

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

Erica K. Dotson

April 15, 2006

Date

The Effects of Deductive and Guided Inductive Approaches on the Learning of Grammar
in an Advanced College French Course

By

Erica K. Dotson
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Educational Studies

Carol Herron
Advisor

George Engelhard Jr.
Committee Member

Robert Jensen
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Todesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Date

The Effects of Deductive and Guided Inductive Approaches on the Learning of Grammar
in an Advanced College French Course

By

Erica K. Dotson

B.B.A., University of Georgia, 1993

B.A. Georgia State University, 2000

M.A. Georgia State University, 2002

M.A. Georgia State University, 2004

Advisor: Carol Herron, Ph.D

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Educational Studies
2010

Abstract

The Effects of Deductive and Guided Inductive Approaches on the Learning of Grammar in an Advanced College French Course

By Erica K. Dotson

This mixed-methodology investigation evaluated the effects of deductive and guided inductive approaches on the learning of targeted linguistic structures in an advanced French university grammar course. Specifically this study compared the effects of these two pedagogical conditions by measuring students' grammar performance on immediate post-treatment tests and pre- and post-tests of advanced-level grammatical structures. This project also investigated whether students preferred to learn via the guided inductive or deductive approach, and whether there was a relationship between their stated instruction delivery preference and their short- and long-term grammar performance.

A quasi-experimental equivalent time samples design featuring the use of pre-, post- and immediate tests was used to compare students' learning of 10 linguistic structures in the two conditions. Further, post-test questionnaires and individual semi-structured interviews were conducted to gauge participants' preferences for both instructional approaches.

Statistical analyses indicated that there were no significant differences detected between the two conditions with regard to short-term learning of the targeted grammar structures. However, this project's findings specifically indicated that advanced students made significant gains in grammar performance from pre- to post-test when they were first exposed to the grammatical material via the guided inductive condition. Despite this result, qualitative findings indicated that participants preferred to learn deductively. Most specifically, they indicated that deductive learning was more comfortable to them as it was the traditional approach to which they had been exposed throughout their educational experiences.

The Effects of Deductive and Guided Inductive Approaches on the Learning of Grammar
in an Advanced College French Course

By

Erica K. Dotson

B.B.A., University of Georgia, 1993

B.A. Georgia State University, 2000

M.A. Georgia State University, 2002

M.A. Georgia State University, 2004

Advisor: Carol Herron, Ph.D

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Educational Studies
2010

Acknowledgements

“Bend your energies to whatever may foster the education of men.”

Gleanings from the Writings of Bahá'u'llah, p. 9.

I would like to thank my husband, Alfredo Louis Dotson, for making my completion of this degree possible. Al, no one will ever know the depths of sacrifice of your own goals and dreams that you have endured for the past ten years to enable me to pursue mine. I thank you and I love you.

I rejoice at the births of my two little lights, Camille and Gabrielle, during the course of my pursuit of this degree. They have truly illumined my heart.

I warmly thank my family, especially my father, Rickey Washington and my brother, Eric Washington, for being the absolute greatest cheerleaders ever. I am especially grateful to Mrs. Evelyn Dotson and Mrs. Patricia Washington for countless hours of lovingly caring for my children so that I could focus on my work. Lots of love to Tiffany and Tatiana Robinson for helping me find lost documents, typing support and good cheer. Merci to Katrina Mathis for never letting me give up.

Finally, I revel in the unknown successes and accomplishments of my foreparents.

Ça y est.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	1
Introduction	1
<i>Historical Review of FL Instructional Trends</i>	3
<i>Measuring and Standardizing Instruction</i>	8
<i>Rule Presentation in Grammar Instruction</i>	9
<i>A Guided Inductive Approach to Grammar Instruction</i>	13
<i>Theoretical Framework for the Guided Inductive Approach</i>	14
Statement of the Problem	16
Purpose	17
Research Questions	17
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	19
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	33
<i>Participants and Course Design</i>	33
<i>Participant Demographics</i>	34
<i>Instrumentation</i>	35
<i>Pre-test of Grammatical Knowledge</i>	35
<i>Pre-test Questionnaire</i>	35
<i>Immediate Tests</i>	36
<i>Post-test of Grammatical Knowledge and Questionnaire</i>	38
<i>Oral participant interviews</i>	39
<i>Mixed Methods Methodology</i>	39
<i>Rationale</i>	40

