



*Objectives and Approaches of Teaching English Language at  
the Intensive Language Teaching Centre (CEIL) Chadli*

*Bendjedid University*

Abdelkader Khaldoun

Chadli Bendjedid University, Faculty of Letters, Human and Social Sciences

Department of English

a.khaldoun@univ-eltarf.dz

Received: 05 /01 / 2024 Accepted: 14 /06 / 2024 Published: 21 /06 / 2024

---

**Abstract:**

An Investigation on the training and teaching approaches had been taken place at the Intensive Language Teaching Center Chadli Bendjedid University (CBU) El Tarf- Algeria- with teachers who are teaching English language. Responses had been collected after a self administered questionnaire distributed to five teachers of English at CBU, linguistic and socio-cultural objectives are the paramount supported teaching approaches with the focus of practice and pragmatism in using the language and the act of learning in situation of social exchange. Literacy and cultural objectives should not be excluded during the academic training.

**Keywords:** *Language teaching, learning methodologies, English language, objectives, teaching approaches, Center for Intensive Language Teaching.*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Lifelong learning is now the slogan of our era. Thus, it is no longer implausible or extraordinary to see students preparing for a university syllabus and at the same time devoting an amount of time studying English at the intensive centers of foreign languages; just as it is no longer surprising to find that practicing professionals undergo intensive training in this language. The idea of improving yourself regardless of your status is now a principle of life.

In this configuration, the Intensive Language Teaching Centers represent training structures of significant interest. As part of this work, we are interested in the teaching of the English language at the Center for Intensive Language Teaching because the dissemination of this language and its weight are now in no way challenged. A planetary expansion that cannot leave us indifferent: language of erudition, prestige, mobility and professional emancipation in the most fashionable economic sectors, the arguments are not limited to this level. Be that as it may, it seems that no individual can shine without having some rays of knowledge of this global language. We do not praise it, we limit ourselves to reporting on a state of development of a language that no one can deny. Intensive teaching is a method of teaching whose objective is to foster or develop the language skills of learners in language teaching, which learners thus experience a period of intense learning of a language with which they experience a deficit, generally linguistic without being exclusive, hindering their academic or professional future, sometimes even social.

The Intensive Language Teaching Centers mainly welcome three categories of public: students, teachers/researchers and people from outside the university community. Sometimes, on request, groups are added made up of members of the university administrative staff. The interest is such that agreements are signed between universities and the socio-economic sector to allow civil servants to register and follow language training. The Centers therefore become service providers.

Faced with the supremacy of the English language, we conducted this investigation with the aim of understanding the teaching procedures of this language in the Center for Intensive Language Teaching (now CEIL), by formulating the hypothesis that with regard to the panorama of language teaching methodologies, from traditional methodology to the action perspective, CEIL teachers use eclectic approaches since none of the methodologies mentioned above dominates the didactic scene on a national scale than international. Before presenting the methodological milestones and the field investigation, a brief reminder of language teaching/learning methodologies will serve as a basis for understanding the approaches adopted by the teachers interviewed.

### **2- Overview of Foreign Language Teaching Methodologies:**

Language teaching has never been confined to a single methodology; on the contrary, the history of foreign language teaching/learning methodologies (Puren, 1988) shows a succession of several methodologies that have alternated in an attempt to better respond to the shortcomings observed over time. Obviously, the history of the evolution of methodologies shows that each is as important as the other with regard to the contributions made and improved, thus contributing to a set of parameters to be taken into consideration for the teaching of foreign languages today. And to understand the present approaches, we must know those of yesterday. Thus, before the grammar-translation methodology, reading the article by Tardieu (2014) allows us to put forward the idea that certain activities and tools were already used to learn languages, such as translation, role-playing, images in the form of paintings, reading aloud, sketches or

dialogues without forgetting immersion as a linguistic bath rich in tones and intonations, in spatio-temporal cultural elements, in speech acts and in socio-cultural norms and ethics.

With the traditional methodology that appeared in the process of teaching/learning foreign languages towards the end of the 18th century until the 19th century, the essential objective was to bring students to read and translate literary texts into a foreign language. She focuses on writing but also takes into account the oral which should resemble academic literary writing. The language was conceived as a set of rules and exceptions to be learned and applied thanks to the support of literary texts.

The teaching of grammar was done by presenting the rule in a general way to apply it particularly at the level of the sentences. This traditional methodology was based mainly on two activities: memorization as a technique for learning the language and versioning as a translation exercise: the theme made it possible to translate into the foreign language and the version is the opposite to translate into the mother tongue. Thus the entire texts were literally translated into the mother tongue. This translation dominated the activities offered by the school textbooks of the time (19th century).

