

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

8 MAI 1945 UNIVERSITY / GUELMA

جامعة 8 ماي 1945/قالمة

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

كلية الآداب و  
اللغات

DEPARTMENT OF LETTERS & ENGLISH LANGUAGE

قسم الآداب و اللغة الإنجليزية



Option: Literature

**The Role of Women in Maintaining or Resisting Patriarchy in  
Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice***

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Language and Culture**

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

Chairwoman: Mrs. Ahlem MEHTALI 1945Guelma	(MAB)	University of 8 May
Supervisor: Mrs. Houda BOURSACE 1945Guelma	(MAA)	University of 8 May
Examiner: Mrs. Meriem BOUREGAA 194Guelma	(MAB)	University of 8 May

**Submitted by:**

Sabra ATTIA

**Supervised by:**

Mrs. Houda BOURSACE

September 2018

## **Dedication**

To my parents

To my sisters, my brother

To my husband Ismail

To my family

To my friends

To everyone who believes in

“Never allow waiting to become a habit. Live your dreams and take risks. Life is happening now” I dedicate this work.

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I thank God without him this work would not be accomplished.

My wish is to salute my role model who helped me to realize this modest work “Mrs. Mounya ABDAOUI” for her valuable advice and her serious guidance and encouragement.

Thanks to the members of the jury for their acceptance to evaluate and review this work. A unique thank to all the teachers who accepted to participate in this research. A special acknowledgement goes to Miss. Benkamouche who inspired me to tackle such study.

## **Abstract**

The current study aims at investigating the influence of specifying the learning objectives on effective materials' design through comparing university teachers and Middle/Secondary school teachers. Teachers at the department of English tend to design their lessons based on the outline of the syllabus provided by the administration. Eventually, they do not make lesson plans in which the learning objectives are specified in a written form. Hence, we hypothesize that if University teachers specify their educational objectives materials' design would be effective. To inquire about this issue, a questionnaire was used for both samples. The first one is University teachers' questionnaire, which seeks to check teachers' views about the necessity of designing lesson plans and establishing learning objectives for every part of the lesson. The second one is Middle and Secondary school teachers' questionnaire. It aims to uncover whether lesson plans and objectives are necessary elements that help in selecting and structuring the content to be taught. After that, the results obtained from both questionnaires were corroborated. The results of the questionnaire yielded the conclusion that most University teachers are aware of the crucial role of setting the objectives but they just state them orally. Whereas, Middle and Secondary school teachers believe that the learning objectives facilitate the process of designing effective teaching materials. Consequently, we highly recommend writing the objectives by university teachers and using at least a workbook. Within this scope, a checklist was designed to be used by teachers to assess the extent to which they reach their educational goals.

## **List of Abbreviations**

OT: Original Taxonomy

RT: Revised Taxonomy

## List of Tables

Table 1.1. Classification of Instructional Materials	9
Table 3.1. Teachers' Specialty	44
Table 3.2. Teachers' Teaching Experience	45
Table 3.1. Teachers' Status of Work	45
Table 3.4. Levels Taught by Instructors	46
Table 3.5 (a). Teachers' Last Obtained Degree	47
Table 3.5 (b). Teachers' Enrollment in PhD Programme	47
Table 3.6. Teachers' Use of the Syllabus	48
Table 3.7 (a). Teachers' Use of the Textbook	49
Table 3.7 (b). The Negative Effects oft the Absence of the Textbook in Universities	49
Table 3.8 (a). Teachers' Personal Design of Materials	50
Table 3.8 (b). Teachers' Preferred Types of Materials	51
Table 3.9 (a). Teachers' Adoption or Adaptation of Materials	52
Table 3.9 (b). Teachers' Aim behind Adaptation	52
Table 3.10. The Most Important Factor in Materials' Selection	53
Table 3.11 (a). Teachers' use of Authentic Materials	54
Table 3.11 (b). Facilitating Learning/Teaching through Authentic Materials	55
Table 3.12. The Importance of Materials in Accordance with the Teaching Method	55
Table 3.13 (a). Teachers' Writing of Long-term Objectives	56
Table 3.13 (b). Place where Teachers Write Long-term Objectives	56
Table 3.14 (a). Frequency of Writing Short-term Objectives	57

Table 3.14 (b). Factors that Prevent Teachers from Writing Short-term Objectives	57
Table 3.15 (a). The Necessity of Lesson Plans in University	58
Table 3.15 (b). Causes of Lesson Plans' Necessity	58
Table 3.15. (c). Causes of the Uselessness of Lesson Plans	59
Table 3.16. Teachers' Criteria of Writing the Learning Objectives	60
Table 3.17. The Significance of Writing the Objectives for Every Part of the Lesson	61
Table 3.18. Informing Students about the Learning Objectives	61
Table 3.19. Explaining to Students What Needs to be done during Lessons	62
Table 3.20. The Effects of Materials on Objectives Realization	63
Table 3.21. Teachers' Teaching Experience	66
Table 3.22. Teachers' Work	67
Table 3.23. Levels Taught by Instructors	67
Table 3.24. Teachers' Last Obtained Degree	68
Table 3.25 (a). Teachers' Extent of Satisfaction with the Content of the Textbook	68
Table 3.25 (b). Teachers' Views towards the Textbook	69
Table 3.26. Materials Preferred by Teachers	70
Table 3.27 (a). Teachers' Adoption and Adaptation of the Textbook	70
Table 3.27 (b). Reasons of the Textbook Adaptation	71
Table 3.28. Teachers' Own Design of Materials	72
Table 3.29. The Most Important Factor in Materials' Selection	72
Table 3.30. Textbook Authenticity	73
Table 3.31. Authentic Materials' Role	72

Table 3.32. The Importance of Selecting Materials in Accordance with the Teaching method	73
Table 3.33. Writing Long-term Objectives	74
Table 3.34. Writing Short-term Objectives	74
Table 3.35. The Necessity of Lesson Plans	75
Table 3.36 (a). The Use of Lesson Plans in Universities	75
Table 3.36 (b). The Importance of the Use of Lesson Plans in Universities	75
Table 3.37. Criteria of Writing the Learning Objectives	76
Table 3.38. The Importance of Writing the Objectives When Designing Materials	77
Table 3.39. Informing Students about the Lessons' Objectives	77
Table 3.40. Explaining the Activities for Pupils	78
Table 3.41. The Significance of Materials in Objectives' Realization	79
Table 3.42. A Checklist for Teachers' Evaluation for their Objectives' Specification and Materials' Design	86



## **Table of Contents**

<b>General Introduction</b>	1
1. Statement of the Problem	2
2. Aims of the Study	2
3. Research Hypothesis	3
4. Research Design and Methodology	3
4.1. Research Method	3
4.2. Population of the Study	3
4.3. Research Tools	4
5. Structure of the Dissertation	4
<b>Chapter One: Materials' Design</b>	6
Introduction	6
1.1. Definition of Instructional Materials	6
1.2. Types of Instructional Materials	8
1.3. Criteria of Effective Language Materials	9
1.4. Components of Materials	11
1.5. Materials' Development	11
1.5.1. Materials' Design and Selection	12
1.5.1.1. Approaches to Materials' design	12
1.5.1.2. Criteria of Materials' Design	14
1.5.2. Materials' Evaluation	17

1.5.2.1. Definition of Materials' Evaluation	17
1.5.2.2. Types of Materials Evaluation	17
1.5.2.3. Audience Involved in the Evaluation	19
1.5.2.4. Criteria for Materials' Evaluation	20
1.5.3. Materials' Adaptation	20
1.6. Authentic Materials	21
1.7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Materials	22
Conclusion	23
<b>Chapter Two: Learning Objectives</b>	24
Introduction	24
2.1. Definition of Learning Objectives	24
2.2. The Difference between Goals and Objectives	25
2.3. Types of Learning Objectives	26
2.3.1. Cognitive Objectives	26
2.3.2. Affective Objectives	27
2.3.3. Psychomotor Objectives	28
2.4. Description of Learning Objectives	28
2.5. Criteria of Learning Objectives	29
2.6. Considerations while Writing Learning Objectives	29
2.7. Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives	30
2.7.1. Problems in the Design of Bloom's Taxonomy	31
2.7.2. Principles of Bloom's Taxonomy	31
2.7.3. Levels of Thinking in Bloom's Taxonomy	32

2.7.3.1. Knowledge	32
2.7.3.2. Comprehension	35
2.7.3.3. Application	35
2.7.3.4. Analysis	36
2.7.3.5. Synthesis	36
2.7.3.6. Evaluation	37
2.7.4. The Importance of Bloom's Taxonomy	37
2.8. The Revised Version of Bloom's Taxonomy	38
2.9. The Role of Learning objectives	39
2.10. Specifying Learning Objectives for Effective Materials' Design	40
Conclusion	41
<b>Chapter Three: Field Investigation</b>	42
Introduction	42
3.1. University Teachers' Questionnaire	42
3.1.1. Population of the Study	42
3.1.2. Description of University Teachers' Questionnaire	43
3.1.3. Administration of University Teachers' Questionnaire	44
3.1.4. Analysis of Results from University Teachers' Questionnaire	44
3.1.5. Summary and Discussion of Results from University Teachers'	
Questionnaire	64
3.2. Middle/ Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire	65
3.2.1. Population of the Study	65
3.2.2. Description of Middle/ Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire	65

3.2.3. Administration of Middle/ Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire	66
3.2.4. Analysis of Results from Middle/ Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire	66
3.2.5. Summary and Discussion of Results from Middle/Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire	80
3.3. The Comparative Study	81
Conclusion	82
<b>General Conclusion</b>	84
1. Concluding Remarks	84
2. Pedagogical Implications	84
3. Research Perspectives and Limitations	87
<b>References</b>	88
<b>Appendices</b>	94
Appendix One: University Teachers' Questionnaire	92
Appendix Two: Middle/Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire	102

## **General Introduction**

The twentieth century witnessed many innovations in the field of language teaching and learning. This was mainly due to the need for Second/Foreign language speakers in order to cope with the economic, social, political, and technological changes all over the world. Consequently, new type of language programmes, methods, and techniques were introduced. The English language took a part in such global spread, which led to the re-establishment of new teaching policies and practices. Materials-based teaching is one of the influential features that were used to improve the effectiveness and the quality of the language teaching and learning process.

In the process of materials' development, investigating and exploring students' needs is a crucial step through which learning goals and objectives are set. This latter helps in selecting an appropriate content to be taught, a suitable method to be used, and effective tasks and activities to be included in order to create a successful learning environment. Specifying learning objectives at the first phase of instruction is of essential importance since it is considered as both a source and a reference for what is going to be taught and how it is going to be delivered.

Throughout the world, lesson plans are considered as a basic guide that teachers rely on in order to realize the objectives of every instruction. Teachers at the University of Guelma often neglect the vital role of lesson planning in selecting and designing materials for language teaching. Hence, this research tries to investigate the influence of specifying learning objectives on materials' design. The study aims at highlighting the importance of directing teachers toward learning objectives so that materials' design would be effective.

## **1. Statement of the Problem**

Unlike Middle/Secondary school teachers, teachers at the department of English (University of Guelma) often design their own materials when they prepare their courses due to the unavailability of textbooks/workbooks. However, it is observed that they do not make lesson plans. Consequently, it is noticed that the majority do not specify their teaching objectives especially by writing them, which makes their materials' design incomplete. This may be due to their unawareness of the crucial importance of setting the learning goals in the design of materials. The ignorance of the objectives may result in teachers' inability to direct and structure what to teach and how to teach it. It is essential that teachers should set objectives by writing them and determining the purpose behind each element in the course because setting objectives would lead to students' understanding of the content and effective materials' design. This research tackles the following main question:

Could setting the learning objectives lead to effective materials' design at the university?

## **2. Aims of the Study**

Designing clear objectives for a given instruction is an obligatory step in language pedagogy. It facilitates the selection of the content according to student's needs. Also, it helps learners orient their learning. For that reason, the main aims of this study are:

- Pointing out the impact of specifying the learning objectives on materials' design.
- Raising University teachers' consciousness toward specifying the learning objectives by writing them through the use of lesson plans.

### **3. Research Hypothesis**

Learning objectives are very important features of lesson planning. They facilitate the process of designing materials effectively by shedding light on the aim of the content to be taught. Neglecting such step may cause both teachers and students' deviation from the desired goal of the course. So, we hypothesize that:

**H<sub>1</sub>:** If university teachers specify the learning objectives by writing them, materials' design would be effective.

The null hypothesis entails that no relation exist between objectives' specification and effective design of materials. Hence, it is hypothesized that:

**H<sub>2</sub>:** If university teachers specify the learning objectives by writing them, materials' design would not be effective

### **4. Research Design and Methodology**

#### **4.1. Research Method**

To display the impact of specifying learning objectives on materials' design, the quantitative descriptive method was used. This enquiry aimed at testing the hypothesis through conducting two questionnaires: one for Middle/Secondary School teachers and the other for University teachers. Then, a comparison was made between the results of each one. Hence, the purpose of this study is comparative and analytical.

#### **4.2. Population of the Study**

Since our study is comparative, two samples that were chosen randomly constitute our research. The first one is composed of teachers of Middle/Secondary School; while the

second consisted of teachers at the Department of English in the University of 8 Mai 1945 (Guelma). The reason behind choosing Middle/Secondary and College teachers as a population of the study is to compare between them in terms of writing the educational objectives of each lesson/activity. Unlike Middle and Secondary school teachers, college teachers tend to design materials on their own due to the absence of textbooks/workbooks. However, they usually do not write the learning objectives since they do not make lesson plans. Following Krejcie and Morgan's sampling table, thirty (30) questionnaires were administered because the whole population of university teachers of English includes fifty-four (54) teacher (1970, as cited in Cohen, Manion & Marrison, 2000, p. 94). However, due to obstacles in administering Middle/Secondary school teachers' questionnaires, only thirty (30) questionnaires were distributed which cannot scientifically represent the whole population of teachers of English in these institutions.

#### **4.3. Research Tools**

To test the hypothesis, two semi-structured questionnaires furnished us with quantitative data about the importance of specifying learning objectives as well as its impact on materials' design and instruction monitoring in three different academic institutions: the University and Middle/Secondary Schools. Both questionnaires provided in-depth information about the context and valuable insights that allowed us to uncover teachers' attitudes about writing the objectives and its influence over materials' design.

#### **5. Structure of the Dissertation**

Our dissertation is divided into three main chapters. The first chapter is entitled "Materials' Design". It covers definition, types, characteristics, and criteria for the selection and evaluation of materials. It investigates the definition and sources of authentic



materials, and the role of materials in teaching. It also explores materials' adoption and adaption. The second chapter is devoted to "Learning Objectives". It deals with their definition, components, and types. It also tackles plans for preparing instructional objectives. Chapter three is "Field Investigation". It highlights the description and aims of teacher's questionnaires. Then, it analyzes the information got from the questionnaires. Later, it explains the results according to the research question and hypothesis. In the "General Conclusion", some pedagogical implications and recommendations are stated in addition to the study limitations.

