

**An Investigation into the Relationship between British
Civilization Teachers' Methodology and Students' Learning
Achievements**

OUAHMICHE Ghania,

Université d'Oran1

BENSAAD Safia,

Université d'Oran 2

Abstract: *The purpose behind this investigation is to probe first year LMD teachers' methodology and their students' learning achievements – at Blida2 University - in the subject of British Civilization in terms of improving their English language proficiency and grasping the content of the subject matter simultaneously. Throughout an analytical descriptive study, the focus is made on revealing the inadequacy of the prevailing teaching methodology of British Civilization in terms of being: (1) non-convergent with current EFL teaching methodologies, which stress the development of language proficiency through interactive communication in the language classroom, and (2) hindering students' achievements in the subject of British Civilization. This study relies on three research instruments: a questionnaire for first year LMD students, a structured interview for first year LMD teachers of British Civilization besides students' British Civilization exam papers analysis. Yet, on the basis of literature reading and the results obtained from the study, some recommendations are made in order to ameliorate the current teaching methodology of British Civilization course in first year LMD classroom. Thus, students are hopefully expected to improve their English language proficiency and attain their achievements in British Civilization subject.*

Keywords: *EFL teaching methodologies, British Civilization teachers' methodology, First year LMD classes.*

Résumé: *Le but de cette enquête est d'investiguer la méthodologie des enseignants de LMD de première année et les acquis de leurs étudiants - à l'Université de Blida2 - dans le domaine de la civilisation Britannique dans le but d'améliorer leur maîtrise de la langue anglaise et de saisir le contenu du sujet traité simultanément. Tout au long d'une étude descriptive analytique, l'accent est mis sur le constat montrant l'inadéquation de la méthodologie d'enseignement dominante de la civilisation Britannique en termes de: (1) non-convergence avec les méthodes d'enseignement actuelles qui soulignent le développement de la compétence linguistique par la communication interactive dans La classe de langue, et (2) la réduction du rendement des étudiants dans le domaine de la civilisation Britannique. Or, cette étude repose sur trois instruments de recherche: un questionnaire pour les étudiants de première année LMD, une entrevue structurée pour les enseignants de LMD de la Civilisation Britannique en première année ainsi que l'analyse des copies d'examen de la civilisation Britannique. Pourtant, sur la base de la lecture de la littérature et des résultats obtenus de l'étude, quelques recommandations seront faites afin d'améliorer la méthodologie d'enseignement*

actuelle du cours de civilisation Britannique en classe de de première année LMD. Ainsi, les étudiants devrait améliorer leur maîtrise en langue Anglaise et d'atteindre leurs réalisations en matière de civilisation Britannique.

Mots clefs: *méthodologie d'enseignement de l'Anglais langue étrangère, méthodologie adoptée par les enseignants de civilisation Britannique, classes de 1ère année.*

Introduction

A steadily growing interest in teaching and learning English as a foreign language is gaining momentum in all present world nations, and Algeria is no exception. Moreover, “*as English becomes the chief means of communication between nations, it is crucial to ensure that it is taught accurately and efficiently*” (Crystal, 1995: 03). For this very end, applied linguists have introduced various new methodologies of EFL teaching and learning. Here, the essence of language learning is based on learners’ participation and interactive communication for the sake of communicating fluently and accurately rather than memorizing the rule-governed structure of the target language as the traditional teaching methodologies used to focus on.

Moreover, the British Civilization course is important in EFL curriculum since it adequately responds to EFL learning, especially for LMD students who are expected to get a “*Licence*” degree in English after three-year study. Generally, as stated Rodrigues, E. (2015: 29), in content-based courses like British Civilization “*language and content subjects are integrated and the goal is that students study the target language with a particular subject (e.g. history, geography, mathematics)*”. Relevant to this, what should be expected from teaching British Civilization to first year LMD students is first the improvement of their English language proficiency. Once this is achieved, students are able to grasp the content knowledge of the course. However, in the English Department at Blida2 University, British Civilization as a one semester subject is introduced to first year LMD students aiming at providing them with a general view about the British community focusing, mainly, on the historical aspect through the target language. Hence, the course of British Civilization plays a dual role in the language classroom by affording learners the content knowledge that would foster their linguistic capacities. Yet, this could not be achieved unless an adequate and effective teaching methodology is applied.

