



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila



Institute of Literature and Languages: English Language
Department of Letters and Foreign Languages

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirement of the Master
Degree in

Language Sciences and Didactics of Language

Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach

A Case Study of First Year Students of English at Abdelhafid

Boussouf University Center of Mila

Submitted by:

Guessas Chabila

Bouafia Aya

Supervisor:

Dr. Dounia Saadi

2018 - 2019

Dedication

To our respectful teachers from the primary school to the university

To our caring parents and beloved siblings

To our dearest nearest, and kind friends

To Aya's husband "Fouad"

We dedicate this work

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, our special thanks and deepest appreciation go to Dr. Saadi Dounia for being kind enough to accept directing this work, we would like also to thank her for her valuable advice, help, and trustworthy knowledge without which this work could not have been carried out.

We are further indebted to all those kind teachers and students at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages for their generous contributions and comments to our study.

We also acknowledge our greatest gratitude to all the authors, researchers, and scholars that have been referred to in this thesis.

Abstract

Questions which are typically and frequently raised in current language teaching are basically related to the teaching of grammar. Not surprisingly, a large body of literature has been specifically dedicated to it. Throughout the history of teaching Grammar there have been always controversial issues that take the greatest portions of scholars' interest, one fundamental question which is arisen by many language practitioners concerns which appropriate teaching model to follow. While some of them still approve of and believe in the value of building sound grammatical knowledge through explicit and direct instruction which is adopted by the Structural Approach, others seem to be enthusiastically inclined towards newest communicative doctrines which advocate the usefulness of the communicative practices in developing primarily the communicative skills of the learners which are thought necessary in a widely globalized world. Still, there are others who are of the view that both approaches are remarkably valuable that is why they call for the integration of both approaches within an ideal teaching model that is the Structural/Communicative Approach. Considering the issue of teaching phrasal verbs which is of paramount importance in the English grammar, the present study is conducted specifically to investigate the usefulness of the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching this particular language form at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages, Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila. We hypothesise that if phrasal verbs are taught systematically through the Structural/Communicative Approach, students would improve their understanding and use of phrasal verbs. We also hypothesize that the Structural /Communicative Approach may become dominant and useful in teaching phrasal verbs . The hypotheses are verified by means of a Teachers' Questionnaire and a Students' Questionnaire. Based on the data obtained from both questionnaires, we can confirm our hypotheses especially that both the teachers and the students agreed that using the Structural/Communicative Approach is virtually effective in the

teaching of phrasal verbs.

List of Abbreviations

Adv.: Adverb

CA: Communicative Approach

CBI: Content-Based Instruction

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

ESL: English as a Second Language

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

N: Noun

O: Object

Parti.: Particle

Phr. V : Phrasal Verb

Prep. : Preposition

SLA : Second Language Acquisition

TBI : Task-Based Instruction

V : Verb

List of Tables

Table 1.1. : Phrasal Verbs with their Equivalent One-Word Verbs.....	8
Table 3.1. : Degree Held by the Teachers.....	49
Table 3.2. : The Teachers' Experience of Teaching.....	49
Table 3.3. : The Teachers' Experience of Teaching Grammar.....	50
Table 3.4. : The Teachers' Opinions about the Difficulty of Teaching Grammar.....	51
Table 3.5. : The Teachers' Opinions about the Most Difficult Grammatical Aspects.....	52
Table 3.6. : The Relationship between the Method of Teaching Grammar and the Nature of the Grammatical Aspect.....	53
Table 3.7. : The Teachers' Familiarity with the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	54
Table 3.8. : Rate of the Teachers' Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	54
Table 3.9. : The Reason for the Teachers' Lack of Using the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	55
Table 3.10.: The Frequency of the Teachers' Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	57
Table 3.11. : The Teachers' Opinions towards the Use of the Fun Aspect in their Teaching of Grammar.....	58
Table 3.12. : The Teachers' Reasons for Supporting the Fun Aspect.....	58
Table 3.13. : The Teachers' Opinion about the Difficulty of Teaching Phrasal Verbs.....	59
Table 3.14. : The Teachers' Reasons for the Difficulty of Phrasal Verbs.....	60

Table 3.15. : The Teachers' Method of Teaching Phrasal Verbs.....	61
Table 3.16. : The Teachers' Attitude towards the Influences of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	62
Table 3.17. : The Rate of the Teachers' Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	63
Table 3.18. : The Students' Beliefs about the Importance of Grammar in the English Language.....	65
Table 3.19. : The Students' Opinion about the Grammatical Aspect they Find Most Difficult.....	67
Table 3.20. : The Students' Preference of how to Be Exposed to Grammatical Content.....	69
Table 3.21. : The Students' Knowledge of the English Phrasal Verb.....	70
Table 3.22. : The Students' Opinion about the Importance of Phrasal Verbs in Learning English.....	71
Table 3.23. : The Students' Views about the Importance of Learning Phrasal Verbs in a Fun Way.....	71
Table 3.24. : The Students' Reasons for their Preference of Learning Phrasal Verbs in a Fun Way.....	72
Table 3.25. : The Students' Reasons for their Negative Attitudes towards the Fun Way in their learning of Phrasal Verbs.....	73
Table 3.26. : The Students' Use of Phrasal Verbs.....	74

Table 3.27. : The Students' Use of Phrasal Verbs in their Discourse.....	75
Table 3.28. : The Students' Use of Phrasal Verbs in Relation to their Semantic Categories.....	75
Table 3.29. : The Students' Reactions towards the Huge Number of Phrasal Verbs and their Polysemy.....	76
Table 3.30. : The Students' Opinion about the Frequency of their Teacher's Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	77
Table 3.31. : The Students' Opinions about the Frequency of their Teacher's Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	78
Table 3.32. : The Students' Opinion about the Way their Teacher Teaches Phrasal Verbs.....	79
Table 3.33. : The Students' Opinion about the Rate of their Teacher's Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach in Teaching Phrasal Verbs.....	80
Table 3.34. : The Students' Belief about the Usefulness of the Structural/Communicative Approach in their Learning of Phrasal Verbs.....	80

List of Figures

Figure 2.1.: Learning Procedures According to the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	41
---	-----------

List of Contents

General Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem.....	2
2. Aims of the Study.....	2
3. Research Questions and Hypothese.....	3
4. Means of Research	3
5. Structure of the Study.....	4

Chapter One : Phrasal Verbs

Introduction	7
1.1. Definitions of Phrasal verbs.....	7
1.2. The Grammar of Phrasal verbs.....	8
1.2.1. Verb + Preposition.....	9
1.2.2. Verb + Adverb.....	9
1.2.3. Verb + Adverb + Preposition.....	10
1.3. Characteristics of Phrasal verbs	10
1.3.1. Syntactic Characteristics.....	11
1.3.1.1. Intransitive Phrasal verbs	11
1.3.1.2. Transitive Phrasal Verbs.....	12
1.3.2. Semantic Charasteristics	14
1.3.2.1. Literal Phrasal Verbs.....	14

1.3.2.2. Semi Transparent Phrasal Verbs.....	14
1.3.2.3. Idiomatic Phrasal Verbs	15
1.4. Difficulties and Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs.....	16
1.5. The Importance of Phrasal Verbs.....	20
Conclusion.....	21

Chapter Two: The Structural/Communicative Approach

Introduction.....	25
2.1. The Structural Approach.....	25
2.1.1. Background to the Structural Approach.....	25
2.1.2. Key Principles of the Structural Approach.....	26
2.1.3. Methods of the Structural Approach.....	27
2.1.3.1. The Grammar Translation Method.....	28
2.1.3.2. The Direct Method.....	28
2.1.3.3. The Situational Language Teaching.....	29
2.1.3.4. The Audio Lingual Method.....	29
2.2. The Communicative Approach.....	30
2.2.1. Background to the Communicative Approach.....	31
2.2.2. Principles of the Communicative Approach.....	32
2.2.3. Types of the Communicative Approach.....	34

2.2.3.1. Process-based Instructions.....	34
2.2.3.1.1. Content- Based Instructions.....	34
2.2.3.1.2. Task –Based Instructions.....	35
2.2.3.2. Product- Based Instructions.....	36
2.2.3.2.1. Text-Based Instructions.....	36
2.2.3.2.1. Competency-Based Instructions.....	36
2.3. The Structural/Communicative Approach.....	37
2.3.1. Definition of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	38
2.3.2. Principles of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....	39
2.3.3. Merits of the Communicative-Structural Approach.....	44
Conclusion.....	45

Chapter Three: The Teachers’ and the Students’ Opinion about Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach

Introduction.....	47
3.1. The Teachers’ Questionnaire.....	47
3.1.1. Description of the Teachers’ Questionnaire.....	47
3.1.2. Analysis of the Teachers’ Questionnaire.....	48
3.2. The Students’ Questionnaire.....	64
3.2.1. Description of the Students’ Questionnaire.....	64

3.2.3. Analysis of the Students' Questionnaire.....	65
3.3. Overall Analysis.....	82
Conclusion.....	83
General Conclusion.....	85
References.....	104

Appendices

Appendix I: The Teachers' Questionnaire

Appendix II: The Students' Questionnaire

General Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem.....	2
2. Aims of the Study.....	2
3. Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	3
4. Means of Research	3
5. Structure of the Study.....	4

1. Statement of the Problem

Grammar has been always one of the most controversial and least understood aspect in language teaching and learning. Like the many other subject matters, Grammar has its own areas of dissent and disputes. Throughout its history, the teaching of Grammar has recognized many shifts and changes, in the 19th century Grammar was central in the teaching practice where direct and explicit instruction was believed necessary to the learning of any language, this was believed necessary to the learning of any language, this was dominant view imposed by the Structural/Communicative Approach. However, more recently and with the advent of the Communicative Language Teaching, a massive shake-up has undertaken the teaching practice where explicit and direct instruction is longer important, what is mostly important is the building up of the communicative competence. Yet, it is believed that the invention of an approach that merges the structural principles with the communicative ones, together, they yield a complete approach in the teaching of English in general, and more specifically Grammar.

Concerning the issue of teaching phrasal verbs which constitutes many challenging difficulties to the majority of EFL and ESL teachers and learners, it is suggested that phrasal verbs can be appropriately taught within the scope of the Structural/Communicative Approach where direct and explicit instruction is provided first in which the primary focus is on “form”, then communicative activities are included through which the focus is paid to meaningful communicative interactions among the students.

2. Aims of the Study

Since phrasal verbs are a distinctive grammatical category in the English language, the present study seeks to investigate the teaching of this particular language form using the

Structural/Communicative Approach. The Effectiveness of this respective approach is measured and examined through a Teachers' Questionnaire and a Students' Questionnaire through which we aim to also shed light on their perceptions and attitudes towards the implementation of the Structural/Communicative Approach.

3. Research Questions and Hypothesis

The study raises two fundamental questions:

- Is the Structural/Communicative Approach suitable for the teaching of phrasal verbs?
- What are the main difficulties encountered when trying to learn phrasal verbs?

In the light of the above research concerns, the study is founded on the ground of the following hypotheses:

- If the Structural/Communicative Approach is used to teach phrasal verbs, the students' understanding and use of this grammatical aspect will be developed.
- The Structural/Communicative Approach may become dominant and useful in teaching phrasal verbs.

4. Means of Research

In order to measure the effectiveness of the Structural/Communicative Approach in the teaching of phrasal verbs, the study has opted for a Teachers' Questionnaire and a Students' Questionnaire as a valuable research means to collect data about the teachers' and the students' attitudes, perceptions, and opinions towards the implementation of this respective approach in the teaching of phrasal verbs. The Teachers' Questionnaire is handed to 12 teachers of English at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages, Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila. In turn the Students' Questionnaire is handed to 70 first

year students of English at the Department of Letters and Foreign Language, Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila. The data obtained from both questionnaires will be of great value to the present study.

5. The Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into three chapters, two theoretical and more practical. The first chapter, “Phrasal Verbs”, focuses on phrasal verbs as an essential aspect in the English Grammar, it provides definitions of the term ‘phrasal verbs’, explores its Grammar, describes its syntactic and semantic properties, and most importantly it investigates the main difficulties encountered by learners when trying to learn phrasal verbs and which eventually leads to the recurrent phenomenon of phrasal verbs avoidance, and finally it accounts for the crucial importance of phrasal verbs in the English language.

The second chapter is about the Structural/Communicative Approach. This latter has been divided into three sections. The first section “the Structural Approach” deals with the Structural Approach in terms of its background, principles as well as the different methods associated with it. The second section “the Communicative Approach” discusses the background of this approach, its principles, and the types of the Communicative Approach. The third section “the Structural/Communicative Approach”, which is the core of our research. It devoted to explore the background of this respective approach, its definition, principles and merits.

The third chapter “the Teachers’ and the Students’ Opinions about Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach” includes the practical side of our research, and it is dedicated to analyze and discuss the data obtained from the Teachers’ Questionnaire and the Students’ Questionnaire.

Chapter One : Phrasal Verbs

Introduction

1.2. Definitions of Phrasal verbs.....

1.2. The Grammar of Phrasal verbs.....

1.2.1. Verb + Preposition.....

1.2.2. Verb + Adverb.....

1.2.3. Verb + Adverb + Preposition.....

1.3. Characteristics of Phrasal verbs

1.3.1. Syntactic Characteristics.....

1.3.1.1. Intransitive Phrasal verbs

1.3.1.2. Transitive Phrasal Verbs.....

1.3.2. Semantic Characteristics

1.3.2.1. Literal Phrasal Verbs.....

1.3.2.2. Semi Transparent Phrasal Verbs.....

1.3.2.3. Idiomatic Phrasal Verbs

1.4. Difficulties and Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs.....

1.5. The Importance of Phrasal Verbs.....

Conclusion.....

Chapter One : Phrasal Verbs

Introduction

1.3. Definitions of Phrasal verbs.....

1.2. The Grammar of Phrasal verbs.....

1.2.1. Verb + Preposition.....

1.2.2. Verb + Adverb.....

1.2.3. Verb + Adverb + Preposition.....

1.3. Characteristics of Phrasal verbs

1.3.1. Syntactic Characteristics.....

1.3.1.1. Intransitive Phrasal verbs

1.3.1.2. Transitive Phrasal Verbs.....

1.3.2. Semantic Characteristics

1.3.2.1. Literal Phrasal Verbs.....

1.3.2.2. Semi Transparent Phrasal Verbs.....

1.3.2.3. Idiomatic Phrasal Verbs

1.4. Difficulties and Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs.....

1.5. The Importance of Phrasal Verbs.....

Conclusion.....

Introduction

English phrasal verbs are distinctive aspects in the English grammar. Thim (2012:45) states that “from the very beginning the use of the term phrasal verbs implies that the construction is distinctively English “. They are said to be exclusive to native speakers whose conversations are remarkably loaded with this particular language form. Many researchers and EFL learners agree that phrasal verbs are among the most problematic and hardest language structures to be learned or acquired (Celce-Murcia and Larsen Freeman, 1999). So, despite their usefulness and frequent use, EFL learners seem to avoid them. This is mainly due to their difficulty.