## Chapter One

### Materials' Design

#### Introduction

One of the most difficult tasks that language teachers face is how to attract the interest and to increase the motivation of their students so that they contribute to the effectiveness of the learning process. To reach the aforementioned goal materials-based learning was adopted. Hence, this chapter is devoted to instructional materials as well as to materials' development and selection. It starts with the definition of materials and the exploration of their types. Then, it moves to the role and the criteria of effective materials in language teaching and learning. In addition, it strives to explore the phases that are followed in materials' design and the principles that should be taken into account in their evaluation and adaptation.

#### 1.1. Definition of Instructional Materials

For the definition of materials, Abimbade (1997) stated that materials are “broad range of resources which can be used to facilitate effective and efficient communication in the teaching and learning process” (as cited in Ajahi & Bifarin, 2017, p. 232). In addition, Nash considered them as “aids to facilitate the students learning” (1999, p. 254). Interestingly, the term “facilitate” is common in both definitions, which indicates that materials are tools applied by teachers to communicate appropriately with students.

The same point was declared by O'Neil and Andrews when they pointed out that “instructional materials refer to printed or other media intended to convey events of instruction or communicate information to the students” (2000, p. 50). Therefore, materials function to convey information. Furthermore, Olumorin (2001) related materials to human

and non-human equipment that facilitate, guide, ameliorate and foster the teaching and learning tasks (as cited in Ololube, kpolovie, & Makewa, 2015, p. 148).

Meduabum believed that materials can be used to clarify any ambiguities during the lesson. He also insisted that the teacher is the most efficient material because he is responsible for its selection and usage according to his class (2004, p. 25). While according to Bshort, materials are limited only to “the collection of text books, teachers guides, and ancillary materials and activities that are adopted for use in schools and for teachers to use in teaching” (2006, p. 78). Moreover, Tomlinson (2011) considered even the lesson provided by the teacher as a material (p. 2). Hence, materials are one of the crucial elements that must be included in any instructional system since they are the basis for content and activities specifications in any instruction (Richards & Rogers, 2014, p. 34).

Additionally, materials are “all physical means an instructor might use to implement instruction and facilitate students’ achievement of instructional objectives” (Ololube et al., 2015, p. 148). This implies that materials are tools employed by teachers to fulfill and accomplish learners’ educational goals. Yet, the utilization of this aids does not aim only to provide implements for teaching and learning, they also enable teachers to concretize what is abstract which make the different components of the instruction “more practical and less vague” (2015, p. 148). Therefore, materials are set of instructional aids utilized by teachers as learning resources. This later helps students to acquire knowledge, skills, and competences so that they can achieve the desired objectives.

## **1.2. Types of Instructional Materials**

In order to fulfill learners' needs, various types of materials were presented. Mukalel (1998, pp. 137-138) argued that materials can be grouped into two main types; language materials and teaching aids. Language materials are those textbooks and supplementary books that are planned officially by syllabus designers. While, teaching aids are the tools teachers use in the classroom to communicate effectively and creatively the information.

Yet, teaching aids are divided into three categories; visual aids, audio model aids, and audiovisual aids. The visual aids involves aids that represent the stimuli through seeing. Whereas, in audio model aids, the information is transmitted through hearing, lastly, the audiovisual aids function through both the auditory and the visual stimuli (1998, pp. 137-138). Most importantly, the decision on what type to use should be based on the educational circumstances in which the instruction occurs.

Further, Forsyth, Jolliffe, and Stevens suggested that there are three types of materials: print materials, audiovisual materials, and computer materials. This is illustrated in the following table:

Table 1.1

*Classification of Instructional Materials*

Print materials	Audiovisual materials	Computer materials
Chalkboard	Overhead transparencies	Computer presentation
Magnetic board	Radio broadcasts	program
Posters	Television broadcasts	Multimedia interactive
Handouts	Tapes and texts	systems
Assignments	Slides filmstrips	Computer based training
Books	Audiotapes	programs
Displays	Audio discs	CD ROM programs
Photographic prints	Slides tape programs	Interactive videos
Models	Filmstrips with sound	Video discs
Real items	Video tapes	

Adapted from: Forsyth, Jolliffe, & Stevens, 1999, p. 96.

**1.3. Criteria of Effective Language Materials**

Materials play a crucial role in guiding teachers to the realization of the educational purposes; that is why, they should be based on certain criteria. Crawford (2002) stated that the best language materials are those that contextualize the language, and encourage its use rather than its structure through using multimedia and audiovisual components. Further, the materials used should be flexible enough to cope with the learners individual differences. Finally, they must engage learners actively in new situations (pp. 84-87). When all these standards are encountered, materials can be considered as effective.

Nash (1999) specified four main features of effective language materials. First, materials should be for the sake of learners rather than teachers. Additionally, they must be practical so that they cope with students' needs and interests. Most importantly, they have to be systematically planned and logically organized. Finally, effective materials develop and stimulate students' critical thinking (pp. 224-225). Hence, teachers should be aware of how to use them according to the classroom conditions.

Tomlinson (2011) stated that effective materials should be characterized by a variety of features. The first one is that materials should achieve impact. This means that materials should encourage students' curiosity, attract their interests, and increase their motivation. The impact of materials can be stimulated via different techniques. Teachers have to use a variety of texts' types that include "unusual" topics in order to break up the routine. Moreover, the content of the materials should be presented through interesting aids like photographs. Furthermore, materials have to include tasks that aim to develop students' critical thinking. Yet, materials' impact differs from one class to another since each class is unique in terms of students' needs (pp. 8-9). The second one is that materials should help learners to feel at ease. The more students feel comfortable and secure, the more teaching will be effective. Tomlinson believed that materials play a crucial role in making students feel at ease. This can be achieved through using materials that teach students how to learn rather than testing them. Students learn sufficiently when they are exposed to materials that can be used in the outside world and those that involve their culture (2011, p. 9). The third feature is that materials should help learners to develop confidence. Tomlinson suggested that students' confidence should be raised through using problematic activities that develop

their creativity and their ability to analyze things. In addition, students' mind should be engaged as much as possible and complex tasks should be simplified (p. 10).

#### **1.4. Components of Materials**

It was argued that materials should be composed of three major components; the delivery system (Weston & Cranston, 1986), content, and presentation (Frantz, 1980). First, the delivery system refers to Softwares including Power Point slides, DVDs, and CD ROM programs, and Hardwares such as computers and DVDs players used in communicating the information to the learners. Yet, the decision on what delivery system to use should be made according to the size and the sensory aspects of the audience as well as the physical context suitable for the delivery (Bastable, Gramet, Jacobs, & Sopczyk, 2011, p. 466). Second, the content is the intended information being delivered to the learners. Teachers should regard the accuracy and the currency of the information in addition to the appropriateness of the medium employed to present this information (Hainsworth, Bastable, & Karey, 2017, p. 421). Third, the term presentation applies to the format of the intended information that can be in variety of shapes including: realia, illusionary representations, commercially prepared materials, demonstration materials, posters, compact discs, and digital sound players (Hainsworth et al., 2017, p. 421-439). Hence, when all these components are appropriately chosen, the desired goal of the instruction will be accomplished.

#### **1.5. Materials' Development**

Throughout history, Applied Linguists were working to design an educational programme that matches students' needs and helps them achieve a full mastery of the

language. For this sake, the focus was on materials' development that provides plans and approaches about what would take place in the classroom.

Tomlinson (2001, p. 66) clarified that materials' development is a field of study which examines the requirements and the techniques needed while planning, applying and evaluating language teaching materials. He also considered it as a practical undertaking that includes "anything" utilized by writers, instructors, or students in order to produce appropriate input to achieve the desired output (2011, p. 2). Likewise, Maroko referred to materials' development as: "the process through which materials are produced and/or used in language learning including materials' evaluation, adaptation, design, exploitation, and research" (2013, p. 1). This indicates that materials' development refers to the way through which materials are designed, adapted, and evaluated.

### **1.5.1. Materials' Design and Selection**

Designing and selecting materials to be employed during language teaching and learning must be based on certain procedures that are specified according to teachers' purpose.

#### **1.5.1.1. Approaches to Materials' Design**

Richards (2010) explained that there are three approaches to materials' design: the forward design, the central design, and the backward design. He added that the three approaches are mainly based on three dimensions: the input, the process, and the output. The input (the syllabus) is "the linguistic content of the course". He also argued that before teaching any language, it is a must to specify what to teach first (p. 6). While the process (the methodology) refers to the set of techniques and methods the teacher uses to transmit



the content of the lesson. Yet, selecting a teaching process should be based on the nature of language teaching and learning as well as the roles of both teachers and students (pp. 6-7). The output (the learning outcomes) on the other hand is the skills and the proficiencies that students will be able to do at the end of a certain instruction (p. 7).

The forward design is based on the idea that before making decisions about how to deliver the lesson and what are its results, it is necessary to specify the content to be taught. According to the forward design approach the methodology must be chosen on the basis of the syllabus specification. Ideally, materials' developers must first choose the theory of language and the syllabus related to it. Then, they determine the learning theory that will facilitate the process specification (Richards, 2010, pp. 8-11).

Moreover, the central design gives less emphasis to the content. It focuses on the techniques and activities during the lesson. The central design concentrates on the idea that the content of the instruction will be pinpointed on the basis of the methodology. Yet, the outcomes in this model has not an important role in comparison to the process since the content and the purpose vary according to students' needs (Richards, 2010, pp. 9-16). Furthermore, the backward design starts with a statement that describes the desired goal of the instruction according to which the content and the process will be chosen (Richards, 2010, p. 20). According to Tab (1962, p. 12), the forward design consists of six main steps. The first one includes the identification of students' needs. The second has to do with the specification of the instructional objectives. The third deals with the content selection and arrangement. While the fourth is concerned with the selection of learning experiences. Finally, the sixth tackles the evaluation of what has been grasped (as cited in Richards, 2010, p. 21).

### 1.5.1.2. Criteria of Materials' Design

Materials' developers should take into account a variety of factors while designing materials. These factors include syllabus type, needs' analysis, and situation analysis. The syllabus is one component of curriculum that is limited to the course content. Accordingly, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) defined it as "a document that says what should be learned" (p. 80). Moreover, Nunan considered it as the content to be taught (1988, p. 5). Similarly, Ur (1991) believed that the syllabus plays a vital role in specifying time, methodology and the materials employed in language teaching and learning (pp. 76-77). Hence, syllabus is the summary of the subject matter to be taught.

Linguists introduced a variety of syllabuses in order to satisfy students' goals. There are five types of syllabuses: the process syllabus, the content-based syllabus, the structural syllabus, the functional syllabus, and the situational syllabus. The first type of syllabus is called *the process syllabus*. It focuses on the process of learning rather than its outcomes. Cunningsworth (1995) claimed that the content of this syllabus occur naturally with the learning situations and it is based on student-student or student-teacher discussion (p. 54). Also, there is *the content-based syllabus* which is also called *the topic-based syllabus*. As its name refers, the topic based syllabus focuses on the content of the language rather than its structure. It is based on presenting themes of the target language that later will serve as the wheels that lubricate the form and the functions of this language (Richards, 2001, p. 157). Moreover, *the structural syllabus* is another type that concentrates on the form of the language rather than its content. Durni (2013) argued that the structural syllabus is the product of the structural approach, which relies on teaching the linguistic items and structures of the language (p. 185). In addition, the communicative functions of the

language are the basis for *the functional syllabus*. Within this syllabus, the functions of the language are selected according to students' needs. The benefit of this syllabus is that the functions studied within it are related not only to the classroom but also to the outside world (Cunningsworth, 1995, pp. 56-57). In *the situational syllabus*, language is taught in context. Wilkins (1976) affirmed that the situations might be selected based on students' needs. This allows students to learn the vocabulary used in different situations (pp. 15-16).

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) shed light on the vital role of syllabus in learning, arguing that it will significantly affect decisions on materials' design. They said that through the syllabus, language can be divided into different units to be taught. It also gives insights to both teachers and students about the language objectives and how to realize them. Moreover, the syllabus guides teachers to select appropriate materials for language learning and teaching (pp. 83-84). Therefore, the syllabus clarifies the procedures through which the learning purposes will be accomplished.

Furthermore, needs' analysis is a procedure conducted by teachers, syllabus designers, curriculum developers, and materials' designers in order to gather information about students' prior knowledge and their needs so that the content of the course will be applicable (Macalister, 2010, p. 24). Therefore, needs' analysis aims to detect how a certain educational content serves the needs of students. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) differentiated between two types of needs: the target needs and the learning needs. The former refers to "what students need to do in the target situations", while the later refers to "what the learner needs to do in order to learn" (p. 54).

In order to analyze the target needs of the learners, designers must look at learners' necessities (what is necessary to the learner to be known), learners' lacks (what

information students lack), and students' wants (what do learners want to accomplish) (pp. 55-56). Analyzing learner' needs involves asking different questions such as: "who are the learners? Why are the learners taking the course? What do learners think they will achieve? How do learners learn? What is their concept of learning? What methodology appeals to them? These questions will provide data about what learners expect from learning the language" (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 62-63).

Additionally, Brindly clarified that needs' analysis plays a crucial role in determining what should be learned and how. He also added that if students were asked about their preferred techniques, materials and topics, language teaching and learning would be easier and effective (1989, pp. 76-77). Most importantly, needs' analysis provides data about the teaching process and its results. Richards (2001) approved that needs' analysis is one of the influential tools to figure out the learners' skills that they need to act appropriately in target situations. It also helps in determining if the content of the course matches the students' goals. In addition, needs analysis serves as a bridge that relates what students are able to do and what they need (p. 52).

Moreover, situation analysis refers to the process of examining the contextual factors that influence the success of the educational programs. It involves gathering information about the context in which the course takes place. This analysis includes different dimensions. The first one is the identification of the societal factors, the social circumstances and the status of the foreign languages which differs from one country to another. The second dimension is the examination of institutional factors since institutions vary in their culture, their way of doing things, their level of professionalism, and their physical resources. The third one is the examination of teachers' factors that involves

language proficiency, teaching experience and skills, qualifications, moral and motivation, in addition to teaching styles and principles (Richards, 2001, pp. 93-99). Therefore, this analysis helps in making decisions about the goals and the content of language teaching instructions so that it suits students' needs.

### **1.5.2. Materials' Evaluation**

One of the challenging tasks that any teacher faces is the selection of effective materials to be used during the instruction. This necessitates conducting an evaluation that determines the appropriateness of these materials according to teachers' objectives. The following titles include definition of materials' evaluation and its types.

#### **1.5.2.1. Definition of Materials' Evaluation**

According to Tomlinson (2003), materials' evaluation is "a procedure that involves measuring the value (or potential value) of a set of learning materials. It involves making judgments about the effect of materials on people using them" (p.15). Interestingly, Ciroki (2010) emphasized two concepts "critically" and "the learner" by arguing that: "it is a process of measuring the worth of learning materials as well as forming critical opinions about how learners are affected by them" (p. 1). This indicates that materials' evaluation concentrates on estimating the impact of and making decisions about the quality and the importance of materials on its users specifically learners. Evaluation can be carried out before, while, or after the utilization of the materials using different tools like questionnaires and interviews (Tomlinson, 2003, pp. 23-24).