In fact, this is the very problem faced by both students and teachers in first year LMD classroom where the emphasis on “*what*” to learn rather than “*how*” to learn dwarfs the role of the students to merely non-interactive receivers of hardly graspable historical information

towards which they rarely feel motivated. And when it comes to the final assessment of the course through an exam held at the end of the first semester, students' bad performance, as the analysis of their exam papers demonstrates, is highly reflective of traditional teaching methodologies which foster learning by rote rather than 'learning by doing'. The latter is increasingly stressed in current EFL teaching methodologies (Berton, G. 2007).

Therefore, in an attempt to tackle the problem the present research paper tries to put the context described above under study through the following research questions:

- To what extent does the prevailing way of teaching British Civilization course in first year LMD classroom reflect the current EFL teaching methodologies in terms of interactive communication to develop learners' language proficiency?
- Being the tool mediating between the students and the content knowledge of the course, to what extent is British Civilization teachers' methodology successful in terms of helping first year LMD students to attain their achievements in the subject of British Civilization in respect to both the development of their linguistic capacities and grasping the content knowledge of the course?

1. Theoretical Background of the Study

1.1 Foreign Language Teaching Methodologies

Until about the mid of 1960's, the field of second language learning research had been dominated by behaviourist ideas. These, according to Tuomaala (2013: 10), are closely linked to an imitating pedagogy where "*learning takes place when the correct behavior is rewarded and with practice learning increases*". Corresponding to these ideas the Direct Method was originated as a reaction to the Grammar Translation method which was based on translation and learning the vocabulary and rule system of the target language by rote. This was rejected by the supporters of the Direct Method and Audiolingual method which suggested that rules of grammar should be acquired inductively through imitation and repetition (Els, T.V. et al, 1984:184).

By the late 1960's and early 1970's, the field of language teaching and learning witnessed controversial developments. Chomsky's (1959) attack of structuralism and behaviourism, because of their rejection of the mental aspect of language learning, led to the decline of Audiolingualism and gave rise to new language teaching approaches and methodologies. Nevertheless, these methodologies

would be forced into re-examination in the coming years as the field of language research witnessed salient progress thanks to studies in sociolinguistics. Therefore, learning a language would no longer be viewed only as an individual accomplishment, but also as a social experience. This would pave the way to the emergence of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as need arises “*to focus in language teaching on communicative proficiency rather on mere mastery of structures.*” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 64)

By the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, the constructivist school of thoughts claimed the failure of the previous language teaching methodologies to consider the functional and communicative potential of language. This new approach to the phenomenon of language marked the shift of interest in language research from the individual to society, i.e. considering language as a social event. This was advocated by many well-known language researchers like: Vygotsky (1978), J. Firth and Halliday (1973; 1978), Savignon (1972), and Hymes (1972). The latter’s seminal work on the communicative competence would not only complete Chomsky’s linguistic competence, but even become the theory basis of the Communicative Language Teaching method.

Hymes’s (1972) contribution in the field of linguistics widened the scope of competence to include not only the ideal speaker-hearer underlying grammatical knowledge, but even the capacity to put this knowledge into use. According to Hymes (1979) “*The acquisition of competence for use, indeed, can be stated in the same terms as acquisition of competence for grammar*” (Hymes, 1972 in Brumfit & Johnson, (eds.) 1979: 16). After Hymes, many other language researchers made seminal participations in the classification of communicative competence (Canale and Swain, 1980; Yule and Tarone, 1990; and Bachman, 1990; cited in Brown, 2000: 246-48). Yet, the most important classification is that of Canale and Swain (ibid. 247) which becomes “*...the reference point for virtually all discussions of communicative competence*”. Other models yielded by for example Yule & Tarone (1990), and Bachman (1990) are based on Canale and Swain’s classification where four subcategories that underpin communicative competence are identified: *grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence*.

