its context to make it helpful for developing learners' proficiency.

Different language scholars all over the world stated that it is important to identify the learners' objectives for learning grammar. For instance, Ur (1999) stated that one of the objectives of learning grammar is that grammatical rules enable learners to know and apply how sentences are put together. Hinkel (2017) argued that "because the purpose of learning grammar is to communicate successfully, the grammar structures necessary for communication should be identified and taught" (p.375). According to Celce-Murcia (2016) and Richards and Reppen (2016), the goal of grammar teaching and learning is to enable learners to communicate effectively and appropriately in context (cited in Hinkel 2017, p.369).

Insufficient studies have investigated the objectives of learning grammar; actually, at the University of Jijel no study has evaluated whether the students are achieving these objectives or not. This study will look at the students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives.

2. Statement of the Problem

In educational settings, EFL learners might have different objectives for learning grammar and it is important to identify their objectives for learning grammar in order to know their points of views about different objectives and their perspectives towards learning grammar in general. Besides, finding out their objectives might help teachers guide their learning process to have a general vision about students' expectations. Determining learners' objectives allow students to check the degree to which they are

meeting the learning objectives and whether they are achieving the grammar objectives or not.

3. Research Questions

The present study tackles the following questions:

- 1) What are the second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar?
- 2) To what extents do second year Licence students achieve the objectives of the course?

4. Hypotheses

To conduct our research, we have posed the following hypotheses:

- Students learn grammar to master language form and language use.
- Students learn grammar to improve their writing, speaking, and reading skills.
- Students learn grammar in order to get good marks in exams.
- Students are not achieving the objectives of the course.

5. Aims of the Study

The study aims to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives.

6. Significance of the Study

Conducting this piece of research is significant because it seeks, on the one hand, to determine EFL students' objectives for learning grammar and it seeks on the other hand, to identify the extent to which they achieve these objectives. It also aims to shed light on

second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar at the University of Jijel. Moreover, it is significant because it is conducted in order to help students determine their objectives and to see whether they are achieving these objectives or not. Furthermore, the study might help students direct their learning efforts appropriately and monitor their own progress.

7. Research Procedure

To test the hypotheses, a quantitative approach was opted for gathering data and a questionnaire is administered to a sample of 50 second year Licence students at the department of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel.

8. Organization of the Study

The present study will be divided into two main chapters. The first chapter will be about the theoretical part. It is divided into two sections. The first section discusses grammar key components; section two, however, deals with the grammar objectives and evaluation. The second chapter consists of the practical part of the study. It is split into three sections: The first section is devoted to the research methodology; the second section deals with the data analysis; and the third section is concerned with the discussion of the data gathered.

Chapter One

Theoretical Perspectives on Grammar Instruction: Objectives and Evaluations

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the background of the related literature, highlighting key terms concerning grammar instruction objectives and evaluations. It is divided into two sections: The first section deals with general issues related to grammar; it provides a definition of grammar, its types, and approaches. In addition, it presents and explains aspects influencing its teaching, its objectives and its importance. The second section discusses the objectives of teaching, gives definition of evaluation, and states its types as well as the importance of evaluation.

Section One: Grammar Instruction

1.1. Definition of Grammar

Many linguists relate the term grammar to a set of components that are phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics; they advocate the central role grammar plays in the study of a language. Accordingly, Radford (1997) defined grammar as

The study of the principles which govern the formation and interpretation of words, phrases and sentences. In terms of the traditional division of grammar into morphology and syntax, we can say that morphology studies the formation and interpretation of words, whereas syntax is concerned with the formation and interpretation of phrases and sentences (p.1).

Nelson and Greenbaum (2013) defined grammar as an important component of the English language, which refers to a set of rules that allows us to combine words in English into a large unit. Besides, Thornbury (1999) said that “grammar is partly the study of what

forms (or structures) are possible in a language”; he also stated that grammar is the study of the rules that govern how sentences are formed and structured. Harmer (1987, p.1) pointed out that “grammar is the way in which words change themselves and group together to make a sentence”. Moreover, Ur (1998) defined grammar as “the way words are put together to make correct sentences” (p.75).

According to many linguists (Al-Moutawa & Kailani, 1989; Harmer, 2001; Thornbury, 1999; Ur, 1988), grammar is the study of syntax and morphology; by syntax, it is meant the study of word order or how words are combined in a sentence while morphology is the study of word formation; that is to say how sounds are related to meaning. Therefore, Woods (1995, p.1) argued that grammar is that “science which treats the principles and the rules of spoken and written language”.

1.2. Types of Grammar

1.2.1. Traditional Grammar

According to Purpura (2004), traditional grammar is one of the oldest theories that described the structures of languages, and it was based on the study of Latin and Greek. He stated that “traditional grammar drew on data from literary texts to provide rich and length descriptions of linguistic form. Traditional grammar also revealed the linguistic meanings of these forms and provided information on their usage in a sentence» .

Radford (2009) argued that in traditional grammar, the syntax of a language is described through a classification of different rules of syntax found in the language. Likewise, Purpura (2004) stated that traditional grammar has been judged for its inability to give descriptions of the language and for its lack of generalization to other languages.

1.2.2. Structural Grammar

According to Al-Moutawa and Kailani (1989), structural grammar is descriptive; it hypothesises that language has a set of grammatical patterns in which words are arranged to convey meaning which is determined by word form, function words, word order and intonation patterns such as stress, and junctions .

Purpura (2004) stated that structural grammar is related to linguists as Bloomfield (1933) and Fries (1940), and it proposed different method for the description of a language's structures in terms of methodology and syntax. In other word, in structural grammar each word is classified according to its structure and patterns of use. Likewise, Purpura (2004) argued structural grammar is not based on a set of rules; however, it seeks to describe the grammatical form of the language.

1.2.3. Descriptive Grammar

According to Thornbury (2006), descriptive grammar describes the rules that govern how words are combined to form sentences in a language. A descriptive grammar describes the way people speak. Besides, he pointed out that descriptive grammars are related to morphology and syntax. Similarly, Cameron (1998) argued that descriptive grammar is related to theories. Moreover, Huddleston (1984) claimed that the aim of descriptive grammar is to present and describe the grammar that focus on the usage of speakers of the language.

1.2.4. Prescriptive Grammar

Nelson and Greenbaum (2013) pointed out that prescriptive grammar is concerned with the rules that specify which usage of the language should be adopted, it includes a decision about the correct grammatical rules that should be take into consideration or

followed. Thornbury (2006) said that prescriptive grammar is known as prescriptive because it prescribes the correct usage of language. It provides both people and learners with the correct way of speaking and writing, and it tells us about the correct and appropriate structures to use. Besides, Cameron (1998) pointed out that prescriptive grammar is taught in the schools, and it has a range of social effects. Therefore, Huddleston (1984) argued that the aim of prescriptive grammar is to inform people or speakers what type of grammatical rules or structures they should follow to make a correct usage of language.

1.2.5. Pedagogical Grammar

Newbey (2015) defined pedagogical grammar as “grammatical descriptions, materials and activities developed to facilitate the learning of a foreign language; it thus includes both grammatical description and methodology. In other words, pedagogical grammar used to describe the methodology of teaching and it refers to the language teaching system. Thornbury (2006) stated that pedagogical grammar is a type of descriptive grammar designed for teaching and learning purposes. It focuses on teaching grammar as a part of improving and enhancing language proficiency, away from vocabulary, phonology or discourse.