#### **1.5.2.2. Types of Materials' Evaluation**

As a way to determine the value of the instructional materials used by teachers, different types of materials' evaluation were introduced. They involve "predictive vs

retrospective, formative vs summative, and for-potential vs for-suitability evaluation”. Focusing on when the evaluation occurs, there are two types of evaluation: *predictive* evaluation and *retrospective* evaluation. As its name refers, predictive evaluation aims to predict and decide what materials “best” satisfy the teachers’ goals before using them. This type can be held through two ways. One is to depend on previous professionals’ probes of the materials. Another option is to conduct a new evaluation based on checklists planned by specialists in the field. However, retrospective evaluation is designed to test the volubility of the materials that have been actually used. It comes up with data that help evaluators to know whether the materials used during the instruction are appropriate to be used once more or it should be modified. It also serves as “a means of testing the validity of the predictive evaluation, and may point ways in which the predictive instruments can be improved for future use” (Ellis, 1997, pp. 36-37).

Based on the information resulted from the evaluation, summative and formative evaluation were developed. On the one hand, summative evaluation takes place after the use of the materials. It aims to check the usefulness and the appropriateness of the instructional materials according to students’ engagement in the classroom. This enables evaluators to build an overall perception of the materials (Richard, 2001, p. 293). On the other hand, formative evaluation addresses the issues and the limitations teachers faced during the implementation of the materials in order to improve them, add what is missed, or find out solutions (p. 288).

The third classification includes *for-potential* versus *for-suitability evaluation*. The for-potential evaluation is conducted without taking into consideration certain class or specific learners. It aims to recognize in which situation and for what purpose a particular material

can be employed i.e. the for-potential evaluation is not made according to preplanned criteria; whereas, the for-suitability evaluation takes into account predetermined guidelines such as learners' needs, objectives, and backgrounds in addition to the availability of the resources (Cunningsworth, 1995, p. 15). Accordingly, the for-potential evaluation differs from the for-suitability evaluation in the sense that the former tries to answer the question "what would this material be good for?" and the later is concerned with the question "would it be good for my class?".

### **1.5.2.3. Audience involved in the Evaluation**

Before starting evaluating the instructional materials, evaluators have to specify the audience with whom the evaluation will be conducted. Richards (2001) explained that any kind of evaluation could be generally conducted by two types of participants: insiders and outsiders. Insiders may include teachers, students, or anyone who experienced the use of the materials. For instance, teachers are mostly appropriate for formative evaluation since they plan, control, and implement the course. Consequently, data about the materials limitations and ameliorations will be provided. By contrast, students best suit summative evaluation because they can check the extent to which the materials used during the instruction are relevant to their needs and goals. Outsiders on the other hand are participants who are not directly involved in the course development. They can be consultants, inspectors, or administrators who are required to "supplement the teachers perception of what happened in a course with independent observation and opinions" (p. 296). Therefore, both participants provide different data according to the purpose of the evaluation.

#### **1.5.2.4. Criteria for Materials' Evaluation**

One of the issues that must be addressed before the evaluation of any instructional material is the criteria according to which evaluation will be held. Cunningsworth (1995) specified four criteria for materials' evaluation. The first criterion is that the material should reflect students' learning goals and purposes (p. 15). The second one is that the material should be based on students' needs which help them to use the language effectively in the needed academic or professional situations (pp. 15-16). The third criterion is that the material should facilitate the process of learning gradually from the familiar to the unfamiliar without imposing any method, style, or strategy (pp. 16-17). The last one is that the material should serve as a supporter and mediator between the target language and the students through providing a learnable input and effective tasks and activities (pp. 17). Furthermore, Cunningsworth summarized that the best material is the one which can be modified and changed because of the difficulty to find materials that cope with all the classroom situations (p. 139). Accordingly, it should be valued according to its ability to foster teachers' creativity in order to meet students' needs.

#### **1.5.3. Materials' Adaptation**

According to Tomlinson and Masahara (2017), materials' adaptation refers to the process of modifying materials in order to satisfy students' needs and teachers' goals so that the language learning and teaching process will be beneficial (p. 82). This implies that teachers should adjust materials regarding students' lacks and necessities.

Although there are a variety of resources that instructors can utilize in order to suit students' needs and make the teaching and learning process effective, it is up to teachers to adopt, develop or adapt materials. Cunningsworth (1995) explained that there are particular



reasons why materials should be adapted. One of these reasons is when the method used is not appropriate for students' level. In some cases the content must be modified if it is not helpful for learners. Moreover, another reason that sometimes pushes teachers to adapt materials is when the subject matter is irrelevant for students' native culture (pp. 136-137). Materials' adaptation seems to be very important in achieving high level language learning.

To make materials effective and beneficial for learners, they can be adapted in different ways. Teachers may modify the content of materials to focus on some skills and activities because of many factors like gender, age, social class, religion, and cultural backgrounds. Moreover, taking into account the time allocated; some units and sections may be omitted to meet the educational goals and learners' needs. In addition, tasks can be extended to cover the gap and to improve the insufficient practices. Finally, teachers may choose not to respect the organization of the materials content for different reasons (Richards, 2001, pp. 259-260). Accordingly, the main aim of materials adaptation is to provide learnable and effective language input.

### **1.6. Authentic Materials**

In order to reach the mastery of the language, materials used in second and foreign language classes should be authentic. Scholars defined authentic materials differently. Ellis and Christine (1994) referred to them as “any kind of materials taken from the real world and not specifically for the purpose of language teaching” (p. 157). Nevertheless, Herrington and Oliver highlighted that they are anything that is related to students' real-life and prepares them to deal with real life conditions (2000, p. 14). Moreover, Jacopson, Degner, and Gates considered them as “print materials used in ways that they would be used in the lives of learners outside of their adult education classes” (2003, p. 1).

Therefore, authentic materials are not designed for instructional goals rather they serve communicative purposes in real-life contexts.

Authentic materials play a prominent role in foreign language learning. Richards (2001) declared that authentic materials increase students' motivation because they are closely related to their interests. They also provide authentic information about the target culture since they serve as a bridge that links the classroom with the outside world. Moreover, through using authentic materials teachers can develop their capacities and abilities in creating tasks that match students learning styles (pp. 252-253). Consequently, authentic materials provide a real model of language use outside the classroom.

### **1.7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Materials**

Materials are very useful in language teaching and learning. Allright (1981) stated that the role of materials lies in two main points. The first one is deficiency, which means that materials protect students from teachers' deficiencies through providing them with valuable lessons and appropriate activities. The second one is the difference, which means that materials are created by experts different from teachers. Accordingly, the significance of materials is that they are designed by professionals of the field (p. 6).

Richards (2001) encouraged the use of teaching materials. He claimed that the importance of materials can be concretized through three points. Firstly, materials take on the responsibility of informing the learner about the language and guide him to use and practice it. Secondly, they act as a model for the content of the lesson as well as the methods of teaching. Finally, they supply learners with an authentic exposure of the target language (pp. 251-252). Thus, without materials, the teacher cannot teach and the learner cannot learn.

The usefulness of the instructional materials has been a questioning point among scholars of the field. Richards (2001) introduced a set of benefits and restrictions of materials; specifically textbooks. He clarified that the textbook serves as the core syllabus for learners in different places and classes. It also contains valuable and relevant resources that have been reviewed before. Besides, the textbook saves teachers' time since it helps them focus on the teaching process instead of searching for the information. In addition, the textbook functions as teachers guide for what to teach and how to teach it. Yet, he pointed out that the textbook may hamper teachers' creativity since they will be restricted by its content. Moreover, they may include decontextualized language and they may not sue the needs and the interests of learners (pp. 254-256). Consequently, deciding what materials to use should be done according to pre-selected principles.

## **Conclusion**

Instructional materials must be employed in any language instruction in order to provide a qualitative and valuable learning atmosphere. Hence, designing and selecting effective materials to be taught should be based on certain criteria and approaches that meet students' needs, level, and educational goals. Yet, materials' evaluation is needed to determine their appropriateness and usefulness in developing learners' academic achievements and fostering teachers' creativity.

In fact, it is the responsibility of teachers to adopt or adapt materials that suit the syllabus type, the classroom situation, and the programme objectives. In addition, materials must reflect the real world so that learners can put into practice what has been learned to serve different tasks.

## Chapter Two

### Learning Objectives

#### Introduction

The main goal of teachers is to search for an appropriate way of teaching that satisfies students' needs and their unique way of teaching situations. This may be achieved only through the development of meaningful teaching lesson plans that take into account students' needs and state their objectives behind such instruction. Therefore, this chapter is dedicated for learning objectives, their definition, components, importance, and the different criteria through which they are written. Then, this chapter deals with a short reference to Bloom's taxonomy and its importance in the educational programme. Finally, it ends with the influence of specifying the objectives on designing effective teaching materials.

#### 2.1. Definition of Learning Objectives

Many definitions of learning objectives were introduced by different scholars. Mishra (2008) defined learning objectives as "statement which describes what the learner is expected to achieve as a result of instruction... they direct attention to the student and the type of behavior they exhibit" (p. 36). She added that these statements can be called "behavioral objectives, learning outcomes, enabling objectives, terminal objectives, educational objectives, performance objectives, and instructional objectives". Moreover, Phillip and Phillip (2008) shared the same view by stating that objectives are "statement describing an intended outcome...it describes one of the key intents of the project or programme" (p. 1). Both the pre-mentioned definitions indicate that learning objectives are statements that specify the skills learners will acquire at the end of a certain instruction.

Besides, these statements do not indicate what the teacher should do to achieve the intended outcomes; rather they describe what is needed to be done by students.

Additionally, Pathak and Chandhary (2012) believed that educational objectives are “a point of view or an overall view of the possible achievement in terms of what students will be able to do when the entire educational system is directed towards the realization of the educational aims” (p. 18). Furthermore, Sindha and Sankaranarayanan (2012) argued that “educational objectives depict what the student should be able to do at the end of a teaching activity that they could not do...or do better after the successful completion of an educational programme” (p. 38). This implies that instructional objectives reflect the desired changes in students’ behavior resulted from a given teaching and learning experience. Therefore, objectives describe the competences pupils unable to do. More specifically, Bloom (1956) clarified that educational objectives are “explicit formulation of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process” (p. 26). He added that this change in students’ behavior might be at the level of their thinking, feelings, and actions (p. 26). On the light of what has been mentioned learning objectives are statements describing the intended outcomes and results of a certain lesson.

## **2.2. The Difference between Goals and Objectives**

There had been a little agreement on the definition of objectives. For instance, some linguists use the term objectives and goals interchangeably. In order to clarify the concept of objectives, we will differentiate it from other related terminologies. Goals are general statements that describe the course aim. They address what can be realistically accomplished in the future. Whereas objectives are specific statements about the ways

through which the goals will be reached. Therefore, objectives are constituent units of the goals i.e. goals are composed of variety of objectives (Graves, 2000, p. 75).

Taking the analogy of a journey, the destination is the goal, the journey is the course and the path is the objectives which describe the different points students should pass through in order to fulfill the journey and reach the destination. Most importantly, the relationship between goals and objectives can be illustrated via the relationship between cause and effect. If students achieve A, B, C objectives, then Y goal is accomplished (Graves, 2000, pp. 76-77).

Brown is another scholar who distinguished between goals and objectives. He stated that “the level of specificity is the single most distinguishing characteristic between goals and objectives” (1995, p. 74). This implies that decisions on whether the statement is a goal or an objective are based on the extent to which it is specific or general.

### **2.3. Types of Learning Objectives**

Based on the type of the intended behavior performed by learners, scholars have classified learning objectives into three main types: cognitive objectives, affective objectives, and psychomotor objectives.

#### **2.3.1. Cognitive Objectives**

Cognitivism refers to the study of the human mental processes and abilities such as perception, sensation, and memory. Cognitivists believed that learning is the result of the well organization and processing of the information in the learners’ mind. Besides, they argued that if teachers understand the information processing mechanism, appropriate learning experiences will be designed easily (Jhordan, Carlil, & Stack, 2008, p. 36).

Furthermore, Jhordan et al. claimed that it is up to teachers to create a way that stimulate learners' cognitive abilities according to their needs. Hence, this enables them to select effective materials to be taught (p. 48). Accordingly, knowing how information is arranged in the learners' mind is a vital step in creating effective teaching experiences.

Bloom (1956) stated that "cognitive educational objectives include those objectives which deal with the recall or recognition of knowledge and the development of intellectual abilities and skills" (p. 7). This means that cognitive learning objectives try to stimulate students' cognitive skills mainly the recognition and the retrieval of the information. Thus, this type of objectives aims to enhance students' intellectual processes. Cognitive educational objectives involve six cognitive classes: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Each can be describes through different action verbs (p. 7).

### **2.3.2. Affective Objectives**

According to Bloom (1956), the affective domain of educational objectives "includes objectives which describe changes in interests, attitudes and values, and the development of appreciations and adequate adjustment" (p. 7). Similarly, Brown (1995) highlighted that the affective educational objectives are those objectives describing aspects related to feelings, emotions, degrees of acceptance, values, biases...etc (p. 83). On the light of what has been mentioned, the affective educational objectives have to do with the students' psychological factors that influence the process of learning and teaching. Most importantly, five categories of behavior can be included in such type of objectives which are receiving the information, responding to it, valuing and evaluating the received knowledge,

organizing the information and determining the relationship between its part, and characterization by a value or value complex (Loree, 1971, pp. 77-81).

### **2.3.3. Psychomotor Objectives**

Simpson (1971) clarified that the psychomotor objectives deal with the physical and the motor skills. They combine between the cognitive and the affective abilities of the learners. This type of objectives focuses on the important role of the physical factors in facilitating the learning process. Also, he suggested five categories of behaviour in the psychomotor educational objectives: perception, set, guided response, mechanism, and complex overt response. The first means the awareness of the objects, qualities or relations of the activity through the organs' senses. The second involves the mental, emotional, and physical readiness to fulfill the action. The third is mainly about making decisions on what response should be made in order to perform a task based on the guidance of the instructors. The fourth is the learned action or behavior. Finally, the fifth one can be defined as the high degree skill or motor performed by the learners (pp. 71-76). Therefore, the psychomotor objectives enable learners to use their organic abilities in their educational experience.

### **2.4. Description of Learning Objectives**

Many researchers argued that learning objectives has three main components: performance, condition, and standard. As far as the first part is concerned, performance is what students will be able to do at the end of the lesson. In other words, it lays down specifications about the observable behavior, action, or outcome resulted from a certain instruction. The condition refers to how students will put into practice the required knowledge. The third part of the learning objectives has to do with the criterion for the successful performance (Jarling & Tertiary, 1996, p. 96; Kirtley, 2003, p. 476; Nadler &



Nadler, 2011, p. 119). Objectives determine what to be taught and the method to be followed. In short, it is up to the teacher to mobilize his/her knowledge and experience to plan a lesson that will effectively pave the way to students to acquire the desired skill.