What can be observed is that all the contributions stated previously complete each other in a way that would provide the theoretical ground on which CLT stands. As Sreehari (2012: 88) maintains, in CLT “*the focus is on improving learners’*

communicative competence”. As such, CLT proves to be the most current language teaching method and all the methods that preceded it are nowadays considered ‘traditional’ though they are still used in some contexts where a structural approach to language teaching often prevails.

Furthermore, unlike the traditional methodologies of language teaching, language research that was conducted after the appearance of CLT would contribute a great deal to its extension and progress rather than stagnation and rejection. Recently, and by the 1990’s the use of various extensions of CLT has become widespread. These extensions can be classified into two types: process-oriented CLT approaches and product-oriented CLT approaches (Richards, 2006). The first type can be best represented by the Competency-Based Approach to Language Teaching (CBALT), while the second type comprises Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT).

As its name reveals, Content-Based Instruction implies the integration of language instruction with content instruction. This type of EFL classroom instruction provides, as Brinton et al., (1989) argue “a meaningful context for language development as it not only builds on students’ previous learning experiences and current needs and interests, but also takes account of the eventual purpose for which students need the language” (cited in Chapple and Curtis, 2000: 420).

The Task-Based Approach, also TBA, TBLT or TBL, is a foreign language teaching method which has been used since the 1980’s and uses tasks as its core programmes to proceed with language teaching. The concept of Task-Based Learning was first coined by Prabhu (1987) after his Bangalore project which was carried out from 1979 to 1984 in India.

In the context of TBLT, instead of focusing on language structure, learners are required to perform a series of activities that should successfully lead to a task realization through a planned process¹. For Long (1995; Long and Robinson, 1998 in Kumaravadivelu, 2007: 18) “learner’s attention is drawn to linguistic features if and only if demanded by the communicative activities and the negotiation of meaning learners are engaged in”. Thus, priority is given to meaning then to its structural system as the latter, it is assumed, can better be acquired indirectly or subconsciously.

¹ Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd. P 38.

As a developing country looking for the best standards for its educational system, Algeria opted for the introduction of some educational reforms to cope with worldwide changes. In higher education, CBA has been supposed to be gradually applied in the Algerian universities generally and the departments of English studies particularly since 2004 following the reforms brought by the recently inaugurated system of LMD (Idri, N., 2005: 04). As far as the Department of English at USDB is concerned, the LMD system has been put into effect since 2007 without CBA, however; i.e. the educational framework is the LMD system, but classroom methodology is based on classical or traditional practices like theoretical lecturing.

After elaborating on the tenets of CBA, Miliani (2005: 03) calls the Algerian EFL teachers to mind the bandwagon effect of CBALT. Yet, Miliani concludes that “the CBALT can in no way be the panacea to the pedagogical problems the teaching of English meets in our country” (*ibid*). Perhaps, failure to applying CBALT in the Algerian EFL education exceeds “pedagogical problems the teaching of English meets in our country”, as the writer states, to include the political, economic and social ideologies that make up the framework of our educational system. As a product-oriented approach CBA fits the context of productive societies (e.g. USA and UK) wherein it first appeared rather than consumerist societies like Algeria. However, this would never mean to stick to most frequently fruitless classroom teaching practices as the case of first year LMD British Civilization classes in the Department of English at USDB. As EFL teachers we have to seek new alternatives in other FL teaching instructions.

1.2.2. Syllabus Design and Methodology

Both concepts of syllabus design and methodology have been influenced by the evolution of language teaching research. The former is often referred to as “what” to be taught in terms of course content while the latter deals with “how” this content is to be taught. McDonough, J. et al. (2013: 11), syllabus design is “the overall organizing principle for what is to be taught and learned. In other words, it is a general statement as to the pedagogical arrangement of learning content”.

Moreover, the distinction between syllabus design and methodology is often determined by the type of the syllabus. This can be identified by one of the two different approaches to syllabus design: the synthetic approach and the analytic approach, (Wilkins, 1976), or what White (1988, cited in Long and Crookes, 1992) refers

to as type A and type B syllabuses. Type A or synthetic or syllabuses focus on how much learners can accumulate linguistic knowledge to yield effective learning product by the end. However, in type B or analytic syllabuses the focus is on “how” to learn, i.e. the process of learning, rather than “what” to learn, i.e. the product of learning.