Likewise, Miliani (2003) drew attention to the fact that pedagogical grammar is not only an appropriate term, but also it covers instructional events that happen in the classroom context (p.59). Stern (1991) highlighted the characteristics of pedagogical grammar, saying that pedagogical grammar is based on the selection and description of language teaching purposes; it is a broad term it has psychological and instructional criteria not only linguistic one. Additionally, it includes a range of language items, concepts and suggestion related to language (Stern, 1991, cited in Miliani, 2003, p.61).

1.3. Approaches to Teaching Grammar

1.3.1. Deductive Approach

Thornbury (1999) argued that the deductive approach starts with the presentation and explanation of rules that are followed by examples in which the rules are applied through these examples. Accordingly, it is also known as rule-driven learning. Besides, Thornbury (1999) stated some advantages of the deductive approach:

It gets straight to the point, and can therefore be time-saving. Many rules especially rules of form can be more simply and quickly explained than elicited from examples. This will allow more time for practice and application. It respects the intelligence and maturity of many especially adults' students, and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition. It confirms many students' expectations about classroom learning, particularly for those learners who have an analytical learning style. It allows the teacher to deal with language points as they come up, rather than having to anticipate them and prepare for them in advance (Thornbury, 1999, p.30).

In this approach, the teacher's role is "to provide meaningful contexts to encourage demonstration of the rule, while the students evolve the rules from the examples of its use and continued practice" (Rivers & Temperley, 1978, p.110). In other words, the teacher is the centre of the teaching/learning situation and is responsible for both the explanation and presentation of the rules, and the learner learns the use of those rules and structures through practice of the language in context.

Furthermore, some linguists argued that foreign languages are best learned deductively; as Purpura (2004) pointed out that, "in this approach, the teaching of language obviously involved the transmission of grammar rules from teacher to student, and to know

a language meant the intricacies of its grammatical system and to recite its rules” (Purpura, 2004, p.1-2).

1.3.2. Inductive Approach

Thornbury (1999) said that “an inductive approach starts with some examples from which a rule is inferred”. It is known as a rule-discovery path. Likewise, Thornbury (1999) stated that through this approach learners engage in the rule on their own and so they become more involved in the process of learning the rules, and thus, develop their own learning experiences.

Moreover, other language educators have maintained that language learning is best achieved inductively. Purpura (2004) stated that “in this approach, students are presented with examples of the target language and led to discover its underlying organizational principles in order to be able to formulate a formal set of rules and prescriptions” (p.2). In addition to this, Thornbury (1999) mentioned some advantages of the inductive approach; he maintained that the rules learners discover by themselves help them develop their mental structures effectively then rules received deductively, it helps learners being actively engaged in the learning process rather than being passive recipients.

Shaffer (1989) saw the inductive approach as the ALM. He stated that “an inductive approach was equated with the Audio-Lingual Method of the sixties where learning is defined as habit formation. Students learned by rote numerous examples of a structure until the use of that structure became automatic” (p.395). In other word, students started by a set of examples followed by the rules.

To sum up, when teaching grammar deductively or inductively, teachers should make a balance between the two approaches and use them interchangeably for different situations. Gower (et al.1995, p.129) stated that “It’s also important to remember that a

variety of approach is interesting and motivating for students; Hence, it is a good idea to try to vary the ways you present and practice language” (Gower et. al, 1995, p.129).

1.4. Grammar Learning in Language Teaching Methods and Approaches

1.4.1. The Grammar Translation Method

Grammar translation method (GTM) is a method of teaching which was used in the nineteenth century; it was based on the study of Latin, and had become the standard way of studying foreign languages. This old method dominated European and foreign language teaching from the 1840's to 1940's. GTM was commonly known as the traditional approach to the teaching of grammar (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

According to Richards & Rodgers (1986), the major focus of this method is on the explicit analysis of grammatical rules and translation of literary text. GTM is based on memorization of rules in order to understand and manipulate the morphology and syntax of the foreign language. Thornbury (1999) pointed out that the grammar translation courses starts with an explicit presentation of grammar rules, followed by activities and translation from mother tongue to the target language.

In addition to this, reading and writing are the major focus; little or no attention is given to speaking or listening, vocabulary selection is based on reading texts; and words are taught through bilingual words lists, dictionary study. In GTM, accuracy is emphasized rather than fluency, and grammar is taught deductively, that is to say, grammatical rules are presented before the examples (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Moreover, these writers stated that GTM creates frustration for learners; teachers and students are passive recipients (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Prator and Celce-Murcia (1979, p.3, cited in Brown 2000, p.18-19) listed the major characteristics of GTM:

- 1- Classes are taught in the mother tongue, with little active use of the target language.
- 2- Much vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words.
- 3- Long elaborate explanations of the intricacies of grammar are given.
- 4- Grammar provides the rules for putting words together, and instruction often focuses on the form and inflection of words.
- 5- Reading of difficult classical texts is begun early.
- 6- Little attention is paid to the content of texts, which are treated as exercises in grammatical analysis.
- 7- Often the only drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue
- 8- Little or no attention is given to pronunciation.

Figures 01: The Characteristics of the Grammar Translation Method (Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979, p.3 as cited in Brown 2000, p.18-19)

1.4.2. The Direct Method

According to Harmer (2007), the direct method (DM) appeared at the end of the nineteenth century as a result of the reform movement which was reacting to the shortcomings of grammar translation method. Thornbury (1999, p.21) mentioned that the direct method appeared to be natural method; the major focus is on oral skills in order to reform GTM practices which focus on written skills. In the DM grammar is taught inductively, and rules are explained after practice. In addition to this, learners learn the

grammatical rules of the target language in the same way as children pick up the grammar rules of their mother tongue (Thornbury, 1999).

Richards & Rodgers (2001, p.12), explained the basic principles and guidelines of the direct method. They are shown in detail in figures 2.

- 1-Classroom instruction was conducted exclusively in the target language.
- 2 -Only everyday vocabulary and sentences were taught.
- 3 -Oral communication skills were built up in a carefully graded progression organized around question-and-answer exchanges between teachers and students in small, intensive classes.
- 4- Grammar was taught inductively.
- 5- New teaching points were introduced orally.
- 6- Concrete vocabulary was taught through demonstration, objects, and pictures; abstract vocabulary was taught by association of ideas.
- 7- Both speech and listening comprehension were taught.
- 8- Correct pronunciation and grammar were emphasized

Figure 02: The Principles of the Direct Method in the Classroom Practice (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p, 12)

1.4.3. The Oral Method

According to Richards & Rodgers (1986), the oral method to language teaching developed with the work of British applied linguists (i.e., Harold Palmer and Hornby) in the 1920's and 1930's. These linguists attempted to develop an oral approach to teaching

English and the result was a systematic study of the principles and procedures that could be applied to the selection and organization of the content.

Richards & Rodgers (2001, p.39) demonstrated the main characteristics of this approach. They are shown in detail in figures "3":

- 1-Language teaching begins with the spoken language. Material is taught orally before it is presented in written form.
- 2- The target language is the language of the classroom.
- 3- New language points are introduced and practised situationally.
- 4- Vocabulary selection procedures are followed to ensure that an essential general service vocabulary is covered.
- 5- Items of grammar are graded following the principle that simple forms should be taught before complex ones.
- 6- Reading and writing are introduced once a sufficient lexical and grammatical basis is established.