Didacticians criticize this traditional methodology for its inefficiency, reflected in the corsage of the minds of learners who developed a limited and artificial grammatical learning, hence the emergence of other methodologies, in particular direct methodology. Appeared in 1902, it is interested in the training of learners capable of producing natural speech in a situation of exchange. Society has evolved away from an exclusively literary language, to focus on the communicative need. Thus emerged the need for a communication tool that can promote the development of exchanges on all levels: economic, political, cultural and touristic.

Openness to the world has led to the need for a practical need and purpose of teaching/learning about modern foreign languages now considered as predominantly oral communication tools. Without totally ignoring the previous methodology, it borrows memorization to bring the student to reactivate what he has learned and then use it while avoiding the use of the mother tongue as a learning resource, hence the denomination of direct. The difference with the traditional methodology is obvious since this methodology represents a cocktail of methods: direct and oral. The first qualifying adjective is justified by the use of a set of means with the aim of avoiding recourse to the intermediary of the mother tongue in learning.

The latter was prohibited, hence the total deletion of the translation exercises through the theme and the version of the previous methodology. The second qualifier is linked to the idea that this methodology has given supremacy to the spoken word, unlike the written word revered by the traditional methodology. As the supreme objective was the communicative exchange introduced by the commercial and tourist opening, the oral practice of the language in class occupied the only training purpose. Another qualifier worth mentioning is the more active role of the learner and the teacher.

The latter contrived to use a set of approaches to promote the active participation of the student who must speak to communicate. To achieve this objective, the teacher questions the students to encourage them to talk; and in the absence of translation, the student is encouraged to develop his imagination or rather his intuition to understand the meaning of words and sentences. He must also deduce the linguistic rules thanks to the different examples given by the teacher; it is therefore active since it does not directly receive these rules.

Finally, a conversation or dramatization game is offered to students so that they can learn the language through action (e.g. imitate a scene of work, meeting, medical consultation, etc.).

The two human protagonists were visibly active in language class. Ultimately, the direct methodology requires the learner to think in a foreign language thanks to the help of the teacher who explains the vocabulary using different artifacts: image, object, mimicry or the environment, giving priority to the oral, especially pronunciation.

From this situation already appeared implicitly the active methodology from the years 20-25 of the year nineteen hundred which adopts a criterion of each of the preceding methodologies from where the various titles in particular "Eclectic methodology" and "mixed methodology", or even "Synthetic methodology" (Puren, 2012.p.143). By way of illustration, this methodology reintegrates the written medium while also retaining the use of the oral auxiliary; it also uses iconic media as well as translation, recalling the theme and the version, to develop the lexicon of learners from words from the immediate and daily environment of the learner, in short from everyday life. This method is reminiscent of vocabulary lists. It also advocates active teaching of the rules of the language by gradually leading the learner to discover the said rules thanks to the examples given by the teacher, this which is commonly called inductive method.

We therefore observe a focus on the learner, on active life and dynamic learning by developing in the taught a clear interest in languages contributing to the development of his motivation and his participation in class. This cocktail of approaches can explain the choice of the use of the qualifying adjective eclectic to name this methodology. On the side of the teacher, the latter is no longer the holder of knowledge as he was during the traditional methodology. This change in the posture of the teacher and the learner increased with the audio-oral methodology linked to the technological development associated with the expansion of the conquering spirit which coincided with the Second World War, in the middle of the fifties of the twentieth century.

This chronological phase was characterized by a communicative need in a foreign language explicitly expressed by the conquering of the American army. The United States had decided to open up linguistically to the world. To achieve this, linguistically, the referents were mainly the Theories of Distributionalism, Skinnerian conditioning emanating from behavioral psychology for the purpose of communicating with others.

These references were the scientific foundations of the time. Thus, under the influence of behaviorism, language was mechanically distributed in the form of linguistic stimulus and linguistic response without taking into consideration the meaning conveyed by the message.

As its title indicates, the main objective of this approach is communication; that means, learning to communicate in a foreign language, hence the interest of cutting it up into speech acts. According to the reading of the works of Sophie Moirand (1982, p. 205), this communicative competence consists mainly of four components:

- a-** The linguistic component: referring to the grammatical, lexical, textual and phonetic rules of the language. It is necessary to know them and be able to apply them;
- b-** The discursive component which includes knowledge of the structure of the discursive typology, the analysis of para-textual indices and iconic supports, the study of cohesion and textual coherence in order to be able to produce a discourse. This knowledge therefore refers to the mastery of the organization of the different types of discourse;
- c-** The referential component for its part concerns knowledge of the world, the thematic information in question at the level of language activity;

**d-** Finally, the socio-cultural component refers to the social rules that govern each society and that even establish the acceptance or refusal to communicate with others.