In fact, as Nunan states “after the emergence of communicative language teaching (CLT), the distinction between syllabus design and methodology becomes more difficult to sustain” (ibid., 06). This shift of emphasis from teacher to learner blurred the distinction between syllabus design and methodology. These would no longer be imposed on the language classroom, but rather decided upon by both teacher and learner through negotiation of content, goals and objectives of the course.

1.2.3. Establishing Course Goals and Objectives:

Though the use of the terms ‘goals’ and ‘objectives’ is often confusing, a distinction can be drawn between these two items of course design. Hedge (2000: 344) regards the difference between both terms as “a distinction between the general and the specific”. In this sense, various objectives can be derived from a general goal of a given course and established to be achieved by the end of this course. Moreover, broader goals are usually set out in a national curriculum or by institutional policy-makers, while specific objectives are left to be interpreted by teachers, (ibid.).

For their part, Richards and Rodgers (1986: 20) make discrimination between product-oriented objectives and process-oriented objectives. Richards and Rodgers claim that this “process-oriented objective may be offered in contrast to the linguistically oriented or product-oriented objectives of more traditional methods”. Therefore, in most current teaching methodologies, like CBI and TBL, objectives are based on the process of learning, i.e. how to learn rather than on the product of learning, i.e. what to learn. As such, learners are more inclined to develop their procedural knowledge than their declarative knowledge.

As far as our case study is concerned, establishing goals and objectives has never been given momentum in first year LMD British Civilization classrooms as revealed by the data collated. Learners are presented with British Civilization course content without being aware why they are studying this course; the fact which makes teachers’ methodology far from being able to sustain learners’ achievements both in terms of their English language development and their content knowledge comprehension.

1.2.4 Teachers' and Learners' Roles

The conceptualization and identification of teachers' and learners' roles in the language classroom have been shaped differently throughout the evolution of various FL teaching approaches and methodologies. Yet, the term 'role' is used here to describe the behavior and/or activities that each of the teacher and learner is engaged in along the teaching/learning process. For Nunan (2004: 64) 'role' means "*the part that learners and teachers are expected to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as the social and interpersonal relationships between the participants [the teacher and the learners]*". In fact, teachers' and learners' roles are often determined by the method used in the language classroom.

Provided that a traditional teaching method is pursued, the language classroom will be teacher-centered. In such a context, the learner is perceived as being passive and having little or no control over content or methods (Ibid.). One good example is Audiolingualism where the teacher is seen as "ideal language model and commander of classroom activity" (Rodgers, T. 2001:2)

However, thanks to the great development FLT field witnessed, new methodologies have been brought in making an unprecedented shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered classrooms. Teachers are no longer perceived as a fountain of language knowledge nor are learners viewed as empty vessels ready to be filled in. Now, learners should "*see themselves as being in control of their own learning rather than as passive recipients of content provided by the teacher*", (Nunan, 2004: 67). This is mainly what current language teaching methodologies, like CLT, call for.

1.2.5 Evaluation of Course Design and Methodology

Semantically, the word evaluation is plainly put forward by Wallace (1998: 181) as "[it] is derived from *value*, and in its most basic sense means putting a value or estimation of worth upon something or someone (i.e. deciding how bad or good he/she/it is)", (author's italics). Nevertheless, pedagogically the notion of evaluation has been further expounded and clarified.

In fact, the identification of evaluation as the assessment of students at the end of a course has often been taken for granted. Though apparently both terms are related there still be as Nunan (1986: 185) posits "a clear distinction between the two concepts". In that assessment refers "to the processes and procedures whereby we determine what learners are able to do in the target language" (ibid). On the other hand, the concept of evaluation, according to the same

researcher, refers “*to a wider range of processes which may or may not include assessment data*” (ibid). Therefore, the concept of evaluation is broader than that of assessment. It includes all aspects of a programme: course content, objectives, learners’ learning achievements, and teachers’ classroom methodology among others.

For his part, Skilbeck (1984) has drawn a clear distinction between assessment and evaluation:

Assessment in the curriculum is a process of determining and passing judgements on students’ learning potential and performance; evaluation means assembling evidence on and making judgements about the curriculum including the processes of planning, designing, and implementing it. (Skilbeck 1984: 238, in Hedge, 2000:351)

So unlike assessment which is limited to learners’ performance judgements, evaluation covers all judgements made about courses and learners.