<i>Implementation and Priority</i>	40
<i>Qualitative Data Analysis Method</i>	41
<i>Qualitative Data Collection</i>	41
<i>Qualitative Data Analysis</i>	43
<i>Reliability and Validity</i>	44
<i>Triangulation</i>	44
<i>Presentation of the researcher's perspective</i>	45
<i>Peer debriefing</i>	45
Classroom Procedures	46
<i>Consent Procedures and Confidentiality</i>	49
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	50
Quantitative Results	50
<i>Preliminary Quantitative Analyses: Pretest</i>	50
<i>Preliminary Quantitative Analyses: Instruments</i>	50
<i>Quantitative Analysis of Research Questions</i>	51
<i>Research Question 1. Short-term learning of structures</i>	51
<i>Research Question 2. Long-term learning of structures</i>	52
<i>Research Question 3. Perceptions and preferences</i>	53
<i>Research Question 4. Long-term learning and preference</i>	54
<i>Research Question 5. Short-term learning and preference</i>	55
Qualitative Results	55
<i>The Deductive approach</i>	56
<i>Traditional Learning</i>	56

<i>Error Avoidance</i>	57
<i>Access to prior knowledge</i>	58
<i>Boosted confidence</i>	58
<i>Less Confusion</i>	59
<i>Disadvantages to the Deductive Approach</i>	59
<i>Difficulty of rule application</i>	59
<i>Teacher-focused instruction</i>	60
<i>The Guided Inductive Approach</i>	60
<i>Learner engagement</i>	60
<i>Naturalness</i>	61
<i>Context</i>	61
<i>Best for review</i>	62
<i>Disadvantages of the Guided Inductive approach</i>	63
<i>Lack of clarity</i>	63
CHAPTER 5: LIMITATIONS AND DISCUSSION	66
Limitations	66
<i>Sampling</i>	66
<i>Generalizability</i>	67
<i>Procedural</i>	68
<i>Ecological</i>	68
<i>Design</i>	69
Analysis of Research Questions	70
<i>Research Question 1. Short-term learning of structures</i>	71

<i>Research Question 2. Long-term learning of structures</i>	73
<i>Research Question 3. Perceptions and preferences</i>	77
<i>Research Question 4. Long-term learning and preference</i>	79
<i>Research Question 5. Short-term learning and preference</i>	81
Conclusion	82
References	84
Appendices	93
APPENDIX A: Pre/Post-Test	93
APPENDIX B: Pre-Test Questionnaire	97
APPENDIX C: Immediate Tests	99
APPENDIX D: Post-Test Questionnaire	105
APPENDIX E: Interview Guide	106
APPENDIX F: First- and Second-Level Codes	107
APPENDIX G: Teaching Scripts	108
TABLES	154
Table 1. <i>Sample Student Characteristics by Class</i>	154
Table 2. <i>Grammar Pretest and Posttest Items Means and Standard Deviations (N = 41)</i>	155
Table 3. <i>Immediate Grammar Test Reliability and Item Difficulty (N = 41)</i>	156
Table 4. <i>Paired samples t Test Results for Immediate Quizzes (N = 41)</i>	157
Table 5. <i>ANOVA Results of Grammar Pre-test and Post-test (N = 41)</i>	158
Table 6. <i>Grammar Pre- and Post-test Means and Standard Deviations by Condition (N = 41)</i>	159

Abstract

This mixed-methodology investigation evaluated the effects of deductive and guided inductive approaches on the learning of grammar in an advanced French grammar university course. Specifically this study compared the effects of these two pedagogical conditions by measuring students' grammar performance on immediate post-treatment tests and pre- and post-tests of advanced-level linguistic structures. This project also investigated whether students preferred to learn via the guided inductive or deductive approach, and whether there was a relationship between their stated instruction delivery preference and their short- and long-term grammar performance.