## **2.5. Criteria of Learning Objectives**

In order to write effective learning objectives, variety of critical attributes must be present. The first one is that the objectives should be students-centred. They should reflect what students are going to accomplish and not what teachers need to fulfill. Besides, learning objectives have to be precise and concise that is written in a simple language so that they will not be interpreted in different ways. Furthermore, they should go hand in hand with learners' grade and level. While defining objectives, teachers should take into consideration both the level and the amount of time needed to accomplish them. Moreover, objectives must provide ideals through which students will be assessed (Craik, 1971, pp. 15-16; Hyland, 2003, p. 69). Accordingly, objectives must be student-centred, specific, measurable, attainable and realistic.

## **2.6. Considerations while Writing Learning Objectives**

Learning objectives play a crucial role in designing instruction, that is to say why scholars have provided set of considerations that should be taken into account while writing objectives. Bloom (1956) clarified that the process of objectives' formulation must be based on several types of information. The first type of information is basically about students' current level, needs, interests, and their intended performance behind such learning experience. The second type is derived from the nature of the subject matter and the extent to which it contributes to students' development. Moreover, objectives have to

match the school's philosophy, view, and values towards the teaching and learning process (pp. 26-27).

Taylor (1971) is another scholar who claimed that formulating learning objectives should be based on many factors. He argued that teachers should analyze students' culture so that they can teach valuable behaviors in order to make students feel, think, and act effectively in their society (pp. 142-143). Furthermore, learners' prior knowledge must be diagnosed to determine their educational abilities; consequently, appropriate objectives would be selected for the next stage of their development (pp. 143-144). Additionally, teachers should have enough knowledge about the subject matter to be taught in order to present learnable materials for students (pp. 144). Another basic consideration is that objectives should be consistent with the theory of learning. This indicates that objectives must match students' desired intentions behind learning (pp. 144-147). Shortly, writing learning objectives should be based on both institutional and educational factors. Yet, when all the pre-mentioned elements are followed, effective objective will be written and reached.

## **2.7. Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives**

Bloom's taxonomy was created in 1948 under the leadership of the educational psychologist Benjamin Bloom. The taxonomy was formed as a result of informal meetings held by group of college examiners in the American Psychological Association Convention in Boston. The taxonomy was created to promote high forms of thinking in education such as analyzing and evaluating rather than just remembering facts. The taxonomy is a multilayered model of classifying thinking into six cognitive classes and action verbs can be associated with each level of learning. These classes and the associated verbs can be used to formulate learning objectives of a course (Bloom, 1956, pp. 2-5). Yet, even if the

creation of the taxonomy was based on informal meetings it is considered as one of the most influential models that are used to design valuable input.

### **2.7.1. Problems in the Design of Bloom's Taxonomy**

Bloom and his colleagues faced variety of obstacles while establishing the taxonomy. Bloom (1956) pointed out three main problems. The first one is that the educational objectives are abstract in nature; consequently, it was very difficult to classify them. Yet, this problem was solved through relating the objectives to students' observable behavior. The second problem is that the taxonomy may hinder teachers' ability to create their own objectives since it provides particular list of objectives. However, this was later regarded as a useful tool for teachers. Lastly, the fragmentation of the educational experience makes the founders afraid of the inability to achieve the intended objectives. This was overcome through generalizing the levels of the taxonomy that simplify teachers' objectives selection (pp. 5-6). Briefly, the creation of the taxonomy faced problems at the level of application but they were solved by its founders.

### **2.7.2. Principles of the Taxonomy**

In order to overcome the pre-mentioned problems, Bloom (1956, pp. 5-6) proposed a set of principles for the taxonomy. These principles are the educational, logical, psychological, and neutral. The educational consideration has to do with teachers' views about the learning experiences in order to facilitate communication among learners. The logical principle necessitates the use of appropriate, concise, and precise terms so that the meaning will be conveyed effectively. The psychological one concentrates on the idea that the taxonomy should consider the psychological states of the human being. It was further suggested that in forming the taxonomy, the educational objectives should meet all the

educational orientations and opinions (1956, pp. 5-6). Therefore, when all these principles are taken into account the educational objectives would surely match students' needs and teachers' goals.

### **2.7.3. Levels of Thinking in Bloom's Taxonomy**

The term thinking has been defined by many scholars throughout history. Moseley et al. (2005) referred to thinking as the conscious or the semi-conscious mental process through which a variety of representations about information is built. Yet, in its educational context, it means “a consciously goal directed process” that is used to remember, form, plan, and reason concepts to draw conclusions (pp. 11-12). Accordingly, thinking can be regarded as a mental process through which individuals can make sense of the world.

Bloom's taxonomy is made of six classes: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. They are ordered hierarchically from the lower level to the higher level. Hence, they clarify learning from low order to high order. Each category of learning is built upon the other (Bloom, 1956, p. 30). To further clarify this concept, it can be said that before a learner can understand a concept, s/he must remember it. To apply a concept, s/he must first understand it. In order to evaluate a concept, s/he must analyze it, and to create accurate conclusions, s/he must complete a thorough evaluation. As teachers explain a concept to students, they must remember, understand, and apply it to move forward to higher level processes such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

#### **2.7.3.1. Knowledge**

Knowledge was defined by different scholars. Thagard (2005) in his part noted that the Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle regarded knowledge as the information

individuals perceive naturally from the experiences they passed through in their lives. The same point was highlighted by David Hume and Jhon Lock calling it “empiricism”. In contrast, another view was brought by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Rene Descarts namely “rationalism”. This latter discussed knowledge in terms of what is gained as a result of thinking and reasoning. Most importantly, Immanuel Kant combined the two pre-mentioned views considering knowledge as both the experiences and the inborn capacities of the mind (pp. 5-6). To summarize, knowledge is the awareness and the perception of the information people are exposed to in their lives.

Blomm (1956) considered knowledge as “those behaviors and test situations which emphasize the remembering, either by recognition or recall of ideas, material or phenomena” (p. 62). This signifies that knowledge involves retrieving, recognizing, and recalling relevant information from the long-term memory. Thus, Bloom argued that this knowledge is organized from the most specific and relatively concrete type of behaviour to the most complex and abstract ones (p. 62).

According to Bloom (1956), there are three types of knowledge: knowledge of specifics, knowledge of ways and means of dealing with specifics, and knowledge of universals and abstractions. Knowledge of specifics refers to the capacity of remembering separated bits of information about the field. These specifics involve knowledge of terminology and knowledge of facts. The former includes the verbal and the non-verbal symbols that have certain concrete denotations. Whereas the later has to do with the knowledge of dates, events, persons, places, sources of information, books, writings...etc. Based on what has been mentioned, the knowledge of terminology differs from the knowledge of facts in the sense that the knowledge of terminology deals with the

conventions and the agreements within the field, while the knowledge of facts represents the findings that cannot be tested according to the agreement of fields' specialists for the purpose of communication (pp. 63-67).

The second type of knowledge is called knowledge of ways and means of dealing with specifics. This knowledge deals with the criteria through which an idea is to be organized, studied, judged, and criticized. It is concerned with the procedures used to present information, the trends employed to determine the interconnectedness among the number of specifics, the classes and the categories created to systemize a certain phenomena, the principles through which these facts are evaluated, and the methodology followed to investigate such information. Specifically, the knowledge of specifics differs from the knowledge of means and ways of dealing with specifics in the point that it is product oriented, unlike the knowledge of ways and means which focuses on the procedure utilized to organize the information (Bloom, 1956, pp. 68-74).

The third type of knowledge is the knowledge of universals and abstractions in a field. It regarded knowledge in terms of the principles, the theories, and the generalizations used to study a phenomenon at its highest level of abstraction and complexity. It involves collecting a large number of specific facts and events, determining the relationship between them, and then arranging them in a "parsimonious form" (p. 75). In addition, the behavior of knowledge that can be measured is the extent to which students are able to recall information as a response to a certain question. Yet, the question's precision and exactness should go in parallel with what has been exposed to students (p. 78). Therefore, in Bloom's taxonomy knowledge is considered as the most important level of the cognition that is why it was offered a detailed analysis and classification.

### **2.7.3.2. Comprehension**

In linguistics, comprehension is defined as “the ability to know or grasp ideas with the mind” (Brassell & Rasinski, 2008, p. 16). This means that comprehension is the understanding of information with the inclusion of the cognitive mechanism. As claimed by Bloom (1956), comprehension is the ability to understand what is communicated both orally, written and symbolic (p. 89). In other words, comprehension is a mental process used to grasp the meaning of certain information.

Bloom (1956) specified three types of comprehension behavior: translation, interpretation, and extrapolation. The first means the ability to communicate the information into another language and from one form to another regarding its meaning as well as its context. Furthermore, the second type refers to the configuration of the information in the mind through recording it according to its importance, relevance, effectiveness, and relationship among its components. Finally, the third type of comprehension is extrapolation. It is concerned with the ability to make predictions and estimates from the presented information. It also involves inferences and drawing conclusions from the conditions available (pp. 89-90). Therefore, comprehension deals with the ability to understand, infer, and communicate the meaning of given information.

### **2.7.3.3. Application**

The level of application has to do with the use of particular information to reach a certain goal. Yet, the utilization of this information requires a full understanding of it. Hence, the application of given information can be demonstrated through six steps. It necessitates first recognition of the problem. Then, it demands students’ familiarity with this problem. Finally, it implies the selection of the problem solution from many possible

ones (Bloom, 1956, p. 120). Accordingly, application embodies what has been understood and grasped in the previous levels in order to deal with new situations.

#### **2.7.3.4. Analysis**

As specified by Bloom (1956), analysis emphasizes the division of the material into constituent pieces and the identification of the relationship between these parts at the level of its meaning and arrangement (p. 140). Similarly, Jhonson (2003) referred to analysis as the ability to divide information and identify the relation between its parts (p. 514). This implies that analysis is an aid used to further understand information. Analysis can be divided into three levels, analysis of elements, analysis of relationships, and analysis of organizational principles. The first covers the division of the material into parts to be then identified. The second encompasses the ability to infer and determine the relationship between the constituent parts of the material. The third deals with the structures through which the material is arranged (p. 145). In other words, analysis is considered as one of the most important levels since it encourages students to develop their cognitive abilities through distinguishing between what is appropriate from the inappropriate, and the relevant from the irrelevant.

#### **2.7.3.5. Synthesis**

As Bloom argued synthesis is “the putting together of elements and parts so as to form a whole” (1956, p. 162). This shows that synthesis is the process through which the bits are combined and reconstructed into new, well integrated, and structured material. Hence, at the level of synthesis learners are expected to produce creative behaviors restricted by the teachers’ guidance (p. 162). Based on the produced performance synthesis can be categorized into three main sub-categories; the production of a unique communication, the



production of a plan or proposed set of operations, and the production of a set of abstract relations. The first one includes the communication of certain ideas for the purpose of informing, describing, persuading, impressing, or entertaining using a particular medium. The second one involves the translation of ideas into actions. The third one is basically about the deduction and the discovery of abstract relations following a detailed analysis of a given hypothesis (pp. 163-164). Synthesis is concerned with the transmission, translation, and the analysis of ideas to reach conclusions.

#### **2.7.3.6. Evaluation**

Bloom (1956) referred to evaluation as making judgments about the value of particular ideas based on preplanned criteria to realize different aims. He added that evaluation is placed at the late stage of the taxonomy because it requires all the previous classes of behavior (p. 185). Evaluation can be conducted through two types of criteria: the internal and the external. The first takes into account the accuracy, the consistency, and the logical representation of the material. While the later comprises the appropriateness, the efficiency, the economy, and the utility of specific means to achieve certain ends (pp. 186-187). In short, critical thinking must be developed to reach accurate results.

#### **2.7.4. The Importance of Bloom's Taxonomy**

Bloom's taxonomy is considered as one of the influential tools that facilitate the learning and teaching process. Weil (2004) pointed four benefits of Bloom's taxonomy. He claimed that it provides a list of vocabulary that describes and articulates what students are going to do and what will happen in the classroom. In addition, the levels of thinking that the taxonomy specifies facilitate the process of designing tasks and activities which cope with students' needs. Moreover, Bloom's taxonomy is a framework for writing effective

educational objectives that represent “road map” for the desired destination. Finally, it is considered as a well organized and systematic guide for promoting students’ critical thinking (p. 81). Besides, Krathwhol (2002) stated that Bloom considered the taxonomy not only a measuring tool; rather it has many advantages at the level of the educational principles. It allows educators to design curriculum, to select evaluation procedures, and to write effective educational objectives (p. 212). Therefore, Bloom’s taxonomy is one of the vital frameworks that ameliorate the learning and teaching systems.

## **2.8. The Revised Version of Bloom’s Taxonomy**

The revised version of Bloom’s taxonomy was formed in 2001 by a former student of Benjamin Bloom named Lorin Anderson and his colleague Krathwhol. It was a kind of reformation and modernization of the original taxonomy, which aims to simplify its language and make it more practical and relevant for the 21st century teachers and students (Darwazah, 2017, p. 15). The most noticeable difference between the RT (Revised Taxonomy) and the OT (Original Taxonomy) is the change in terminology. Bloom’s six main classes were renamed from a noun form to a verb form and the two last categories were exchanged. This change in terminology is basically made to reflect the cognitive skills through which a certain concept is processed (Krathwhol, 2002, p. 310). Another change included in the RT is the shift from one to two dimensions. According to Krathwhol (2002), the learning objectives are written using a noun that reflects the intended knowledge and a verb that represents the function of this knowledge unlike the OT which focuses only on the knowledge (p. 213). Furthermore, the category of knowledge was given more emphasis in the RT. While knowledge in the OT was divided into three main types, in the RT one type was added. Hence, knowledge in RT includes

factual knowledge, conceptual knowledge, procedural knowledge, and metacognitive knowledge (p. 2014). Accordingly, the RT made changes on three main levels: terminology, structure, and emphasis.

## **2.9. The Role of Learning Objectives**

Educational objectives are of crucial importance for the success of any educational experience. McDonald (2002) pointed out that instructional objectives serve as a guide for the planning and the implementation of learning, teaching, and evaluation. Setting the objectives will help teachers provide standards and principles for the type of learning experience that would take place. They also stimulate students' efforts in an effective way. Henceforth, learners could assess their own progress when they are pre-informed about the objectives of the lesson. Through stating instructional objectives, teachers will be able to determine what students need to understand and what they are expected to accomplish at the end of the course. In addition, they would identify an accurate description about the desired lesson structure and tasks (p. 32).

Einstein stressed the fact that instructors must specify objectives at the first phase of course design claiming that they are "critical piece of effective instruction". He argued that when teachers inform their students about the intended results of a particular instruction, this helps in specifying what needs to be done. Besides, instructional objectives provide models for the content to be taught and how it is going to be taught. Hence, objectives increase students' autonomy because they allow them to accommodate strategies to be used in order to meet what is needed (2008, p. 543). Consequently, teachers should set objectives because they lead to effective, strategic, and sequenced teaching and learning process.