From the foregoing, we can deduce that the practical application of communication in a situation close to social reality constitutes the supreme objective of the teaching of foreign languages, hence the use of authentic materials, whether written or oral. With regard to the components of communicative competence, the interest in grammar is implicit and inductive at the beginning to become explicit and deductive thereafter. The same is true for the almost exclusive use of the foreign language with , however, permission to use the mother tongue. Ultimately, this conception of the communicative approach favors a range of didactic activities using visual and written documents, as well as simulation and role-playing activities to put the learner in a learning situation as close as possible from reality.

The configuration of Europe, however, has given rise to a final possible approach to the teaching/learning of languages, that of the action-oriented approach. Europe is changing the conception of language teaching. Europe is now multilingual and multicultural, hence the need to design education based on acting together, like multinational companies. Despite a communicative approach mobilizing spoken acts and authentic documents, communicative exchanges are tense and learners are unable to mobilize learning in the concrete situations of the society in which they live. Thus, at the start of the 1990s, knowing how to communicate was no longer enough, it was necessary to add to it knowing how to act in a foreign language, because we are now dealing with a learner/social actor who acts by accomplishing verbal and non-verbal tasks, at the level of which they learn to negotiate, to develop a common project with others, to act concretely with others, and finally to experience socio-constructivist situations (Puren, 2009).

The outline of the main methodologies that have marked the didactics of foreign languages leads us to question the field of the Center for Intensive Language Teaching in order to describe and understand the didactic action and thereby the methodological referents to which the English language teaching approaches.

### **3- Methodological Overview:**

In March 2022, an investigation at the Center for Intensive Language Teaching at Chadli Bendjedid University, El-Tarf (Algeria) has been taken place after announcing on its official page an offer of training and solutions adapted to suit students' need through accelerated courses, audio-visual sessions, courses in small groups, training in specialized languages, flexible timetables, (...) role-playing to practice current and professional vocabulary. In a heuristic aim, five English language teachers have been interviewed through a questionnaire composed of three sections. The first one allows us to identify the profile of trainers; the second sheds light on the objectives of teaching the English language at the CEIL and which condition the approaches and didactic tools used by the trainers represents the third and last section of the self-administered questionnaire.

This investigative tool was tested with two teachers before generalizing it. During this pre-test phase, we added two questions to explain the meaning of the flipped classroom, which was not known to the two teachers interviewed. Following this step, the questionnaire took the form used in the context of our present work. This research tool allows us to describe in a comprehensive way the approaches of teaching the English language, declared by the public questioned, since "description is at the heart of qualitative research. Not because the latter would be reduced to description, but because description is a research issue and there is no good

theory without good description” (Dumez, 2016,p. 99). This approach will allow us to uncover the existence or non-existence of eclectic, common or disparate teaching approaches between the actors of didactic action.

### **3-1 Teachers Interview Profile :**

The teachers interviewed working at the CEIL have varied profiles. Thus, we were able to approach two male and three female teachers. The age as well as the diploma training are variable since they are aged between twenty-three and forty and four teachers have an academic qualification of level master 2 didactics of English "a masters degree in English didactics" against a single teacher "Doctor in linguistics".

#### **From audience to goals :**

Faced with the disparity of the profiles of the teaching team, we are now wondering about the profiles of the public registered at the CEIL as well as their training needs. Concerning the public requesting training, it is made up of three categories: students; teachers/researchers and external to the university structure. As for the students, they are of all levels with different backgrounds", from the first year of university (L1) to those following doctoral training. Their specialization is heterogeneous since they come from various backgrounds; however, the teachers declare a predominance of students from scientific streams.

“Most of the students studying the scientific stream (Biology and veterinary). Although most of the students seeking intensive training in English have a scientific profile, the fact remains that other academic training is present since there are also students with training in legal sciences and economics: “students studying economics, law”. With regard to teachers enrolled in training at the CEIL, the responses collected show a majority of foreign language teachers “They are foreign language teachers”.

Finally, with regard to the public outside the university, the teachers questioned put forward the existence of a diversified panorama of profiles, oscillating between graduates; doctoral students, as well as professionals of different profiles "different professions"; “some work at the health sector, more specifically anesthesia/resuscitation paramedics and clinical psychologists; others have administrative jobs”.