A quasi-experimental equivalent time samples design featuring the use of pre-, post- and immediate tests was used to compare students' learning of 10 linguistic structures in the two conditions. Further, post-test questionnaires and individual semi-structured interviews were conducted to gauge participants' preferences for both instructional approaches.

Statistical analyses indicated that there were no significant differences detected between the two conditions with regard to short-term learning of the targeted grammar structures. However, this project's findings specifically indicated that advanced students made significant gains in grammar performance from pre- to post-test when they were first exposed to the grammatical material via the guided inductive condition. Despite this result, participants' reported preferring to learn deductively. Most specifically, they indicated that deductive learning was more comfortable to them as it was the traditional approach to which they had been exposed throughout their educational experiences.

CHAPTER 1

“I like it when the teacher gives me the rules first. Then, I know what I am about to learn. I don’t have to guess. Everything is clear and I can follow what she is saying.”

“When we get the examples first I have a chance to see how it [a targeted grammar structure] works.”

These two quotations from students in the current study illustrate polar positions represented among foreign language (FL) and second language (SL) researchers and teachers. They describe opposing views of how best to teach grammar to improve learner’s communicative competence. On one side of this debate are those who favor overt attention to grammatical forms. Contrasting this pedagogical approach are those who propose providing students with little or no explicit grammar instruction. This current project adds new knowledge to this debate by its evaluation of two approaches to grammar instruction in an advanced French course in a university setting. The results of this mixed methodology empirical project provide important insights into which of the two approaches led to improved grammar performance. Additionally, it explored student preference for the two approaches and potential links between stated preference and performance.

The role of grammar instruction in the FL classroom has intrigued teachers, researchers and linguists throughout the history of language instruction. As a result, the effectiveness of grammar instruction and its influence on language acquisition have been widely disputed in the field of Applied Linguistics. In an effort to explore the most effective and efficient ways to teach and learn a language, applied linguists have investigated how and if grammar should be taught to FL learners. Methods and

approaches to teaching grammar have ranged from the notion that language learners should acquire grammar naturally and without explicit grammar instruction as children do in their first language (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) to theories featuring the extensive discussion of grammar rules and structural drills for practice (Chastain, 1976; Chomsky, 1965; Omaggio Hadley, 2001).

Today, most researchers and theorists agree that learners benefit from some type of formal instruction as they learn grammatical forms. Widely accepted findings of significant projects published in the 1980s and 1990s (Dougherty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 1998; Larsen- Freeman, 1995; Long, 1983; Pienemann, 1985) concluded that grammar instruction indeed made a difference in language acquisition. Therefore after decades of theoretical wrangling and pedagogical debates about the need and efficacy of grammar instruction, Ellis stated in 2006, “there is now convincing indirect and direct evidence to support the teaching of grammar” (p. 86). As a result, research studies in the area of second language acquisition (SLA) have begun to focus on exploring the value of various instructional interventions in FL classrooms (Erlam, 2003; Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Haight, 2008; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Piot, Herron, Cole & York, 2008; Shaffer, 1989). Instead of debating the usefulness of grammar instruction, these studies explored which types of instructional approaches were most effective in terms of the positive effects they had on learner outcomes. The need for these investigations is significant as there is little agreement regarding what the formal instruction of grammar should entail (Brown, 2007; Chaudron, 1988; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Hossein & Fotos, 2004; Katz & Blyth, 2008; Long, 1983).

Historical Review of FL Instructional Trends

Periods governed by various methods of language teaching have characterized the history of FL instruction. As formalized language study began in the 16th century, literal translation was the prevailing method of language teaching via the classical and grammar translation methods (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Following a bottom-up word level method of study, language instruction was based strictly on rule use and memorization. Little attention was given to aural/oral communication as the prevailing goal of language study was to promote intellectuality, not to teach students to actually speak a language (Brown, 2007). As a result, learners translated texts or conversations from the target language to the native language and vice versa. Constant reference was made to students' first language as they made comparisons between the two grammatical systems to master the rules of how the target language functioned. Students were not encouraged to create novel utterances or express their own ideas in either written or spoken production.