Figure 03: The Main Characteristics of the Oral Approach (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.39)

1.4.4. The Audio-lingual Method

According to Richards & Rodgers (1986), the Audio-lingual method (ALM) appeared in the end of the 1950's; it resulted from the demand given to foreign language teaching in the United States. Besides, Brown (2000) stated that ALM was based on linguistic and

psychological theories. Additionally, Richards & Rodgers (1986) argued that this method was selected especially for teaching foreign languages in North America universities.

The characteristics of ALM are summarized in the following points adopted from Prator & Celce-Murcia (1979 -cited in Brown, 2000, p.23).

- 1- New material is presented in dialogue form.
- 2- There is dependence on mimicry, memorization of set phrases, and over-learning.
- 3- Structures are sequenced by means of contrastive analysis and taught one at a time.
- 4- Structural patterns are taught using repetitive drills.
- 5- There is little or no grammatical explanation. Grammar is taught by inductive analogy rather than by deductive explanation.
- 6- Vocabulary is strictly limited and learned in context.
- 7- There is much use of tapes, language labs, and visual aids.
- 8- Great importance is attached to pronunciation.
- 9- Very little use of the mother tongue by teachers is permitted

Figure 04: The Characteristics of the Audio-Lingual Method (Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979, p.23, as cited in Brown 2000, p.23)

1.4.5. The Communicative Language Teaching

In the late of 1980's the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged as a result of the work of the council of Europe and the writing of Wilkins and other applied linguists (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). This approach was a response to the theory of

Chomsky when he talked about competence and performance. Later, the concept of competence and performance was developed by Hymes as ‘communicative competence’ (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

Thornbury (1999) stated grammar remained the main component of the syllabus of CLT courses; even it drew attention to functional aspects of the language, through making meaning. Similarly, Littelwood (1981) affirmed that communicative language teaching gives attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language (p.1). Likewise, Richards & Rodgers (1986) affirmed that the focus in communicative language teaching is on meaning not form. That is to say, grammar is learned through communication and not through explicit teaching of rules, as Thornbury (1999) stated “explicit attention to grammar rules was not incompatible with communicative practice” (p.22).

Furthermore, in CLT the learner has become a negotiator in the learning process through interacting with the members within the groups and within classroom procedures, and the teacher has the responsibility to determine and respond to learner’s language needs (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

1.4.6. The Competency Based Approach

The Competency-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) emerged by the end of the 1970's, as an approach to language teaching, it focuses on the outcomes of learning, addresses more what the learner are expected to learn. Likewise, the CBLT seeks to teach students and prepare them for situations in relation to the social contexts or everyday life. In this approach, language occurs as a result of interactions and communication between students in a social context for achieving such purposes. It is based on developing learners' competence, skills, attitudes and behaviours in real-world tasks (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

According to Wong (2008), CBA focuses on developing the learner's attitudes, abilities and skills in the target language, by giving a great emphasis on the learners' products or outputs rather than the learning process, what learners are expected to achieve with the target language. Grammar is taught inductively, it is integrated with teaching other skills. In fact, both CLT and CBA shared some principles and features regarded developing functional communicative skills in learners, as Richards & Rodgers (2001) argued "CBLT thus shares some features with Communicative Language Teaching" (p.143).

1.5. Aspects Influencing Grammar Teaching

Grammar teaching is influenced by many aspects among them: language acquisition, rule presentation and explanation, pragmatics and discourse.

1.5.1. Language Acquisition

According to Harmer (2007), language acquisition is a concept introduced by Krashen in his input hypothesis 1984, in his distinction between language acquisition which is "that language we acquire subconsciously " is language we can use in spontaneous conversation, because it is available when we need to use it, and language learning which is language that taught and studied as grammar and vocabulary, is not available for spontaneous use (Harmer, 2007). According to Harmer (2007), studying grammar has no effect on communication because the language learners learnt is not available for use, it only serves to check and monitor communication. A focus on traditional forms of language teaching by the use of repetition and controlled practiced; however, studies show that it is impossible to show a connection between drilling of any particular grammatical item (Harmer, 2001).

Moreover, Pienemann (1985) stated "instruction attempts to promote the second language development. Instruction can be adjusted to natural acquisition by building up on

the regularities entailed in natural second language development” (p.23). In other words, instruction can enhance language acquisition as soon as the structures are going to be taught and acquired in a natural development.

1.5.2. Rule Presentation and Explanation

Rule presentation and explanation is an important point in grammar teaching, because choosing the appropriate way of presenting and explaining grammatical features has its effect on students' performance. Larsen-Freeman (2001) shed light on the role teacher plays in explaining and representing grammatical structures. According to him, teachers should have a general idea and comprehensive knowledge to monitor important students' learning process (p.255). Likewise, Larsen–Freeman (2001) mentioned that teacher can represent grammatical rules inductively or deductively, explicitly or implicitly.

In fact, research in the 1960's was directed at the question of whether and when to present explicit grammar rules to students. It found that the explicit or deductive approach to grammar teaching instruction has no significant role and not consistently superior than other approaches, and therefore the CLT method de-emphasized the use of explicit grammar rule presentation or the deductive approach because an emphasis was directed to the inductive approach (Crookes & Chaudron, 1991).

Indeed, while presenting and explaining grammatical rules we need to be prepared and take into account certain factors which are: grammatical description should be explicit or not; whether a rule is isolated or not; whether the explanation need a deductive or inductive approach; the person who gives the explanation to teachers, text, or another student; whether the language is abstract or not; and whether the explanation is provided orally or in writing. (Crookes & Chaudron, 1991)

1.5.3. Pragmatics and Discourse

Larsen-Freeman (2001) pointed out that grammar involves three interrelated dimension of language which are structures, semantics and the pragmatics governing appropriate usage. Besides, Brown (2000) stated that grammar gives us the form of language, but those forms are related to semantics, and pragmatics. In fact, Nelson and Greenbaum (2013) defined pragmatic as “the use of particular utterances within particular contexts”. Payne (2011) stated that semantics has to do with the meaning of linguistics structures and pragmatics has to do with the use of structures in contexts.

Keh (1991) stated that “we should be sure that the grammar is always in a context of coherent discourse where students analyse the phrases/structures in a text”(p.18). Brown & Yule (1984) point out that “the discourse analysis is a sentence grammarian and the sentence grammarian must also pay attention to discourse” (cited in Keh, 1991, p.17).

1.6. The Objectives of Grammar Learning

Ur (1999) stated one of the objectives of learning grammar is that grammatical rules enable learners enable learners to know and apply how sentence patterns should be put together. Hinkel (2017) argued that “because the purpose of learning grammar is to communicate successfully, the grammar structures necessary for communication should be indentified and taught” (p.375). According to Celce-Murcia (2016) and Richards and Reppen (2016), the goal of grammar teaching and learning is to enable learners to communicate effectively and appropriately in context (cited in Hinkel 2017, p.369).

Moreover, Ur (1988) saw that grammar learning as important for the acquisition and mastery of the language, since learner need to know how to combine correctly the different units of language in order to use it correctly and effectively in order to master a particular language.

1.7. The Importance of Grammar Teaching and Learning

Grammar is an important aspect of language and it is the fundamental organizing principle of language. Yong (1984) argued that grammar is a way to describe the system of communication which member of the society possesses and shared. Nunan (1991) stated that grammar exists to enable us to make meaning, and without grammar it is impossible to communicate.