The description of the profiles of the registered candidates allows us to conclude that there is a range of applicants who are subject to a positioning test prior to any training: this is the starting principle at the Language Center "At the beginning of the year when launching the registration in Intensive Courses, learners will be evaluated through test (placement test) level test to know their levels”. In this configuration, we questioned the teachers on the approaches adopted during the preparation of the test. The answers obtained show that it is the training team that makes the placement test taking into account all aspects of the language: “Dealing with all the aspects of language (grammar, vocabulary, phonetics part of speech and written expression) » and referring to the linguistic requirements of each level, to the didactic material available to the training structure as well as international references "The placement test are developed with the help of the English teachers, taking into consideration the materials needed to be taught in the ongoing year, also some notes from famous placement tests from other universities such as Cambridge (which will be found on their official websites).

Through this example, the pedagogical team tries to adapt to global standards to train language users capable of meeting the challenges posed by communication in the English language.

Since these tests refer to different levels (Cadre, 2001), we asked the teachers about the results of the language level tests in order to have an idea of the levels of the applicants for training. Overall, teachers argue that at the level of this structure, learners can be of five main levels "There are 5 levels in our language center (A1/A2/B1/B2/C1), the students will be placed based on their results on the written and oral tests" but that the majority of the results refer to a beginner level "The majority of learners are beginners (A1)".

In spite of the preponderance of a language level, the participants still present a certain variability of profiles which only reinforces our questioning in connection with the objectives of the training intended for this range of applicants (students, teachers, officials). In order to draw up a table responding to this, we asked the teachers about the objectives of the English language courses. The responses obtained show a preponderance of the communicative competence in English associated with a certain act of language, a vision that we put forward the following details:

The five teachers interviewed focus on improving the four basic language skills "Improve the productive and receptive skills of learners (writing, speaking, listening and reading)".

Indeed, these language activities are implemented by a language user in two areas, oral and written, where he will exercise his knowledge and know-how (Médioni, 2010, p. 3010).

Thus, the written and oral production and constitute the fundamental pillars of teaching the English language; supplemented according to the comments collected by a focus on the correct structuring of sentences by teaching grammar as evidenced: "The ability to express themselves in correct grammar". Indeed, grammar has always been "a thorny subject" (Dorronzoro & Klett, 2007, p. 500) but necessary since it "knowledge of the rules of a language (...) makes it possible to acquire the ability to differentiate between correct sentences from those that are not" (Dorronzoro & Klett, 2007, pp.501-502) These first answers only arouse our scientific curiosity to understand the status of oral interactions in the development of the communicative competence recommended by teachers of the CEIL.

Thus, in addition to the four basic skills mentioned above, teachers include oral interaction as the fifth pillar of learning English in an intensive teaching situation, as reported in the following extract: "Learners will cover a variety of topics while practicing English conversation management, conversational styles, and pronunciation. Students learn commonly-used idioms and slang in a communicative way". As a result, teachers exploit various themes with the aim of teaching and encouraging the practice of conversation in the English language, which contributes to the learning of adequate pronunciation and to the development at the same time of various registers of language and proverbial expressions which refers to the development of a double objective, linguistic and sociolinguistic. As a result, the oral interactions associated with pronunciation and the teaching of language registers and proverbial expressions contribute to the acquisition of communicative competence and even to act in language (the action perspective) since it calls upon the Listening and production at the same time "In the interaction, at least two actors take part in an oral exchange and alternate the moments of production and reception" (CECRL, 2001, p. 18).

This interest in oral exchange is reinforced by several English language teaching works postulating that “It is in and through use that linguistic forms emerge and the dynamic process of acquisition develops” (Manoilov, 2019, p 25)12c

At this stage of analysis of the answers collected, we may conclude that the objective of teaching the English language at the Intensive Language Teaching Center is communicative, integrating the five fundamental activities: comprehension and production of oral as well as comprehension and production of writing and verbal interactions. This communicative competence is consolidated according to a teacher questioned by the orientation of the learner's interest towards the cultural dimension of the language to which he attributes the status of fifth pillar of communicative competence considering it as a competence in its own right: “Our main objectives in our language center are focusing on all language skills (listening, reading, writing and speaking), I personally focus on culture because it is considered as a 5th skill nowadays”. Indeed, cultural competence is important for consolidating not only communicative competence but also acting through language since it “consists of knowing, even mastering, a number of classified situations” (Xiaomin, 2010, p. 150) 13, which makes it possible to avoid misunderstandings during the effective exercise of this language with the natives and develops the know-how of the learners. In this wake, our questionnaire sought to question English language teachers on the proportions taken by the practical aspect of the language and its cultural aspect by formulating the question Are these objectives mainly practical (communicating and expressing oneself) or also cultural (civilization of the language)? obtained converge towards a skillful mix of the two skills:

linguistic and cultural. The teachers consider that “Basically the objectives set forth are a bunch of different activities including the expressing of oneself and also presenting the cultural civilization of language and people (Native British and American)”. There can therefore be no teaching of the English language without a concomitant development of activities of expression and communication associated with knowledge of the two civilizations linked to this language, in this case the British civilization and Thus, in the words of one teacher interviewed: “Communicating and expressing oneself in one language also means bathing in the culture of the Other”.