As a reaction to the grammar translation method, the direct method of language instruction came into use in FL classrooms in the late 1800s through the mid 1900s. In contrast to the grammar translation method, a primary goal of this approach was to foster greater use of the target language in the classroom. As a result, this method strictly avoided use of translation. Advocated by Berlitz, this approach stressed the importance of small class sizes and proposed the use of specially created pictures that enabled the teacher to illustrate concepts without translating (Brown, 2007; Omaggio Hadley, 2001). In addition to serving as a means by which students made connections between ideas, pantomime and words, these images featured scenarios from the native culture of the target language demonstrating the importance of culture in the language learning process.

In terms of rule treatment, the direct method did not advocate explicit analysis of grammatical rules. Rather, classroom practices led students to generalize about rules from meaningful sentences in simple discourse.

During the 1950s and 1960s another type of immersion language instruction followed the direct method. Known as the audiolingual method, this approach also featured exclusive use of the target language in the classroom; however, the audiolingual method focused primarily on developing oral competence and listening comprehension skills (Long, 1983). Behaviorist in its orientation, there was also a significant emphasis on the use of stimulus-response drills and the memorization and repetition of dialogues (Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2005). The audiolingual method was often criticized for being too mechanized and devoid of meaningful practice. In relation to rules, there was no overt attention to grammatical forms with the audiolingual method as patterns governing language use were not discussed. Instead, students were expected to infer rules based on the practice they received via drills and repetition.

With the appearance of the field of SLA in colleges and universities across the world in the mid-1960s, there was a marked shift in the way FLs would be taught during the next five decades (Ellis, 1997). A relatively new area of study, SLA began to investigate the processes by which learners acquire a language other than their mother tongue *within* a region where the language is commonly spoken. This developing field contrasted FL instruction which is formal classroom instruction *outside* of a region where the language is generally spoken (Shrum & Glisan, 2005). Due to the cognitive, social, cultural and physical nature of language learning, SLA researchers drew on theories from linguistics, sociology, psychology, psycholinguistics and anthropology, as they analyzed,

in educative contexts, students' ability to learn to communicate in the target language and the most effective means for teachers to foster those abilities (Ellis, 1984). As a result of the increase in research presented from this relatively new field, pedagogical emphasis has been placed on re-evaluating the role of the teacher, the communicative aspects of language acquisition in FL classrooms and understanding language acquisition from the learner's perspective (Ellis, 1984, 1997; Omaggio Hadley, 2001).

The three previously described approaches to language instruction featured a significant emphasis on attention to grammatical forms. Though there was variation in terms of rule treatment, either overt attention to rules, or more implicit inference of rules, one would still consider these approaches grammar-based. However, a tendency towards the development of methodologies that were more concerned with students' ability to communicate was forthcoming within the SLA community. Giving greater attention to learners' needs and to the nature of communication, the 1970s saw a rise in popularity of fostering communicative competence in second and FL classrooms. A new emphasis on creativity and communicative competence would mark a departure from the more traditional emphasis on grammatical competence stressed in the previous grammar translation methodology of FL instruction. This movement was based on the notion that students needed to develop the ability to communicate within a meaningful context (Savignon, 1983; Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, & Thurrell, 1997).

The prominence of communicative competence rose steadily as researchers and theorists began to focus on the development of an approach to FL instruction that emphasized meaningful communication as well as grammatical accuracy. Teachers and researchers wanted to ensure that students could create meaning using grammatical

forms, though a primary emphasis was not placed on overt grammatical instruction (Shrum & Glisan, 2005; Wiemann & Backlund, 1980). As a part of this approach, FL teaching fostered “the ability to function in a communicative setting by using not only grammatical knowledge, but also gestures and intonation, strategies for making oneself understood, and risk-taking in attempting communication” (Shrum & Glisan, 2005 p. 13).

Resulting from the emphasis on communicative competence, teachers began to place their attention on the dynamic nature of communication, including the importance of the use of strategies for interlocution and strategies for compensating for linguistic deficiencies. Beyond the grammatical and discourse elements of communication, researchers probed and investigated the social, cultural and pragmatic features of language. In short, the goal was to develop a pedagogical strategy to foster authentic communication in the classroom (Brown, 2007; Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrell, 1995; Omaggio Hadley, 2000; Savignon, 1983).