## **2.10. Specifying the Learning Objectives for Effective Materials' Design**

Many scholars have discussed the influence of specifying learning objectives on effective material design. Krashen and Terrell stated that “a decision on the methods and materials to be used in a course is possible only once the goals of that course have been defined” (as cited in Griffiths, 1995, p. 50). This entails that establishing objectives facilitates the selection of the instructions' content and the way through which it is delivered. The same point was highlighted by Grounland (1991, p. 2) who maintained that defining learning objectives allows teachers to get knowledge about what will be delivered as a lesson. Besides, Brindly (1984, p. 35) argued that learning objectives play an essential role in the process of students' assessment since they allow teachers to know what learners have grasped.

Nunan is another scholar who tackles the relationship between learning objectives and material design. He stated that “the advantage of having a restricted set of goal statement is that it can provide a degree of coherence which may be otherwise lacking. They also enable syllabus planners to link classroom tasks to real world uses” (1988, p. 99). This means that objectives help in designing consistent and organized syllabuses. Furthermore, Tyler (1946) claimed that objectives should be set before the tasks and the content because they serve as “a guide to the selection of the other elements in the curriculum” (as cited in Nunan, 1988, p. 60). Mager (1975) also highlighted the same idea when he considered objectives as “curriculum signpost which indicate our destination” (as cited in Nunan, 1988, p. 65). Yet, no one tackled the impact of specifying objectives on materials' design effectiveness in the university context. So this research aims to investigate this issue in Algerian universities where no textbooks/workbooks are available.

## **Conclusion**

Educational objectives form the reference and the basis upon which instructions are organized and activities are specified. They identify the conditions and the circumstances under which learners will reach the intended purpose of a given teaching experience. Effective and well-stated objectives help both teachers and students to monitor and direct the teaching and learning process. In fact, there may be specification of learning objectives; but they are not suitable to learners' level or the syllabus. The fit between these can be realized by important techniques such as Bloom's taxonomy. Hence educational objectives should be in accordance with such taxonomy since it provides frameworks for students' performance and assessment.

## Chapter Three

### **Field Investigation**

#### **Introduction**

The current chapter is dedicated to the analysis of both university teachers' questionnaire and Middle/Secondary school teachers' questionnaire. The two questionnaires were conducted to highlight the impact of learning objectives and their influence on designing effective materials for language teaching and learning. The questionnaires encompass valuable insights and views that guide teachers to design and monitor appropriate instructions. The reached results and findings serve to determine the extent to which objectives are significant in selecting and specifying the content to be taught. This chapter starts with identifying the research tools, the analysis of the questionnaires' questions, and the summary of findings and results. It ends up with a comparison between the university and middle/secondary school on the light of the research aims.

#### **3.1. University Teachers' Questionnaire**

Field investigation started by the analysis of university teachers' questionnaire, which aims to check teachers' perceptions about learning objectives and materials' design.

##### **3.1.1. Population of the Study**

Our sample was selected randomly. It is composed of teachers at the department of English at the University of 8 Mai 1945 (Guelma). The reason behind choosing college teachers as a population of the study is that they tend to prepare lessons and design materials on their own since they do not have a textbook/workbook. However, they usually

do not write the learning objectives since they do not make lesson plans. Eventually, their awareness should be raised toward the role of establishing objectives in determining the components of learning and teaching. Following Krejcie and Morgan's sampling table, thirteen (30) questionnaires were administered because the whole population includes fifty-four (54) teachers (1970, as cited in Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000, p. 94). So, our sample (S) could be representative of the theoretical population (N).

### **3.1.2. Description of University Teachers' Questionnaire**

The questionnaire is mainly devised based on the theoretical part of the current study. It is composed of twenty-one questions divided into three sections. Approximately all the questions are close-ended through which participants were asked to choose from listed options. To seek further clarifications and to avoid ambiguities, few open-ended questions were also incorporated to look for justifications.

The first section contains questions about teachers' specialty, their teaching experience, the levels they teach, and their last obtained degree. Section two (from Q6 to Q12) seeks information about teachers' use of materials, their views about materials' role, and the absence of textbooks in universities. Section three (from Q13 to Q21) tries to investigate teachers' awareness of the crucial significance of learning objectives in language teaching and learning especially materials' design.

### **3.1.3. Administration of University Teachers' Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was distributed at the Department of English at 8 Mai 1945 University (Guelma) during one week, from April 8<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup>. Teachers were very helpful in that they provide more clarifications/comments than it is needed. In addition, they are experienced and knowledgeable enough to give reliable and valuable responses.

### 3.1.4. Analysis of Results from University Teachers' Questionnaire.

#### Section One: General Information

##### Question One

Table 3.1

*Teachers' Specialty*

	Frequency	Percentage
Linguistics	10	33.33%
Civilization	8	26.66%
Literature	10	33.33%
Translation	2	6.66%
Total	30	100%

Concerning teachers' specialty, the question was answered by variety of teachers who have diverse specialties. Teachers specialized in Linguistics and Civilization were the majority and they represent 66.66% of the whole population (sample). Whereas, 26.66% were teachers of Literature and the rest of them (26.66%) studied Translation. Therefore, this diversity in specialty might have provided different views and perceptions about the current study.

##### Question Two

Table 3.2

*Teachers' Teaching Experience*



	Frequency	Percentage
From 1 to 5 years	4	13.33%
From 6 to 10 years	21	70%
From 11 to 15 years	5	16.66%
Total	30	100%

As it is shown in the previous table, the majority of teachers (70%) have been teaching English for six to ten years. Additionally, 16.66% were teaching for more than eleven years. However, only 13.33% of teachers are still at the beginning of their teaching career. This indicates that the majority of teachers have a moderate experience that could be sufficient to give us valuable comments.

### Question Three

Table 3.3

#### *Teachers' Status of Work*

	Frequency	Percentage
A part-time teacher	0	0%
A full-time teacher	30	100%
Total	30	100%

The previous table shows that all teachers (100%) work as full-time teachers. This indicates that they are permanent teachers who may devote all their time for teaching and improving their professional career.

### Question Four

Table 3.4

*Levels Taught by Instructors*

	Frequency	Percentage
L1	17	56.66%
L2	16	53.33%
L3	8	26.66%
M1	9	30%
M2	6	20%

As it is indicated in table 3.4, more than half the teachers (56.66% and 53.33%) instruct first and second-year respectively. Also, 30% of them teach third-year. This implies that the majority of teachers are instructors of first, second and third-year students who may need more focus on materials' design and the content of the lesson since they need to learn basic elements about language in these stages. Nonetheless, some instructors (30% and 20%) teach Master-one and Master-two students who have developed more language proficiency so that they may be able to negotiate the syllabus with the teacher and to participate in the specification of their own objectives.

**Question Five**

Table 3.5 (a)

*Teachers' Last Obtained Degree*

	Frequency	Percentage
Master	0	0%
Magistère	30	100%
Doctorat-es-sciences	0	0%
Doctorat LMD	0	0%

When asked about teachers' last obtained degree, all teachers (100%) opted for Magistère degree. None selected Master or PhD. This indicated that the sample is homogeneous and that all the teachers belong to the classical system.

Table 3.5 (b)

*Teachers' Enrollment in PHD Programme*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	29	96.66%
No	1	3.33%
Total	30	100%

Table 3.5 (b) shows that nearly all teachers (96.66%) are enrolled in PhD programme. Whereas, only one teacher (3.33) is not. This entails that our sample is serious and motivated to achieve a high level of education.

**Section Two: Materials' Design**

**Question Six**

Table 3.6

*Teachers' Use of the Syllabus*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	20	66.66%
No	10	33.33%
Total	30	100%

the syllabus is the main reference for University teachers to structure and order the content of the lessons, it is not followed by many of them. Those teachers justified their choice by claiming that they order the lessons' content/sequence according to its importance. The results of the previous table show that the majority of teachers (66.66%) follow the syllabus provided by the administration. Surprisingly, 33.33% of teachers do not present the lessons as outlined in the syllabus. Hence, their adjustment in the syllabus structure aims to meet the syllabus objectives and to facilitate students' understanding. So, they are aware of the importance of meeting learners' needs and goals.

### **Question Seven**

Table 3.7 (a)

#### *Teachers' Use of the Textbook*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	7	23.33%
No	23	76.66%
Total	30	100%

Table 3.7 (a) indicates that the majority of teachers (76.66%) do not follow a textbook while teaching. This stresses the fact that textbooks are not available in the university. Surprisingly, only seven teachers (23.33%) admitted that they follow the textbook, which

means that they consider books as textbooks, which is not a logical/correct consideration. By textbooks we mean the use of a common textbook imposed by the ministry for each module/level (similar to Secondary and Middle schools).

Table 3.7 (b)

*The Negative Effects of the Absence of Textbooks in Universities*

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	1	3.33%
Agree	8	26.66%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	6.66%
Disagree	11	36.66%
Strongly disagree	1	3.33%
Total	23	100%

Concerning teachers' opinions about the textbook absence in the university, 36.66% of teachers disagreed that textbooks' absence may have negative effects. While, 26.66% of teachers agreed on the negative effects of the absence of textbooks. Some teachers (6.66%) stand neutral, they neither agree nor disagree on its usefulness, which means that they probably do not recognize the relation between the textbook and effective teaching process. The same percentage (3.33%) strongly agreed/strongly disagreed respectively about its negative effects. This entails that the former really realize its advantages on learning and teaching; however, the latter do not think that the textbook may facilitate language teaching and learning.

**Question Eight**

Table 3.8 (a)

*Teachers' Personal Design of Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	18	60%
No	12	40%
Total	30	100%

The previous table shows that 60% of teachers declared that they design their own lessons without plagiarism. Whereas, 40% of them confessed that they use ready materials from different sources. This implies that teachers do not design their own materials. Perhaps they are not able to do so or they do not have time to design them. So, they would have different lesson content, which means that students are not exposed to the same input.

Table 3.8 (b)

*Teachers' Preferred Type of Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Electronic materials	0	0%
Online materials	0	0%
Printed materials	2	16.66%
Both electronic/online and print materials	10	83.33%
Total	12	100%

Teachers who do not design their own materials were asked about the types of materials they prefer to use. Most of them (83.33%) stated that they rely on both electronic/online and print materials; while, 16.66% of them proclaimed that they depend only on printed

materials. None selected electronic materials alone or online materials alone. This means that the majority integrate technology in teaching. However, some teachers still use printed sources and neglect technology.

### Question Nine

Table 3.9 (a)

*Teachers' Adoption or Adaptation of Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Adopt	4	13.33%
Adapt	26	86.66%
Total	30	100%

When asked about materials' adaptation and adoption, the majority of teachers (86.66%) opted for materials' adaptation. Therefore, they are aware of the importance of adaptation on presenting appropriate learning components to students. Only 13.33% of teachers chose materials' adoption. This means that teachers neglect the crucial role of materials' adaptation in meeting the course objectives and students' needs or they just do not care for that due to time constraints and the heavy workload.

Table 3.9 (b)

*Teachers' Aim behind Adaptation*

	Frequency	Percentage
--	-----------	------------

To meet the learners' needs	2	7.69%
To make them aligned with the syllabus	0	0%
To make them more comprehensible	1	3.84%
All the above	23	88.46%
Total	26	100%

According to the results obtained, the majority (88.46%) chose “all the above”. This indicates that teachers’ aim behind adaptation is making the input suitable for learners’ needs, comprehensible and motivating. Also, 7.69% of teachers stated that they adapt materials to meet learners’ needs. Only 3.84% of teachers declared that the aim is to make materials more comprehensible. None stated that his/her aim is making materials aligned with the syllabus. So, teachers’ aims may differ according to their own perceptions and approaches to teaching.

Table 3.10

*The Most Important Factor in Materials' Selection*

	Frequency	Percentage
Learners' needs and proficiency level	23	76.66%
Syllabus content	5	16.66%
Authenticity	1	3.33%
Learners' involvement	0	0%
Developing learners' communicative competence	1	3.33%
Total	30	100%



When asked about the most important factor in materials' selection, the majority of teachers (76.66%) considered the learners' needs and proficiency level as the principle factor, which implies that materials must better suit the needs and the level of learners. Whereas, 16.66 of them claimed that taking into consideration the syllabus content is more beneficial for the selection of materials. This entails that they limit the content of their lessons to the syllabus. In addition, the same percentage (3.33%) selected authenticity and developing learners' communicative competence as the main factors for effective selection of materials. This indicates that the majority of teachers do not give priority to students' communicative abilities and authentic materials. Surprisingly, none opted for learners' involvement as a major factor in selecting materials to be taught.

### **Question Eleven**

Table 3.11 (a)

#### *Teachers' Use of Authentic Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	24	80%
No	6	20%
Total	30	100%

Concerning teachers' use of authentic materials, the vast majority (80%) claimed that they use authentic materials while teaching. This indicates that teachers believe in the prominent advantages of this type of materials. Whereas, only 20% argued that they do not use authentic materials. This may be due either to the nature of the modules they are teaching or to their possible ignorance of the role of these materials in promoting understanding and communication.

Table 3.11 (b)

*Facilitating Learning/Teaching through Authentic Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	24	100%
No	0	0%
Total	24	100%

Teachers who answered that they use authentic materials were asked whether these materials help in facilitating language teaching and learning. All of them (100%) argued that they do. None stated the opposite. This means that authentic materials are useful and have a paramount importance in language teaching and learning.

**Question Twelve**

Table 3.12

*The Importance of Materials in Accordance with the Teaching Method/Approach*

	Frequency	Percentage
Very important	22	73.33%
Important	8	26.66%
Not important	0	0%
Total	30	100%

Table 3.12 shows that nearly all teachers (73.33%) claimed that materials are very important in selecting the teaching approach. While only 26.66% of them thought that they are important. None (0%) believed that materials are not important. This entails that

materials are of crucial importance in selecting the appropriate teaching method followed to deliver the lesson.

### **Section Three: The Influence of Specifying Learning Objectives on Effective Materials' Design**

#### **Question Thirteen**

Table 3.13 (a)

#### *Teachers' Writing of Long-term Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	24	80%
No	6	20%
Total	30	100%

When asking teachers about whether they write long-term objectives, the majority (80%) assured that they do. While, only 20% of them declared that they do not write them. This means that teachers realize only the importance of the long-term objectives.

Table 3.13(b)

#### *Place where Teachers Write Long-term Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
In the syllabus	22	91.66%
In lesson plans	0	0%
In a notebook	2	8.33%
Total	24	100%

The previous table indicates that the majority of teachers (91.66%) write long-term objectives either in the syllabus. However, 8.33% stated that they write them in a notebook. This proves that the majority of teachers in the university do not write lesson plans. However, writing them in a notebook is a good initiative.

#### **Question Fourteen**

Table 3.14 (a)

##### *Frequency of Writing Short-term Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	19	63.33%
No	11	36.66%
Total	30	100%

According to the results shown in table 3.14 (a), 63.33% of teachers answered that they do write short-term objectives. While, 36.66% of them do not. This entails that more than half the teachers realize the effectiveness of the short-term objectives in language teaching.