Now that we have circumscribed the objectives of English language teaching at the Center for Intensive Language Teaching at Chadli Bendjedid University (EL-Tarf; Algeria), we asked teachers about the decision-makers who determined these objectives: is it the guardianship (the ministry); the teacher responsible for the training or the learners registered at the Centre? The answers are unanimous; the objectives are elaborated following an exchange between the trainers and the trainees; which reinforces the idea that Language Centers are structures offering training. A final question was asked before focusing on the approaches to teaching the English language at the CEIL; which question deals with the weekly duration of this teaching. The responses do not show any difference in the hourly volume of training depending on the level of the learners since all those enrolled benefit from a frequency of two hours per week of teaching of this language "At CEIL (CBU) El Tarf, they had been offered two hours a week”.

#### **4. From Objectives to Approaches:**

We are now entering the third and final category of our questionnaire, which looks at the English language teaching approaches adopted by teachers; in the absence of ministerial directives, we wonder about the didactic choices of teachers to achieve the training objectives previously detected.



As a reminder, English language training supports the development of oral and written language activities, in comprehension as well as in production, without forgetting oral interactions in class as well as the development of sociolinguistic and cultural competence to bring the learner to know the main factors contributing to the development of communicative competence. However, it emerges from a question asked about the preferred language activity in an intensive training situation that it is the oral exchange that takes the lion's share of the training to meet the needs of the students. "because the students like to speak more than to write, only a few like to focus on grammar". However, this choice is not linked solely to the requirements of the learners since some teachers share this representation of the importance of the spoken word in learning communicative competence in a foreign language: "Because I assume that the language Oral is the fundamental mode of our communication". We therefore see a didactic approach emphasizing oral exchange in English language class to learn. This idea refers to a conception of language bath or the natural acquisition of language where the child learns to communicate through oral exchanges with members of his family as well as those of his social environment. Thus, linguistic immersion is offered at the CEIL to motivate the registered candidates, an approach recognized at the didactic level since it "advocates above all the learning of a target language in a context that most closely resembles natural learning" (Pellerin , 2008, p. 30614).

But is this linguistic immersion total or partial? Is the use of other languages allowed during the training, particularly Arabic? The answers note that this varies according to the levels of the learners "It depends on the level, Arabic is 50% used in A1 classes, the percentage gets smaller the higher the levels get until it gets to 0% in a B2 class". Overall, the teachers are permissive and do not adopt a direct methodology for teaching English: "learners are so motivated to learn English, for beginners no harm for time to time to use the target language to help them a little bit understand". However, they prefer other possible means to overcome the difficulty as this teacher attests: "I try to avoid using Arabic as much as I can so I Think paraphrasing is the best method to make students understand the meaning or let the others students look for itself". She therefore resorts to paraphrase considered as the best method to make the meaning understood or appeals to the class group, that is to say to peers to look for synonyms.

Regarding teaching approaches, teachers offer several. Some focus on the creativity and pragmatics of learning activities: "Gaining fluency by using creative and helpful learning tasks"; creativity and pragmatism using "educational games, songs"; others exploit the small number of learners to create a rich and stimulating communicative context

"With 20 or less students in each class, there will be a lot of opportunities to practice whilst meeting with each other". Another teacher specifies three activities referring to listening tasks, role playing, and contextualized verbal interactions: "Teachers also use various activities to introduce students to these new idioms including listening tasks, role playing, and context-relevant discussions ". In these guided activities, a teacher insists on the need to promote teaching approaches that allow the development of autonomy.

I also encourage student's autonomy and provide them with ways to learn and improve their own».

In order to understand better the teaching approaches used, we initiated a centripetal reflection around two subsystems of the language by questioning the trainers on the strategies deployed during the teaching of two fundamental parameters: grammar and vocabulary for understand whether there is methodological eclecticism, as an evidence by the data previously analyzed in terms of language competence. Thus, for grammar, teachers specify an implicit teaching of grammar:

“Grammar had been taught implicitly rather than explicitly (Modern teaching of foreign languages)”; a teacher specifies that he “generally begins by giving examples and then explaining”. This language subsystem “shows a certain disarray” (Lepoivre-Duc & Sautot, 2009, p. 77) which explains why some teachers resort to games and the anecdote to lighten the learning environment and end the lesson by reading in connection with the grammar points covered: “I try to make the grammar sessions as fun as I can (using my unlimited amount of sense of humor and never ending sarcastic comments), but grammar lessons are pretty basic at first, then I end the session with a small reading session related to the grammatical material taught”.