Moreover, as Brown (in Johnson, 1989: 244) claims evaluation should not be confused with other concepts like ‘testing’ and ‘measurement’ in that ‘testing’ is confined “solely to procedures that are based on tests”, and if added to extra sorts of “measurements, such as attendance records”, it would be identified as ‘measurement’. However, “an even broader term,” evaluation “includes all kinds of measurements as well as other types of information –some of which may be more qualitative than quantitative in nature” (ibid), for example classroom observations. Yet, for evaluating a course two varieties of evaluation can be used: summative evaluation and formative evaluation.

- **Summative evaluation:** It occurs at the end of a course to review the whole course in order to pinpoint elements for improvements (Hedge, 2000: 356). According to Brown (in Johnson, 1989: 299) the purpose for carrying out summative evaluation is “to determine whether the program was successful and effective.”
- **Formative evaluation:** This takes place during the progress of a program and its curriculum, and its aim is to collect information that will be useful for program evaluation (ibid).

Be it summative or formative, “the data resulting from evaluation assist us in deciding whether a course needs to be modified or altered in any way so that objectives may be achieved more effectively” (Nunan, 1986: 185). Thus, it is obvious that without evaluation of

course design changes in teaching methodologies cannot be made, let alone improvements.

2.2.2 British Civilization Course in First Year LMD Classes

British Civilization subject is a one semester content-based course scheduled for first year LMD students enrolled in the department of English at USDB. The time allotted for this subject is one hour and a half per week. After three years of study (which equals six semesters) these students are expected to obtain a degree of a Bachelor of Arts in English language. Hence, as a course with a dual role British Civilization subject aims at enhancing students' linguistic capacities through a content-based instruction and by the same way provides students with a general view about the British community focusing mainly on the historical aspect as we have been informed by first year LMD teachers of British Civilization.

Methods

Participants

Since the case under investigation in our research project involves first year LMD students and teachers in the Department of English at USDB, we will address both populations. The population of first year LMD students comprises 5 groups, the equivalent of approximately 230 students enrolled in the Department of English at USDB for the academic year 2009-2010. The population of British Civilization teachers in first year LMD classes comprises 5 teachers only.

Instruments

Three research instruments were used in this study, namely a questionnaire, a structured interview and first year LMD students' British Civilization exam papers.

Students' questionnaire

The students' questionnaire contains 22 items preceded by an introductory paragraph that informs the participants about the purpose of the research. The 22 items are systematically ordered and thematically divided into 5 sections each one is arranged for a specific set of information. The latter concerns: Students' general information (Q1 → Q3); Students' perception of British Civilization course (Q4 → Q09); Students' perception of their teachers' classroom methodology (Q10 → Q13); Students' difficulties (Q14 → Q18) and Students' expectations and suggestions (Q19 → Q22).

Teachers' structured interview

Teachers' structured interview is designed in the form of a questionnaire. It contains 25 questions. These questions are divided into 7 theme-based sections. These themes are hopefully meant for enlightening our research questions set up at the beginning of this study. These themes are as follows: Teachers' general information (Q1 → Q4); Teachers' perception of British Civilization course (Q5 → Q9); Teachers' perception of their students 'needs (Q10 → Q11); Teachers' classroom methodology (Q12 → Q16); Teachers' and students' roles in the classroom (Q17 → Q18); Teachers' assessment of their students' achievements and evaluation of course objectives (Q19 → Q23); Teachers' difficulties and expectations (Q24 → Q25).

Students' exam papers

To triangulate students' questionnaire and teachers' interview, students' British Civilization exam papers were used as a reliable source of eliciting information which will assist us to rationally scrutinize:

- The level of students' English linguistic productive capacities which emanates here from analyzing their writing skill going mainly over the kinds of errors and mistakes students make.
- Students' ability to understand exam questions which implies their capacity to grasp the content knowledge of British Civilization course; hence to elucidate students' English language perceptive abilities.
- Teachers' way of assessing their students; i.e. do they take into consideration language only, content only, or both of them. For teachers' way of assessing their students makes part of the evaluation of their teaching methodology.