During the 1970s other approaches such as The Silent Way and Suggestopedia illustrated that there was also a shift of views from empiricist and behaviorist perspectives rooted in Skinner’s theory (1957) of language learning as a stimulus-response pattern of habit formation, to a more cognitive view purported by Chomsky (1965), Ausubel (1968) and others. Cognitive perspectives implied that learners used thought to process language as learning was believed to be the result of mental activity rather than something originating outside the learner (Ellis, 1985). In order to develop proficiency, learners must automate, integrate and organize language into internal representations that are “constantly restructured as proficiency develops” (McLaughlin, 1987). Cognitive theories thus stressed learner’s abilities to create and re-create

organizational schema of information as they were exposed to it. Ausubel (1969) described that meaningful knowledge is organized hierarchically, with new knowledge being related to existing knowledge via “combinations of previously learned ideas” (p. 59). As a result, the addition of new knowledge is viewed as a restructuring of the language learning system.

One aspect of Chomsky’s research (1965) asserted that learners’ linguistic knowledge was not the result of their conditioned behavior, but their ability to generate unique and novel discourse (Hymes, 1972; Savignon, 1972). In general, cognitive approaches focused more on creativity, encouraging students to personalize their language use. They also relied on, learning activities that emphasized meaningful, as opposed to rote learning. However, these approaches were still rooted in Chomskian theories that stated that learners must first gain control of the rules that govern the target language before they can manipulate it (Brown, 2007). As such, it is important to note that cognitive approaches did feature rule-based grammar instruction. Still, this attention to the forms of language was viewed as a vehicle to enable students to communicate, rather than the goal of language learning.

In the 1980s the Natural Approach continued to highlight the importance of authentic language creation and use with a lessened emphasis on the overt teaching of grammatical forms. Advocated by Krashen (1982) and Krashen and Terrell (1982) this full immersion approach implied that students should receive large amounts of comprehensible input in a low anxiety classroom environment. This input should be just beyond learners’ current level of competence ($i + 1$) and highly contextualized. The Natural Approach particularly emphasized the teaching and practice of vocabulary while

also featuring limited attention to grammar rules and corrective feedback. Common types of learning activities included real-world situations, games, role-plays, dialogs, and group or pair work.

Currently, the broadly defined communicative language teaching (CLT) is favored among theorists and teachers in FL classrooms (Shrum & Glisan, 2005). Rooted in the communicative competence movement previously described, the aim of this approach is to teach communicative competence which includes four areas of knowledge and skill: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). CLT emphasizes the importance of meaning-based instruction where interaction and contextualization is a primary principal (Richards & Rogers, 1986). Teachers assume the role of facilitator in CLT classrooms. Highly interactive learning activities such as simulations, role-plays, social games and information sharing activities are crafted to encourage completion of real-world tasks and the negotiation of meaning among learners. As a result, the CLT classroom focuses on all of the aspects of competence, not only grammatical competence.

Measuring and Standardizing Instruction

Though these various methods and approaches have gradually shifted the emphasis in FL instruction from a focus on the study of grammar to an emphasis on the components of communication, none has prescribed how to define and assess students' proficiency. In other words, how should teachers analyze what students can actually accomplish with their language skills? To address this need, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) developed and later refined proficiency guidelines that measured students' language abilities in the areas of speaking, listening,

reading and writing in the mid-1980s. The *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Provisional Proficiency Guidelines* (1982, revised in 1999) defined overall levels of language ability via global characterizations of performance. Representing a range of ability, the *Guidelines* outline stages of proficiency ranging from Novice through Superior. All stages except Superior are also subdivided into low, mid and high levels.

While these guidelines assess learners' linguistic competence, they did not mandate curricular content. The profession thus continued to grapple with the subject matter that should be addressed in FL classes. As a result, in the mid-1990s a task force representing a range of interests from geographic regions, commonly and less commonly taught languages, and level of instruction created the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (1996). These standards define what students should know as a result of their FL study. The *Standards* are divided into five interconnected goal areas: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons and Communities; each further subdivided into content standards that describe the specific knowledge and abilities students should acquire (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). The institution of these guidelines and standards moves FL instruction beyond teaching mastery of grammatical patterns. They place greater emphasis on the creation of meaningful communication and cultural understanding.