In this chapter phrasal verbs are discussed in terms of their definitions, grammar, syntactic and semantic characteristics as well as difficulties regarding them. No less importantly, this chapter also addresses the recurrent issue and phenomenon of phrasal verbs avoidance, and it accounts also for the importance of phrasal verbs.

1.1. Definitions of Phrasal Verbs

Many studies have been conducted with respect to phrasal verbs to mention but few (Dagut and Laufer, 1985; Darwin and Gray, 1999; Liao and Fukuya, 2004; Anna and Schmitt, 2007). Not surprisingly, various terms and definitions have been proposed to refer to them. The term phrasal verb is used in many works as an umbrella term for all Multi-word verbs categories. This can, for example, be seen in (Courtney, 1983), where phrasal verbs are defined as idiomatic combinations of a verb and an adverb, a verb and a preposition, or a verb with both an adverb and a preposition, or in Celce-Murcia and Larsen Freeman (1999), who define phrasal verbs as a phrase which consists of a verb paired with a preposition or an adverb or both. The meaning of which is different from its separate parts.

Moreover, among dictionaries' definitions, the definition provided by the Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary is worthy to be credited as it states that phrasal verbs or Multi-word verbs which consist of two, or sometimes of three words. The first word is a verb and it is followed by an adverb (turn down) or a preposition (eat into) or both (put up with). These adverbs or prepositions are sometimes called particles (1995: 310-311).

Since phrasal verbs are mainly used in spoken communication of the native speakers, they are often described as being less formal than their one-word equivalents which are usually used in more formal contexts. So, when learners opt to one-word verbs, they sound more formal. This point was discussed in the work of McCarthy and O'Dell (2004) who provided these following examples:

Less formal	More formal
Let's put off the meeting until Friday.	Let's postpone the meeting until Friday.
Please take off your shoes when you enter the temple.	Please remove your shoes when you enter the temple.
Everyone turned up on time for the meeting.	Everyone arrived on time for the meeting.

Table 1.1.: Phrasal Verbs with their Equivalent One-Word Verbs

(McCarthy and O'Dell, 2004: 4)

1.2. The Grammar of Phrasal Verbs

The verb is the main element in the construction of a phrasal verb. Murcia & Freeman (1999: 426) explained that a phrasal verb is made up of two or more parts that function as a single verb. Phrasal Verbs are made up by adding particles. So, they can be classified into,

prepositional (verb + preposition), adverbial (verb + adverb), or phrasal-prepositional verb (verb + adverb + preposition), depending on their particles. The particle is either a preposition (from, with, at...), or an adverb (about, above, up...) (McCarthy and O'Dell, 2004: 10).

1.2.1. Verb + Preposition

A prepositional phrasal verb is formed by the combination of a lexical verb and a preposition.

These phrasal verbs are transitive and non-separable; the complement always goes after the phrasal verb, and the object always follows the preposition because the verb and the preposition are inseparable, for example:

Eg1. I really cared about my cousin.

V Prep.

Eg2. My mother picked on nobody.

V + Prep.

Eg3. Joe came across this old painting in the attic.

V + Prep.

1.2.2. Verb + Adverb

A phrasal verb or an adverbial verb consists of a verb and an adverb; it does not take a complement. Unlike prepositional verbs, adverbial verbs can be transitive or intransitive.

In case they are transitive, they are separable. For example:

Eg1. They get together every day.

V+Adv.

Eg2. Jane picked the book up.

V Adv.

Eg3. Do not get out from the house.

V + Adv.

1.2.3. Verb+ Adverb+ Preposition

When a phrasal verb consists of three parts, it is called a phrasal-prepositional verb. The adverbial part always precedes the prepositional part. The object which is either a noun or a pronoun always goes after the phrasal verb (the three parts cannot be separated), for example:

Eg1. He is looking forward to a rest .

V Adv. Prep.

Eg2. You can't back out of this agreement.

V Adv. Prep.

Eg3. I really look up to my teachers.

V Adv. Prep.

1.3. The Characteristics of Phrasal Verbs

Turning to the characteristics of phrasal verbs, this section explores some descriptions and discussions regarding the syntactic properties as well as the semantic ones. The syntactic characteristics look at the issues of ‘‘transitivity and non-transitivity’’ and ‘‘separability and non-separability’’. The semantics of phrasal verbs is more concerned with the different meanings expressed by phrasal verbs as it classifies phrasal verbs semantically into three main categories which are: literal, aspectual and figurative phrasal verbs.

1.3.1. Syntactic Characteristics of Phrasal Verbs

Regarding the syntactic properties of phrasal verbs, they are usually divided into four main types; intransitive, transitive, transitive-separable, and transitive-inseparable phrasal verbs.

1.3.1.1. Intransitive Phrasal Verbs

Phrasal Verbs that do not take a direct object are called intransitive phrasal verbs. Many authors such as Quirk et al. (1985: 95) call intransitive phrasal verbs “ type 1 phrasal verb “. The verb and particle in this group convey a complete meaning by themselves. Thus, there is no possibility to attach any object to the construction. For example, ‘pass away’ means ‘ to die’.

Eg. Mr.Riley passed away. It is not possible to say Mr.Riley passed away him or Mr.Riley passed him away.

Yet it is possible to add further information to the construction, for example;

Eg1. The car broke down on the motorway.

V

Eg2. The bank robbers got away in a stolen van.

V

In the case of intransitive phrasal verbs the verb and its particle are particularly non-separable;

Eg. I get up at 08 o'clock →not: I get at 08 o'clock up.

Since verbs in this category never accept an object, some students may find them the easiest to acquire, mainly due to the fact that they are less worried about

separating or not separating the verb and its particle because there is no object. This type of phrasal verbs does not take the passive form.

1.3.1.2. Transitive Phrasal Verbs

In this type of phrasal verbs, the verb has an object unlike intransitive phrasal verbs. They are called type 2 phrasal verbs. Transitive phrasal verbs must be followed by an object, otherwise the meaning is incomplete.

For example:

, Eg 1. Jane takes after her sister.

Phr. V O

Eg2. Brenda ran into Philip at the station.

Phr. V O

The notion of separability and non-separability is a salient feature in this category. Transitive phrasal verbs are further classified into separable phrasal verbs and non-separable phrasal verbs.

Concerning transitive separable phrasal verbs Celce-Murcia and Larsen Freeman (1999:64) comment that this is a peculiarity of transitive phrasal verbs and that it means that the particle of a phrasal verb can be separated from its lexical verb by a direct object. Similarly, Darwin and Gray (1999: 69) remark that the speaker has the choice of where the particle will appear, giving examples:

Eg1. They have decided to call off the match . Or, they have decided to call

V Parti. O V

the match off.

O Parti.

The choice, however, is only possible when the direct object is a noun.

Mc Arthur (1989: 39) points out that when the direct object is a pronoun, that pronoun must be placed between the verb and the particle. Considering the following examples:

Eg1. I called up my mother .

V Parti. N.O

Eg2. I called my mother up .

V N.O Parti.

Eg3. I called her up .

V Pron.O Parti.

As for transitive non-separable phrasal verbs they cannot be separated. The particle has only one possible fixed position in the sentence as it immediately follows the verb.

Eg1. (Take after =be similar to: he takes after his mother. Not: he takes his mother after).

Moreover, it doesn't matter whether the object is a noun or a pronoun, because it must be located after the V + particle combination. Even if the object is a pronoun object, it must be located after the phrasal verb.

Eg2. I love coffee. I can't do without it in the morning (not do it without).

V Parti. Pron. O

The verb + two particles construction (i.e.): V+ Adv. + Prep. are especially non- separable “since they have two particles following the verb “ (Yahia, 2009: 11) .

Eg3. Do you get along with your new boss?

V Adv. Prep.

1.3.2. Semantic Characteristics of Phrasal Verbs

Concerning the semantic criterion, phrasal verbs are usually organized into categories according to their semantic properties. (Celce – Murcia and Larsen Freeman, 1999 as cited in Castillo, 2017: 95) identify three types of phrasal verbs; literal, aspectual, and idiomatic phrasal verbs.

1.3.2.1. Literal Phrasal Verbs

Waibel (2007: 16) maintains that most of the time, the terms “literal “and “transparent “are used interchangeably. In this category, the meaning of the phrasal verbs is straightforward as it can be easily guessed or deduced from the basic transparent meaning of its constituent parts. Consider the following examples:

Eg1. Can you bring up the radio from downstairs?

Eg2. Put on your coat.

The meanings of the phrasal verbs in the above examples are clearly understood, as the items; “bring, up and put, on“retain their literal original meanings.

“These Phrasal Verbs are the easiest for English language learners to acquire, since their meanings are transparent “(Thom, 2017: 55).

1.3.2.2. Aspectual Phrasal Verbs

A number of terms are used with regard to this second category, for example , Celce-Murcia and Larsen Freeman (1999: 432) call them “ Aspectual Phrasal Verbs “, while Quirk et al.(1985: 1162) call them “Semi-idiomatic“.

Dagut and Laufer (1985) used the term “Completive Phrasal Verbs“, and Laufer and Eliason (1993) preferred the term “Semi-literal“. This terminological issue does not arise any kind of conceptual divergence among these respective researchers as they all agree that the verbal element of these phrasal verbs in general retains its original meaning, while the particle is non-transparent and usually contributes an aspectual meaning; in other words, it specifies the verb. For example:

Eg. “run on“, “carry on“, and “hurry along”

(Fahrol et al., 2016: 03). The verbal elements in such examples are transparent in meanings; the particles nevertheless add a very specific dimension to the overall meaning which is not transparent. On in run on and carry on, implies a continuative property as does along in hurry along.

Another example can be : “ eat up“, “mix up “ , the particle in such phrasal verbs does not imply (direction) or (movement) from a lower to a higher position , but ‘entirely, completely’ (Waibel, 2007).

1.3.2.3. Idiomatic Phrasal Verbs

The “figurative, opaque or non-literal/ transparent phrasal verbs are used to refer to this category“ Waibel (2007). As with respect to idiomatic phrasal verbs, both the lexical verb and its particle have an idiomatic figurative meaning; a meaning which is hard to be predicted from the literal interpretation of its individual parts. For example:

Eg. I ‘came across’ a wallet this morning.

‘Come across’ is an idiomatic phrasal verb, whereby neither the lexical verb “come“ nor the particle “across“ are understood literally. Together, they create a completely figurative meaning which has nothing to do with the literal meaning of its constituent parts.

Unlike literal phrasal verbs which EFL learners acquire with remarkable ease, idiomatic phrasal verbs constitute a learning problem to EFL learners.

(Yorio, 1989 as cited in Waibel, 2007: 27) showed that EFL learners used figurative phrasal verbs less frequently than literal ones , similarly, (Wierszycka, 2013 as cited in Radišić, 2018: 27) pointed out that the most neglected and avoided category among EFL learners is the one of idiomatic phrasal verbs.

1.4. Difficulties and Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs

Phrasal Verbs usually constitute a problematic challenge to the majority of EFL learners. They are considered among the hardest aspects in the English language. For example, Schmitt and Redwood (2011) claim that semantic complexity, in addition to particle movement are the main difficulties presented to learners. Concerning the first reason, phrasal verbs are perceived as difficult by learners because their meaning is more than often opaque and problematic to grasp. Two frequent and seemingly simple components, that is a monosyllabic verb, for instance a verb (run) and a particle (into) constitute a new lexical unit whose meaning is completely figurative:

Eg. I ran into an old friend at the bus station this morning.

In addition to the problematic issue of opacity, there is also the notion of polysemy. A considerable number of phrasal verbs are polysemous in meaning, i.e. (they have the potential to express more than one only meaning depending on the context given), and the semantic link between the different senses is not always transparent for example:

Eg. Fill in a hole and fill in a form.

The second reason is the particle movement. Separable phrasal verbs confuse learners by letting them decide where the particle should be inserted in the construction as the particle may be separated from their verbs by pronouns, adverbs or noun phrases.

Eg1. She put it down on the table.

Eg2. I will come straight over to see you.

Eg3. We tried to calm the old woman down.

Blau, Gonzales, and Green (1983) point out that the placement of objects in relation to the particle is able to create confusion to students, i.e. whether certain phrasal verbs are separable or non-separable.

In addition to the above mentioned semantic and syntactic complexities. Bolinger (1971) notes that native speakers generate novel phrasal verbs regularly (White, 2012: 240). This huge number of phrasal verbs in the English language is a challenging factor to EFL learners.

Most importantly, phrasal verbs are a marked construction in the English language and other languages with a Germanic background. Thus making them difficult for speakers whose mother tongues are non-Germanic, subsequently the difficulties encountered by EFL learners when endeavoring to master phrasal verbs lead them eventually to consistently avoid them.

In fact, avoidance in the usage of phrasal verbs has been an area of research in second language acquisition (SLA), learners typically prefer to use one-word verb instead of using a phrasal verb. Avoidance implies choice, since students have the same extent passive knowledge and are well familiar with different types of one-word verbs as well as two-word

verbs; their choice of one word-verb indicates their avoidance of such elements. Actually, a number of studies have been conducted specifically to address this very phenomenon.

To tackle this issue, Dagut and Laufer (1985) conducted a study which is said to be the first one to discuss explicitly the avoidance of phrasal verbs. The overall results showed that although Hebrew-speaking university students of English were familiar with the phrasal verbs which were presented in the tests, they preferred a single verb over a phrasal verb. Dagut and Laufer concluded from the results that since there is no phrasal verb equivalent in Hebrew, learners “avoid using what they do not properly understand “(1985: 78). The authors also concluded that, since phrasal verbs are a peculiarity of the Germanic languages, all learners of English with a non-Germanic mother tongue will undoubtedly avoid phrasal verbs. The final conclusion was that; the absence of a similar or corresponding L2 feature or form in the learners’ native language prevents its use in L2 production.

Based on the Dagut and Laufer’s (1985) research findings, Hulstijn and Marchena (1989) conducted a similar study which targeted learners with a Germanic L1 background. They tested Dutch learners of English, bearing in mind the proficiency levels (intermediate and advanced learners). Their hypothesis was that structural differences between L1 and L2 are not the only impedimental reasons to the use of phrasal verbs; semantic complexities should also be accounted. They found out that Dutch intermediate learners used less phrasal verbs and preferred simple verbs with a general meaning over phrasal verbs with a more specialized or idiomatic meaning compared to the advanced Dutch ones. Yet, both Dutch intermediate and advanced learners of English still use more phrasal verbs than Hebrew learners. Consequently, this result can be considered as an indirect support to Dagut and Laufer (1985). Furthermore, the research also drew attention to the semantic difficulties which hinder the advanced and intermediate Dutch learners from producing phrasal verbs, especially that it was noted from the results obtained that the Dutch learners remarkably avoid

idiomatic phrasal verbs and even those phrasal verbs similar to their Dutch counterparts, believing that translating word for word can be misleading and they may commit mistakes. The study established that structural and semantic similarities of L1 and L2 can be seen as impedimental factors contributing to the phenomenon of phrasal verbs avoidance (Waibel, 2007: 23).