Data analysis procedure:

We plan to analyze the information obtained by identifying it in terms of different yet interrelated themes which in their turn are explained to show their effect(s) on the situation under study; so that new insights would hopefully be yielded. Furthermore, the paradigms of research we have chosen are both quantitative and qualitative as we intend to discuss the data qualitatively and quantitatively by interpreting the respondents' answers into numbers and percentages, i.e. statistical analysis. Then, all the data collated and examined will be taken into consideration and presented either in tables and/or graphs.

Findings of the study

Does the prevailing way of teaching British Civilization course in the first year LMD classroom reflect current EFL teaching methodologies in terms of interactive communication to develop the learners' language proficiency?

Throughout a careful examination of the data collated we have been able to diagnose the tenets of British Civilization teachers' methodology in first year LMD classes. Both students (66%) and teachers (80%) confirmed that no objectives were established at the beginning of the academic year to be achieved by the end of the British Civilization course. In addition, the answers of both populations concerned by this study testify to teachers' reliance on explanation, dictation and handouts in terms of the way they deliver the course to their students. The latter, in turn, take translation for granted in order to understand the content they have been taught and would learn by heart while preparing for their British Civilization exam.

Yet, considering what has been reviewed in the literature about foreign language teaching methodologies, the teaching methodology of British Civilization in first year LMD classes falls into the stream of traditional teaching methodologies like Traditional Grammar. Therefore, as we have assumed the way of teaching British Civilization in first year LMD classes in the Department of English at USDB is inadequate and far from being reflective of current EFL teaching methodologies like the Communicative Language Teaching method.

Furthermore, first year LMD students are university EFL learners and should reveal sufficient English language command to be able to grasp the content of British Civilization course. However, this does not seem to be the case in first year LMD classes as teachers are more inclined to overestimate course content in spite of the language weaknesses students often reveal. As such, instead of taking into consideration their students' needs by being language advisors and facilitators most teachers (80%) prefer to be providers of historical information that most students find difficult and boring. Evidently, and as we have postulated, British Civilization teachers' methodology in first year LMD classes is inappropriate in respect to the development of students' language proficiency, especially as the latter is the only tool available for students to meet the difficulties of the course content.

To what extent is British civilization teachers' methodology successful in terms of helping first year LMD students to attain their achievements in the subject of British Civilization in respect to both

the development of their linguistic capacities and grasping the content knowledge of the course?

On the evidence of the results obtained from students' exam papers analysis, the majority of the students (60%) have made no advantage from studying this subject; hence no progress has been attained, i.e. students came with a weak level (teachers' interview: item 10) and ended with a weak level (students' exam papers analysis). Moreover, the way teachers assess their students does not reflect their role as EFL teachers, i.e. they seem to teach British Civilization for its own sake rather than for the sake of developing students' English language. The same can be said for the assessment of the project work where the content is overestimated at the expense of language among other aspects (teachers' interview, item 20). So, this way of assessing students underpins a teaching methodology built on shaky grounds and this hinders students' achievements in the subject of British Civilization. As such, the assumption of our second research question is confirmed.

Conclusion

English has long been established as a global language imposing itself as a means of survival, especially for the 21st world nations, and Algeria is no exception. Though EFL education in the Algerian University is increasingly gaining momentum, its achievements are still qualitatively and quantitatively far from being reflective of current EFL teaching / learning developments. A microcosm of such a phenomenon is tackled in this research which investigates the teaching methodology of British Civilization course in first year LMD classes in the Department of English at USDB, mainly in terms of being reflective of current EFL teaching methodologies and improving students' learning achievements.

Based on the literature review and the results obtained from the field investigation which was conducted by means of three research tools: students' questionnaire, teachers' structured interview and students' British Civilization exam papers analysis, we were able to confirm our assumptions that the teaching methodology of British Civilization is inadequate. It does not cope with current teaching methodologies to enhance students' language proficiency and it hinders students' achievements in British Civilization subject.