There is therefore no normative transmission but rather implicit and contextualized learning.

Regarding vocabulary, teachers also offer varied and contextualized approaches. A teacher argues that the vocabulary is taught through the reading of different texts considered as contexts allowing the learner to extract the meaning of words by mobilizing global understanding

“Reading texts than trying to understand words in the different contexts”; another teacher uses different media including word lists but this time created by the learners in an active approach “I teach vocabulary by proposing song lyrics, short texts/dialogues as well as word lists that they produce themselves. A third teacher reinforces this active approach to teaching vocabulary by integrating educational games, oral exchanges and even a short written activity: “I teach vocabulary using scientific articles, explaining the vocabulary then having about 5 discussion questions and they discuss with orally or through a small written paragraph. I also include a lot of educational games in class and they seem to like it the most”. The result of these answers is a lexical enrichment taught according to a contemporary approach, however, modernizing some traditional approaches leading to the implementation in class of activities of research and discovery of the words of the language of Shakespeare.

Our interest in English language teaching approaches has led us to question teachers about the status of error in language class; which error is considered according to the answers obtained as an element little tolerated by the teachers:

“learners should not be tolerated by making mistakes and should be taught how to avoid doing it so”; another writes: “I consider the error to be a fault or a malfunction between teachers / proposed content”; a third adds that he focuses more on pronunciation errors by only correcting grammatical errors when they are repeated: “I try to focus on correcting pronunciation errors more than grammatical, except if the task was clear and the errors get repetitive”. Finally, a last answer shows the interest that the teacher takes in the class group when faced with error: “try to correct them... or check their classmates if they paid attention to the mistakes or no”. Unanimously, error is little tolerated, or even little considered as a phase in the learning of a language from which the learner progresses in his learning.

Three last parameters were included in our questionnaire in order to draw an overview of the approaches to teaching the English language at CEIL; which parameters refer respectively to group work, to the flipped class and finally to work to be done outside the classroom. Regarding group work, all without exception encourage this form of constructive exchange: “yes, pair work is VERY encouraged in my classes because I noticed that they learn more when they ask each other or check internet for answers”; another states:

“yes, they should figure out how to work in collaborations with their colleagues”; finally a final one completes: “cooperative learning is needed so yes”. Group work is encouraged because it

“advocates active learning by learners in small groups” (Abu Hanak, 2019, p. 8317) hence the positive effects and the enthusiasm of teachers for this form of work. As for the flipped classroom, it is relatively little used by CEIL teachers in the literal sense that this approach advocates because, according to one teacher, of the difficulty in setting it up in this intensive teaching configuration: “not everyone, most don't prepare the lessons but there are some hard working ones who do”, a teacher adds:

“sometimes the learner prepares the lesson in advance but this is rarely done”. Thus, we can conclude that there is almost no work process related to the flipped classroom. This result should, however, be considered with the other activity required of the learners, the one that takes place downstream of the intensive teaching since they are required to do work outside the classroom after the lesson: “The only work they do at home is either revising the lesson as advised or self learning through apps recommended by me”, another adds: “Home work and assignments When it is needed”. Overall, the teaching of English remains directed by the language teacher.

To conclude this descriptive of the teaching of English at the CEIL, we have proposed a final question related to the training of teachers in intensive teaching. Of the five interviewed, four say they have not received intensive teaching training; only one states: “Yes, i have a TESOL certificate from Arizona state university. Also been trained for online teaching”.

Overall, the results obtained allow us to observe an alternation between communicative competence centered on the development of language skills to communicate and an action-oriented competence that is predominantly oral since the teaching of the English language focuses on oral action through oral verbal interaction activity. There is indeed an eclecticism between language as instrument and activity (Carrell, Devine & Eskey (198818). This spirit is visible in teaching approaches that promote a focus on the four basic language skills to which teachers associate, in a pragmatic aim, the development of oral interactions contextualized by choice of themes related to the context of life of the learners enrolled in the CEIL. These five skills are immediate and greatly needed support for the learners. Very specific objectives have governed the choice of these approaches based more on content and tasks than on problem-based learning, probably due to the fact that the majority of those registered are at level A1.