Laufer and Eliason's (1993) is another important study which addresses and questions the above mentioned studies. In essence, their research tested whether avoidance is a result of L2 inherent semantic difficulties or structural (dis) similarities between the L1 and the foreign language. Two groups of advanced Hebrew and Swedish learners of English were selected as informants. It was found out that Swedish learners used significantly more phrasal verbs than Dagut and Laufer's (1985) Hebrew learners. Subsequently, approving of the Dagut and Laufer's assumption that avoidance should be attributed to the structural differences between the L1 and the L2 (Waibel, 2007: 24).

Laufer and Eliason (1993) contradicted Hulstijn Marchena's (1989) research finding, as it is suggested that L2 semantic complexity is not an important impedimental factor. Swedish learners remarkably used literal and idiomatic phrasal verbs in a balanced way. They also used more opaque "idiomatic" phrasal verbs than Hebrew and Dutch learners. Swedish learners did not refrain from using opaque phrasal verbs with a Swedish translation equivalent. Thus, "idiomatic meaning similarity between L1 and L2 does not necessarily induce learner disbelief and subsequent avoidance", consequently agreeing with Dagut and Laufer (1985) and disapproving with Hulstijn Marchena (1989) (Waibel, 2007: 25).

Following this research, Liao and Fukuya (2004) conducted their own analysis of phrasal verbs use by Chinese advanced and intermediate learners of English. The intermediate learners in this research used fewer phrasal verbs than advanced learners. Surprisingly, in this

study, the advanced group performed similarly to native speakers. They used nearly as many phrasal verbs as native speakers. Liao and Fukuya explain the intermediate learners' avoidance by the structural differences between English and Chinese (Chinese has no equivalent to English phrasal verbs). Subsequently, this lends further support to the previous studies. The fact that advanced learners performed much better than intermediate learners was interpreted by the notion that "learning seems to have counteracted the effects of the L1-L2 differences" (Liao & Fukuya, 2004:212) which supports their results.

The ideas which exerted the greatest influence from these four major studies confirmed the notion that L1-L2 structural and semantic distance is an impedimental hindrance to the use of phrasal verbs. As it was remarkably noticed that participants who share non-Germanic languages (Hebrew, Chinese) are more likely to avoid phrasal verbs compared to those participants whose mother tongue has Germanic origins as the case of (Swedish and Dutch). No less importantly, those studies show that advanced EFL learners are more likely to use more phrasal verbs than that at a lower level.

1.5. The Importance of Phrasal Verbs:

Phrasal Verbs occupy a large body of literature in the English language, as evidence by the great variety of books, dictionaries, and grammar references books exclusively devoted to phrasal verbs and their use. The importance of phrasal verbs is obvious in EFL. (Bywater, 1982: 97) perfectly summed up the necessity of learning and teaching phrasal verbs:

"The plain fact is that what distinguishes the writing and above all the speech of good foreign student from those of an Englishman is that what an Englishman writes or says is full of these expressions whereas most foreigners are frightened of them, carefully avoid them, and sound stilted in consequences. Foreign students who enjoy being flattered on their English can best achieve this by correctly using masses of these compound verbs" (Waibel, 2007).

It should be noted that phrasal verbs are ubiquitous, especially that they are extremely common, and they form a large part of conversational English, thus making EFL learners confused when they cannot understand sentences containing them . Hence, the necessity of learning phrasal verbs is advocated by many researchers. Armstrong (2004) emphasized the necessity of developing at least receptive knowledge of phrasal verbs, which will help them decode those phrasal verbs they encounter later.

As proposed by Cornell (1985), phrasal verbs are notably essential to comprehend and communicate with native speakers since they are commonly used in spoken and informal written language. Moreover, (Vasbieva, 2015) noted that “phrasal verbs perform an essential function due to the greater succinctness and at the same time more expressive coloring “(60).

Brown (2004: 1) also stated that the number of phrasal verbs is increasingly developing. The formal and informal registers of British, American and Australian English is loaded with this particular language form. Knowledge of the most common of these is essential if one wants to understand and speak English well.

Conclusion

This chapter reveals that the issue of phrasal verbs is really controversial. From its definition which arises terminological divergence among its respective authors and researchers, to their syntactic complexities and semantic difficulties, and no less importantly to their peculiarity in the English language, and the recurrent issue of the avoidance phenomenon. Despite all these problematic issues, phrasal verbs are worthy to be explored and investigated as they are very common in the natives’ daily discourse. One important point concerning this grammatical category is the fact that they have proved to be really hard and difficult to be taught and learned as well. In order to make their acquisition and teaching easier, one of the newest approaches is used to teach them which is the

Structural/Communicative Approach, which will be discussed in the second chapter of this thesis.

Chapter Two: The Structural/Communicative Approach

Introduction.....	
2.1. The Structural Approach.....	
2.1.1. Background to the Structural Approach.....	
2.1.2. Key Principles of the Structural Approach.....	
2.1.3. Methods of the Structural Approach.....	
2.1.3.1. The Grammar Translation Method.....	
2.1.3.2. The Direct Method.....	
2.1.3.3. The Situational Language Teaching.....	
2.1.3.4. The Audio Lingual Method.....	
2.2. The Communicative Approach.....	
2.2.1. Background to the Communicative Approach.....	
2.2.2. Principles of the Communicative Approach.....	
2.2.3. Types of the Communicative Approach.....	
2.2.3.1. Process-based Instructions.....	
2.2.3.1.1. Content- Based Instructions.....	
2.2.3.1.2. Task –Based Instructions.....	
2.2.3.2. Product- Based Instructions.....	
2.2.3.2.1. Text-Based Instructions.....	

2.2.3.2.1. Competency-Based Instructions.....

2.3. The Structural/Communicative Approach.....

2.3.1. Background to the Structural/Communicative Approach.....

2.3.2. Definition of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....

2.3.3. Principles of the Structural/Communicative Approach.....

2.3.4. Merits of the Communicative-Structural Approach.....

Conclusion.....

Introduction

Language teaching and learning is a prolific field. Studies and research which have been conducted in this domain are remarkably numerous in number; this is mainly due to the fact that specialists in the field and educators constantly question everything. Their carefulness to ensure a better and successful learning and teaching experience results in a variety of methods and approaches. Among those approaches, the Structural and Communicative Approaches are regarded as the most prominent ones. Despite the fact that these respective approaches are ideologically and methodologically different, in recent years, a new approach which integrates teaching principles and methods from both approaches has been proposed. In essence, it is termed the Structural/Communicative Approach.

2.1 The Structural Approach

The Structural Approach is regarded by many researchers as the most traditional and classical approach as it can be dated back to the teaching of the so called dead languages ‘‘ Greek and Latin ‘‘ (Yule, 2010: 189). Despite the shifts and changes which convulsed the area of language teaching, the Structural Approach has not keeled over and died in the way so many think, its worthiness is still valued by certain educators. This section discusses the Structural Approach background, its salient principles, as well as its associated methods.

2.1.1 Background to the Approach

In America, the Second World War has obliged language teaching theoreticians and methodologians to provide a ‘‘convincing and powerful theory of language to draw upon’’ (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 50). This was mainly due to their urgent need for sound foreign language training to their personnel in the army. Eventually, this resulted in a Structure-Based Approach which is derived from a language theory that is called ‘‘Structural Linguistics’’, and at the same time it was remarkably influenced by the emergence of a prominent American

theory of learning that is called “Behaviorism” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986:49-50). All in all, the Structural Approach is rooted in “Structuralism” in linguistics, and “Behaviorism” in psychology. In the work of Richards and Rodgers (1986: 47) the Structural Approach is referred to as the Oral Approach, the Aural Approach, and the Structural Approach. However, the work of Abdullah (2015: 194) refers to the Structural Approach as “the Overt Approach”.

In language teaching, the Structural Approach is recognized by many people as being a method and not an approach. However (Bhandari, 1961, as cited in Renau, 2016: 84) advocates the importance of establishing the Structural Approach as an independent and comprehensive approach whose educational philosophies are reflected in a number of methods. He stated that “it is not proper and correct to call the Structural Approach a method of teaching. It is not a method (...). Any method can be used with it”.

2.1.2 Key Principles of the Structural Approach

The Structural Approach can be classified as a descriptive approach which elaborates through structural analysis. This latter seeks to explore the possible distributions of forms in a language. In other words, it is mainly concerned with establishing correct language forms where grammaticality of the sentences is necessarily important (Yule, 2014: 87). In the same vein, Chung (2014: 34) identifies the Structural Approach as he claims that ‘grammatical structures’ are of paramount importance in the language system. One may conclude that grammar teaching and learning of the target language is at the core of this approach. As it seeks to establish and achieve accuracy. Widdowson (1991: 159-160) concludes that the Structural Approach is remarkably concerned with building up an accurate knowledge of language which requires mastery of grammatical rules of that particular language. Thus, “knowing” is prior or more important than “doing”. Abdullah and Shah (2015: 14) also maintain that the Structural Approach centers around the teaching of grammatical rules which

are presented either “deductively” i.e. the teacher follows explicit and direct instructions, or “inductively” which is also known as “the Discovery Method”. This implies that with the help of examples and exercises given by the teacher who provides implicit or indirect explanations the student will be able to deduce and discover the rules of the language. Moreover, Abdullah (2015: 194) suggests that teachers in this approach are responsible for the selection of appropriate language parts which are thought necessary to the linguistic development of the learners. The teacher also needs to follow a precise methodology which organizes these whole and big language units into small manageable chunks.

No less importantly, among listening, speaking, and reading, this approach gives priority to listening activities in which aural and pronunciation training are built first and the other skills are built up from them. Moreover, this approach is based on the principle of effective use of speech because language was identified with speech which can be approached through structure. Since the Structural Approach is derived from ‘Behaviorism’, a theory which views language learning as learning a set of habits through intensive oral drilling the most dominant classroom technique. (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 46-47)

2.1.3 Methods of the Structural Approach

The discussion above shows that the Structural Approach has been introduced to language teaching and learning many years ago. Since then, it has always been of significant importance. In fact, the educational doctrines and philosophies of the Structural Approach have been reflected on a number of methods. Mareva and Nyota (2011: 104) classified these methods as follows: the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Oral Approach or Situational Language Teaching, and the Audio Lingual Method.

2.1.3.1 The Grammar-Translation Method

In this method, the emphasis is on the correct use of grammar in translation exercises, i.e., students learned grammatical rules and then applied their knowledge of language in translation from the target to native language. As a result, students often knew the theoretical aspects of language very well but they were not able to use them effectively in every day communication (Yule, 2010: 189). According to Richards and Rodgers (1986: 11-12) the goal of this method is to prepare students for reading literature in the target language and to give them complete knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. The ability to communicate in the target language is not as important as reading and writing. Therefore, almost no attention is paid to speaking and listening skills. The main activities are translation and doing Grammar exercises. The teacher holds the superior position as s/he controls all the activities. Moreover, the lesson is presented deductively, using mainly the mother tongue which is the language of instruction and interaction.

2.1.3.2 The Direct Method

Another structural method is known as the Direct Method which came as a response to the Grammar-Translation Method. In fact, these two methods do not work in the same manners. In general, the goal of this method is to communicate and think in the target language which is the dominant language in the class and is primarily spoken. Thus, it is based on a ‘monological approach to teaching’ (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 9). Moreover, no translation is allowed. Instead, demonstration is encouraged and rules of the language are acquired inductively, that is, through using the language (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011: 25-34). Although this method introduced a number of outstanding innovative teaching procedures, it ‘lacked a thorough methodological basis’ (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 11).

2.1.3.3. The Oral Approach or Situational Approach

It was developed by the British Applied linguists from the 1930's to the 1960's. In essence, it follows a systematic framework which is based on selection, grading and presenting of language structures and content, more specifically, vocabulary and grammar were of paramount importance, as they were intensively stressed and controlled. Moreover, priority is given to the spoken language over the written one. (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 33-34)

2.1.3.4. The Audio-Lingual Method

It is a very different method which seeks to develop the communicative fluency of the target language where the listening and speaking skills are of significant importance. In fact, it labored under the assumption that language learning is the building up of a set of correct language habits (Yule, 2010: 190). Learners trained in this method have to repeat grammatical patterns until they are able to produce them spontaneously. One evident disadvantage of this method is the enormous efforts and boredom experienced by learners (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 48-49).

Despite the apparent usefulness of the structuralist movement which has dominated language teaching and learning for decades, its deficiencies were recognized especially in the widely globalized world where the need for fluent communicative skills has become of paramount importance. Hence, language experts and educators have focused their perspectives towards the invention of a new approach to language teaching which will guarantee and meet the needs and the expectations of the current population.

2.2. The Communicative Approach

In the last few decades, many shifts and trends have been in the field of second language teaching. Numerous methods have come into view. We have seen the Audio-lingual Method, the Direct Method, and the Grammar-Translation Method. Many researchers and scholars have widely discussed and evaluated those methods. Based on theories such as behaviorism, structuralism, constructivism, and universal grammar, those methods have progressed. Each of the methods has its own weak points as well as strong ones. In other word, using one single method is not enough to meet all the learners' needs as well as programs' goals. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is not exceptional (Freeman, 1986 and Ellis, 1994). Communicative Language Teaching methodologies are rooted in a range of theories. Many linguists and teachers realized that CLT is a useful approach to language teaching and considered it as a typical model in English Language Teaching (ELT) (Barnaby and Sun, 1989; Ellis, 1996). In this part of the chapter; we try to define the Communicative Approach, its theoretical background, its principles, and its types.

The Communicative Approach has been defined by many writers as an approach to teaching language (Cannale, 1983; Cook, 1991; Littlewood, 1981; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Richards and Rodgers 2001; Rivers, 1987). In the Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, Richards et al. have defined CLT as "an approach to foreign or second language teaching which emphasizes that the goal of language learning is communicative competence" (1992: 65). In different ways, other authors have introduced CLT (Howatt, 1984; Littlewood, 1981; Savignon, 1991; Scarcella and Oxford, 1992). Littlewood explains that "one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language, combining these into a more fully communicative view" (1981: 1). CLT is based on the theory that

communication is the primary function language use, i.e. communicative competence is the primary goal to be developed by learners (Hymes: 1971). In general, researchers who agreed on CLT proposed that it is beneficial for learners to use the target language in real-life situations and in a meaningful way, rather than learning grammatical rules of the target language because it enables them to develop communicative competence.

2.2.1 Background to the Approach

The Communicative Approach (CA) can be traced back to the mid-1960s, when linguists started to rethink about the theoretical assumptions of the traditional approaches, and when the notions of 'competence' and 'performance' have been advanced by Chomsky as a reaction against the Audio-Lingual method. Galloway says: "the Communicative Approach could be said to be the product of educators and linguists who had grown dissatisfied with the audio-lingual and grammar-translation methods of foreign language instruction" (1993). Richards and Rodgers (1986), on the other hand, claim that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) appeared during the changes in the British language teaching which have occurred in the 1960s. Meanwhile, Savignon (1991) asserts that "the emergence of CLT can be traced to concurrent developments on both sides of the Atlantic, i.e. in Europe and the United States". Candlin (1981) and Widdowson (1978) believed that focusing on communicative proficiency rather than mastery of structures in language teaching is needed. And they saw that through using those methods, i.e., Situational Language Teaching, Audio-Lingual or Grammar Translation Method, students were not capable to use what they have learned in the target language in the real-situations (Richards and Rodgers, 1986 ; Savignon, 1987, 1991 ; Galloway, 1993).