Rule Presentation in Grammar Instruction

Indeed the importance of formal instruction has been underscored in current SLA literature along with the development of communicative competence as a framework for the design and execution of classroom teaching and learning tasks. Due to the lack of

consensus regarding which form of grammatical instruction is most effective, a wider debate now draws the attention of teachers, researchers and theorists. This discussion relates to the most useful means of teaching grammar within a communicative approach that privileges meaning over grammatical form.

Brown (2007) and Shrum and Glisan (2005) indicated that Communicative Language Teaching is generally accepted as the most popular method of instruction in the fields of FL and SL education. At the same time, Katz and Blyth (2008) summarized concerns in SLA literature concerning the role of grammar in communicative classrooms as they explained, “Studies have suggested that communicative, entirely input-based programs may not provide enough guidance for students to acquire problematic elements of grammar” (in Katz & Wartzinger-Tharp, 2008, p. 7). Thus, within the communicative competence framework, the debate regarding the most effective approach to language instruction focuses even more narrowly on what emphasis should be placed on form-focused instruction (Norris & Ortega, 2000).

A broad continuum of form-focused instructional approaches have been proposed ranging from the Zero Option (Ellis, 1997) of no attention to form whatsoever, to Long’s (1991b, 1997) notion of presenting targeted forms in a sequence determined by their complexity, to Doughty and Williams’ (1998) suggestion that learner attention to meaning should occur prior to attention to the linguistic code and that attention to form should be drawn briefly and overtly. Principal to these considerations was when, if ever, grammatical rules should be presented to learners. Researchers began to investigate both whether and when to present rules to learners in a burgeoning communication-privileged

context that stressed meaning over form (Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Herron and Tomasello, 1992; Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Norris & Ortega, 2000).

In addition to raising issues regarding how and when grammatical rules should be presented, discussion also focused on whether or not rules should be presented at all: implicit vs. explicit grammar instruction. Explicit grammar instruction consists of explanation of grammar rules accompanied by examples and exercises to practice linguistic structures. In other words, learners' attention is overtly drawn to grammatical explanations (Long, 1991b; Doughty & Williams, 1998b). Many FL learners are familiar with this approach as most FL textbooks present grammar in this way (Aski, 2003; Brooks & Donato, 1994). Some criticisms of the explicit approach are that opportunities for meaningful practice can be minimal. Practice drills are often mechanical and repetitive and do little to engender motivation on the part of learners. Also characteristic of explicit learning, students manipulate the grammatical form before they experience its meaning (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). As a result, they are not given an opportunity to connect meanings from their own experiences with use of the structure. Explicit approaches are also often teacher-centered. Teachers assume an authoritative role as they are responsible for constructing and imparting grammatical knowledge about the grammatical material to learners.

Conversely, implicit grammar instruction relates to ideas presented by Krashen and Terrell (1983) where formalized rule explanations are avoided. There is no focus on form as researchers of this orientation argue that learners will acquire language naturally if they receive enough comprehensible input. This approach explains that learners will gradually induce how linguistic structures function if they are exposed to enough

understandable examples of those structures in use. Possible limitations of implicit grammar instruction could be that learners might develop partial or inaccurate hypotheses about linguistic forms and that learners may learn less rapidly overall (Adair-Hauck, 1993; Brown, 2001; Celce-Murcia, 1991; Herron & Tomasello, 1992).

A related area of debate and of current investigation addresses the order in which rules should be presented: deductive vs. inductive grammar instruction. Deductive grammar instruction involves teachers' first providing students with the rule for any given linguistic structure. After students are exposed to the rule, the teacher provides contextualized activities and exercises to practice application of the rule. The deductive approach is viewed as teacher-centered. As a result, students tend to play a passive role in the rule explanation process because teachers are responsible for rule generation and for delivering form-based explanations to students (Adair-Hauck, Donato & Cumo-Johanssen, 2005; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Shaffer, 1989).