According to Ur (1988), “learner who knows grammar is one who has mastered and can apply these rules to express him or herself in what would be considered acceptable language forms”(p.4). In addition to this, a great attention is given to grammar in language teaching. Accordingly, Corder (1973) claimed that the teaching of grammar is related to the teaching of meaning, since understanding the meaning of grammatical structures help to know how and when to use them successful. Moreover, Ellis (2006) argued that teaching grammar means to teach students different parts of speech to make them use the language correctly.

Therefore, grammar is the corner stone in language teaching, it is an important component of the language system; linguists see language without grammar as incomplete, they emphasize the importance of teaching grammar, as Batstone (1994) stated that “language without grammar is chaotic; countless words without indispensable guidelines for how they can be ordered and modified” (p.4).

Conclusion

This section is concerned with a review of the related literature by discussing key issues related to grammar. It presented the different grammar definition, its types and approaches. In addition, it discussed aspects influencing its teaching, its objectives as well as its importance.

Section Two

1.8. Objectives of Teaching and Evaluation

1.8.1. Definition of Objectives

Richards (2001) defined objectives as “objective refers to a statement of specific changes a program seeks to bring about and results from an analysis of the aim into different components” (p.122-123). In other word, objectives are brief statements that describes or indicate what the students will achieve or learn as a result of instruction. Besides Nunan (1988) argued that objectives are specified before content and activities given to students because their essential role is to guide the selection of structures and other elements in the curriculum.

1.8.1.1. Learners Objectives

Richards (2001) stated that students are essential participants in curriculum development and it is important to gather information about them before the project begins (p.101). Brinddley (1984) stated that

Setting learning objectives serves a number of useful purposes: it enables the teacher to evaluate what has been learned since terminal behaviour is always defined in terms which are measurable; it means that learners (provided they have participated in the process of setting objectives) know what they are supposed to be learning and what is expected of them; it provides a constant means of feedback and on-going evaluation for both teacher and learner; and it provides ‘a way of beginning the individualisation of instruction’(Steiner, 1975) since learners can set their own standards of performance and evaluate how well these standards have been attained (Cited in Nunan 1988, p.66).

According to Kerry (2002), learning objectives are not always related to knowledge, skills, and understanding that students acquire; however, they are related to how the learning process is acquired. Moreover, Laurel (2008) argued that well-organised learning objectives are specific, observable, and measurable. They describe what the learners will do to learn and to monitor their learning process. Accordingly, Kerry (2008) said that effective learning objectives are based on identifying learners' needs; they are not based only on what the learners will learn as a result of instructions but also why they should care about training. Because learning objectives delineate how learners will demonstrate what they have learned, they provide a basis for their evaluation and assessment.

1.8.1.2. Teachers Objectives

Carl (2009) stressed the importance of involving the teacher in curriculum development that is teachers have to be empowered in the process of curriculum development. He involved as an implementer or receiver. Besides Carl (2009) stated that the teacher's involvement take the form of consultation and feedback before and during the design with participation during implementation.

Likewise, the teacher's roles and responsibilities during his involvement in the curriculum development take the form of providing quality education for learners and evaluating whether the instruction is meeting the learners' needs and the educational system (Carl, 2009, p.201). Richards and Lockhart (1994) stated that teachers made use of different statements of course objectives to help them plan and organize the teaching process. Teachers were able to formulate what the lesson was intended to accomplish and how its goal was to be achieved.

Therefore, Richards and Lockhart (1994) claimed that teachers expressed their roles in terms of objectives as to develop learners' confidence in speaking and listening skills, to activate the learners' comprehension, to develop learner autonomy.

1.8.1.3. Syllabus Objectives

Widdowson (1984) defined a syllabus as “syllabus is simply a framework within which activities can be carried out: a teaching device to facilitate learning” (p.26). Besides, Afros & schryer (2009) mentioned that the syllabus offers different theories and strategies to describe the course, its goals and objectives, its structures and its correlation with other courses within the program. It mediates the interaction between students and teachers. Yalden (1984) stated that the syllabus is related to the learners' needs and aims, and should associated with the content and methodology. Brown (1995) said that a syllabus provides a focus of what should be studied, how the content should be selected and ordered.

Furthermore, Richards et al. (1985) stated that the syllabus provides a variety of different kinds of tasks and activities which the learners are expected to do in the learning process. Grunert et al. (2008) claimed that the function of a syllabus is to indicate to students their responsibility, what they have to do, and under what conditions. What they will be able to do by the end of the course and what they have learned or experienced during the learning process.

According to Parkes & Harris (2002), a syllabus has three purposes: serving as a contract, serving as a permanent and serving as an aid to students learning process.

1.9. Evaluation

1.9.1. Definition of Evaluation

The term evaluation is defined by different researchers, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) stated that “evaluation is the process of judging the suitability of particular purpose” (p.96). Lynch (1996) defined evaluation as “the systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions” (p.2). In addition to this, Mc Donald (1973) pointed out that “evaluation is the process of conveying, obtaining and communicating information for the guidance of educational decision making, with regard to a specific program” (p.1-2). The term evaluation is defined by Rea-dickens and Germaine (1992) as “evaluation is an intrinsic part of the teaching learning” (p.3).

Cronbach (1963) defined it as “the collection and use of information to make decisions about [an educational] program” (p.672). Davidson (2005) stated that evaluations are conducted for two main reasons “to find areas for improvement and/or to generate an assessment of overall quality or value” (p.2).

To sum up, from the above definitions we conclude that evaluation is the systematic collection that attempts to gather and obtain information about a specific program in order to measure its value, appropriateness or whether it needs modifications or decision-making to improve that program.

1.9.2. Types of Evaluation

1.9.2.1. Formative Evaluation

According to Nunan (1992), formative evaluation takes place during the preparation of the program and it provides a way for improving the program. Richards (2001) stated that formative evaluation carried out as part of the program development in

order to find out what is working well and what problems need to be modified. It focuses on the improvement of the program. According to Richards (2001), typical questions that are related to formative evaluation are:

- Has enough time been spent on particular objectives?
- Have the placement tests placed students at the right level in the program?
- Is the pacing of the material adequate?

Patton (2002) pointed out that formative evaluation aims at improving a specific program, policy, group of staff; it mainly focuses on ways of improving the effectiveness of a program.

1.9.2.2. Summative Evaluation

Nunan (1992) claimed that summative evaluation takes place at the end of a program that has been implemented, and it provides information for the modification of program. According to Richards (2001), summative evaluation seeks to make decisions about the effectiveness or value of different aspects of the curriculum. It focuses on determining the effectiveness of a program, its efficiency, and its acceptability. Richards (2001) maintained that summative evaluation seeks to answer questions such as these:

- How effective was the course? Did it achieve its aims?
- How well was the course received by students and teachers?
- How appropriate were the teaching methods?

Asaad and Hailaya (2004) stated that the purpose of summative evaluation is “the grading of students at the end of a broad unit of work usually by grading period, semester, or course” (p.14).

1.9.2.3. Process Evaluation

According to Gertler et.al (2011), process evaluation focuses on how a program is implemented and designed, whether it needs modification as its original design. Nunan (1992) argued that the focus in process evaluation is on the evaluator providing ongoing feedback during and at the end of a program. Besides, Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam (1983) claimed that process evaluation involves determining whether planned activities are carried out in which a program accepted and have the expected quality and efficiency. According to Scriven (1967) process evaluation answers questions such as

- How external factors influence program delivery?
- Did your program continue to be met its goals for recruitment of program participants?