Table 3.14 (b)

##### *Factors that Prevent Teachers from Writing Short-term Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
No use of lesson plans	11	100%
Other	0	0%
Total	11	100%

Table 3.14 (b) displays that all teachers (100%) do not write short-term objectives mainly because they do not use lesson plans. This means that using lesson plans could help

teachers improve the quality of instruction by specifying both long and short-term objectives.

### Question Fifteen

Table 3.15 (a)

*The Necessity of Lesson Plans in University*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	19	63.33%
No	11	36.66%
Total	30	100%

In table 3.15 (a), more than half the teachers (63.33%) argued that lesson plans are necessary in the university. This entails their full agreement on the significance of lesson planning to design learnable and complete content. Yet, some teachers (36.66%) said that it is not necessary, which shows their little interest in writing lesson plans.

Table 3.15 (b)

*Causes of Lesson Plans' Necessity*

	Frequency	Percentage
To facilitate objectives' specification	2	10.52%
To outline the type of assessment techniques	0	0%
To specify the learning activities	0	0%
To outline the teaching content through time management	2	10.52%
All the above	15	78.54%
Total	19	100%

Teachers who support the usefulness of lesson plans have been asked about the reasons behind such necessity. The majority of teachers (78.94) reported that in addition to objectives' specification and the content outlining, lesson plans select the assessment techniques and the learning activities. 10.52% of teachers replied that lesson plans facilitate objectives' specification. Similarly, 10.52% argued that they help in outlining the teaching content through time. This means that lesson plans are vital in designing, selecting, and ordering the content to be taught and how it will be taught.

Table 3.15 (c)

*Causes of the Uselessness of Lesson Plans*

	Frequency	Percentage
The outline of the lesson is enough	3	27.27%
Writing the long-term objectives in the syllabus is sufficient	2	18.18%
Specifying the short-term objectives in the syllabus could be effective	0	0%
All the above	6	54.54%
Total	11	100%

For teachers who disconfirmed the necessity of designing lesson plans. 54.54% of teachers claimed that specifying long and short-term objectives in the syllabus is adequate. Furthermore, 27.27% of them declared that the outline of the lesson is enough. 18.18% proclaimed that writing the long-term objectives is sufficient. This means that teachers rely on the syllabus in designing their lessons and ignore lesson plans.

### Question Sixteen

Table 3.16

*Teachers' Criteria of Writing Learning Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
What is going to be learned	6	20%
How it will be learned	1	3.33%
Both	23	76.66%
Total	30	100%

Concerning what teachers' focus on while writing the objectives. The majority of them (76.66%) opted for both what is going to be learned and how it will be learned. Hence,

they view that both factors help in writing effective learning objectives; whereas, some teachers (20%) concentrated more on the content to be taught. This indicates that they give more importance to the input. Finally, 3.33 % (only one teacher) focused on how it will be learned, which means that s/he gives more importance to the method of teaching.

### **Question Seventeen**

Table 3.17

*The Significance of Writing the Learning Objectives for Every Part of the Lesson*

	Frequency	Percentage
Very important	7	23.33%
Important	13	43.33%
Not important	10	33.33%
Total	30	100%

Concerning the significance of writing the learning objectives for every part of the lesson, nearly half the teachers (43.33%) claimed that writing the objectives is important. This entails that objectives are beneficial. Whereas, some teachers (33.33%) reported that it is not important, which indicates their little interest in writing the objectives. 23.33% of students indicated that it is very important to write the objectives for each part of the lesson. So, more than half the teachers are aware of the importance of that.

### **Question Eighteen**

Table 3.18

*Informing Students about the Learning Objectives*



	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	18	60%
No	12	40%
Total	30	100%

When teachers were asked whether they inform their students about each lessons' objectives, 60% replied that they do. This implies that they know that it helps learners monitor their own learning; whereas, 40% do not inform their students about them, which may cause deviation from the intended goals of learning and a lack of involvement.

### **Question Nineteen**

Table 3.19

*Explaining to Students What Needs to be done during Lessons*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	21	70%
No	09	30%
Total	30	100%

Concerning whether teachers explain what is going to be done during the lesson, the majority (70%) claimed that they do. This reflects teachers' awareness about the significance of students' knowledge of the lessons' content. Some teachers (30%) declared that they do not explain that for students, which indicates that teachers believe that explaining the lesson's tasks does not affect positively the process of learning and teaching.

## Question Twenty

Table 3.20

*The Effects of Materials on Objectives' Realization*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	100%
No	0	0%
Total	30	100%

Table 3.20 shows that all teachers (100%) agreed on the fact that materials play a crucial role in helping teachers realize their objectives. This indicates that teachers recognize the importance of materials without which the lesson cannot be delivered.

## Question Twenty-one

The last question is an open-ended one. It is about further suggestions about the importance of setting the objectives in materials' design. Only 13.33% of teachers (four teachers) answered it. Hence, their comments could be summarized as follows:

- There is a serious lack in this area at the university level.
- Teachers need to develop these course design procedures for improved qualitative teaching and learning outcomes.
- The selection of teaching materials is based on the specification of learning objectives.
- Lesson plans are very important in preventing deviations from what has been pre-planned.
- Setting the learning objectives enables the teacher and the student to be aware of the aim of the course, the elements that are learned, the methods used and the way through which the setbacks are overcome.

In general, the majority of teachers do not make lesson plans. So, they do not set the objectives at the first phase of course design.

### **3.2.2. Summary and Discussion of Results from University Teachers' Questionnaire**

The majority of teachers think that the syllabus is the basic reference for their lessons without relying on a certain textbook. This indicates that teachers are not aware of the vital role of textbooks in directing teaching. However, they use other electronic/online and print materials which they modify according to students' needs, level, and syllabus content. In addition, nearly all teachers use authentic materials. This entails that they are aware of the importance in facilitating language teaching and learning. Moreover, teachers believe that exploring and analyzing students' needs is the major factor that should be taken into account while designing materials. They also claimed that materials help in selecting appropriate teaching methods and approaches. This indicates that teachers appreciate the significance of materials in achieving the desired outcomes.

Most of teachers specify the long term objectives of their lessons. Yet, the majority write them in the syllabus neglecting the importance of lesson plans in designing organized, sequenced, and effective content to be taught. In the same time, the results show that teachers start to realize the necessity of writing lesson plans in the university similar to Middle and Secondary schools because they enables them to specify the objectives, the assessment techniques and the teaching content. Furthermore, approximately all teachers argued that informing students about what needs to be done help in selecting materials. consequently, the objectives would be realized.

### **3.2. Middle/Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire**

The second tool used in this research is Middle/Secondary School teachers' questionnaire. It aims to investigate teacher' views towards the learning objectives and its impact on materials' design.

#### **3.2.1. Population of the Study**

Our sample was chosen randomly so that it could reveal the views of Middle and Secondary school teachers of Guelma. The reason behind choosing Middle and Secondary school teachers as a population of the study is that they used to prepare and design materials based on lesson plans that consider learning objectives as the basic upon which instructions are organized. Eventually, they are aware of the significance of establishing objectives in determining the components of learning and teaching. However, only thirty teachers were selected because it is difficult to have access to a great number of teachers since there are many schools in Guelma City and its surroundings. Thus, the sample is not representative of the whole population.

#### **3.2.2. Description of Secondary and Middle School teachers' Questionnaire**

The questionnaire is a semi-structured one that is composed of twenty-one questions divided into three sections. Nearly all the questions are close-ended. To get further clarifications, teachers were asked for justifications.

The first section contains questions about teachers' specialty, their teaching experience, the levels they teach, and their last obtained degree. Section two (from Q6 to Q12) seeks information about teachers' use of materials, their views about materials' role, and the textbook absence in universities; whereas, section three (from Q13 to Q21) tries to

investigate teachers' awareness of the crucial significance of learning objectives in language teaching and learning specifically materials' design.

### 3.2.3. Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was administered to thirty Middle and Secondary school teachers in Guelma (Nechmaya city, Guelaa Bousbaa, Héliopolis, Boumahra Ahmed, Sellawa Anouna, and Belkhir). The teachers were very collaborative and helpful which facilitated the process of distributing this questionnaire in a short period from April 15 to April 24.

### 3.2.4. Analysis of Results from Middle/ Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire

#### Section One: General Information

#### Question One

Table 3. 21

#### *Teachers' Teaching Experience*

	Frequency	Percentage
From 1 to 5 years	9	30%
From 6 to 10 years	5	16.66%
From 11 to 15 years	8	26.66%
From 16 to 20	5	16.66%
From 21 to 25	3	10%
Total	30	100%

Concerning the teaching experience, the questionnaire was filled by teachers who have different teaching experiences. 30% of teachers were new in the field. Whereas, 26.66% have an average experience of eleven to fifteen years. 16.66% have been working for six to

ten years. The same percentage worked for sixteen to twenty years. The rest of them (10%) were about to finish their teaching career (from 21 to 25). This indicates that teachers' experiences are different.

### Question Two

Table 3. 22

#### *Teachers' Work*

	Frequency	Percentage
A permanent teacher	30	100%
A substitute teacher	0	0%
Total	30	100%

Concerning teachers' work, all teachers (100%) work as permanent teachers. This implies that our sample is homogeneous and that teachers are more experienced and involved.

### Question Three

Table 3.23

#### *Levels taught by Instructors*

	Frequency	Percentage
First year	12	40%
Second year	16	53.33%
Third year	9	30%
Fourth year	17	63.33%

As it is shown in the previous table, the majority of teachers (63.33%) teach fourth year. Also, more than half the teachers (53.33%) teach second year. Furthermore, 40% of teachers instruct first year while. 30% of them teach third year. So, all the teachers teach at least two levels. Which shows their experience in dealing with different levels.

#### **Question Four**

Table 3. 24

##### *Teachers' Last Obtained Degree*

	Frequency	Percentage
Licence	15	50%
Master	14	46.66%
Magistère	1	3.33%
PhD	0	0%
Total	30	100%

According to the results obtained, half the sample (50%) has a Licence degree. While, 46.66% has a Master degree. Yet, 3.33% (one teacher) has a Magistère degree. None has a PhD. So, teachers are academically qualified to teach in the Middle or Secondary school.

#### **Section Two: Materials' Design**

##### **Question Five**

Table 3. 25 (a)

##### *Teachers' Extent of Satisfaction with the Content of the Textbook*

	Frequency	Percentage
To high extent	0	0%
To a limited extent	19	63.33%
To a very limited extent	11	36.66%
Total	30	100%

As indicated in the previous table, the majority of teachers (63.33%) are satisfied to a limited extent with the content of the textbook. Also, 36.66% of them are satisfied to a very limited extent. However, none is satisfied to a high extent. This entails that the textbook includes some inappropriate content to be taught.

Table 3. 25 (b)

*Teachers' Views towards the Textbook*

	Frequency	Percentage
Some texts and activities are very complicated especially scientific ones	13	43.33%
Some words are very hard and need to be replaced	17	56.66%
Some texts/activities violate our religion	0	0%
Total	30	100%

More than half of teachers (56.66%) claimed that some words are difficult and pupils cannot understand them. Nearly half the teachers (43.33%) revealed that some texts and activities are very complicated especially scientific ones. However, none agreed that texts/activities violate our religion (0%). This entails that the textbook content does not match the level of pupils. Yet, teachers are aware of this problem and the way of solving it.



### Question six

Table 3.26

*Materials Preferred by Teachers*

	Frequency	Percentage
Electronic materials	5	16.66%
Online materials	0	0%
Printed materials	9	30%
Both electronic/online and print materials	16	53.33%
Total	30	100%

As shown in table 3.27, 53.33% of teachers claimed that they prefer to use both electronic, online and print materials. This means that these materials help teachers in designing effective teaching instructions; whereas, 30% of teachers prefer to utilize printed materials. 16.66% of them use electronic materials. This implies their different views vis-à-vis the integration of technology.

### Question Seven

Table 3.27 (a)

*Teachers' Adoption and Adaptation of the Textbook*

	Frequency	Percentage
Adopt	2	6.66%
Adapt	28	93.33%
Total	30	100%

When asking teachers about whether they adapt or adopt the textbook content, nearly all teachers (93.33%) adapt it. This indicates that they are aware of the significance of materials' adaptation. Whereas, only 6.66% of teachers (two) declared that they adopt it. This means that they neglect the importance of adjusting some texts/activities in the textbook according to pupils' needs.

Table 3.27 (b)

*Reasons of the Textbook Adaptation*

	Frequency	Percentage
To meet the learner' needs	12	42.85%
To make it aligned with the programme	5	17.85%
To make it more comprehensible	9	32.14%
All the above	2	7.14%
Total	28	100%

Concerning the reasons given by teachers behind the adaptation of the textbook, the majority (42.85%) opted for students' needs. So, teachers value the crucial role of needs' analysis in specifying materials to be learned. 32.14% of them said that comprehension is the main reason. This indicates that pupils are the center of the teaching and learning process. 17.85% of teachers chose to make it aligned with the programme, which means that the aims of the programme should be taken into account while selecting materials. Only 7.14% of teachers (two) opted for all the reasons. This entails that they believe that all the reasons provided must be taken into consideration.

### Question Eight

Table 3.28

#### *Teachers' Own Design of Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	100%
No	0	0%
Total	30	100%

Table 3.29 shows that all teachers (100%) design their own materials in addition to the textbook. This implies that they are aware of their pupils' needs and objectives. Therefore, they add elements that are necessary to meet such goals.

### Question Nine

Table 3.29

#### *The Most Important Factor in Materials' Selection*

	Frequency	Percentage
Learners' needs and proficiency level	25	83.33%
Syllabus content	0	0%
Authenticity	0	0%
Learners' involvement	5	16.66%
Developing learners' communicative competence	0	0%
Total	30	100%

As indicated in the previous table, most of teachers (83.33%) argued that the most important factor for selecting materials is meeting students' needs and their proficiency

level. This implies that teachers know that effective teaching materials need to meet pupils' level and lacks. Whereas some teachers (16.66%) claimed that learners' involvement is the most important factor in selecting materials. This entails that materials have to engage learners as much as possible in the learning process. Surprisingly, none selected authenticity, syllabus content and developing communicative competence. This implies that teachers focus more on learners' needs.

### Question Ten

Table 3.30

#### *Textbook Authenticity*

	Frequency	Percentage
Always	0	0%
Usually	9	30%
Sometimes	21	70%
Never	0	0%
Total	30	100%

When asking teachers whether the textbook reflect the real world, 70% chose sometimes; while, 30% opted for usually. This indicates that the textbook do not always include materials that enable pupils to apply what is learned in different tasks in their lives.

### Question Eleven

Table 3.31

#### *Authentic Materials' Role*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	27	90%
No	3	10%
Total	30	100%

According to the results obtained, nearly all teachers (90%) claimed that authentic materials help in facilitating language teaching and learning. While, only three teachers (10%) argued that they do not. This indicates that authentic materials are crucial elements in any language teaching experience.

