



Ecole Normale Supérieure d'Oran

Année Universitaire : 2015/2016

2^{ème} Année PES Anglais

Nom de l'enseignant : **LARSEN**
 Résultat Final du Module : Introduction à la linguistique 2



N°	NOM	PRENOM	DAT_NAI	ETAT	EMD1	EMD2	Moy CC	Synth	Moy Sy	Sup Sy	rat	Moy R	Moy
1	ABIDELLAH	AHLAM	05/05/1995	N	11,75	12,75							
2	AHMED	HADJIRA	1994	N	10,50	12							
3	Aliane	Djamila	22/12/1995	N	12,25	13							
4	AZIRIA	MERIEH	15/03/1996	N	11,25	12							
5	BEKHTAOUI	ABDERRAHMEN	26/10/1995	N	13,50	15							
6	BELAID	HOCINE	09/03/1995	N	11,75	13,5							
7	BELHADI	ELBATOUL	29/06/1995	N	13,25	14,25							
8	BELKEDARI	FATIMA ZOHRA	20/03/1995	N	11,75	12,5							
9	BELWASSA	KHAYRA	25/01/1995	N	10,25	11,25							
10	Ben Lahcen	Kawter	13/11/1996	N	13,00	13,5							
11	Benachour	Kaoutar	03/02/1995	N	13,50	13,75							
12	BENADDA	MOHAMED AMINE	02/12/1995	N	13,00	13							
13	BENAISSA RAHAL	WIDAD	26/05/1995	N	12,50	11,75							
14	BENBAKOUR	HADJIRA	20/07/1995	N	12,25	13,25							
15	BENCHEKKOUR	BESMA	13/06/1995	N	11,75	12,75							
16	BENDAREUR	OUASSILA	10/03/1995	N	11,00	13,5							
17	BENNACER	ABIR	08/06/1995	N	10,75	12,25							
18	BENSALAH	NOURIA	07/09/1994	N	10,75	12,25							
19	BENYAHIA	AMINA	28/12/1995	N	11,75	12,5							
20	BOUALEM	NOURIA	30/07/1995	N	11,25	12,75							
21	BOUFELDJA	YAMINA	22/12/1995	N	11,75	12,75							
22	chabane	hadjera	27/05/1995	N	12,50	13,75							

LARSEN

18/05/2016

23	CHERIF HOSNI	FATHA	23/05/1995	N	13,00	13,5														
24	CHIKH	HOUDA	30/08/1995	N	12,00	13,5														
25	DIENDARA	IMENE	21/02/1995	N	12,25	13,5														
26	DJORDEM	FATIMA ZOHRA	24/12/1995	N	11,75	13														
27	DOUCENE	AMEL	11/02/1996	N	12,00	13,25														
28	ESSIAF	IMANE	14/06/1995	N	11,25	12,75														
29	FADHA	HOUDA HADJAR	20/03/1995	N	11,00	12,5														
30	FEKIR	HABIBA	27/03/1996	N	12,00	13														
31	HACHEM	ABDELHAKIM	14/01/1995	N	09,00	Abs														
32	Hadjari	Karima	25/09/1995	N	10,75	12,25														
33	HAMDADA	SOUMIA	13/07/1994	N	11,50	12,5														
34	KADRI	BAYA	14/03/1996	N	10,50	11,75														
35	KHAOUID	IMANE	23/09/1995	N	11,50	13,25														
36	KHELFALLAH	HALIMA	19/12/1995	N	13,00	13,75														
37	Lahmar	Asma	01/12/1995	N	12,50	12														
38	LARBI	FATIMA	01/01/1995	N	10,75	12,5														
39	MECHRAOUI	HANANE	16/06/1995	N	12,75	13,25														
40	MEKAOUI	CHARAF	20/11/1995	N	11,50	12,75														
41	MELLAH	WAFAA	11/01/1996	N	12,50	13														
42	MOKHTARI	HOUSSAM EDDINE	30/04/1996	N	Abs	Abs														
43	MOSBAH	SOUMIA	22/11/1995	N	10,50	12,75														
44	NAAS	NAIMA	05/10/1995	N	10,50	11,5														
45	NADJI	NAIMA	15/12/1995	N	13,50	13,5														
46	NAIMI	MOAMED EL AMINE	23/02/1996	N	12,50	14,75														
47	OMERI	SAID	21/05/1995	N	12,00	14														
48	OUZANI	FATIMA	01/04/1995	N	09,75	12,5														
49	SEBAA	SARRA	01/01/1995	N	10,50	12														
50	SEMGHOUNE	RABIE	04/03/1995	N	13,50	14														
51	TAHLAOUI	AMEL	25/08/1995	N	11,75	12														
52	ZAHAF	AMINA	10/02/1995	N	11,75	13														
53	ZEFFANE	IMANE	03/12/1995	N	11,75	13,75														



LARBI

18/05/2016

Labeled Zohra
2nd Year Linguistics
Second Examination
Sample Answer

Points of strength/ weaknesses of Chomskian generative grammar

Form (08pts)

- Spelling (02)
- Lexis (02)
- Grammar (02)
- Punctuation (02)

Methodology (06pts)

- Introduction (01)
- Conclusion (01)
- Body coherence (02)
- Body cohesion (02)

Content (06pts)

Strength:

- Limited number of rules → unlimited number of sentences
- Language has known a high level of systematic study
- Language has been subjected to more exactness and precision
- There has been remarkable brevity in Chomskian straightforward language analysis

Weaknesses:

- Meaning is neglected
- Absence of sentence disambiguation in many language cases (illustrations)

2. Inspiration of structural schools by Saussure dichotomies

Form (08pts)

- Spelling (02)
- Lexis (02)
- Grammar (02)
- Punctuation (02)

Methodology (06pts)

Introduction (01)

Conclusion (01)

Body coherence (02)

Body cohesion (02)

Content (06pts)

Similarities: Prague school/Copenhagen School/American School

- All the three schools emphasised langue and neglected parole
- All the three schools emphasised the synchronic rather than the diachronic description of language
- All the three schools followed Saussure (1916) in his double-sided concept signifier/signified (sign)

Differences:

Prague School:

Phonology (form)

Phonetics (substance)

Copenhagen School

Content plane (form)

Expression plane (substance)

Word substitution (paradigmatic relationship)

Word order (Syntagmatic relationship)

American School

Sentence generation (paradigmatic relationship)