1.9.3. The Importance of Evaluation

According to Rea-Dickins and Germaine (1992) evaluation is important for the teachers because it provides essential information for classroom practice, planning and organization of courses, and management of learning tasks and activities. Borich (1974) argued that evaluation provides ongoing feedbacks which guide the revision, improvement and modification of a program. Likewise, Patton (2002) pointed out that summative evaluation serve the purpose of rendering an overall judgment and decision-making about the effectiveness of a program, policy, or Product. Moreover, Asaad and Hailaya (2004) stated that evaluation focuses of determining the effectiveness and efficiency of teaching methodologies, instructional materials and feedback.

Weir and Roberts (1994) maintained that evaluation serves to gather information in order to indicate the worth and merits of a programme and to inform decision making (Cited in Jordan 1997, p.85)

Conclusion

This section was concerned with a review of the related literature by discussing some issues related to objectives of teaching and evaluation. It first presented different definitions of objectives. In addition, it discussed the objectives of teaching, different definitions of evaluation as well as its types and its importance.

Chapter Two: Research Methodology and Data Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

2.1. Research Methodology	30
2.1.1. Research Paradigm.....	30
2.1.2. Setting.....	31
2.1.3. Research Design.....	31
2.1.3.1. Sample of the Study	31
2.1.3.2. Data- Gathering Instrument	31
2.1.3.3. Data Collection Procedure.....	32
2.2. Data Analysis.....	32
2.3. Data Discussion.....	39
2.3.1. Second Year Students' Objectives for Learning Grammar.....	39
2.3.2. Second Year Students Fulfilment of Learning Objectives.....	41
2.4. Limitation of the Study.....	43
2.5. Recommendations.....	43
General Conclusion.....	45

Chapter Two

Research Methodology and Data Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the practical part of the research. It is divided into three sections. The first section is for the research methodology which contains research paradigm, setting, sample of the study, data-gathering instrument, data collection procedure, and data analysis. The subsequent section is devoted to the analysis of results obtained from students' questionnaire. Finally, the last section discusses the results obtained from the students' questionnaire, limitation of the study and recommendations.

2.1. The Research Methodology

2.1.1. Research Paradigm

This research work aims to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives. A quantitative approach is used. In this regard, Phakiti (2014) stated that "quantitative research is primarily related to numerical data, measurement and statistical analysis" (p.9). In other word, quantitative data is presented in numerical form and analyzed by statistical methods. In the case of this study, numerical data came from the questionnaire that was administered to second year Licence students to a sample of 50 participants. This type of research allows the researchers to choose questionnaire as the basic tool to gather data from a large population. Hence, the questionnaire is the appropriate tool for answering the research questions.

2.1.2. Setting

The current study was carried out to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives. This study was accomplished at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel, specifically, at the department of English language and literature. The students' speciality in Licence is English. Besides, in second year grammar is an essential module and it is taught inductively. Students studied grammar two sessions a week in which every session takes one hour and a half.

2.1.3. Research Design

The research design discusses such issues as the sample of the study, the data-gathering instruments that involve the questionnaire and the data collection procedure.

2.1.3.1. Sample of the Study

The population of this study consisted of second year EFL students at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel. Concerning the sample, 50 participants were chosen randomly from the total number of second year EFL students; the reason behind choosing second year Licence students is that they have learned grammar as a fundamental module in first year and they have knowledge about its instruction. Dörnyei (2007) defined a sample as "the group of participants whom the researcher actually examines in an empirical investigation" (p.96).

2.1.3.2. Data-Gathering Instrument: the Questionnaire

The questionnaire is acknowledged as an important source of information to obtain data in a research. Wilson and Mc Lean (1994, cited in Cohen et al., 2007) stated that "the

questionnaire is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, providing structured, often numerical data, being able to be administered without the presence of the researcher; and often being comparatively straightforward to analyse” (p.317).

Our questionnaire is built around 10 questions. We have used two types of questions which are open-ended questions and close-ended questions. Closed questions are Q1, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9, and Q10, whereas Q2 and Q4 are opened questions. According to Nunan (1992), in questionnaires there are two types of questions which are in-closed items in which the respondents are required to select answer determined by the researcher and in-open items in which the respondents can decide and express their points of view in their own ways (p.143).

2.1.3.3. Questionnaire Implementation Procedure

This study is based on quantitative data collection. The researchers used the questionnaire as a tool to determine second year students’ objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives.

2.2. Data Analysis

In this section we are going to present the data gathered from the questionnaire in form of tables followed by the students’ comments. The main aim of the questionnaire is to determine second year Licence students’ objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives.

2.2.1. Analysis of Students' Questionnaire

Question1 (How do you consider your level in grammar?)

Table 01

Students' Evaluation of their Grammar Level

Options	Numbers	Percentage %
Average	14	28, 6
Good	32	65, 3
Very Good	3	6, 1
Total	49	100

From the above table, we notice that the highest number of students (65,3%) have rated their level to be good; on the other hand, 6,1 % reported that they possess a very good level; however, 28,6 % of learners rated their level as average. From these results, it is noticeable that not all students have the same level of proficiency.

Question 2 (According to you, what are your objectives for learning grammar?)

Table 02

Students' Objectives for Learning Grammar

Options	Numbers	Percentage %
To become a successful communicator	22	44
To construct grammatically correct sentences	16	32
To get good marks in exams	3	6
To write correctly	9	18
Total	50	100

The aim of this question is to know students' objectives for learning grammar. From the data shown above, the highest number of students (44%) learn grammar to become a successful communicator; however, 32% of participants learn grammar to construct grammatically correct sentences, 18% of students learn grammar to write correctly and only 6% of learners reported that they learn grammar to get good mark in exams. Consequently, students major objectives for learning grammar are: to become a successful communicator, to construct grammatically correct sentences and to write correctly..

Questions 3 (How do you find the grammar lessons at second year?)

Table 3

Students' Views regarding the Grammar Lessons

Options	Numbers	Percentage %
Easy	32	65, 3
Difficult	17	34, 7
Total	49	100

According to the results obtained from the above table, more than half of the participants (65, 3 %) found grammar lessons easy; however, 34, 7 % found them difficult. This means that the majority of lessons of second year are easy for them.

Question 4 (Do grammar lessons in the syllabus help you develop grammar competence?)

Table4

Students' Views about the Lessons in the Syllabus

Options	Numbers	Percentage%
Yes	44	88
No	6	12
Total	50	100

The results from the above table show that the majority of students (88 %) answered with yes; however, 22 % answered with no. It can be concluded that the grammar lessons in the syllabus are appropriate for students. The students justified their answers saying that grammar lessons help them understand the English language better and avoid making mistakes.

Question 5 (How do you find the activities proposed by your teacher?)

Table 5

Students' View about the Proposed Activities

Options	Numbers	Percentage %
Interesting	12	24
Helpful	31	62
Boring	7	14
Total	50	100

As shown in the above results, it can be noted that 24% of students said that the activities are interesting; however, the majority of student (62 %) said they are helpful, and only 14 % of participants said they are boring. Hence, the results reveal that the majority of students are satisfied with the types of activities proposed by the teacher.

Question 6 (Do you think the scheduled grammar sessions enough for the mastery of grammar?)

Table 6

The Scheduled Grammar Sessions

Options	Numbers	Percentage %
Enough	26	46, 9 %
Insufficient	23	53, 1 %
Total	49	100

As shown in the table, 46, 9 % of students answered that grammar lessons are enough, and 53, 1 % of learners said they are insufficient. Thus, we can conclude that the majority of learners found the proposed activities insufficient for acquiring grammar.