Therefore, we recommended policy-makers and administrators to reflect on the creation of balance between policy and practice, amelioration of teaching conditions, reconsideration of course content,

establishment of course goals, and focus on teacher training development. Then, for teachers we proposed teacher self-development, collaborative teaching, and classroom research.

Yet, coming to the British Civilization classroom, we find it very important to draw both teachers' and students' attention to reconsider their classroom practices. For that we suggested some key teaching techniques and tips like: flexible planning, course introduction, besides some tasks and activities to help deliver British Civilization lessons. Then, we proposed consideration of students' feedback as a good way to evaluate the adequacy of teachers' methodology.

Last but not least, we would like to call everyone involved in the Algerian EFL educational realm to work hand in hand with great commitment to boost EFL education in Algeria in general and in the Department of English at USDB in particular.

Bibliography

BERTON, G. (2007), Tasks, Learning Activities and Oral Production Skills in CLIL Classrooms, In M. Coonan (Ed.), *CLIL e l'Apprendimento delle Lingue. Le Sfide del Nuovo Ambiente di Apprendimento*, Venezia: University Ca' Foscari, Venezia, 143-151.

BRUMFIT, C.G & JOHNSON, K. (Ed.). (1979), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*, Oxford: OUP.

CHAPPLE, L & CURTIS, A. (2002), Content-based Instruction in Hong Kong: Students Responses to Film, *System* (28), 419-433.

CRYSTAL, D. (1995), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, Cambridge: CUP.

ELS. T. V, BONGAERTS. T, EXTRA. G, VAN OS. C & DIETEN. J-V. (1984), *Applied Linguistics and the Learning and Teaching of Foreign Language*, Trans. by Oirsouw, R. GB. Arlond Ltd.

HEDGE, T. (2000), *Teaching and Learning in the English Classroom*, Oxford: OUP.

IDRI, N. (2005), The LMD System Experience as a Struggle between the Educational Development and Reform: An Analytical Study of the Endeavour of the Academic year 2004/2005 in Bejaia University with Suggested Solutions, *Rencontres Internationales sur le Dispositif LMD- Problèmes et Perspectives* 4-6 Déc, 2005- Université de Bejaia.

JOHSON, R. (Ed.) (1989). *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.

KUMARAVADIVELU, B. (2007). Learner Perception of Learning Tasks. In Van den Branden, K., Gorp, K. & Varhelst (Ed.) (2007). *Tasks in Action: Task-Based Language Education from a Classroom Perspective*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: UK.

LONG, M. H& CROOKES, G. (1992), Three Approaches to Task-based Syllabus Design, *TESOL Quarterly 26 (1)*, 27-56.

MILIANI, M. (2005), The Competency-Based Approach to Language Teaching: Mind the Bandwagon Effect!, 6-8 March, communication presented in a colloquium held at the University of Tizi-Ouzou, 1-3.

McDONOUGH, J. et al. (2013). Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide. John Wiley& Sons, Inc. Wiley Blackwell: UK.

NUNAN, D. (2004), *Task-Based Language Teaching*, Cambridge: CUP.

NUNAN, D. (1986), *Research Methods in Language Learning*, Cambridge: CUP.

RICHARDS, J. & RODGERS, T. (1986), *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A description and analysis*, Cambridge: CUP.

RICHARDS, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: CUP.

RODGERS, T. (2001), Language Teaching Methodology, *ERIC Clearninghouse on Languages and Linguistics*. Center for Applied linguistics. WDC. WWW.CAL.ORG/ERICCLL.

RODRIGUES, E. (2015). Curriculum Design and Language Learning: An Analysis of English Textbooks in Brazil. PhD Dissertation <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>.

SREEHARI, P. (2012). *Communicative Language Teaching: Possibilities and Problems*. English Language Teaching 5 (12). Canadian Center of Science and Education. www.ccsenet.org/elt

SAVIGNON, S. (Ed.) (2002). *Integrating Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*, London. Yale University.

TUOMAALA, S. (2013), Behaviourism versus Intercultural Education in the Novel Purple Hibiscus: A Literature Study of Education in Purple Hibiscus from a Swedish Perspective. *Teacher Education*, Sodertorn University.

WALLACE, M. (1998), *Action Research for Language Teachers*, Cambridge: CUP.