In the early 1970's, the Communicative Approach was developed by the studies of the European Council and the contributions of many linguists, such as an American psychiatrist

and psychoanalyst Robert Langs MD. Since 1970's the Communicative Approach became known as CLT and has dominated the EFL/ESL profession. Around 1980 the Communicative Language Teaching was established in Britain as a language teaching method. In ESL and EFL classes, it has become one of the most popular and the most used method by teachers and institutions all around the world.

2.2.2. Key Principles of the Communicative Approach

In the field of foreign/second language teaching the communicative approach has been one of the newest used and adapted approaches. Communicative Language Teaching is a ‘‘ hybrid approach to language teaching, essentially ‘progressive’ rather than ‘Traditional’ ...’’ (Wright, 2000: 7). According to Savignon different fields in language teaching which include, linguistics, psychology, philosophy, sociology, and educational research are the source from where the Communicative Language Teaching derived (1991). The advocates of the Communicative Language Teaching consider it as an approach not a method (Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Savignon, 1991; Brown, 1994). Brown said that: ‘‘Communicative Language Teaching is a unified but broadly-based theoretical position about the nature of language and language learning and teaching’’ (1994: 244-245). There are numerous and different ways to Communicative Language Teaching in order to be used and applied, for that proponents to the field, Littlewood (1981) ; Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983); Brumfit (1984) ; Widdowson (1978, 1979) ; Johnson and Marrow (1981) ; Richards and Rodgers (1986) ; Larsen-Freeman (1986) ; Celce-Murcia (1991) and Johnson (1982) put some of the major principles of CLT. Language function is considered as the main element in CLT, the primary priority is given to, and the language structure comes after (Larsen-Freeman 1986; Johnson 1982). Littlewood says ‘‘one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of the language’’ (1981: 1). ‘‘ CLT suggests that grammatical structure might better be subsumed

under various functional categories... we pay considerably less attention to be overt presentation and discussion of grammatical rules than we traditionally did'' (Brown, 1994: 245). Another factor is needed which is meaning, according to Finocchiaro and Brumfit 'meaning is paramount' (1983: 91) since it helps learners to understand and to be understood.

'Fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques'' (Brown 1994: 245). These two factors enable learners to use language in its proper meaning. 'Authentic language' is the language used for day-today communication, it should be introduced in the classroom in order to facilitate on learners to use language in a meaningful context. In addition to that, using authentic materials is also needed in the classroom because it helps the learners to better understand the language as it is used by native speakers. The main purpose in the classroom is the communicative one, and all the activities are based on it (Johnson and Marrow, 1981).

Grammar is not ignored in CLT, Savignon (2002: 7) says "... for the development of communicative ability research findings overwhelmingly support the integration or form-focused exercises with meaning-focused experience". "CLT is not exclusively concerned with face to face oral communication" (Savignon, 2002: 7). This approach is not interested in the oral skills only, and it gives attention to all four skills areas.

Working in pairs or groups is a beneficial technique for learners which makes them active all the time. It helps them to learn new meanings and to solve problems during the activities (Thompson, 1996 and Savignon, 2002).

According to Larsen-Freeman (1986) the students' native language will not achieve the goal and it may be an obstacle to acquire the target language. The target language is the mainly used one inside the classroom. In all cases, " the teacher should be able to use the target language fluently and appropriately" (Celce-Murcia, 1991: 8). However, Finocchiaro

and Brumfit (1983) say that using the native language in some cases as providing tips and explaining how to do homework and tests is acceptable.

The teacher is the one who facilitates the process of learning. S/he is the one who manages the classroom activities (Littlewood, 1981; Breen and Candlin, 1980). The teacher may engage in the communicative activity and share his/her ideas with the learners but in fact he has to act as an independent participant. The teacher talks less and listens more. He/she acts as an observer and sometimes becomes a monitor. On the other hand, managing the process of learning is the responsibility of the students. The student is an active element. They talk, exchange ideas, and negotiate meanings in order to make themselves understood. Communicating is a way to learn communication (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Since the learner's role is more dominant, the teaching/learning process is student-centered.

2.2.3. Methods of the Communicative Approach

According to Richards (2005), there are different current approaches which can be viewed as falling within the general framework of communicative language teaching:

Process-based CLT approaches (content-based instruction and task-based instruction) and **Product-based CLT approaches** (text-based instruction and competency-based instruction).

2.2.3.1. Process-Based Instruction

Process-Based CLT approaches are extensions of CLT but take different ways to develop learners' communicative competence.

2.2.3.1.1. Content-Based Instruction

Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is "an approach to second language teaching in which teaching is organized around the *content* or information that students will acquire,

rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: 204) . Content-Based Instruction is “the teaching of language through exposure to content that is interesting and relevant to learners” (Brinton, 2003: 201). According to Krahnke (1987: 65) “the teaching of content or information in the language being learned with little or no direct or explicit effort to teaching the language itself separately from the content being taught”. Content- Based Instruction is based on the following assumption about language learning:

- People learn a language more successfully when they use the language as means of acquiring information, rather than as an end itself.
- CBI better reflects learners’ needs for learning a second language. Content provides a coherent framework that can be used to link and develop all the language skills.

2.2.3.1.2. Task-Based Instruction

Task-Based Instruction or TBI is another method of process-based instruction which makes tasks the central unit in the learning process. Its purpose is to enable the designers to design the appropriate types tasks; taking into consideration students’ needs, those tasks are the vehicle to better acquire the target language structures and functions (Loschky and Bley-Vroman, 1990).

Problem solving, listing, comparing, ordering and sorting are the tasks used in TBI. According to Baylis (2007) in order to achieve the outcomes, learners are not obliged to use a specific language form, they are free. “With TBI the focus shifts to using tasks is to create interaction and then building language awareness and language development around task performance” (Richards, 2006: 32).

2.2.3.2. Product-Based Instruction

Product-Based CLT Approaches are concerned with the products or outcomes of learning. These approaches have focused on what learners are able to do at a given period of instruction with the kinds of uses of language. In order to achieve these goals many teaching strategies are then selected (Richards, 2005).

2.2.3.2.1. Text-Based Instruction

This approach focuses on units of discourse called texts. It focuses on the use of whole texts in specific contexts in specific ways (Richards, 2005).

According to this view learners in different contexts have to master the use of the text types occurring most frequently in specific contexts. These contexts might include: studying in an English medium university, studying in an English medium primary or secondary school, working in a restaurant, working in an office, etc. (Richards, 2005).

2.2.3.2.2. Competency-Based Instruction

Competency-based instruction is an approach to vocational education and training which focuses on the competencies gained by an individual rather than the training process itself. According to Richards (2005), competency-based instruction has been followed since the 1970s as the basis for the design of work-related and survival-oriented language teaching programs for adults.

As mentioned in **TeachThought Staff**:

Competency-based learning is an approach to education that focuses on the student's demonstration of desired learning outcomes as central to the learning process. It is concerned chiefly with a student's progression through curriculum at their own pace, depth, etc. As competencies are proven, students continue to progress. It is similar to mastery-based

learning, with the primary difference being that competency-based learning often focuses on observable skills or ‘competencies,’ while mastery learning may be academic as likely to focus on concepts as skills.

As stated before, things are constantly changing in the area of language teaching and learning. Approaches and methods which were once highly valued and recommended are now criticized and revolutionized. Similar to the Structural Approach whose principles are partly abandoned in some modern educational establishment, CLT is no exception, as its limitations and shortcomings were more soonly recognized. The upcoming section suggests the probability of integrating both approaches in teaching English.

2.3. The Structural/Communicative Approach

Based on the belief that variety doubles the chances of a successful teaching and learning experience, the Structural/Communicative Approach has come to embrace this philosophy which integrates educational principles from both the Structural Approach and the Communicative Approach. This section discusses this recent approach in terms of its background, definition, principles, and merits.

2.3.1. Background to the Structural/Communicative Approach

A clear definition of the Structural/Communicative Approach entails first a full understanding of its background as it is crucial to know the source that has brought this approach into existence. In fact, the literature done on this topic revealed that the first seed of this approach is to be found in the Communicative Approach which is considered as a broad approach, rather than a specific teaching methodology. Since the 1970's, the Communicative Approach's perspectives have expanded to include other objectives that seek to promote procedures for the teaching of the four language skills in addition to prioritizing the status of

the communicative competence as the ultimate goal of language teaching. The fact that should be admitted is that the Communicative Approach is unique in comparison to the other approaches, and this can be justified by the fact that each language practitioner has its own interpretation and understanding of this approach, especially that there is no single universally agreed model among them (Richards and Rodgers,1986:66).

Howatt (1984:279), for example, introduced two versions of this approach, a ‘strong’ version and a ‘weak’ version. The ‘strong’ version advocates the communicative features of the language which claim that language is better acquired through communication. The ‘weak’ version of the Communicative Approach which has become standard practice nowadays, on the other hand, believes in the necessity of combining the structural practice with the communicative elements. In other words, while the ‘weak’ version means “learning to use the language”, the strong version implies “using the language to learn it”. In fact, the Structural/Communicative can be regarded as the actual realization of the ‘weak’ version as it manifests what Littlewood (1981:1) calls, “one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to the functional as well as the structural aspects of language”. This is the kind of interpretations and assumptions that the Structural/Communicative Approach is built around.

2.3.2. Definition

At the terminological level, two key words constitute the body of the Structural/Communicative Approach which are structural and communicative. The first key word ‘structure’ as defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2015) refers to “the way something is built or organized: relating to the structure of something”. Considering the definition provided by the Free Dictionary, it is “connected with systematic structure in a particular field of study, such as linguistics or behavioral sciences”. In the area of language,

the word 'structure' denotes the arrangement of linguistic units into forms that are governed by specific rules. As for the second word communication, this latter is defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2015) as "the act or process of using words, sounds, signs, or behaviors to express your ideas, thoughts, feelings, ect., to someone else". Communication is, then, a process where "at least two parties are involved in an interaction or transaction of some kind where one party has an intention and the other party expands or reacts to the intention" (Syllabus for Primary Schools, 1981:5). In essence, this activity dominates a great part in peoples' lives as it is actualized through many forms: verbal, non-verbal, dialogue, monologues...etc.

At the conceptual level, this respective approach is based on two concepts that derive from two major approaches in the area of language teaching which are: the Structural Approach and the Communicative Approach. Basically, this approach adopts educational principles from both approaches as it calls for integration of "communicative exercises onto an existing structural syllabuses" (Yalden, 1983; Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 66). Thus, 'structure+ function' is the first syllabus type among eight types of syllabuses described by Yalden (1986, as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 74). In the same vein did Chung (2014: 35) discuss this approach, as she identified it as a "proportional approach" which was suggested by Yalden (1987:94) in which "students learn more form than meaning at an early stage as time increases (and as students' language proficiency improves), the intervention of communicative functions increases" (Chung, 2014: 35). Further understanding of this approach can be better achieved through a discussion of its main principles.

2.3.3. The Principles of the Structural/Communicative Approach

The philosophy behind the Structural/Communicative Approach can be clearly seen in a theory of learning namely described as a skill learning model in which the mastery of

communicative competence in a language is a kind of skill development that requires both cognitive and behavioral aspects. In other words, it labors under the influence of the Communicative Approach which belongs to the cognitive school of thought, and the Structural Approach which is deeply rooted in behaviorism. Littlewood (1984) is largely cited as the founder of this theory, considering his own explanation in the following line:

The cognitive aspect involves the internalisation of plans for creating appropriate behavior. For language use, these plans derive mainly from the language system — they include grammatical rules, procedures for selecting vocabulary, and social conventions governing speech. The behavioral aspect involves the automation of these plans so that they can be converted into fluent performance in real time. This occurs mainly through practice in converting plans into performance (74).

According to this theory, the development of sound communicative skills can be better achieved through an emphasis on practice (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 72-73). It is fair to say that the innovative teaching and learning principles which have been introduced in the communicative approach appeal to many language practitioners mainly due to the interactional atmosphere they create in the classroom. Yet, as Richards and Rodgers (1986:82) comment that these activities have similar points in common with those followed in classes taught according to structural principles. In fact, the Structural/Communicative Approach does not disapprove completely of the traditional orthodoxies, as it acknowledges the importance of integrating those practices into the communicative teaching agenda. Thus, “traditional procedures are not rejected but are reinterpreted and extended” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986:82).

A similar educational doctrine governing the Structural/Communicative Approach establishes that new teaching points should be first introduced according to the structural

perspectives where explicit and direct instructions are provided first, then followed by a controlled practice of the main grammatical patterns. Once these operations are done, the second step is to provide free communication activities which encourage students to use and practice functions and forms of the language. Thus, the Structural/Communicative Approach advocates the status of explicit teaching of Grammar as a means of achieving higher levels of language proficiency (Rubio et al., 2004: 160). Following the same point, Lee and Vanpatten (2003: 76) point out that in such case, “communication is at the service of Grammar rather than the other way around”. Littlewood (1981: 86) represents a sketch of the above discussed procedures as follows:




Figure 2.1.: Learning Procedures According to the Structural/Communicative Approach

In essence, these procedures imply the necessity of “gaining control over individual skills (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary) before applying them in communication tasks” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 82).

Another underlying principle of the Structural/Communicative Approach entails a “focus on form” combined with a “focus on meaning”. Rubio et al. (2004: 162) state that Lee

and Vanpatten (2003) recommend Processing Instruction as an approach which equally balance, between a “focus on form” and a “focus on meaning” in which there is the possibility of processing input adequately and develop ‘form-meaning connections’ before producing the target structure in the output.

A relative principle concerns the importance given to the input in the Structural/Communicative Approach. According to Gass (1997: 1), input is “perhaps the single most important concept of second language acquisition”. The Structural/Communicative Approach recognizes the necessity of providing comprehensible input which is imperative in the acquisition of all aspects of a language. However, the role of the input is not a mere matter of being exposed to meaningful input; it requires attention to the forms as well as to the meaning. This is the view of Nassaji and Fotos who claim that “It is necessary for learners to notice target forms in the input; otherwise they process input for meaning only and do not attend to specific forms, and consequently fail to process and acquire them” (2004: 128).

Moreover, teachers as well as learners are at the core of the Structural/Communicative Approach. The former’s duties and responsibilities are remarkably flexible. Actually, the role of the teacher within the scope of the Structural/Communicative Approach is not merely dictated by a given approach or an entitled authority altogether. The teacher as described by Littlewood (2013: 8) is free to choose whatsoever procedures and techniques which are helpful in accelerating the pace of achieving the desired outcomes of this respective approach. Teachers may break free altogether from concepts such as ‘traditional’ and ‘CLT’. They may simply choose ideas and techniques from the universal, transnational pool that has been built up over the years and evaluate them according to how well, in their own specific context. They contribute to creating meaningful experiences which lead towards communicative competence. From this perspective, the notion that CLT is a distinct methodology disappears.