Question 7 (How do you find the methodology?)

Table 7

Students' Opinion about the Teacher Methodology of Teaching

Options	Numbers	Percentage%
Effective	20	40
Ineffective	10	20
Neutral	20	40
Total	50	100

The results from the above table show that 40 % of students said that the teacher methodology is effective; similarly, 40% of students have mixed feeling about it. However, 20 % of learners answered that it is ineffective. Consequently, it seems that there is a

balance between the number of students who think that it is effective and the participants who are undecided.

Question 8 (How does your teacher teach grammar?)

Table8

The Way Grammar is taught

Options	Numbers	Percentage%
Deductively	22	44
Inductively	28	56
Total	50	100

The aim of this question is to know how students learn grammar. From the results shown above, it is noticeable that 44% of students learn grammar deductively; however, 56 % of participants learn it inductively. Such percentage revealed that the teachers used the inductive approach when teaching grammar.

Question 9 (How does your teacher assess your grammatical competence?)

Table 9

Teachers' Type of Assessment

Options	Numbers	Percentage %
Gap filling	9	18, 4
Multiple choice	10	20, 4
Error identification	2	4, 1
Error correction	7	14, 3
Paragraph writing	10	20, 4

Grammatical games	5	10, 2
Sentence completion	3	6, 1
Sentence combining	0	0
Transformation	3	6, 1
Total	49	100

The results of the table illustrate that the answers vary from one student to another. Multiple choice and paragraph writing have the highest percentage 20, 4 %. Gap filling has 18, 4 %, and error correction has 14, 3%. Besides, Grammatical games get a percentage of 10, 2 %. Both sentence completion and transformation get the percentage of 6, 1%. The percentage of 0% and 4, 1% is given to sentence combining and error identification. What it is salient from table 9 is that the major assessments used by teachers are multiple choice, paragraph writing, gap filling and error correction.

Question 10: (Tick the extent to which you have achieved the following objectives of the grammar course?)

Table 10

Achievement of Learning Objectives

Options	Average	A little	Good
Communicate fluently	25%	41, 7%	33, 3%
Read easily	24, 5%	12, 2%	63, 3%
Write correctly	50%	22%	28%

Get acceptable grades in grammar	36%	30%	34%
Gaining confidence when using English	44%	30%	26%

As it is shown in this table, the highest number of students (41, 7%) failed to communicate fluently. In the second options, the majority of students (63, 3%) have a good level in reading. In writing, 50% of students have an average level. Additionally, a highest number of students (36%) do not get acceptable grades in grammar. 44% of them have not gain confidence when using English. What can be drawn from the students' answers to this question is that students do not share the same level in grammar. The results revealed that a highest number of students did not achieve the objectives of the course.

2.3. Data Discussion

This section is devoted to the discussion and interpretation of the results obtained from the students' questionnaire. The results generated from students' questionnaire will be discussed in relation to the research questions that have been posed in the introduction. As a reminder; the research questions are as follow:

1. What are the second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar?
2. To what extents do second year Licence students achieve the objectives of the course?

2.3.1 Second Year Students' Objectives for learning Grammar

The first research question of the study is about finding second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar. According to the results obtained from the questionnaire, the major objective of the students for learning grammar is to become a successful communicator, because nowadays with the development of technology many students learn grammar to be more confident when they chat with foreigners. This idea is supported by researchers such as Murcia, Richards & Reppen (2016, cited in Hinkel 2017, p.369)

who stated that the goal of grammar teaching and learning is to enable learners to communicate effectively and appropriately in context. Additionally, Purpura (2004) claimed that the goal of grammar teaching nowadays is to achieve communicative competence. Mart (2013) pointed out that learners have to study grammar rules in order to become an effective language user and it will help them recognize speech and make it meaningful.

Likewise, their second objective for learning grammar is to construct grammatically correct sentences. According to students, learning grammar enables them to know how to combine and frame grammatically correct sentences. In this regard, Ur (1999) argued that one of the objectives of learning grammar is that grammatical rules enable and help learners to apply how sentence patterns should be put together.

Moreover, the third objective for learning grammar is to write correctly. According to students, learning grammar helps them to be more accurate, to avoid making mistakes and to understand the content of any piece of writing and make sense of sentences. Similarly, Frodesen and Eyrin (cited in Ali Fatimi 2008) stated that a focus on form (grammar) in writing can help writers develop rich linguistics resources needed to express ideas effectively. In other word, a focus on grammatical forms in writing help learners and writers develop their writing proficiency, and hence increase the grammatical competence.

Mart (2013) claimed that “language acquisition without grammar will be confusing. Learners will fail to use the language correctly without grammar skills (p.125). That is to say that, a focuse on grammar rules in writing, learners will face difficulties in understanding any piece of writing. Besides, Emery, et al. (1978) argued that “the more you know about the form and function of the parts that make up the larger unit, the sentence, the better equipped you are to recognize and to construct well-formed sentences ”

(cited in Mart 2013). This means, the mastery of grammatical structures enable learners to develop the writing competence.

2.3.2. Second Year Students Fulfilment of Learning Objectives

According to the results obtained from the questionnaire, the majority of students did not fulfil the learning objectives and only very small percentages fulfil the objectives of the course. Based on the results shown in question 10, the highest number of students (41, 7%) did not fulfil the objective of communication and a small percentage (33, 3%) achieves the objective of communicating fluently. This means that students are faced by different problems which affect their communication. Accordingly, Ur (1996) stated that there are four factors that affect students' speaking skills which are inhibition, nothing to say, low or uneven participation and mother-tongue use. Similarly, Juhana (2012), in her study found that there are some psychological factors that face the students when they speak which are fear of mistakes, shyness, anxiety, lack of confidence and lack of motivation.

According to the results obtained in question 10, the highest number of students (63, 3%) fulfils the objectives of reading. It can be said that students have effective reading comprehension strategies and material that help them develop their reading skills. This idea is supported by the study of Khoirul (2020) who found that the students' reading skills was only 50% because the students did not know how to use pronunciation, but after the implementation of different techniques in the class, the students reading skills was 100 %.

According to Ruhul (2019), during the teaching process of the reading skills teachers can assist their students in improving their reading comprehension by giving different reading strategies and techniques such as predicting, making affiliation, envisaging, inferring, questioning and summarizing (p.36). Duke and Pearson (2005) argued that “ It is also important for the teachers to teach the strategies by naming the

strategy, clarify the implemented strategy, modeling through the think aloud process, group practice, partner practice, and autonomous use of the strategy” (as cited in Ruhul Amin,2019,p.36).

Moreover, the findings in question 10 indicated that a highest number of students (50 %) failed to write correctly. It is obvious that students have numerous errors in their writing especially in grammar which prevents them to write correctly. In this regard, Hourany's study (2008) showed that students made grammatical errors in their essays. These included: verb tenses and form, passivation, articles, plurality and auxiliaries. In addition to this, in question 10 a highest number of students (36%) failed to get acceptable grades in grammar; this is because of the difficulty of grammatical structures. Ur (1996) stated that “it is surprisingly difficult to present and explain foreign-language grammatical structures to class of learners” (p.81).