### **Question Twelve**

Table 3.32

*The Importance of Selecting Materials in Accordance with the Teaching Method*

	Frequency	Percentage
Very important	16	53.33%
Important	14	46.66%
Not important	0	0%
Total	30	100%

In the previous table, teachers were asked about the importance of selecting teaching materials in accordance with the teaching method or approach. 53.33% of teachers argued that it is very important and 46.66% claimed that it is important. However, none declared that it is not important. This indicates that selecting materials goes hand in hand with the teaching method.

### Section Three: The Influence of Specifying Learning Objectives on Materials' Design

#### Question Thirteen

Table 3.33

##### *Writing Long-term Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	23	76.66%
No	7	23.33%
Total	30	100%

Table 3.34 shows that the majority of teachers (76.66%) claimed that they write long-term objectives; while, 23.33% of them disconfirmed that. This indicates that teachers are aware of the importance of writing the long-term objectives.

#### Question Fourteen

Table 3.34

##### *Writing Short-term Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	100%
No	0	0%
Total	30	100%

When teachers were asked whether they write short-term objectives, all teachers (100%) confessed that they write short-term objectives. This implies that short-term objectives are very important in language teaching and learning.

### Question Fifteen

Table 3.35

#### *The Necessity of Lesson Plans*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	100%
No	0	0%
Total	30	100%

When teachers were asked about their views about the necessity of lesson plans, all of them (100%) replied that lesson plans are very necessary. This entails that lesson plans are useful to direct teachers' courses.

### Question Sixteen

Table 3.36 (a)

#### *The Use of Lesson Plans in University*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	29	96.66%
No	1	3.33%
Total	30	100%

The previous table indicates that nearly all teachers (96.66%) reported that lesson plans are necessary for University teachers too. While, 3.33% (one teacher) replied that they are not. This emphasizes the crucial importance of lesson plans.

Table 3.36 (b)

#### *The Importance of the Use of Lesson Plans in University*

	Frequency	Percentage
To facilitate objectives' specification	3	10%
To outline the type of assessment techniques	0	0%
To specify the learning activities	0	0%
To outline the teaching content through time management	0	0%
All the above factors	27	90%
Total	19	100%

Concerning table 3.37(b), approximately all teachers (90%) claimed that all the aforementioned reasons are very important. Also, 10% of teachers declared that lesson plans are important in the university to facilitate objectives' specification. This implies that lesson plans guide and direct teachers to easily design effective instructions that include all the elements at the level of both the content and the method. However, none opted for the other causes.

### Question Seventeen

Table 3.37

#### *Criteria of Writing Learning Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
What is going to be learned	0	0%
How it will be learned	0	0%
Both	30	100%
Total	30	100%



In the previous table, teachers **were** asked about the criteria which they focus on while writing the learning objectives. All teachers (100%) considered both what is learned and how it is learned. This entails that objectives specify the teaching content and the method followed to deliver such content.

### **Question Eighteen**

Table 3.38

*The Importance of Writing the Objectives When Designing Materials*

	Frequency	Percentage
Very important	9	30%
Important	20	66.66%
Not important	1	3.33%
Total	30	100%

As indicated in table 3.38, 66.66% of teachers opted for the importance of writing the objectives when designing materials. This entails their total accordance with the relevance of specifying objectives on materials’ design. 30% of teachers claimed that writing the objectives for every part of the lesson is very important when designing materials. Whereas, Only 3.33% (one teacher) argued that objectives are not important, which implies his/her ignorance of the significance of writing the objectives.

### **Question Nineteen**

Table 3.39

*Informing Pupils about the Lesson’s Objectives*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	24	80%
No	6	20%
Total	30	100%

The previous table shows that 80% of teachers inform their students about each lesson's objectives. While, the other 20% claimed the opposite, which means that they neglect their importance. The first category do not ignore the significance of informing pupils about the lesson objectives on directing their efforts towards their realization.

### **Question Twenty**

Table 3.40

#### *Explaining the Activities for Pupils*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	24	80%
No	6	20%
Total	30	100%

Teachers were asked whether they explain to their pupils what needs to be done during the lesson. The majority of them (80%) insisted that they do. However, 20% of teachers disconfirmed that. This means that teachers acknowledge the significance of explaining the teaching activities on pupils monitoring of their efforts to accomplish the educational objectives successfully.

### **Question Twenty-one**

Table 3.41

*The Significance of Materials for Objectives Realization*

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	100%
No	0	0%
Total	30	100%

As table 3.42 indicates, all teachers (100%) confessed that materials play a crucial role in helping teachers realize the learning objectives. This implies that teachers have experienced the positive effects of materials **by** achieving the intended goal of the lesson.

**Question Twenty-two**

This question is open-ended. Teachers were kindly invited to provide further suggestions about the importance of setting the objectives in materials' design. Only 23.33% of teachers added comments that could be summarized as follows:

- Objectives are highly required in any learning context because nothing can be done randomly.
- Through objectives, both teachers and learners find their way to reach what is going to be learned and how it is taught.
- Lesson plans are as an outline or synopsis that steers both teachers and learners to the right teaching points.
- Objectives give accurate information about the important elements to be included in the lesson.
- Objectives must be set based on pupils' level and needs.

To conclude, nearly all teachers agreed on the fact that learning objectives are very important in designing effective lesson materials that cope with pupils' needs, level of proficiency, and lacks.

### **3.2.5. Summary and discussion of Results from Middle and Secondary Teachers' Questionnaire**

When asking teachers about the extent to which they are satisfied with the textbook content, the majority of them opted for to a limited extent. Yet, the main reason behind such claim is that the vocabulary of the textbook is complicated and needs to be changed. From the analysis of teachers' responses about materials, it can be observed that the teachers employ both electronic and online materials in addition to the textbook. However, these materials must be adjusted in order to meet students' needs and make them more comprehensible. Also, teachers believed that taking into account learners' proficiency level is the most important factor in materials' selection. Most importantly, they argued that in any teaching and learning instruction authentic materials must be utilized because they facilitate the delivery of the content.

Furhtermore, most teachers write long-term and short-term objectives, which indicates that they are aware of their significance in language teaching. Hence, they also think that lesson plans are necessary for university teachers too since they easily specify the activities and the tasks included in the course. In addition, they totally agreed on the importance of writing, informing, and explaining the objectives of every lesson to students. This implies that teachers are fully interested in setting the objectives because they have experienced their positive effects. More specifically, all teachers believed that materials play a crucial

role in helping teachers realize the objectives. This entails that objectives are of vital role in designing qualitative and paramount teaching and learning input.

### **3.3. The Comparative Study**

Based on the results got from the analysis of both questionnaires, it can be noticed that our samples' responses varied according to their perceptions of the topic. Unlike University teachers who follow the outline of the syllabus to structure their lessons, teachers of Middle and Secondary schools rely on textbooks to design the content to be taught. Hence, college teachers confessed that the absence of the textbook **does not have** negative effects on language teaching and learning opposite to Middle and Secondary teachers who consider it as the core reference of information about the language that enables them to accomplish their educational goals.

Both teachers design their own materials. They prefer to use electronic, online, and print materials in the same session (blended learning). They also agreed on the fact that teaching materials must be adapted and adjusted to serve students' needs and level. In addition, both samples reported that students' needs and their proficiency level is the most important factor that should be taken into account while selecting teaching materials.

According to the research data, it was noticed that the Middle and the Secondary schools' textbooks sometimes include authentic components that reflect the real world. Similarly, university teachers argued that they employ authentic materials because they help in facilitating language teaching and learning. Furthermore, both samples claimed that selecting materials should be done in accordance with the teaching approach.

Concerning the learning objectives, teachers are aware of writing long-term objectives as well as short-term objectives. Yet, Middle and Secondary school teachers state them in the lesson plan contrary to university teachers who write them in the syllabus neglecting the crucial role of designing a plan for their courses. In the light of teachers' answers, College teachers do not support the use of lesson plans arguing that the outline of the lesson is enough and writing the long-term objectives in the syllabus is sufficient. However, Middle and Secondary school teachers stressed the necessity of making lesson plans since they facilitate objectives' specification, outline the type of assessment techniques, order the teaching content through time management, and specify the learning activities.

When asking whether teachers inform their students about the learning objectives, Middle and Secondary school teachers do inform and explain them; whereas, university teachers ignore such influential step that helps in achieving students' success. Most importantly, both samples pointed out that writing the objectives for every part of the lesson is very important while designing materials. Therefore, materials play a crucial role in helping teachers realize the learning objectives.

## **Conclusion**

The analysis of university teachers' questionnaire stipulates that teachers at the department of English do not make lesson plans and do not state short-term objectives. However, Middle and Secondary school teachers confirmed that lesson plans are very necessary in language teaching and learning. The questionnaires' findings show that objectives are of a paramount value in selecting what needs to be done during a certain teaching experience.

The results of the study confirmed our hypothesis that specifying learning objectives could lead to effective materials' design. So, teachers have to establish what their learners will be able to perform at the first phase of lesson planning. This would enable them to structure the content to be learned and how it is learned. In addition, it may allow them to outline the learning activities and the teaching tasks to be included. Furthermore, the administrative educational authority have to collaborate with teachers in order to create a common textbook for each course so that students will be exposed to the same learning input.

Teachers need to increase their awareness towards materials' design because the outline of the syllabus is not sufficient. Yet, learners' needs and prior knowledge must be diagnosed in order to set objectives that cope with their level of proficiency. Therefore, they contribute to the effectiveness of language teaching and learning.

## **General Conclusion**

### **1. Concluding Remarks**

Teachers at the Department of English generally neglect the crucial significance of specifying learning objectives at the first phase of any teaching experience. Hence, they should raise their interest toward such step in order to design effective content to be taught. On the light of the dissertation findings, it was observed that Middle and Secondary school teachers tend to make lesson plans that consider both short and long-term learning objectives as the starting point through which the different tasks and activities are structured according to the time allocated. Yet, what University teachers need to take into consideration is that writing learning objectives help them to create appropriate learning exercises that enable learners to acquire the desired skills and select good assessment tools to evaluate students' achievements.

### **2. Pedagogical Implications**

This research aims to highlight the importance of directing university teachers' attention toward learning objectives so that materials' design will be effective. The main problem in universities is that the majority of teachers do not follow a common textbook to design their lessons. Therefore, learners are not exposed to the same learning input. In addition, they do not make lesson plans which may cause deviation from the desired learning destination.

The textbook plays a prominent role in foreign language teaching and learning. It is considered as the basic source and the core syllabus that both teachers and learners rely on. It also provides valuable lessons and appropriate activities that inform learners about the



language and guide them to use it effectively. Moreover, it supplies learners with authentic exposure to the target language which enables them to apply what is learned in the outside world. Furthermore, the textbook is reviewed by different professionals, which ensures its validity and reliability. Hence, university teachers have to design their own textbooks/workbooks.

The lesson plan allows teachers to organize the teaching content logically so that it flows coherently according to the time allocated. It also provides a shape and a framework for the different teaching aids and learning tasks. Further, the lesson plan enables teachers to remember what they want to do, where they are going, and the order of the activities. Yet, teachers should be aware of the crucial significance of both the textbook and the lesson plan in reaching qualitative teaching and valuable learning.

Most importantly, the best teacher is the one who evaluates the extent to which s/he reached the desired educational goals of the teaching and learning process. In fact, teaching does not end when the session ends, rather teachers have to assess the quality and the value of the lesson they have made. In many cases, teachers find that their lessons need to be adjusted or modified due to many reasons such as time and the resources available. One of the sufficient tools used to evaluate teaching is checklists. The following checklist can be employed to determine teachers' success or failure in determining the learning objectives.

Table 3.42

*A Checklist for Teachers' Evaluation of their Objectives' Specification and Materials'*

*Design*

Items	Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The objectives of the lesson are clearly stated.</li> <li>- The objectives stimulate students' cognitive skills.</li> <li>- The objectives involve students' affective and physical abilities.</li> <li>- The objectives specify exactly the desired behavior and performance.</li> <li>- The objectives make learners feel, think, and act effectively in their society.</li> <li>- The objectives promote students' high forms of thinking.</li> <li>- I used materials that attract the interest and increase the motivation of students.</li> <li>- I employed flexible materials that cope with learners' individual differences.</li> <li>- I selected materials that match the classroom context.</li> <li>- I utilized materials that go in parallel with the followed type of syllabus.</li> <li>- I used authentic materials.</li> <li>- I organized the materials logically.</li> <li>- The content of the course serves students' prior knowledge and lacks.</li> <li>- The teaching aids communicate effectively the intended information.</li> <li>- The materials reflect students' learning goals and purposes.</li> <li>- I followed a method that is appropriate for students' level and the resources available.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">continued</p>		

continuation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The subject matter is relevant for students' culture.</li> <li>- The tools of assessment are specified effectively.</li> <li>- The teaching equipment foster teachers' creativity and stimulate students' critical thinking.</li> <li>- I reached the objectives of the lesson.</li> <li>- Students' goal behind learning is accomplished.</li> <li>- I respected time.</li> <li>- The learned skills enable learners to act appropriately in the target situation.</li> <li>- The materials used are sufficient to be employed once more.</li> <li>- The materials need modification.</li> </ul>		

### 3. Research Perspectives and Limitations

Discussing the research limitations, there has been two major obstacles. The first one has to do with the time allocated for conducting such research. Due to some administrative problems in the Department of English, Master-two students were obliged to write the whole dissertation in three months only. Longer time may enable them to reach better results that can be generalized to the Algerian universities. The second one is concerned with teachers. Some teachers refused to answer the questionnaires administered for this study. Yet, their collaboration is very necessary to reach the intended aim of the research. Also, due to the large number of Middle and Secondary schools and their far location, we were restricted by teachers of English in thirty schools, which makes our sample not representative of the whole population.

## References

- Ajahi, D. T. W., & Bifarin, M. S. (2017). Teaching skills for effective teaching of geography in nigeria school. *KIU Journal of Humanities*, 15 (2B), 227-233.
- Allright, L. R. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal*, 36, 5-18.
- Bastable, S. B., Gramet, P.; Jacobs, K.; & Sopczyk, D. L. (2011). *Health professional as educator: principles of teaching*. United States: Jones and Bartlett Learning.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook I: The cognitive domain*. New York: David Mckay Co Inc.
- Brassell. D., & Rasinski, T. (2008). *Comprehension that works: Taking students beyond ordinary understanding to deep comprehension*. Huntington Beach C A. Shell Education.
- Brindly, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R. k. Jhonson (Eds.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown. J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Bshort, J. (2006). Leading professional development for curriculum reform. In J. Rhoton & P. Shane (Eds.), *Teaching science in 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp. 85-100). Virginia: National Science Teachers Association Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (1989/2000). *Research methods in education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Routledge.
- Craik, M. B. (1971). Writing objectives for programmed instruction or any instruction. In M. B. Kapfer (Eds.), *Behavioral objectives in curriculum development : selected*

- readings and bibliography* (pp. 14-21). New Jersey : Educational Technology Publications.
- Crawford, J. (2002). The role of materials in the language classroom : finding the balance. In J. C. Richards & A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching : An anthology of current practice* (pp. 80-91). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Ciroki, A. (2013). Age is only a number: evaluating and modernizing dated EFL materials. *International Journal of Education and Research*. (7), 1-8.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Macmillan Heineman.
- Darwazah, A. N. (2017). A new revision of the [Revised] Bloom's taxonomy. *Distance Learning for Educators, Trainers and Leaders*, 14 (3), 13-28.
- Dunni, M. (2013). designing approaches and procedures of syllabus. *Canadian Social Sciences*, 9 (6), 185-188.
- Einstein, A. (2008). Identity development. In N. J. Salkind (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of educational psychology* (pp. 499-1022). California: Sage Publications.
- Ellis, M., & Christine, J. (1994). *Teaching business English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51, 36-42.
- Forsyth, L., Jolliffe, A., & Stevens, D. (1999). *Planning a course: practical strategies for teachers, lectures and trainers* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Jacopson, E., Degener, S., & Gates, V. (2003). *Creating authentic materials and activities for adult literacy classroom: A handbook for practitioners*. USA: NCSSALL.
- Johnson, A. (2003). Procedural memory and skill acquisition. In A. F. Healy., R. W.