#### **As a conclusion:**

This work has allowed us to shed light on the teaching of the English as a language of universal vocation in view of its planetary diffusion; language haloed with prestige or linguistic imperialism. The light that we bring concerns a particular structure that is the Center for Intensive Language Teaching, peculiarity linked to the configuration of small groups, to a personal investment by the autonomous and voluntary registration to follow a paid training, to conscious needs and a limited training time. This field is very different from language departments. We conducted this study having as a research question the approaches used for the teaching of the English language and by formulating the hypothesis that these approaches are eclectic in the absence of an efficient methodology, suitable for the teaching culture and the learning culture for all. Following a pre-test, we administered a questionnaire to five English language teachers practicing at the Intensive Language Teaching Center of Chadli Bendjedid University, El-Tarf (Algeria); as teachers present various profiles. Thus, our contribution presented an inventory of English language training for non-native learners of this language in a comprehensive descriptive aim “comprehensive research is interested in the actors, their motivations, the way they act and interact” (Dumez, 2016, p.180). After a presentation of a

summary image of the chronological evolution of the different language teaching/learning methodologies that have marked the course of the history of language teaching, we analyzed the responses of the practices described by the teachers; which practices refer to responses that echo each other leading to an identical vision that corroborates each other where the dissimilarities are almost non-existent. Under the aegis of the CEIL, the teaching of the English language is developed according to a double aim: communicative and action-oriented referring to two methodologies of language teaching/learning: the communicative approach and the action-oriented perspective. There is therefore eclecticism referring to “two great universes of belief at once: academicism and pragmatism” (Tardieu, 2014; 47).

Eclecticism is manifest in several aspects, to mention only the teaching approaches which, on the one hand, give precedence to the oral aspect of the language, without excluding the written word, by insisting on phonetics, intonation, articulation and oral interactions in various forms including role-playing thematic exchanges that can be considered as survivals of the direct methodology, and on the other hand, offer activities related to life because they are meaningful situations for acting with language in all its dimensions. Our results thus converge with those of Tardieu on the teaching of English in France, resulting in the existence of "a pendulum movement between direct approaches centered essentially on the practical objective (direct, audiovisual and, to a certain extent, measurement, action-based) and indirect approaches which, without abandoning the practical objective, also target the cultural and intellectual formation of the learner (active method, communicative approach)" (Tardieu, 2014, p. 1219). Regarding the status of the error, teachers subscribe to the idea that we learn by trial and error by adopting a posture of correctors in which they invite peers to collaborate to create a cognitive and sociocognitive conflict between the group members. Peers are considered learning resources and their role is valued in the didactic approaches of the teachers interviewed, which correlates with the work of Rivens Mompean, 2018, § 120) noting that “peers are also learning resources. 'potential learning'. Despite the variability in the profiles of English language teachers, the analysis of teaching approaches shows the presence of “unifying elements within this diversity” (Rivens Mompean, 2014, § 121); these recurring and constitutive elements of teaching approaches can be summarized in the interest given to oral language, the learner's involvement in his learning, the use of audiovisual tools and the enhancement of interaction skills without forgetting a clear orientation towards an approach close to immersive teaching where "the hypothesis underlying the immersive approach is that learning a second language can be based on processes similar to those that allowed the 'mother tongue acquisition' (Briquet, 2006, p. 422).

Our choice of understanding the approaches to teaching the English language as a lingua franca has shed some light on the approaches to teaching it to an adult audience, which allows us to better understand the repertoire of didactic approaches used by the teachers interviewed. by seeing whether they adopt a common or, on the contrary, varied methodology. This view, admittedly limited, opens up avenues for further research, particularly in connection with the didacticization of the tools used in the language class: what choices

**-Annex:**

**Teachers' Questionnaire**

Hello,

We are conducting academic research on English language teaching approaches at the Center for Intensive Language Teaching at Chadli Bendjedid University (EL TARF). We thank you for your valuable contribution.

The questionnaire is composed of three categories: Profile, The needs noted at the Center for Intensive Language Teaching, the teaching methods and tools used

I- Profile:

- First Name:

- Gender:

- Age:

-Diplomat:

-Poste permanent ? (permanent job)    oui    non

II- The needs noted at the Center for Intensive Language Teaching

- What is the composition of the learner public at the intensive language teaching center?

- students ?

(What level)? L1    L2    L3 M1 M2    Doctorat

-What background are these students from ?

.....

-Teachers ?

- What university specialization?

.....

- External ?

-De quelle formation ou profession (What education or profession)?

.....

- What are the objectives of intensive English teaching?

.....

.....

.....

- How were these objectives determined?