Conversely, inductive grammar instruction involves students being given contextualized examples of the target structure in use. These examples are presented to students as they naturally occur within an oral or written text. The teacher then provides opportunities for the student to apply the targeted structure in novel sentences without furnishing the rule that governs the structure's use. Students are actively engaged during inductive learning as they hypothesize about the rule and practice using it in context. The teacher, rather than providing the rule explanation for the students, gives immediate feedback to confirm or disprove students' emerging linguistic hypotheses about the structure (Herron & Tomasello, 1992; DeKeyser, 1994).

The presence or absence of rules illustrates a dichotomy of categories of instructional approaches. DeKeyser (1994) contrasted inductive and deductive approaches and implicit and explicit approaches and explained why these terms are problematic in research and classroom contexts:

Deductive means that the rules are given before any examples are seen; *inductive* means that rules are inferred from examples presented (first). *Implicit* means that no rules are formulated; *explicit* means rules are formulated (either by the teacher or the student, either before or after examples/practice). Thus, whereas the two dichotomies are clearly independent in principle, they tend to coincide in practice...because explicit learning is almost always the result of deductive teaching...” (p. 188).

A Guided Inductive Approach to Grammar Instruction

Further expanding upon the active and participatory nature of the inductive approach, Adair-Hauck, Donato, and Cumo-Johanssen (2005) created the PACE model of language instruction. PACE is an inductive “story-based and guided participatory approach” to grammar instruction where learners are exposed to the linguistic content of a targeted grammar structure via rich, integrated and authentic context (p. 268). More specifically, the P of PACE refers to a presentation of the targeted form via an orally recounted story, written text or video medium. The A represents an attention to form. In this phase learners’ attention is drawn to some regularity of the language via questions or repetition. Next the C refers to the co-construction phase of the model where learners are led to generalize and predict grammatical patterns related to the targeted form by the

teacher's use of guided questions. Finally E represents the extension activities by which learners practice the new form in creative and contextualized ways.

Building on the strengths of the PACE model, Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007) investigated the effects of a modified inductive approach to grammar instruction on the grammar performance of elementary level French students in a university setting. This approach was termed the guided inductive approach. Though it was fashioned after the PACE model, its co-construction phase featured an important departure from its predecessor. Teachers asked guiding questions that were scripted in the guided inductive approach. Conversely, in the PACE model, the co-construction phase was improvised based on student responses to the teacher's guided questions. As noted by Haight et al., these differences in the co-construction phases were important as the scripting of questions in the guided inductive approach allowed for the empirical rigor necessary for their study. While this prescribed questioning represented a variation from PACE, both approaches stressed the importance of guided questions. This form of student-teacher interaction engendered collaboration in the classroom and active involvement of the student in the discovery of rules governing a linguistic structure.

Theoretical Framework for the Guided Inductive Approach

Both the PACE model and the guided inductive approach shift learners into an active role where they interact with the teacher to discover the pattern governing a form's linguistic behavior rather than passively receiving rule information about the targeted form. As such, collaboration, a form of mediation, or link between the teacher and the learner, is key to the PACE model. It plays an important role in situating the PACE model within the basic tenets of sociocultural theory, an approach to learning and

behavior that has its origins in the writings of Vygotsky (Cole, John-Steiner, Scribner & Souberman, 1978). Sociocultural theory posits that learning and human development are mediated processes that occur during social interaction. A significant component of Vygotsky's theory rests on the notion that the interaction between a learner and a competent expert leads learners to modify and re-craft their environment to suit their needs and for their own purposes (Vygotsky, 1978). Through interaction with an expert, learners progress from their current level of development to their potential level of development. The difference between these two levels, what students currently know and what they could know if guided by an expert, is defined by Vygotsky (1978) as the learner's Zone of Proximal Development.

In relation to educative contexts, this interaction or mediation can take several forms such as textbooks, teacher interaction, classroom discourse, visual material or other learning aids such as computers (Lantolf, 2006). Learners develop strategies to employ these tools to make sense of their environment and to exploit language learning opportunities. Collaboration with these mediators expands learners' cognitive abilities. In this way, these tools become competent experts with whom learners can interact in order to develop higher level functioning- or in the case of the current project, learn the specified grammar structure.