Ideas and techniques from whatever source – so-called traditional, so-called CLT, or indeed any other source – constitute a common pool on which teachers can draw in order to design classroom practices which are real and meaningful to their learners and help learners towards fulfilling their communicative needs. (Littlewood, 2013: 8).

The learners' needs, individual differences and preferences are also taken into account that is why great emphasis is laid to the standard way of adopting appropriate instructions as a means of securing a better and a successful learning experience for learners. The kind of language instructions developed by Ellis (2005 a, 2005b) and Erlam (2008) included 10 “principles of effective instructed language learning” which are believed to be helpful in facilitating the process of transmitting knowledge to the learners, instruction need to:

- Ensure that learners develop both a rich repertoire of formulaic expressions and a rule-based competence.
- Ensure that learners focus predominantly on meaning. Instruction needs to ensure that learners also focus on form.
- Be predominantly directed at developing implicit knowledge of the L2 while not neglecting explicit knowledge.
- Take into account the learner's “built-in syllabus”.
- Require extensive L2 input.
- Require opportunities for output. The opportunity to interact in the L2 is central to developing L2 proficiency.
- Take account of individual differences in learners. In assessing learners' L2 proficiency it is important to examine free as well as controlled production (Littlewood, 2013: 9).

2.3.4. Merits of the Structural/Communicative Approach

Among a number of approaches and teaching models, many researchers and studies favor the model proposed by Brumfit (1980) which advocates a “grammatically based syllabus around which notions, functions, and communicational activities are grouped” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 76). Thus, the value of the approach which equally focused on ‘form’ as well as ‘meaning’, results in an ideal teaching model which is grounded around a systematic methodological framework which seeks first to build adequate linguistic knowledge in the learners, and then develops their communicative proficiency. On this light, Lightbown and Spada (1999: 172) state that “successful language learning involves not only a knowledge of the structures or forms of the language, but also the functions and purposes that a language serves in different communicative settings.”

Moreover, due to its integration of the structural practices into the communicative agenda, the Structural/Communicative Approach has proven useful in building adequate language competence that requires attention to form as well as meaning. In addition, studies conducted in relation to this issue reveal that learners who had been formally instructed and who had experienced the integration of communicative practices with regular Grammar drills, learnt the language at a faster rate and even outperformed those who had not been exposed to the same learning environment (Rubio et al., 2004: 160).

Furthermore, the comprehensive and heterogeneous scope of this approach makes it unique especially that two prominent educational philosophies contributed in its overall shaping. Most importantly, the Structural/Communicative Approach has come to cover the shortcomings of both the Structural and Communicative Approaches (Saadi, 2017: 99). Typical deficiencies concern the status established for accuracy and fluency. While proponents of the Structural Approach enthusiastically call for the primary of accuracy over

fluency. The Communicative Approach, on the other hand, is more fluency-oriented. However, the Structural/Communicative Approach holds the view that both accuracy and fluency are equally important. Thus, there is no dominance of a particular skill over another; basically there is a balance in the teaching of the four language skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing (Saadi, 2017: 100).

Conclusion

The ideas which exerted the greatest influence in this chapter prove that in language teaching there is always enough space and room for creativity. Despite the fact that the Structural and Communicative Approaches are run essentially by two opposing doctrines, yet the possibility of integrating these respective approaches within an approach resulted in an ideal teaching model which is the Structural/Communicative Approach. The merits and principles of this approach lead many language educators and practitioners to advocate and recommend its implementation.

Chapter Three: The Teachers' and the Students' Opinion about Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach

Introduction.....

3.1. The Teachers' Questionnaire.....

3.1.1. Description of the Teachers' Questionnaire.....

3.1.2. Analysis of the Teachers' Questionnaire.....

3.2. The Students' Questionnaire.....

3.2.1. Description of the Students' Questionnaire.....

3.2.3. Analysis of the Students' Questionnaire.....

3.3. Overall Analysis.....

Conclusion

Introduction

A further investigation on the topic under discussion recommends administering a Teachers' Questionnaire and a Students' Questionnaire, through which we can explore new insights and shed light on the most important issues in relation to the present research. These questionnaires were conducted at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages at Abdelhafid Boussouf Mila University Center. In essence, the Teachers' Questionnaire seeks to inspect the teachers' familiarity with the Structural/Communicative Approach, their attitudes and perceptions about implementing it, and whether they actually employ it in their teaching of Grammar in general and phrasal verbs in particular. Moreover, the students' opinions and views are of no less importance to our research that is why a Students' Questionnaire is designed specifically to explore their views and perceptions towards the effectiveness of the Structural/Communicative Approach in their learning of phrasal verbs. The results obtained from both questionnaires will significantly help in testing the research's hypotheses and hence, confirming or rejecting them.

3.1. The Teachers' Questionnaire

The Teachers' Questionnaire is of significant value to the present research especially that it is specifically devoted to the issue of teaching that is why their opinions and views are worthy to be taken into account based on which some important conclusions might be drawn.

3.1.1. Description of the Teachers' Questionnaire

The Teachers' Questionnaire was distributed to 12 teachers of English at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages, at Abdelhafid Boussouf Mila University Center. The questionnaire consists of twenty two questions divided into five sections. **Section One, General Information** (Q1-Q3) answers questions about the teachers' degree (Q1), the length of their teaching experience (Q2), and their experience in teaching Grammar. **Section Two,**

Teaching Grammar (Q4-Q7) addresses the teachers' views about the difficulty of teaching Grammar (Q4), which grammatical aspect they find difficult to teach (Q5) and whether the nature of the grammatical aspect decides the method they follow (Q6) and Why (Q7). **Section Three, the Structural/Communicative Approach** (Q8-Q15), the teachers were asked whether they had been familiar with this approach (Q8), whether they use it in teaching Grammar (Q9). If they had replied "No", they justified their position (Q10), and if they had answered "Yes", they stated for which grammatical aspect, why, and how often (Q11-Q12). The question thirteen inspects the teachers' attitudes towards the use of the fun aspect in teaching Grammar, their reasons if they opted for "Yes" (Q14) as well as if they opted for "No" (Q15). **Section Four, Phrasal Verbs and the Structural/Communicative Approach** (Q16-Q21), deals with the teachers' opinion concerning difficulty of teaching phrasal verbs and the reasons behind it (Q16-Q17), the way they like to teach phrasal verbs (Q18). The question nineteen reveals the teachers' views about implementing the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching phrasal verbs, the way of adopting it (Q20), and whether they have actually used it in teaching phrasal verbs (Q21). **Section Five, Further Suggestions** (Q22), it welcomes the teachers' comments and recommendations in relation to the research.

3.1.2. Analysis and Discussion of the Results

Section One: General Information

Q1. What is your degree?

- a. License**
- b. Master**
- c. Magister**
- d. Doctorate**

Options	N	%
b	6	50
c	1	8.33
d	5	41.67
Total	12	100

Table 3.1.: Degree Held by the Teachers

50% of the teachers hold a Master degree, followed by a 41,67% with a doctorate degree, and only 8,33% have a Magister degree. Those numbers suggest that the teachers are very well qualified to teach English and more specifically Grammar.

Q2. How long have you been teaching?

Options	N	%
1-5	6	50
6-10	3	25
11-15	3	25
Total	12	100

Table 3.2.: The Teachers' Experience of Teaching

Table 3.2. reveals that half of the teachers (50%) have an experience in teaching English that ranges between 1 and 5 years. Another 25% have taught English between 6 to 10 years, while the other 25% have taught it for a period between 11 to 15 years. The length of the

teachers' professional experience displayed in the above table would be remarkably beneficial for the research.

Q3. How long have you been teaching Grammar?

Total	N	%
1-5	9	75
6-10	3	25
Total	12	100

Table 3.3.: The Teachers' Experience of Teaching Grammar

As for the teachers' experience in teaching Grammar, table 3.3. shows that the majority of the teachers (75%) have taught Grammar for a period between 1 and 5 years. 25% of them have an experience that ranged between 6 and 10 years. These results imply that these respective teachers are knowledgeable enough to take a part in this research especially that it is essentially concerned with the teaching of one important grammatical category.

Section Two: Teaching Grammar

Q4. Do you think that teaching Grammar is difficult?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	9	75

No	3	25
Total	12	100

Table 3.4. The Teachers' Opinions about the Difficulty of Teaching Grammar

Regarding this question, the majority of the teachers (75%) believe that teaching Grammar is a difficult task. The students' passive attitudes towards Grammar make its teaching difficult especially that it is not easy to teach a group of unmotivated students also might not be at all responsive; one teacher noted that it is not always clear which teaching method to follow. Others complained about the number of session dedicated to Grammar lessons as well as the lack of practice. In addition to that another teacher commented that syntactic and semantic dissimilarities between the target Grammar and the mother Grammar constitute serious problems. The teachers who believe that Grammar is easy to teach (25%) claimed that the teaching of Grammar is like teaching mathematics, it is all about explaining rules and apply them.

Q5. Throughout your experience in the teaching of Grammar, which grammatical aspect do you find difficult to teach?

a. Tenses

b. Articles

c. Prepositions

d. Phrasal Verbs

e. Other: Please, specify.

Options	N	%

a	1	8,33
c	2	16,67
d	2	16,67
ad	4	33,33
acd	2	16,67
cd	1	8.33
Total	12	100

Table3.5.: The Teachers’ Opinions about the Most Difficult Grammatical Aspects

We can see from the results displayed in table 3.5. that 33,33% of the teachers recognized tenses in addition to phrasal verbs as problematic, prepositions were also seen as difficult (16,67%), the same percentage also opted for phrasal verbs. In addition tenses, phrasal verbs, and prepositions were also thought to be difficult. Other teachers added prepositions and phrasal verbs (one teacher) as well as articles (one teacher). These results conclude that the English Grammar is full of challenging and difficult aspects, on the light of which further research is recommended.

Q6. The method you use in teaching Grammar depends on the nature of the grammatical aspect:

Yes

No

Options	N	%

Yes	10	83,33
No	2	16,67
Total	12	100

Table 3.6.: The Relationship between the Method of Teaching Grammar and the Nature of the Grammatical Aspect

83,33% of the teachers declared that the nature of the grammatical aspects they teach determines which method to follow, while only 16,67% stated that they did not teach under the influence of the nature of the grammatical aspects, this implies that the nature of the grammatical aspects dictate the method that should be used.

Q7. Please explain why.

The teachers who used the method depending on the nature of the grammatical aspect believe that teaching Grammar has always been a flexible process where teachers are not necessarily bound to be committed to a given method or technique. For them, the nature of each grammatical aspect is imperative in determining which method to use, especially that each aspect has its unique properties which determine the way it should be approached. At times, the teacher is fully aware of the complexities of a given aspect, hence s/he plays it safe by clearly stating the rules so that no more vague is added. At other times, the aspect is less complex and difficult and its rules might be deduced through discovery procedures.

Section Three: the Structural/Communicative Approach

Q8. Are you familiar with the definition of the Structural/Communicative Approach?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	10	83,33
No	2	16,67
Total	12	100

Table 3.7.: The Teachers' Familiarity with the Structural/Communicative Approach

83,33% of the teachers recognized the definition of the Structural/Communicative Approach. While only 16,67% of them stated that they do actually know the Structural/Communicative Approach as they are not yet familiar with its definition. The percentage of the teachers' familiarity with this approach suggests that this approach is popular and it might have been already implemented.

Q9. If "Yes" do you use it in teaching Grammar?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	7	70
No	3	30
Total	10	100

Table 3.8.: Rate of the Teachers' Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach

Seven teachers out of ten said that they are familiar with the definition of the Communicative/Structural Approach, and they actually use it when they teach Grammar. This is a clear sign that this approach is believed appropriate to be adopted in teaching Grammar.

Q10. If ‘No’, is it because:

a. It is not as effective as the Communicative Approach

b. It is unsuitable for Grammar lessons

c. It is not well understood

d. Other: Please, specify.

Options	N	%
b	1	25
c	2	50
bc	1	25
Total	4	100

Table 3.9.: The Reason for the Teachers’ Lack of Using the Structural/Communicative Approach

Concerning the teachers’ lack of use the Structural/Communicative Approach, one teachers believes that it is unsuitable for Grammar lessons, especially that time allocated for them is not enough, in addition to the fact that the majority of the students are unmotivated to learn Grammar and might not be entirely responsive to its techniques. Another teacher explained that s/he is not really familiar with its principles and it is not well understood. The other two teachers stated that in addition to the fact that it is not well understood, and it is not

appropriate for Grammar lessons, this approach requires innovative tasks which are time-demanding and energy consuming.

Q11. If ‘Yes’, for which grammatical aspect do you use it and why?

The seven teachers who stated that they use the Structural/Communicative Approach declared that they employ it to teach aspects of paramount importance especially in teaching the different structures and types of sentences that students need in their writing as well as their conversations (4 teachers). The Structural/Communicative Approach is also believed to be useful in covering all the grammatical aspects (1 teacher), it is also effective in teaching difficult and complex grammatical patterns which require the special systematic procedures it dictates (1 teacher). Prepositions and conjunctions are also thought to be better approached through this approach (1 teacher).

Q12. How often?

a. Always

b. Usually

c. Sometimes

d. Rarely

Options	N	%
a	3	42,86
b	1	14,28
c	3	42,86

Total	7	100
-------	---	-----

Table 3.10.: The Frequency of the Teachers’ Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach

Table 3.10. shows that 42,86% of the teachers rated their use of this approach as always, similarly did another 42,86% who stated that they sometimes employ this approach, while only one teacher (14,28%) described her/his use of this approach as usual.

Q13. In your opinion, is teaching Grammar in a fun way useful?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	12	100
No	0	0
Total	12	100

Table 3.11. : The Teachers’ Opinions towards the Use of the Fun Aspect in their Teaching of Grammar

Surprisingly, all the teachers (100%) advocated the importance of teaching Grammar in a fun way. This indicates that the fun aspect is still highly valued and it might be of great utility to the teaching of Grammar.

Q14. If “Yes”, is it because:

- a. It maintains an intimate relation with your students**

b. It gets the whole class engaged in the session

c. It achieves collaboration among students

d. It facilitates the process of explaining difficult points

e. Other: Please, specify.

Options	N	%
b	3	25
abcd	2	16,67
abc	3	25
bc	1	8,33
cd	2	16,67
bcd	1	8,33
Total	12	100

Table 3.12.: The Teachers' Reasons for Supporting the Fun Aspect

For 25% of the teachers the most prominent reason beyond their positive attitude towards the fun aspect is due to their belief that it creates a sense of wholeness in the classroom as it gets all the students engaged in the session. Others believe in all the given advantages of the fun aspect (16,67%). These results suggest that teachers are really interested in procedures which are intended to yield productive sessions of Grammar where all students get involved in a friendly and enjoying atmosphere.

Q15. No opted for 'No'.