Students failed in writing because grammar is a difficult aspect of the language that students find it hard to master. Accordingly, Dekeyser and Sokalski (1996) consider grammar difficulties are related to comprehension and production. They argued that some grammar rules are easy to comprehend, but difficult to produce; however, some other rules are easy to produce, but difficult to comprehend (as cited in Shiu, 2011, p. 2). Similarly, this idea is supported by Berent (1985) considered grammatical difficulties are related to production and comprehension. (as cited in Shiu, 2011,p.2). In fact, in contrast to those researchers Larsen freeman (2003) argued that grammatical difficulties are related to linguistic form, semantic meaning, and pragmatic use (as cited in Shiu 2011,p.2). Ellis (2006) stated that grammar difficulties to explicit/ implicit knowledge (as cited in Shiu, 2011, p.3).

Therefore, the findings in question 10 showed that only 26% of students fulfil the objective of gaining confidence when using English. In contrast, a highest number of

students (44%) failed to achieve this objective. This means that learners still have poor communication skills and they do not have confidence in speaking. This idea agrees with the findings of a study made by Audina, Hasanah and Desvitasari (2021) about the correlation between students' self-confidence and their English achievement. The results indicated that there is no significant correlation and significant influence between self-confidence of undergraduate EFL students and their speaking achievements.

Based on the obtained results from the questionnaire, students' major objectives for learning grammar are to become a successful communicator, to construct grammatically correct sentences and to write correctly. In addition, the findings revealed that a highest numbers of students did not fulfil the objectives of the course.

2.4. Limitation of the Study

When carrying on this research work, the researchers were confronted by a number of constraints that are as follow:

- The lack of relevant resources about the topic faced by the researchers when collecting data.
- The students were not cooperative during the process of the questionnaire because some of them answered few questions and others were not interested.

2.5. Recommendations

Based on the results obtained from this study, the researchers suggest the following recommendation for both students and teachers.

For teachers

- It is important to teach grammar in speaking classes because according to students grammar is important tool to become a good communicator.

- Teachers should focus on teaching grammar in writing classes because according to students learning grammar helps them to write with accuracy.
- It is crucial to add extra sessions of grammar in the schedule because according to students two sessions are not enough for the acquisition of grammatical rules.
- In teaching grammar, teachers should focus on developing language form and use because according to students their major objectives for learning grammar is to communicate fluently and to write accurately.
- Teachers should sensitize the students to learn grammar because it is important for both accuracy and fluency.

For Student

- Students should pay more attention to grammar when they learn communication.
- Grammar is the core of the language; students have to be aware of the importance of grammar when learning the language.

Conclusion

This chapter represented the practical part of the study; it presented the research methodology and the interpretation of the data obtained from the questionnaire. The results showed that second year students' major objectives for learning grammar are to become a successful communicator, to construct grammatically correct sentences and to write correctly. Additionally, the findings revealed that a highest number of students did not achieve the objectives of the course.

General Conclusion

The current piece of research was set up to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar. This study aims to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives at the University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel. It is based on the following hypotheses: Students learn grammar to master language form and language use; students learn grammar to improve their writing, speaking and reading skills; students learn grammar to get good marks in exams; and students are not achieving the objectives of the course.

The present work consists of two chapters. The first chapter is devoted to the theoretical part. It is divided into two sections: the first section deals with general issues related to grammar; it provides a definition of grammar, its types, and approaches. In addition, it presents and explains aspects influencing its teaching, its objectives, and its importance. The second section discusses the objectives of teaching, gives definition of evaluation, and states its types as well as its importance. The second chapter; on the other hand, is devoted to the practical part of the study. It is divided into three sections. The first section describes the research methodology used to carry out this study. Subsequently, the second section presents the results obtained from the questionnaire. The third section is concerned with the interpretation and discussion of the data. Ultimately, some recommendations were suggested and some limitations were stated.

The findings of this study showed that the students' objectives for learning grammar are to become a successful communicator, to construct grammatically correct sentences and to write correctly. Furthermore, the results revealed that a highest number of students did not achieve the objectives of the course.

Consequently, this study recommends teaching grammar in both speaking and writing classes for students to master language form and language use because according to students their major objectives for learning grammar is to communicate fluently and to write accurately.

References

- Afros, E., & Schryer, C. F. (2009). The genre of syllabus in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(3), 224-233.
- Al-Mutawa, N., & Kailani, T. (1989). *Methods of teaching English to Arab students*. Longman .
- Asaad, A.S. , & Hailaya, W. M. (2004). *Measurement and evaluation: Concepts and principles*. Rex Book Store.
- Audina, R. M., Hasanah, A . , & Desvitasri, D. (2021). The Correlation between Self-Confidence of the Undergraduate EFL Students and Their Speaking Achievement. *Jadila: Journals of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education*, 1(4), 518- 533.
- Batstone, R. (1994). *Grammar. Language teaching :A Scheme for teacher education*. Oxford University Press.
- Borich, G.D.(1974). *Evaluating educational programs and products*. Educational Technology.
- Brown, J.D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 20 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* 2nd Edition. New York: Adision Wesley Longman.
- Cameron, D. (Ed.). (1998). *The feminist critique of language: A reader*. Psychology Press.
- Carl, A. E. (2009). *Teacher empowerment through curriculum development: Theory into practice*. Juta and Company Ltd.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K . (2007). *Research methods in education*, 6. Baski, Oxon: Routledge.

- Corder, S.P. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Penguin Group.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1963). *Course improvement through evaluation*. *Teachers college record*, 64(8), 1-13.
- Crookes, G. , & Chaudron, C.(1991). *Guidelines for classroom language teaching*. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 46-67.
- Davidson, E.J. (2005). *Evaluation methodology basics: The nuts and bolts of sound evaluation*. Sage.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). *Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective*. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Fatemi, M. A. (2008). *The Relationship Between Writing Competence, Language Proficiency And Grammatical Errors In The Writing Of Iranian TEFL Sophomores [LB2372. E5 F252 2008 frb]* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Sains Malaysia).
- Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B., & Vermeersch, C. M. J. (2011). *Impact Evaluation in Practice* (The World Bank, Washington, DC).
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (1995). *Teaching practice handbook* (new edition). *England: Heinemann*.
- Harmer, J. (1987). *Teaching and Learning Grammar*. Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* 4th ed. *England: Pearson Education Limited*.
- Hinkel, E. (2017). *Prioritizing grammar to teach and not to teach: A research perspective*,(w:) Hinkel E.(red.), *The handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (vol. 3).
- Hourani, T. M. Y. (2008). *An analysis of the common grammatical errors in the English*

- writing made by 3rd secondary male students in the Eastern Coast of the UAE.
- Huddleston, R. (1984). *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge university press.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Juhana, J. (2012). *Psychological factors that hinder students from speaking in English class (A case study in a senior high school in South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia)*. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12), 100-110.
- Keh, C. L. (1991, January). *Teaching Grammar as a Process in the Process of Writing*. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 17-21).
- Kerry, T. (2002). *Learning objectives, task-setting and differentiation*. Nelson Thornes.
- Khoirul, A.A. (2020). The effect of collaborative strategic reading toward students reading skill. *Anglophile Journal*, 1 (1), 21-28.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). *Teaching grammar. Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 3, 251-266.
- Laurel, D. S. (2008). *Jump-Start Your Learning Objectives*. États-Unis: American Society for Training & Development.
- Littlewood, W., William, L., & Swan, M. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge university press.
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Ernst Klett Sprachen GmbH.
- Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M. S., Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., Stufflebeam, D., &