- Proctor., & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of psychology, volume 4: experimentation psychology* (pp. 499-523). New York: Jhon wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Jarling, K., & Tertiary, K. (1996). *Education, training and development in organizations*.
- Jordan, A., Carlil, O., & Stack, A. (2008). *Approaches to learning: A guide for teachers*.  
The McGraw-Hill companies: Open University Press
- Hainsworth, D., Bastable, S., & Karey, K. (2017). Instructional materials. In S. B. Bastable (Eds.), *Essentials of patient education* (pp. 418-453). USA: Jones & Baretlett Learning.
- Hayland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (2000). *An instructional design framework for authentic learning environment*. Australia: University of Wollongong.
- Hutchinson, T. A., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning centured approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York:  
Routledge.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Design language course: A guide for teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Griffithsm C. (1995). Evaluating materials for teaching English to adult speakers of other languages. *Forum*, 33 (3), 50-55.
- Gronland, N. E. (1991). *How to write and use instructional objectives*, England:  
MacMillan.
- Kirtley, E. (2003). Fire and life safety education: theory and techniques. In E. Arthar & P. E. Cote (Eds.), *Organizing for fire and rescue services: A special edition of the fire Protection handbook* (pp. 469-482). Massachusettes, National Fire Protection

Association.

Krathwohl, D. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41* (4), 212-218.

Loree, M. R. (1971). Creativity and the taxonomy of educational objectives. In M. B. Kapfer (Eds.), *Behavioral objectives: Selected readings and bibliography* (68-82). New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.

Maroko, G. H. (2013). Development of language materials for national development: A language management perspective. *International Journal of Education and Research, 1* (7), 1-4.

McDonald, M. E. (2002). *Systematic assesment of learning outcomes: Developing multiple choice exams*. Boston : Jones and Baetlett Publishers.

Meduabum, Z. A. (2004). *Instructional edia and new technologies of instruction*. New York: New York University Press.

Michra, R. C. (2008). *Lesson planning*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.

Mosley, D., Baumfield, V., Elliott, J., Gregson, M., Higgins, S., Miller, J., & Newton, D. (2005). *Frameworks for thinking: A handbook for teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mukalel, J. C. (1998). *Creative teaching to classroom teaching*. New Delhi: New Delhi Publishing House.

Nadler, L., & Nadler, Z. (2011). *Designing training programs: The critical events model*. New York: Routledge.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nash, J. (1999). Learning materials: their use and evaluation. *Lepr Rev, 70*, 254-260.

- O'Neil Jr, H. F., & Andrews, D. H. (2000). *Airecrew training and assessement*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher.
- Ololube, N. P., Kpolovie, P. J., & Makewa, L. N. (2015). *Handbook of research on enhancing teacher education with advanced instructional technologies*. USA: IGI Global.
- Pathak, R. P., & Chandhary, J. (2012). *Educational technology*. Delhi: Pearson.
- Phillip, J. J., & Phillip, P. P. (2008). *Beyond learning objectives: Develop measurable objectives that Link the bottom line*. Alexanderia: ASTD Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C.. (2010). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44 (1), 5-33.
- Richard. J. C., & Rogers. T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sankaranaraganan, B., & Sindha, B. (2012). *Learning and teaching nursing* (4th ed.). New Delhi: Jaypee Brothers Medical Publishers.
- Simpson, E. (1971). *The classification of educational objectives in the psychomotor domain: the psychomotor domain*, 3. Washington, Dc: Gryphon House.
- Tayler, R. W. (1971). Some persistent questions on the defining of objectives. In M. B. Kapfer (Eds.), *Behavioral objectives in curriculum development: selected readings and bibliography* (pp. 139-147). New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.
- Thagard, P. (2005). *Mind: introduction to the cognitive sciences* (2nd ed.). London: The



MIT Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. New York: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2011). Introduction: principles and procedures of materials development. In B. Tomlinson (Eds.), *Materials development in language Teaching* (pp. 1-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2017). *A complete guide to the theory and practice of materials' development for language learning*. Black well: WILY.

Ur, P. (1991). *A course in language teaching: practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weil, D. (2004). Bloom's taxonomy. In J. L. Kincheloe & B. Weil (Eds.), *Critical thinking and learning: An encyclopedia for parents and teachers* (pp. 77-82). London: Greenwood Press.

Wilkins, A. D. (1976). *Notional syllabus: A taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## **Appendices**

### **Appendix One: University Teachers' Questionnaire**

Dear teachers,

The aim of the current questionnaire is to tackle the issue of learning objectives' specification and its influence over materials' design. Hence, you are kindly invited to answer the following questions by crossing the appropriate answer (X) and providing full answers when it is necessary. I will be thankful for your collaboration and valuable comments.

**Cheriet Zeyneb**

**Department of English**

**University of 8 Mai 1945. Guelma**

**Section One: Personal Information**

1. What is your specialty?.....

2. How long have you been teaching (including this year)?.....years.

3. Do you work as

A part time teacher?	
A full time teacher?	

4. What levels do you teach?

L1	
L2	
L3	
M1	
M2	

5. What is your last obtained degree?

Master	
Magistère	
Doctorat-es-sciences	
Doctorat LMD	

-If Master or Magistère, are you enrolled in a PhD programme?

Yes	
No	

**Section Two: Materials' Design.**

6. Do you present the lessons as outlined in the syllabus?

Yes	
No	

-If no, justify

.....

.....

7. Do you have a textbook for each module (to follow while teaching)?

Yes	
No	

-If no, do you agree that the absence of textbooks has negative effects on Foreign Language Teaching/ Learning?

Strongly agree	
Agree	
Neither agree nor disagree (Not sure)	
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	

8. Do you design your own materials (your own lesson without plagiarism)?

Yes	
-----	--

No	
----	--

-If no, what type of materials do you prefer to use while teaching?

Electronic materials	
Online materials	
Printed materials (books, dictionaries, Journal articles....)	
Both electronic/online and printed materials in the same session (blended learning)	

9. Concerning electronic/printed materials, do you

Adopt them (use them as they are)?	
Adapt them (change/adjust them)?	

-If your answer is “adapt”, what are your aims behind that?

To meet the learners’ needs	
To make them aligned with the syllabus content	
To make them more comprehensible	
All the above	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

10. What is the most important factor that should be taken into consideration while selecting teaching materials? (one option).

Learners' needs and proficiency level	
Syllabus content	
Authenticity (reflecting the real world)	
Learners' involvement	
Developing learners' communicative competence	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

11. Do you use authentic materials (materials which reflect the real world) while teaching?

Yes	
No	

-If yes, do authentic materials help in facilitating language teaching/ learning?

Yes	
No	

12. How important do you consider selecting the teaching materials in accordance with the teaching method/approach?

Very important	
Important	
Not important	

**Section Three: The Influence of Specifying the Learning Objectives on Effective Materials' Design.**

13. Do you write the long-term objectives of your lessons?

Yes	
No	

-If yes, where?

In the syllabus	
In lesson plans	
In a notebook (or a sheet of paper)	

14. Do you write the short-term objectives for each lesson?

Yes	
No	

-If your answer is no, why?

No use of lesson plans	
other (please specify below)	

15. Do you think that lesson plans are necessary in the university (Similar to the Secondary and Middle schools)?

Yes	
No	

-If yes, why?

To facilitate objectives' specification	
To outline the type of assessment techniques	
To specify the learning activities	
To outline the teaching content through time management	
All the above factors	

-If no, why?

The outline of the lesson is enough	
Writing the long-term objectives in the syllabus is sufficient	
Specifying the short-term objectives in a notebook could be effective	
All the above factors	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

16. What do you focus on while writing the learning objectives?

What is going to be learned	
How it will be learned	
Both	

17. Do you think that writing the objectives for every part of the lesson is important when designing materials?



Very important	
Important	
Not important (specifying the objectives orally could be helpful too)	

18. Do you inform students about each lesson's objectives?

Yes	
No	

19. Do you explain for your students what needs to be done during the lesson?

Yes	
No	

20. Do materials play a crucial role in helping teachers realize the learning objectives?

Yes	
No	

21. Further suggestions about the importance of setting the objectives in materials' design

are welcome.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your collaboration

## **Appendix Two: Secondary School Teachers' Questionnaire**

Dear teachers,

The aim of the current questionnaire is to tackle the issue of learning objectives' specification and its influence over materials' design. Hence, you are kindly invited to answer the following questions by crossing the appropriate answer (X) and providing full answers when it is necessary. I will be thankful for your collaboration and valuable comments.

**Cheriet Zeyneb**

**Department of English**

**University of 8 Mai 1945. Guelma**

**Section One: Personal Information**

1. How long have you been teaching (including this year)?.....years.

2. Do you work as

A parmanent teacher?	
A substitute teacher?	

3. Which levels do you teach?

First year	
Second year	
Third year	
Fourth year (for Middle school teachers)	

4. What is your last obtained degree?

Licence degree	
Master degree	
Magistère degree	
PhD	

**Section Two: Materials' Design.**

5. To what extent are you satisfied with the content of the textbook?

To a high extent	
To a limited extent	
To a very limited extent	

-If not to a high extent, why?

Some texts/activities are very complicated especially scientific ones	
Some words are very hard and need to be replaced	
Some texts/activities violate our religion	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

6. In addition to the textbook, what type of materials do you prefer to use while teaching?

Electronic materials	
Online materials	
Printed materials (texts from books, dictionaries, literary texts....)	
Both electronic/online and printed materials in the same session (blended learning)	

7. Concerning textbooks' content, do you

adopt it (use it as it is)?	
adapt it (change/adjust it)?	

-If your answer is "adapt", what are your aims behind that?

To meet the learners' needs	
To make it aligned with the programme	
To make it more comprehensible	
All the above	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

8. Do you design your own materials in addition to the textbook?

Yes	
No	

9. What is the most important factor that should be taken into consideration while selecting teaching materials? (one option).

Learners' needs and proficiency level	
Syllabus (programme) content	
Authenticity (reflecting the real world)	
Learners' involvement	
Developing learners' communicative competence	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

10. Do you think that the textbook content is authentic (reflects the real world)?

Always	
Usually	
Sometimes	
Never	

11. Do authentic materials help in facilitating language teaching/ learning?

Yes	
No	

12. How important do you consider selecting the teaching materials in accordance with the teaching method/approach?

Very important	
Important	
Not important	

**Section Three: The Influence of Specifying the Learning Objectives on Effective Materials' Design**

13. Do you write the long-term objectives of your lessons?

Yes	
No	

14. Do you write the short-term objectives for each lesson?

Yes	
No	

15. Do you think that lesson plans are necessary?

Yes	
No	

-If no, justify.

.....

.....

16. Do you think that lesson plans are necessary for university teachers too?

Yes	
No	

-If yes, why?

To facilitate objectives' specification	
To outline the type of assessment techniques	
To specify the learning activities	
To outline the teaching content through time management	
All the above factors	

-If no, why?

The outline of the lesson is enough	
Writing the long-term objectives in the syllabus (a paper given to the administration, it includes the content and the long-term objective for the whole semester) is sufficient	
Specifying the short-term objectives in a notebook could be effective	
All the above factors	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

17. What do you focus on while writing the learning objectives?

What is going to be learned	
How it will be learned	
Both	

18. Do you think that writing the objectives for every part of the lesson is important when designing materials?

Very important	
Important	
Not important (specifying the objectives orally could be helpful too)	

19. Do you inform students about each lesson's objectives?

Yes	
No	

20. Do you explain for your students what needs to be done during the lesson?

Yes	
No	

21. Do materials play a crucial role in helping teachers realize the learning objectives?

Yes	
No	

22. Further suggestions about the importance of setting the objectives in materials' design are welcome.....



.....  
.....

Thank you for your collaboration

## المخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التحقق من مدى تأثير تحديد الأهداف التعليمية على تصميم محتوى تدريسي فعال وذلك من خلال المقارنة بين أساتذة الجامعة وأساتذة التعليم المتوسط والثانوي. اعتاد الاساتذة في قسم اللغة الانجليزية بجامعة قالمة على تقديم الدروس للطلاب بناء على البرنامج الممنوح من طرف الادارة، مما يدل على عدم اهتمامهم بتصميم مخططات تدريسية تفسح المجال لتحديد وكتابة الأهداف التعليمية. حيث نحاول من خلال هذا البحث رفع وعي الأساتذة تجاه ضرورة تحديد الأهداف العامة والخاصة لكل درس أو نشاط تعليمي في المراحل الأولى من كل خبرة تعليمية. للحصول على معلومات حول هذه المشكلة، تم استعمال استبيان لكلتا العينتين إذ وجه الاستبيان الأول إلى الأساتذة الجامعيين لمعرفة آرائهم حول ضرورة تصميم مخططات تدريسية في الجامعات. بينما وجه الاستبيان الثاني إلى أساتذة التعليم الثانوي والمتوسط ويهدف إلى كشف ما إن كان تصميم المخططات التدريسية وتحديد الأهداف التعليمية لكل جزء من الدرس عناصر ضرورية تساعد في اختيار وتشكيل المحتوى التدريسي. بعد هذا، قارنا النتائج المتحصل عليها حيث أظهرت نتائج الاستبيان أن أغلب أساتذة الجامعة على علم بالدور الفعال لتحديد الأهداف التعليمية لكنهم يحددونها شفهيًا فقط، في حين يقر أساتذة التعليم المتوسط والثانوي بأن الأهداف التعليمية تسهل عملية تصميم الدروس المقدمة للطلاب. ولهذا فنحن نوصي بوجوب كتابة الأهداف التعليمية من قبل الأساتذة الجامعيين أو على الأقل الاعتماد على سجل عمل موحد. ضمن هذا السياق تم تصميم ورقة مرجعية تمكن الأساتذة من تقييم مدى تحقيقهم للأهداف التعليمية المسطرة.