Section Four: Phrasal Verbs and the Structural/Communicative Approach

Q16. Teaching phrasal verbs is a difficult task

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	11	91,67
No	1	8,33
Total	12	100

Table 3.13. : The Teachers' Opinion about the Difficulty of Teaching Phrasal Verbs

From table 3.13. we can conclude that only one teacher was an exception as s/he regarded the teaching of phrasal verbs as an easy task. Nevertheless, the majority of the teachers (91,67%) recognized the difficulty of teaching phrasal verbs. Therefore, we assume that the Structural/Communicative Approach can help in facilitating their teaching.

Q17. If "Yes", is it difficult because:

- a. The English phrasal verb is complex in nature
- b. Phrasal verbs are numerous and polysemous in meaning
- c. Learners constantly avoid using them
- d. They have no equivalent structure in the mother tongue
- e. They are mainly informal and rarely found in the written discourse

f. Others: Please, specify.

Options	N	%
b	4	36,36
ac	1	9,09
bcd	1	9,09
abcde	1	9,09
bc	2	18,18
abcd	2	18,18
Total	11	100

Table 3.14.: The Teachers' Reasons for the Difficulty of Phrasal Verbs

Table 3.14. shows that the most challenging difficulty regarding the teaching of phrasal verbs is attributed to their being huge in number and polysemous in meaning, others (18,18%) added learners' avoidance of using phrasal verbs to the one mentioned before, and another (18,18%) recognized all the difficulties.

Q18. How do you prefer to teach phrasal verbs?

a. Deductively

b. Inductively

c. Eclectically

Options	N	%
a	5	41,67
b	1	8,33
c	6	50
Total	12	100

Table 3.15.: The Teachers' Method of Teaching Phrasal Verbs

Half of the teachers (50%) favored an eclectic method for teaching phrasal verbs. One teacher explained that the teacher is always working under the influence of the nature of the grammatical aspect, and phrasal verbs are no exception as it all depends on the type of the phrasal verb, as such some would not lend themselves exclusively to deductive or inductive method, plus variety doubles the chances of a better comprehension of rules under discussion. 41,67% of the teachers preferred the deductive way, some of these teachers stated that the complexity and confusion which might be caused by phrasal verbs can be better avoided through direct and explicit instructions. Whereas, only one teacher opted for the inductive method. This implies that the teaching of phrasal verbs is not exclusively devoted to one given method, especially that teachers are not following the same means continually.

Q19. The Structural/Communicative Approach is helpful in the teaching of phrasal verbs:

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	10	83,33
No	2	16,67
Total	12	100

Table 3.16.: The Teachers’ Attitude towards the Influences of the Structural/Communicative Approach

Table 3.16. reveals that the highest percentage of 83,33% agreed that the Structural/Communicative Approach is helpful in the teaching of phrasal verbs. This entails that the Structural/Communicative Approach is highly valued by teachers as they really believe in its effective utility in teaching phrasal verbs.

Q20. If “Yes”, please explain how.

One teacher explained that this approach covers all the communicative aspects of phrasal verbs with giving full details about their structures, uses, and meanings. Another teacher stated that since phrasal verbs are mainly used in the natives’ informal conversation, this approach is properly suitable for learners to discover phrasal verbs in a native-like context. Others argued that students ought to be adequately familiar with the functional value of a rule or else readiness to know it might go down. The teachers’ explanations suggest that they are very well familiar with the educational principles of this approach.

Q21. Have you ever used the Structural/Communicative Approach to teach phrasal verbs?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	8	66,67
No	4	33,33
Total	12	100

Table 3.17.: The Rate of the Teachers' Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach

66, 67% of the teachers declared that they have already implemented this approach in teaching phrasal verbs. However, the other 33,33% stated that they have never used it although they believe in its effective merits. The teachers' use of the Structural/Communicative Approach is a good sign which suggests that this approach is appropriately adequated and recommended in teaching complex grammatical patterns.

Section Five: Further Suggestions

Q22. Please, add any other comment.

The teachers who have completed this section recommended that more research about this topic had to be carried in order to tackle more of its aspects (4 teachers), another teacher commented that the field of Grammar has always been in quest for the appropriate approach whose principles and methods are worthy to be adopted, and s/he added that the Structural/Communicative Approach is qualified to be followed and implemented, another teacher agreed with this comment, s/he stated that this approach implies teaching in a productive fashion, and s/he believes that its tenets are worthy to be applied, and it can be implemented more fully only when the teacher is given the freedom to choose the content and the number of lessons to cover per term.

3.2. The Students' Questionnaire

In addition to the Teachers' Questionnaire which was of paramount importance to this study, no less importantly, a Students' Questionnaire was also conducted because their opinions, beliefs, and views are also worthy to be taken into account.

3.2.1. Description of the Students' Questionnaire

The Students' Questionnaire was distributed to 70 students of English at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages, at Mila University Center. The Questionnaire consists of twenty two questions which are organized into five sections. **Section One , Learning Grammar (Q 1- Q 3)** addresses the students' opinions about the importance of Grammar in the English language (Q1) , and the grammatical aspect they find most difficult (Q2) , as well as the way they like to be exposed to grammatical content (Q3). **Section Two , Phrasal Verbs (Q4 -Q 14)** , tackles the students' knowledge of phrasal verbs (Q4) , their own explanations (Q5) , their views regarding the importance of such elements in their English language learning (Q6) , the importance of the fun aspect in learning them (Q7), with their justification (Q8, Q9). In addition to that, it asks whether students use phrasal verbs (Q10), and in which discourse they use them (Q11). Question 12 has to do with the frequency of the students' use of phrasal verbs, while question 13 addresses which type of phrasal verb is preferred, and (Q14) is more concerned with investigating the effects of the huge number of phrasal verbs and their polysemy in the learning and using of this respective grammatical category. **Section Three, the Structural/Communicative Approach (Q15-Q16)** investigates whether the teachers at Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center in Mila use the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching Grammar (Q15), and how often they employ it (Q16). **Section Four, Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach. (Q17-Q21)** was dedicated exclusively to enquire the students about the way their

teachers follow when teaching them phrasal verbs (Q17), and whether they have ever been taught phrasal verbs following this approach (Q18). In addition to that, question 19 asks the students about their opinions concerning the effectiveness of the Structural /Communicative Approach in learning phrasal verbs, with explaining their stand (Q20, Q21). **Section Five, Further Suggestions** (Q22) gives the students the opportunity to add any comments or suggestions in relation to the topic.

3.2.2. Analysis of the Students' Questionnaire

Section One: Learning Grammar

Q1. Do you think that Grammar is an important aspect of English?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	69	98.57
No	1	1.43
Total	70	100

Table 3.18.: The Students' Beliefs about the Importance of Grammar in the English Language

The majority of the students (98, 57 %) believe that Grammar is of paramount importance in the English language. The value given to Grammar is partly due to their belief that Grammar is the backbone of any language, for them having enough grammatical

knowledge will surely guarantee a successful learning of the English language. Others think that Grammar gives sense to their utterances, but most importantly they believe that it is useful especially in their writing. One student explains that Grammar helps him/her to determine the level of his/her interlocutor; "be it a speaker or a writer", the less grammatical mistakes s/he utters or writes, and the better his/her level is. Surprisingly, only one student believes that Grammar is of little importance as it contains, as s/he assumes, a huge number of complicated rules which are useless and hence make English learning less enjoying but in fact 'a scaring experience'. The overall results obtained confirm the notion that the students' acquisition and mastery of grammatical knowledge should be central in the teaching of the English language.

Q2. Which aspect of Grammar is the most difficult?

- a. Nouns (countable and uncountable)**
- b. Prepositions**
- c. Phrasal Verbs**
- d. Tenses**
- e. Other: Please, specify.**

Options	N	%
a	8	11.43
b	18	25.71
c	21	30
d	14	20

ab	2	2.86
ac	1	1.43
ad	2	2.86
bd	3	4.29
bc	1	1.43
Total	70	100

Table 3.19.: The Students' Opinion about the Grammatical Aspect they Find Most Difficult

Table 3.18. shows that a significant percentage of students 30 % recognize phrasal verbs as difficult, while 25,71% of them opt for prepositions, this was explained by the fact that phrasal verbs as well as prepositions are numerous and they have no fixed meaning as they vary from one context to another. The other 20 % have difficulties with tenses; this was attributed to their syntactic as well as semantic complexities and irregularities. A less percentage of 11,43% find nouns (countable/uncountable) challenging and confusing . Other students opt for more than one option, 4.29 % recognize prepositions as well as tenses as difficult. One student thinks that nouns in addition to phrasal verbs are challenging, while another one recognizes phrasal verbs and preposition as problematic. Although these results they differ variously from one aspect to another, they imply that the English language is full of grammatical aspects which are really problematic to EFL learners. Considering the above percentages, phrasal verbs in addition to prepositions and tenses constitute a serious learning problem to the majority of first year students. Therefore, extensive importance and training need to be given to these respective grammatical categories.

Q3. How do you like being exposed to grammatical content?

- a. Worksheets**
- b. Games**
- c. Blackboard / Whiteboard**
- d. Songs and Plays**
- e. Everything**
- f. Other : Please, specify :**

Options	N	%
a	11	15.71
b	14	20
c	9	12.86
d	6	8.57
e	11	15.71
ab	2	2.86
abd	1	1.43
ad	2	2.86
ae	1	1.43
bc	1	1.43

bcd	2	2.86
bd	9	12.86
be	1	1.43
Total	70	100

Table 3.20.: The Students' Preference of how to Be Exposed to Grammatical Content

We can see from the table 3.19. that 20 % of the students favor games. The majority of these students believe that games create a friendly atmosphere and keep boredom away as well as make them enjoy Grammar lessons. Following games, worksheets also have been opted for by 15, 71 %. Similarly another 15, 71 % also stated that they enjoy all the given options. 12, 86 % opt for blackboard/whiteboard while another 12.86 % also prefer games in addition to songs and plays. Whereas 8,57 % like songs and plays. A less percentage of 2,86 % favor worksheets and games, similarly does the other 2.86 % as it opts for both worksheets plus songs and plays, again the same 2.86 % enjoy games, blackboard/whiteboard as well as songs and plays. The least percentage of 1,43 % is distributed variously among the given options. These results suggest that the students' preferences of the way to be exposed to grammatical content should be further investigated in order to take them into account and to make their learning a successful experience.

Section Two: Phrasal Verbs

Q4. Do you know what the English phrasal verb is?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	24	34.29
No	46	65.71
Total	70	100

Table 3.21. : The Students' Knowledge of the English Phrasal Verb

Only 34.29 % of the students stated that they are familiar with the English phrasal verb, whereas the majority of the students (65.71 %) showed their ignorance of this grammatical category. A final conclusion can recommend that more research and attention should be devoted to phrasal verbs.

Q5. If 'Yes', please explain:

Only 7 students provided explanations. Three students explained that the English phrasal verb is a compound verb, whereas only two students stated that a phrasal verb is a verb followed by a preposition. The last two students explained that a phrasal verb is a verb that is paired with a noun or an adjective. The students' explanations were surprising because their knowledge of phrasal verbs seems to be vague and even mistaken. Thus, further research and investigations should be conducted exclusively to address this very problem so that to raise students' awareness and knowledge of phrasal verbs.

Q6. Do you think that phrasal verbs are an important element in learning the English Language?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	58	82.86
No	12	17.14
Total	70	100

Table 3.22. : The Students' Opinion about the Importance of Phrasal Verbs in Learning English

From the results displayed in table 3.21., we can see that the majority of the students (82.86%) believe in the importance of phrasal verbs whereas only (17.14%) think that phrasal verbs are of little value in learning English language. The students' awareness of the importance of phrasal verbs can be better emphasized by extensive training and good instructions.

Q7. Is it important to learn phrasal verbs in a fun way?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	62	88.57
No	8	11.43
Total	70	100

Table 3.23.: The Students' Views about the Importance of Learning Phrasal Verbs in a Fun Way

A remarkable number of the students (88.57%) recognized the importance of the fun way in their learning of phrasal verbs, while only (11.43%) conceived of the fun way as unimportant and of little significance. In fact, this correlates with their already preference of games in question number three in the first section. Thus, this confirms the students' inclinations towards innovative and speculative procedures which are likely to make their learning of grammar as well as their acquisition of phrasal verbs much more enjoying and desirable. The students' individual preferences should be taken into account so that to ensure a successful learning experience.

Q8. If "Yes", is it because:

- a. It encourages creative and spontaneous use of the language**
- b. It promotes communicative competence**
- c. It builds class cohesion**
- d. Other: Please, specify**

Options	N	%
a	42	67.74
b	13	20.97
c	5	8.06
ab	2	3.23
Total	62	100

Table 3.24. : The Students' Reasons for their Preference of Learning Phrasal Verbs in a Fun Way

67.74% of the students attributed their preference of the fun way in their learning of phrasal verbs to the fact that it encourages creative and spontaneous use of the language. 20.97% of the students thought that the fun way enhances their communicative competence, and only 8.06% believed in its usefulness in achieving class cohesion. The last 3.23% opted for both advantages of the spontaneous use of the language as well as enhancing the communicative competence.

Q9. If ‘No’, is it because:

- a. It takes a long time**
- b. It generates noise**
- c. Other : Please, specify:**

Options	N	%
a	2	25
b	6	75
Total	8	100

Table 3.25.: The Students’ Reasons for their Negative Attitudes towards the Fun Way in their learning of Phrasal Verbs

Table 3.24. shows that the reason behind the students’ dislike of the fun way is due to the disturbing noise it generates (75%) of the students maintained that the fun factor results in disorder and chaos in the class, and makes them lose concentration. 25% of the students believe that the activities of the fun way take time as well as energy. The other two students said that this way is not suitable for university students because they think themselves adults who should be instructed in a formal way.

Q10. Do you use phrasal verbs?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	10	14,29
No	60	85,71
Total	70	100

Table 3.26.: The Students' Use of Phrasal Verbs

Table3.25. shows that the majority of the students (85.71%) do not use phrasal verbs, and only 14.29% stated that they use them. Not surprisingly, these results confirm the ones obtained from question four. The reasons behind avoiding this category should be seriously studied, and practically solved.

Q11. If 'Yes', do you use them in:

- a. Written discourse**
- b. Spoken discourse**
- c. Both**

Options	N	%
a	3	30
b	6	60
c	1	10

Total	10	100
-------	----	-----

Table 3.27.: The Students' Use of Phrasal Verbs in their Discourse

60% of the students stated that their use of phrasal verbs is mostly found in their spoken discourse while 30% of them showed that they use phrasal verbs in their written discourse, and only one student opted for both types of discourse. The students' use of phrasal verbs in their spoken discourse is similar to the natives' use whose conversational discourse is loaded with this grammatical pattern. This implies that the students are influenced by the way the natives prefer to use the language.

Q13. Which type of phrasal verbs do you prefer to use?

- a. Literal (such as stand up)**
- b. Semi-literal (such as carry on)**
- c. Idiomatic (such as run into)**

Options	N	%
a	55	78.57
b	12	17.14
c	3	4.29
Total	70	100

Table 3.28.: The Students' Use of Phrasal Verbs in Relation to their Semantic Categories

The results obtained from table3.27. reveal that the more a phrasal verb is semantically difficult, the less it is used. This implies the least percentage (4.29%) opted for idiomatic

phrasal verbs, followed by another 17.14% of the students who used semi-literal phrasal verbs, whereas the highest percentage (78.57%) favors literal phrasal verbs. This implies that the semantic properties of phrasal verbs determine the likelihood of their use.