By the ministry ?

By the teacher responsible for the subject?

By the requesting public?

- Are these objectives mainly practical (communicating and expressing oneself) or also cultural (civilization of the language)?

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

How is the level test developed?

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

The analysis of the tests refers to what levels of the public? A1/B1/etc).

.....

What is the weekly duration of English lessons per group)?

.....

Does the Intensive Language Teaching Center offer English teaching for specific purposes?

(Yes)      No

Who supports it? the English language teacher or the specialist teacher or both?

.....  
.....

III- The teaching methods and tools used: Is there an official ministerial program?

.....

What are the language activities taught?:

oral comprehension, writing comprehension , oral production:

Written production (others)?

Among these activities, is there one more privileged than the others) ?

(yes) (what is it) ? ..... and why?  
?.....

(no, there isn't)

What didactic means/supports do you use?

National education textbook)? Vidéo (video) ?

audio (podcast)?

Language method proposed by the center)?

(Which is)?

.....  
(Others)?

.....  
Does the Center offer an interactive whiteboard?.....

Does CEIL offer a language lab?.....

How do you teach vocabulary? (from list of words)?

.....  
.....  
.....  
Rule and exercises or example then identification of the rule?

.....  
.....  
.....  
Quel What status do you give to error)?.....

.....  
Do learners work in groups)?.....

How does the evaluation of intensive teaching take place at the Centre: application exercises or analysis. activities)?.....

.....  
Is the student's participation graded)?.....

.....  
Is the student's attendance noted)?.....

.....  
Is translation through the use of Arabic allowed? encouraged? or do you adopt a direct method with exclusive use of English)?.....

.....  
.....  
.....  
Does the learner prepare the lesson in advance)?.....

.....  
Is there any work to do at home)?  
.....  
.....

### References

- 1- Puren, C. 1988. History of language teaching methodologies. Paris: Nathan, Clé international.
- 2- Tardieu, Claire. Resurgence and persistence of methods over time: reflection on the methodologies of teaching English in France. Cahiers de L'APLIUT Volume XXXIII No. 2; 2014. Emerging Practices and Research in English Teaching: Milestones, Questions and Perspectives
- 3- Puren, C. 2012. History of language teaching methodologies. Paris: Nathan-CLE international
- 4- Cuq, J.-P. & Gruca, I. 2003. Cours de didactique du français langue étrangère et seconde. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- 5- Moirand, S. 1982. Teach to communicate in a foreign language, Paris, Hachet
- 6- Puren Christian (2009) Variations sur la perspective de l'agir social en didactique des langues-cultures étrangères, Le français dans le monde, Recherches et applications, n° 45, p. 154-168.
- 7- Council of Europe (2001) Common European Framework of Reference for languages, Paris, Didier
- 8- <http://univ-eltarf.dz/en/index.php/services-commun/ceil/60-services-common/ceil/340-presentation-du-ceil>. Accessed 27 December 2021.
- 9- Dumez, Hervé. 2016. Qualitative research methodology. All key questions in the process. 3rd edition. Paris: Vuibert.



- 10- Médioni, Maria-Alice. Not a program, but avenues for teaching Les Cahiers pédagogiques n°18, April 2010; pp. 267-270.
- 11- Dorronzoro, M. & Klett, E. The role of grammar in teaching reading in a foreign language. Etude de linguistique appliquée n°148; 2007, pp. 499-511.
- 12- Manoïlov, Pascale. Oral interaction and cooperation: interdependent learning. Linx Revue des linguistes de l'université Paris X Nanterre n° 79 Teaching and learning to interact in a foreign language: linguistic and didactic reflections. 2019. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/linx/3784>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/linx.3784>.
- 13- Xiaomin, Meng. Communication and Cultural Competence verbal politeness in French manuals in China. Synergies Chine n° 5 - 2010 pp. 147-155.
- 14- Pellerin, Martine. The Situation of French Immersion Education Applied Language Studies 2008/3 no. 151 | pages 305 to 314.
- 15- Rivenc, P. (2003): Methodology. Language Learning 3. Brussels (De Boeck University).
- 16- Lepoivre-Duc, S. & Sautot, J;-P. Grammar: a problem for the students, a problem for the teacher too. Repères n°39. 2009 <https://doi.org/10.4000/reperes.831>
- 17- Abu Hanak, N. The Cooperative Approach to Better Learning written comprehension in a university setting: the case of Jordanian students learning French. Synergies Algérie n° 27 - 2019 p. 83-98.
- 18- Carrell, P.L, Devine, J.& Eskey, D. E. (Eds.), 1988. Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading. Cambridge