- Scriven, M. S. (1983). *Program evaluation: A historical overview. Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*, 3-22.
- Macdonald, B., & Parlett, M. (1973). Re-thinking evaluation: Notes from the Cambridge Conference Authority, Teacher Education and Educational Studies. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 3(2), 74-82.
- Makhloufi, H., & Hammam, K. (2018). *Investigating the importance of grammar rules in student's writing production: a case study firstyear LMD students of english at Bejaia university* (Doctoral dissertation, Université de Bejaia).
- Mart, Ç. T. (2013). Teaching grammar in context: why and how?. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1).
- Miliani, M. (2003). *Foreign Language Teaching Approaches, Methods & Techniques*. Editions Dar El Gharb.
- Murcia, C. C. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 3rd. New York: Heile & Heinle. Thomson Learning Inc, 13.
- Nasri, W., Diar, S., & Boulemaiz, D. (2021). *An Evaluation of grammatical structure sequencing in second-and third-year middle school EFL textbooks" My Book of English (2AM and 3AM)"*.
- Nelson, G., & Greenbaum, S. (2013). *An Introduction to English Grammar*.
- Newby, D. (2015). *The role of theory in pedagogical grammar: A Cognitive+ Communicative approach. Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 13-34.
- Nunan, D., Candlin, C. N., & Widdowson, H. G. (1988). *Syllabus design* (Vol. 55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology* (Vol. 192). New York: prentice hall.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge university press.
- O'Brien, J. G., Millis, B. J., & Cohen, M. W. (2009). *The course syllabus: A learning-*

centered approach. John Wiley & Sons..

OUMSALEM, F., & DJABARNI, K. (2012). *The Effectiveness of Teaching EFL Grammar in Context Case Study: Of Third Year Pupils Middle Schools in Algeria* (Master's thesis).

Parkes, J., & Harris, M. B. (2002). *The purposes of a syllabus*. *College teaching*, 50(2), 55-61.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A personal, experiential perspective*. *Qualitative social work*, 1(3), 261-283.

Payne, T. E., & Payne, T. E. (2010). *Understanding English grammar: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Phakiti, A. (2014). *Experimental research methods in language learning*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Pienemann, M. (1985). *Learnability and syllabus construction*. *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition*, 23-75.

Purpura, J. E. (2004). *Assessing grammar* (Vol. 8). Cambridge University Press.

Radford, A. (1997). *Syntax: A minimalist introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Radford, A. (2009). *Analysing English sentences: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Rea-Dickins, P., & Germaine, K. (1992). *Evaluation*. Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge university press.

Richards, P. (7). Weber.(1985). *Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*:

A Description and Analysis.

- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*.
- Rivers, W. M., & Temperley, M. S. (1978). *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016.
- Ruhul, Md. A. (2019). Developing reading skills through effective reading approaches. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 4(1), 35-40.
- Scriven, M. (1967). *The Methodology of Evaluation*. In. Tyler, RW, Gagne, RM, Scriven, M.(ed.): *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*. '^eds.'): *Book The Methodology of Evaluation*. In. Tyler, Rw, Gagne, Rm, Scriven, M.(Ed.): *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*, Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Shaffer, C. (1989). *A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 395-403.
- Shiu, L. J. (2011). *EFL learners' perceptions of grammatical difficulty in relation to second language proficiency, performance, and knowledge*. University of Toronto.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. *Readings in Methodology*, 129.
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *An AZ of ELT: A dictionary of terms and concepts used in English language teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan, 2006.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities-practical guide for teachers* Cambridge university press
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching* (Vol. 1, No. 998, p. 41). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching trainee book*. Cambridge University Press.

- Widdowson, H. G. (1984). Educational and pedagogic factors in syllabus design. *General English syllabus design*, 23-27.
- Wong, R. M. (2008). Competency-Based English Teaching and Learning: Investigating Pre-Service Teachers of Chinese's Learning Experience. *Online Submission*.
- Yalden, J. (1984). Syllabus design in general education: Options for ELT. *CJ Brumfit, CJ (Ed). General English Syllabus Design*, 13-21.
- Young, D. J. (1984). *Introducing English Grammar*. Psychology Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Students' Questionnaire

Dear students,

This questionnaire is designed to collect information to our research study which aims to determine second year Licence students' objectives for learning grammar and the extent to which they achieve these objectives.

You are kindly requested to answer the questionnaire by putting a tick (✓) in the box and justify your answers whenever it is necessary. Thank you for your collaboration.

1-How do you consider your level in grammar?

Average

Good

Very Good

2-According to you, what are your objectives for learning grammar?

a-To become a successful communicator

b- To construct grammatically correct sentences

e- To get good marks in exams

g- To write correctly

Other objectives, please specify

3-How do you find the grammar lessons at second year?

Easy

Difficult

4- Do grammar lessons in the syllabus help you develop grammar competence?

Yes

No

Elaborate.....

5-How do you find the activities proposed by your teacher?

Interesting Helpful Boring

6-Do you think the scheduled grammar sessions enough for the mastery of grammar?

Enough Insufficient

7-How do you find the methodology of grammar teaching?

Effective Ineffective neutral

8-How does your teacher teach grammar?

Deductively (starts with the presentation of rules and is followed by examples)

Inductively (starts with some examples before the presentation of rules)

9- How does your teacher assess your grammatical competence?

a. Gap filling f. Grammatical games

b. Multiple choice g. Sentence combining

c. Error correction h. Sentence completion

d. Error identification i. Transformation

e. Paragraph writing

Others please specify.....

10-Tick the extent to which you have achieved the following objectives of the grammar course?

a. Communicate fluently Average A little Good

b. Read easily Average A little Good

c. Write correctly Average A little Good

d. Get acceptable grades in grammar Average A little Good

e. Gaining confidence when using English Average A little Good

Résumé

Cette étude vise à apprendre les objectifs des étudiants en deuxième année de Licence d'Anglais en ce qui concerne l'apprentissage de la grammaire, ainsi que dans quelle mesure les étudiants de deuxième année de Licence à l'Université Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia-Jijel ont atteint ces objectifs d'apprentissage. Dans cette optique, un questionnaire a été administré à 50 étudiants du département d'anglais en deuxième année de Licence. Après avoir analysé les données, la recherche a abouti à plusieurs résultats. Il en ressort que l'objectif des étudiants en apprenant la grammaire est de communiquer de manière fluide et de construire des phrases grammaticalement correctes, ainsi que d'écrire correctement. De plus, les résultats de l'étude ont révélé l'échec du programme d'études, car la majorité des étudiants de deuxième année de Licence n'ont pas réussi à atteindre les objectifs de ce programme d'études

ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة أهداف طلبة السنة الثانية ليسانس لغة انجليزية من تعلم القواعد ، و إلى مدى حقق طلاب السنة الثانية ليسانس أهداف المنهج الدراسي بجامعة محمد الصديق بن يحيى ، و بناء على ذلك تم توجيه استبيان ل 50 طالب في السنة الثانية ليسانس قسم اللغة الانجليزية. و بعد القيام بعملية التحليل خلص البحث إلى مجموعة من النتائج تتمثل في كون هدف الطلبة من تعلم القواعد هو التواصل بطلاقة و بناء جمل نحوية صحيحة ، إضافة إلى الكتابة بشكل صحيح. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، أظهرت نتائج الدراسة فشل المنهج الدراسي، حيث أن أغلبية طلاب السنة الثانية ليسانس فشلوا في تحقيق أهداف المنهج الدراسي.