Q14. Since phrasal verbs are numerous they may express different meanings, this may lead to:

- a. Hardly use them**
- b. Hardly learn them**
- c. Other, please specify.**

Options	N	%
a	34	48.57
b	36	51.43
Total	70	100

Table3.29.: The Students' Reactions towards the Huge Number of Phrasal Verbs and their Polysemy

The challenging features mentioned in Q14 lead 48,57% of the students to hardly use phrasal verbs, and the other 51,43% to hardly learn them. These challenging features which hinder students from using and learning phrasal verbs are problematic and should be investigated so that to provide solutions to them.

Section Three: The Structural/Communicative Approach

Q15. Does your teacher use the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching Grammar

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	50	71,43
No	20	28,57
Total	70	100

Table3.30.: The Students' Opinion about the Frequency of their Teacher's Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach

As it is shown in table3.28., the majority of the students (71,43%) declared that their teacher follows the Structural/Communicative Approach in his/her teaching of Grammar, while the other 28,57% stated that their teacher does not use this approach in grammar lessons. This implies that the Structural/Communicative Approach is popular and its principles are already adopted in Grammar teaching.

Q16. If 'Yes', how often?

- a. Always**
- b. Usually**
- c. Sometimes**
- d. Rarely**

Options	N	%
a	13	26
b	24	48
c	9	18
d	4	8
Total	50	100

Table3.31.: The Students' Opinions about the Frequency of their Teacher's Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach

Table 3.29. displays the students' description of their teacher's use of the Structural/Communicative Approach. It reveals that only 8% of the students stated that their teacher rarely uses this approach. Another 18% stated that their teacher sometimes uses it. While 26% of them declared that their teacher always uses this approach. However, 48% of the students described their teacher's use of this approach as usual. Despite the fact that the students have already been taught Grammar using this approach, its use varies considerably as it is not always implemented.

Section Four: Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach

Q17. Does your teacher teach you phrasal verbs?

- a. Deductively**
- b. Inductively**
- c. Eclectically**

Options	N	%
a	30	42,86
b	18	25,71
c	22	31,43
Total	70	100

Table 3.32.: The Students' Opinion about the Way their Teacher Teaches Phrasal Verbs

Concerning the method that the teacher uses in teaching phrasal verbs, 42,86% described it as a deductive way. Another 25,71% stated that it as inductive , and a considerable number of them (31,43%) mentioned that they were taught phrasal verbs eclectically . This implies that the direct and explicit instructions are dominant in the teaching of Grammar.

Q18. Have you ever been taught phrasal verbs following the Structural/Communicative Approach?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	28	40
No	42	60

Total	70	100
-------	----	-----

Table.3.33.: The Students' Opinion about the Rate of their Teacher's Use of the Structural/Communicative Approach in Teaching Phrasal Verbs

40% of the students declared that they have been taught phrasal verbs following this approach, while 60% of them stated that their teacher has never used it. Based on the results obtained from the above table (table.3.32.), we can assume that most of the students have been instructed in a direct way which means that the principles of the Structural Approach are still widely used.

Q19. Do you think that the Structural/Communicative Approach helped you learning phrasal verbs?

Yes

No

Options	N	%
Yes	55	78,57
No	15	21,43
Total	70	100

Table 3.34.: The Students' Belief about the Usefulness of the Structural/Communicative Approach in their Learning of Phrasal Verbs

The Majority of the students (78,57%) showed a positive attitude towards the Structural/Communicative Approach as they recognize it as helpful in their learning of phrasal verbs. The other 21,43% held a negative view towards this approach as they do not

find it as useful as it should be. The principles of the Structural/Communicative Approach need to be implemented especially that most of the students highly value it.

Q20. If 'Yes', please explain how?

Regarding this request, only very few students (4 students) justified their choice; three of them believe that it helps them develop their grammatical knowledge without neglecting their speaking proficiency. Only one student assumes that this approach takes into account their individual preferences as it varies techniques and procedures.

Q21. If 'No', please explain why?

Students who opted for this answer (9students) explained that they get used to direct and traditional methods, especially which they have always been taught in this way, and it is very difficult for them to be instructed differently. Another 3 students believe that this approach is not appropriate for large classes which are loaded with mixed-ability students. In addition to that, one student stated that Grammar is better understood through direct instructions and explanation. For him, this approach may complicate things for them.

Section Five: Further Suggestions

Some students (3 students) commented that the English Grammar is very difficult especially that they are still novice learners. Other students (2 students) complained about the irregularity of the English verb. One student stated that his/her excitement and enthusiastic love of the English language faded away because he/she started to recognize the complexity of its Grammar.

3.3. Overall Analysis

Half of the teachers (50%) who took part in this questionnaire favored an eclectic approach to teach phrasal verbs. Their choice was grounded on their belief that variety doubles the chances of a better comprehension of rules under discussion, that is why, as they stated (83,33%) are flexible in choosing the method according to the grammatical aspect they teach as they explained that teaching Grammar has always been a flexible process especially that each grammatical aspect has its unique properties which determine the way it should be approached. Basically, flexibility is one of the Structural/Communicative Approach's main principles.

Concerning the teachers' familiarity with the Structural/Communicative Approach 83,33% were familiar with it, and almost all of those teachers use this approach (7 teachers out of 10). They consequently used it to teach aspects of paramount importance like types of sentences and difficult grammatical patterns. Their support to this approach is clearly manifested in their consistent and frequent use of this approach (42,85%).

With regard to using the Structural/Communicative Approach in the teaching of phrasal verbs, the highest percentage of 83,33% agreed that the Structural/Communicative Approach is effective to teach phrasal verbs. They justified that this approach covers all the communicative aspects of phrasal verbs with giving full details about their syntactic and semantic properties. Besides, it is thought appropriate for learners to be adequately familiar with the functional value of the rules. Therefore, 66;67% of them declared that they have already used it to teach phrasal verbs. The teachers seem to be very impressed and satisfied with this approach as they stated that this approach implies teaching in a productive fashion and its tenets are worthy to be applied. However, it is recommended that this approach can be

implemented more fully only when the teacher is given the freedom to choose the content and the number of lessons to cover per term. Besides, more research must be conducted about it.

The analysis of the results obtained from the Students' Questionnaire has revealed that the majority of the students (98,57%) recognized the importance of Grammar as they believe it essential and crucial in their learning of English. For 30% of the students phrasal verbs are regarded as the most difficult grammatical pattern. Though they believe (82,86%) in the importance of phrasal verbs in the English language, 65,71% of them showed their ignorance of them. When they were asked whether they prefer to learn phrasal verbs through the fun way, the majority of them (88,57%) advocated this way, in addition to their adherence to games (30%) in Grammar lessons. This is why we suggest that the students' expectations about learning Grammar and their preferences can be better secured through the Structural/Communicative Approach.

When they were asked whether their teachers used the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching Grammar 71,43% of the students agreed that their teachers did use this approach. Eventually, their answer is consistent with their teachers' (70%). The students (78,57%) showed encouraging perspectives towards the usefulness of the Structural/Communicative Approach in their learning of Grammar, and more specifically phrasal verbs.

Conclusion

The teachers who have answered this questionnaire agreed that the eclectic approach is appropriately suitable in teaching Grammar, in general, and phrasal verbs more specifically. The teachers' answers are consequently consistent with their students' answers which also recognized the usefulness of implementing the Structural/Communicative Approach. The overall analysis of these questionnaires concluded that teachers as well as students advocated

the use of the Structural/Communicative Approach, their support was evidently clear in their answers which confirm the validity of this approach. Hence, we have come out to confirm our hypothesis that teachers at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages at Abdelhafid Boussouf Mila University Center believe that the Structural/Communicative Approach is effective in teaching phrasal verbs and actually use it in their own teaching.

General Conclusion

This research aims at investigating and checking out the effectiveness and importance of implementing the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching phrasal verbs to first year students at the Department of Letters and Foreign Languages, Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila. Since Grammar has always been thought as the backbone of any language, the acquisition of enough grammatical knowledge is essentially imperative in achieving and developing higher levels of proficiency. Nevertheless, for the majority of EFL and ESL learners, the acquisition of such knowledge is a challenging endeavor, especially that a variety of grammatical aspects constitute many learning problems, and phrasal verbs are no exception as they are remarkably problematic. The question which is raised then concerns the appropriate way of teaching phrasal verbs, whether to follow direct and explicit instruction which is advocated by the Structural Approach, or to adopt a communicative perspective through which phrasal verbs are addressed explicitly in communicative contexts.

This study suggests the use of a systematic and innovative teaching model to teach phrasal verbs, that is the Structural/Communicative Approach. In this approach, direct instruction is believed necessary to build a better understanding of this language form, then communicative practices are provided through which the students' understanding is further developed and fostered. This study takes account of the teachers' views, perceptions, beliefs as well as attitudes towards the implementation of the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching grammar in general, and particularly phrasal verbs. No less importantly, the students' attitudes and perceptions regarding the implementation of this approach in their learning of phrasal verbs are also explored. Based on the above intended aims, this research work is founded on two fundamental hypotheses, we hypothesise that if the Structural/Communicative Approach is used to teach phrasal verbs, the students' understanding and use of this grammatical aspect will be developed. We also hypothesise that teachers at the Department of Letters and Foreign

Languages, Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila believe that the Structural/Communicative Approach is helpful to teach phrasal verbs and use it in their own teaching.

In the light of this situation, it is thought appropriate to conduct a Teachers' Questionnaire and a Students' Questionnaire through which further investigation on the topic under discussion was carried out. In essence, the analysis of the Teachers' Questionnaire revealed promising results in relation to the implementation of this approach in teaching grammar in general, and more specifically phrasal verbs. The majority of the teachers who took part in this questionnaire agreed that the Structural/Communicative Approach is really beneficial and worthy to be adopted. In fact, the teachers' standpoint was a result of a teaching of phrasal verbs experience where the usefulness of this approach was evidentially manifested. The students' responses, on the other hand, correlate with their teachers' answers as they believe in the worthiness of this approach in achieving better understanding of phrasal verbs.

It may be concluded that the wide ranging approval of the Structural/Communicative Approach which has been unveiled from the Teachers' Questionnaire and the Students' Questionnaire can be taken as a proof which confirmed our suggested hypotheses and answered the thesis' questions. In other words, the Structural/Communicative Approach is adequately appropriate in teaching phrasal verbs, especially that both the teachers and the learners hold positive and encouraging attitudes towards its implementation in the teaching practice. In addition to that these respective teachers really support this approach as they actually used it in their teaching of phrasal verbs. Thus, it is recommended that the usefulness of the Structural/Communicative Approach can be further investigated in other research works through which the Structural/Communicative Approach can be tackled from other

perspectives and angles that may be of great service to the field of language teaching and learning.

Appendices

Appendix I: The Teachers' Questionnaire

Appendix II: The Students' Questionnaire

The Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teacher,

This questionnaire is part of a research study which is about investigating the teachers' views about using the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching phrasal verbs.

We would be very thankful if you take time to answer this questionnaire. Please tick (✓) in the appropriate box , or make full statements when necessary. Your answers will be valuable for this study.

May we thank you, in advance , for your collaboration

Miss, Guessas Chabila

Bouafia Aya

Departement of Foreign Languages

English Section

Mila University Center

Section One : General Information

1. What is your degree?

a. Licence

b. Master

c. Magister

d. Doctorate

2. How long have you been teaching?

..... years.

3. How long have you been teaching Grammar?

..... years.

Section Two: Teaching Grammar

4. Do you think that teaching Grammar is difficult?

a. Yes

b. No

Please, justify:

.....
.....

5. Throughout your experience in the teaching of Grammar, which grammatical aspect do you find difficult to teach?

a. Tenses

b. Articles

c. Prepositions

d. Phrasal Verbs

o

.....
.....

6. The method you use in teaching Grammar depends on the nature of the grammatical aspect:

a. Yes

b. No

7. If "Yes", please explain why:

.....
.....

Section Three: The Structural/Communicative Approach

The Structural/Communicative Approach adopts teaching principles and methods from both the structural and communicative approaches. The Structural/Communicative Approach implies learning about structures of the language " its grammar ", and how effectively communicate with these language structures when provided with appropriate communicative contexts.

8. Are you familiar with the definition of the Structural/Communicative Approach?

a. Yes

b. No

9. If ‘‘Yes’’ do you use it in teaching Grammar?

a. Yes

b. No

10. If ‘‘No’’, is it because:

a. It is not as effective as the Communicative Approach

b. It is unsuitable for Grammar lessons

c. It is not well understood

d. Other: Please, specify:

.....
.....

11. If ‘‘Yes’’, for which grammatical aspect do you use it and why ?

.....
.....

12. How often?

a. Always

b. Usually

c. Sometimes

d. Rarely

13. In your opinion, is teaching Grammar in a fun way useful?

a. Yes

b. No

14. If ‘Yes’, is it because:

a. It maintains an intimate relation with your students

b. It gets the whole class engaged in the session

c. It achieves collaboration among students

d. It facilitates the process of explaining difficult points

e. Other: Please, specify:

.....
.....
15. If “No”, is it because it is:

a. Difficult to control, especially large classes

b. Time and energy consuming

c. Generates noise

d. Other: Please, specify:

.....
.....

Section Four: Phrasal Verbs and the Structural/Communicative Approach

16. Teaching phrasal verbs is a difficult task

a. Yes

b. No

17. If “Yes”, is it difficult because:

a. The English phrasal verb is complex in nature

b. Phrasal verbs are numerous and polysemous in meaning

c. Learners constantly avoid using them

d. They have no equivalent structure in the mother tongue

e. They are mainly informal and rarely found in the written discourse

f. Others: Please, specify:

.....
.....

18. How do you prefer to teach phrasal verbs?

a. Deductively

b. Inductively

c. Eclectically

Please, explain why?

.....
.....

19. The Structural/Communicative Approach is helpful in the teaching of phrasal verbs:

a. Yes

b. No

20. If ‘‘Yes’’, please explain how:

.....
.....

21. Have you ever used the Structural/Communicative Approach to teach phrasal verbs?

a. Yes

b. No

Section Five: Further Suggestion

22. Please, add any other comment.

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

The Students' Questionnaire

Dear students,

This questionnaire is part of a research study which is about investigating the students' attitudes towards the effect of using the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching phrasal verbs.

We would be very thankful if you take time to answer this questionnaire. Please tick (√) in the appropriate box, or make full statements when necessary. Your answers will be valuable for this study.

May we thank you, in advance , for your collaboration

Miss, Guessas Chabila

Bouafia Aya

Departement of Foreign Languages

English Section

Mila University Center

Section One: Learning Grammar

1. Do you think that Grammar is an important aspect of English?

a. Yes

b. No

Please, justify:

.....
.....

2. Which aspect of Grammar is the most difficult?

a. Nouns (countable or uncountable)

b. Prepositions

c. Phrasal Verbs

d. Tenses

e. Other: Please , specify:

.....
.....

3. How do you like being exposed to grammatical content?

a. Worksheets

b. Games

c. Blackboard / Whiteboard

d. Songs and Plays

e. Everything

f. Other: Please, specify:

.....
.....

Section Two: Phrasal Verbs

4. Do you know what the English phrasal verb is?

a. Yes

b. No

5. If “ Yes “, please explain:

.....
.....

6. Do you think that phrasal verbs are an important element in learning the English language?

a. Yes

b. No

Please, justify:

.....
.....

7. Is it important to learn phrasal verbs in a fun way?

a. Yes

b. No

Please, justify:

.....
.....

8. If ‘‘Yes’’, is it because:

a. It encourages creative and spontaneous use of the language

b. It promotes communicative competence

c. It builds class cohesion

d. Other: Please, specify:

.....
.....

9. If ‘‘No’’, is it because:

a. It takes a long time

b. It generates noise

c. Other: Please, specify:

.....
.....

10. Do you use phrasal verbs?

a. Yes

b. No

11. If ‘‘Yes’’, do you use them in:

a. Written discourse

b. Spoken discourse

c. Both

12. How often do you use phrasal verbs?

a. Always

b. Often

c. Occasional

d. Never

13. Which type of phrasal verbs do you prefer to use?

a. Literal (such as stand up)

b. Semi-literal (such as carry on)

c. Idiomatic (such as run into)

14. Since phrasal verbs are numerous they may express different meanings, this may lead to:

a. Hardly use them

b. Hardly learn them

c. Other, please specify:

.....
.....

Section Three: The Structural/Communicative Approach

The Structural/Communicative Approach adopts teaching principles and methods from both the structural and communicative approaches. The Structural/Communicative Approach implies learning about structures of the language ‘‘ its grammar ‘‘, and how effectively communicate with these language structures when provided with appropriate communicative contexts.

15. Does your teacher use the Structural/Communicative Approach in teaching Grammar?

a. Yes

b. No

16. If ‘‘Yes’’, how often s/he use it?

a. Always

b. Usually

c. Sometimes

d. Rarely

Section Four: Teaching Phrasal Verbs Using the Structural/Communicative Approach

17. Does your teacher teach you phrasal verbs:

a. Deductively

b. Inductively

c. Eclectically

18. Have you ever been taught phrasal verbs following the Structural/Communicative Approach?

a. Yes

b. No

19. Do you think that the Structural/Communicative/Approach helped you learning phrasal verbs?

a. Yes

b. No

20. If “Yes”, please explain how?

.....
.....

21. If “No” please explain why?

.....
.....

Section Five: Further Suggestions

22. Please add any further comment

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

References

- Abdullah, H.I. (2015). "Enhancing Competency in English: The Covert Approach a complementary to the overt approach in teaching grammar. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(1), 191- 197.
- Abdullah, H.I. & Shah, P.M. (2015). "Secondary School Students' Beliefs, Perceptions and Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Structural Approach (SA)". *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*.
- Armstrong, K. (2004). Sexing up the Dossier: a Semantic Analysis of Phrasal Verbs for *Language Teacher*, 13(4). 213-224.
- Baylis, P. (2007). *Current Approach to Language Teaching and Learning*. UWS, Bankstown, NSW, Australia.
- Blau, E. K., Gonzales, J. B., & Green J. M. (1983). Helping students sort out phrasal verbs. In H. F. John (Ed.), *Selected articles from the TESOL newsletter, 1986-1983*(pp.184). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages".
- Bolinger, D. (1971). *The Phrasal Verb in English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Breen, M & Candlin, C. (1980). The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 1(2) : 99-112.
- Brinton, D. (2003). Content-Based Instruction. In Nunan, D. (Ed.), *Practical English Language Teaching* .Mc Graw-Hill Comtemporary.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of Language Teaching* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Burnaby, B. and Y. Sun, 1989. Chinese teachers' views of western language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23: 219-238.
- Bywater, F.V. (1982). *A Proficiency Course in English, with Key*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Canale, M. (1983). "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy." In J.C Richards and R.W. Schmidt (Eds.). *Language and Communication*, 2-27. Harlow: Longman.
- Candlin, C.N. (1981). *The Communicative Teaching of English: Principles and an Exercise Typology*. Essex: Longman
- Castillo, S. E. (2017). *Fostering Conceptual Metaphors in Vocabulary Teaching. Phrasal Verbs in Spanish Secondary Education: A Pedagogical Implementation. A Doctoral Thesis*. Universidad de La Rioja.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). *Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching*. *TESOL Quarterly* 25, 259-480.
- Chung, S.F. (2014). A Communicative Approach to Teaching Grammar: Theory and practice. *The English Teacher*, 34.
- Complementary to the Overt Approach in Teaching Grammar". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*.
- Cornell, A. (1985). Realistic Goals in Teaching and Learning Phrasal Verbs. *IRAL*, 23(4), 269-280.
- Courtney, R. (1983). *Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*. Essex, England: Longman Group Limited.

- Darwin, C. M., & Gray, L. S. (1999). Going after the Phrasal Verb: an Alternative Approach to Classification. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33. 65-83.
- Ellis, G. (1996). How Culturally Appropriate is the Communicative Approach? *ELT Journal*. 50(3): 213-218.
- Erlam, R. (2008). What do you researchers know about language teaching? Bridging the gap between SLA research and language pedagogy. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(3), 253-267. Erlam, R., Sakui, K. and Ellis, R. 2006.
- Fahrol, Z. Norlizawati, GH. & Hifzurrahman, R. (2016). In Proceedings of Malaysian Technical Universities International Conference on Engineering & Technology (MUICET 2011). 13-15 November, Malaysia.
- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: National Centre for English Teaching and Research.
- Finocchiaro, M & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The Functional-National Approach: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Galloway, A. (1993). *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction and Sample Activities*. 15. Aout. 2011. <[http:// www.usingenglish.com/](http://www.usingenglish.com/)>.
- Gass, S.M. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hulstijn, J., & Marchena, E. (1989). Avoidance: grammatical or semantic causes? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 241-255.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondworth: Penguin.
- Instructed Second Language Acquisition: Case Studies, Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Johnson, K. & Marrow, K. (1981). *Communication in the Classroom*. Essex: Longman.
- Johnson, K. (1982). Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology. *Modern Language Journal*, 67(3): 275.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, J., & Vanpatten, B. (2003). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Liao, Y. & Fukuya, Y.J. (2004). Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs: the Case of Chinese Learners of English. *Language Learning*, 54(2): 193-226.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. 1999. *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Language teaching. An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2013). *Developing a Context-Sensitive Pedagogy for Communication-*
- Loschky, L. & Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). *Creating Structure-Based Communication Tasks for Second Language Development*. Hawaii: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

- Mareva, R. & Nyota, S. (2012). Structural or Communicative Approach: A Case Study of English Language Teaching in Masvingo Urban and Peri-Urban Secondary Schools. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 3(5), 103-111.
- McArthur, T. (1989). The Long-Neglected Phrasal Verb. *English Today*, 5(2), 38-44. DOI: 10.1017/S026607840000393X.
- McCarthy, M. & O'Dell, F. (2004). *English Phrasal Verbs in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar. *In [Annual Review of Applied Linguistics](#)* 24(1):126-145. DOI: 10.1017/S0267190504000066.
- Oriented Language Teaching. Hong Kong: Baptist University.
- Pragmatics*, 39, 207-220.
- Quirk, R., Sidney, G., Geoffrey, L., & Jan, S. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Radišić, N. (2018). Recognition and Use of Phrasal Verbs by EFL Learners. A Master Thesis. J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek.
- Renau, M.L. (2016). *A review of the Traditional and Current Language Teaching Methods*. Spain: Jaume I University.
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Communicative Language Teaching*. In *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. W. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Longman.
- Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubio, R., Passey, A. & Campbell, S. (2004). *Grammar in Disguise: the Hidden Agenda of Communicative Language Teaching Textbooks*. University of Utah (USA).
- Saadi, D. (2017). *Teaching the English Article System through the Communicative/Structural Approach*. A Doctoral Thesis, University of Mentouri Constantine.
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Savignon, S. J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of*
- Savignon, S.J.(2002). Communicative Curriculum Design for the 21st Century. In *English Teaching Forum* 40(1), 2-7.
- Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schmitt, N. and Redwood, S. (2011). Learner knowledge of phrasal verbs. A corpus-informed study. In Meunier, F., De Cock, S., Gilquin, G. and Paquot, M. (eds.), *A taste for corpora: In honour of Sylviane Granger*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 173-207.
- Siyanova, A. & Schmitt, N. (2007). Native and nonnative use of multi-word vs. one-word verbs.

- Spada, N & Lightbrown, P.M. (1999). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Thim, S. (2012). *Phrasal Verbs: The English Verb-Particle Construction and its History* (Topics in English Linguistics 78). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. xiv + 302. ISBN 978-3-11- 025702-1.
- Thom, D. (2017). *A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Phrasal Verbs: A Teacher's Guide*. Honors Senior Theses/Projects, 139.https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/honors_theses/139
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching. In *ELT Journal*. 50(1), 9-15.
- Vasbieva, D.G. (2014). *Lean Approach as a Means of Achieving Communicative Competence*. *XLinguae*, 7(4), 75-82.
- Waibel, B. (2007). *Phrasal Verbs in Learner English: a Corpus-Based Study of German and Italian Students*. A Doctoral Thesis. Freiburg: Albert-Ludwigs. Universität Freiburg.
- What Is Competency-Based Learning? (2017). [teachthought.com](https://www.teachthought.com/learning/what-is-competency-based-learning/). Retrieved from <https://www.teachthought.com/learning/what-is-competency-based-learning/>
- White, B.J. (2012). A Conceptual Approach to the Instruction of Phrasal Verbs. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(3), 419-438.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978a). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierszycka, J. (2013). Phrasal verbs in learner English: A semantic approach. A study based on a POS tagged spoken corpus of learner English. *Research in Corpus Linguistics*, 0(1), 81–93.

Yahia, N. (2010). Bolstering –up Students with Authentic Literary Loaded Texts as an Affective Device to Use Phrasal Verbs in Their Writings. A Master Thesis, University of Mentouri Constantine.

Yalden, J. (1983). The Communicative Syllabus. Evolution, Design and Implementation. Toronto. Pergamon Press

Résumé

Les questions qui sont généralement et fréquemment posées dans l'enseignement linguistique actuel sont essentiellement liées à l'enseignement de la grammaire. Il n'est pas surprenant que de nombreux ouvrages lui aient été spécifiquement consacrés. Tout au long de l'histoire de l'enseignement de la grammaire, il ya toujours eu des questions controversées qui retiennent particulièrement l'attention des chercheurs, une question fondamentale soulevée par de nombreux praticiens des langues étant le modèle d'enseignement approprié à suivre. Alors que certains d'entre eux approuvent encore et croient en la valeur de la construction d'une bonne connaissance grammaticale par le biais d'une instruction explicite et directe adoptée par l'Approche Structurelle, d'autres semblent être enclins à adopter les dernières doctrines de communication qui prônent l'utilité des pratiques de communication dans le développement. Principalement les compétences de communication des apprenants, jugées nécessaires dans un monde largement globalisé. Cependant, d'autres estiment que les deux approches sont remarquablement utiles, c'est pourquoi elles préconisent l'intégration de ces deux approches dans un modèle d'enseignement idéal, l'Approche Structurelle / Communicative. Considérant la question de l'enseignement des verbes à particule qui revêt une importance primordiale dans la grammaire anglaise, la présente étude a pour objectif spécifique d'examiner l'utilité de l'Approche Structurelle / Communicative dans l'enseignement de cette forme linguistique particulière au Département des Lettres et des Langues Etrangères, Abdelhafid Boussouf. Centre Universitaire de Mila. Nous émettons l'hypothèse que si les Phrasal Verbs sont enseignés systématiquement par l'Approche Structurelle / Communicative, les élèves amélioreraient leur compréhension et leur utilisation des Phrasal Verbs. Nous émettons également l'hypothèse que l'Approche Structurelle / Communicative peut devenir dominante et utile dans l'enseignement des Phrasal Verbs. Les hypothèses sont vérifiées au moyen d'un questionnaire destiné aux enseignants et d'un questionnaire destiné aux étudiants. Sur la base

des données obtenues des deux questionnaires, nous pouvons confirmer nos hypothèses, en particulier si les enseignants et les étudiants étaient d'accord pour dire que l'utilisation de l'Approche Structurale / Communicative est pratiquement efficace dans l'enseignement des Phrasal Verbs.

الملخص

ترتبط الأسئلة التي عادةً ما تثار في تدريس اللغة الحالي بشكل أساسي بتدريس القواعد. ليس من المستغرب أن مجموعة كبيرة من الأدب قد خصصت له على وجه التحديد. طوال تاريخ تدريس قواعد اللغة، كانت هناك دائمًا مشكلات مثيرة للجدل تأخذ الجزء الأكبر من اهتمام العلماء، سؤال أساسي واحد يطرحه العديد من ممارسي اللغة يتعلقون بنموذج التدريس المناسب الذي يجب إتباعه. بينما لا يزال البعض منهم يوافقون على قيمة بناء المعرفة النحوية السليمة ويؤمنون بها من خلال تعليمات واضحة ومباشرة تعتمد على المنهجية الهيكلية، يبدو أن البعض الآخر يميل بحماس نحو مذاهب تواصلية تدعو إلى الاستفادة من الممارسات التواصلية في تطوير في المقام الأول مهارات التواصل للمتعلمين التي يعتقد أنها ضرورية في العالم على نطاق واسع. ومع ذلك، هناك آخرون ممن يرون أن كلا النهجين لهما قيمة ملحوظة وهذا هو السبب في أنهما يدعوان إلى تكامل كلا النهجين في نموذج تعليمي مثالي هو النهج الهيكلي / التواصلية. بالنظر إلى مسألة تدريس العبارات الفعلية ذات الأهمية القصوى في قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية، أجريت هذه الدراسة على وجه التحديد للتحقيق في جدوى النهج الهيكلي / التواصلية في تدريس هذا الشكل اللغوي المعين في قسم الآداب واللغات الأجنبية، عبد الحفيظ بوصوف، المركز الجامعي ميلة. نحن نفترض أنه إذا تم تدريس العبارات الفعلية بشكل منهجي من خلال المنهج الهيكلي / التواصلية، فإن الطلاب سوف يحسنون فهمهم واستخدامهم لها. نحن نفترض أيضًا أن النهج الهيكلي / التواصلية قد يصبح مهيمًا و مفيدًا في تدريس العبارات الفعلية. يتم التحقق من الفرضيات من خلال استبيان المعلمين واستبيان الطلاب. استنادًا إلى البيانات التي تم الحصول عليها من كلا الاستبيانين، يمكننا تأكيد فرضياتنا خاصةً أن كلا من المعلمين والطلاب قد وافقوا على أن استخدام النهج الهيكلي / التواصلية فعال فعليًا في تدريس العبارات الفعلية.