The co-construction phase of the guided inductive approach investigated in the current study was the same as the one used in the Haight, Herron and Cole (2007) project. It exemplifies the mediation and collaboration that is a key component to Vygotsky's theory. The researcher engaged learners via scripted, guiding questions that led learners to develop and test hypotheses regarding the function of the linguistic structures. Though

scripted, use of the guiding questions was a form of interaction among the researcher and the students. This mediated process enabled students to hypothesize and construct their own knowledge about the linguistic structures under investigation.

Statement of the Problem

Ongoing debates about the most effective means to teach grammar as a communicative tool where form, meaning and use are integrated indicate a need to conduct research to investigate various methods of instruction proposed by scholars and researchers (Katz & Blyth, 2008; Larsen-Freeman, 2003). While many teachers and linguists advocate inductive approaches which are meaning-based and have no attention to rules, others support integrating deductive approaches featuring focused attention to form. Still, to date, only a few empirical projects have investigated inductive and deductive approaches to grammar instruction (Erlam, 2003; Haight, 2008; Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Shaffer, 1989).

In addition to a paucity of research on the effectiveness of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching grammar, there is also a lack of primary or secondary research that has investigated advanced-level FL or SL grammar classes. There are some investigations that address theoretical concerns related to the affective needs of advanced learners (Frazer, 1988), course/syllabus design at the advanced level (Eigler, 2001) and pedagogical approaches to the teaching grammar embedded in literary texts (Zyzik, 2008). However, empirical research on any aspect of language acquisition or learner outcomes at the advanced level of language study, the area of focus for this current project, is scarce. Potential reasons for the lack of research at the advanced level are discussed in the Review of Literature.

Purpose

This study investigated the effects of deductive and guided inductive approaches on the learning of grammar in an advanced French grammar course. Specifically this study compared the effects of these two pedagogical conditions by measuring students' grammar performance on immediate and delayed post-tests of advanced-level linguistic structures. This project also investigated whether students preferred to learn via the guided inductive or deductive approach, and whether there was a relationship between their stated instruction delivery preference and their short- and long-term grammar performance.

To achieve these objectives, the project was framed around the following research questions:

1. Which instructional approach, deductive or guided inductive, will be more effective on advanced French students' short-term learning of grammatical structures?
2. Which instructional approach, deductive or guided inductive, will be more effective on advanced French students' long-term retention of grammatical structures?
3. What are students' stated preferences in terms of instructional approach?
4. Is there a relationship between students' stated instructional preference and their grammar performance as measured by post-test scores?
5. Is there a relationship between students' stated instructional preference and their grammar performance as measured by immediate test scores?

This study also marked the continuation of a program of research undertaken by graduate students in the joint doctoral program of French and Educational Studies at Emory University. Many faculty and staff associated with the program have evaluated the use of various instructional approaches in the FL classroom. As such, the effects of the PACE method and the guided inductive approach to FL instruction have been a primary area of investigation. This project was the first study to evaluate deductive and inductive approaches at the advanced level and will provide an important means of comparison for projects at the beginning level (Haight, 2008; Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992) and at the intermediate level (Piot, Herron, Cole & York, 2008).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While there are many published articles that address various theoretical aspects of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching grammar, few projects have assessed the effects of the two approaches on actual learner performance using experimental or quasi-experimental research techniques (Erlam, 2003; Haight, 2008; Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Scott, 1989; Shaffer, 1989). Norris and Ortega (2000) completed a meta-analysis and summary of 77 research projects published during the period 1980-1998 that investigated the effectiveness of various approaches (including inductive and deductive approaches) to SL instruction. The results of their analyses indicated that research studies with treatments featuring an explicit focus on rule explanation were more effective than those that were more implicit in nature. Though Norris and Ortega reviewed a number of different SL instructional treatments, the average observed effect size of ($d = 0.96$) across treatments indicated that treatments featuring metalinguistic aspects of targeted structures were superior to treatments that did not include such a focus (Norris & Ortega, 2000).

At the same time, research projects that tested the effects of inductive and deductive instructional approaches have yielded conflicting results regarding the effectiveness of these two approaches (Abraham, 1985; Erlam, 2003; Haight, 2008; Haight, et al, 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Robinson, 1996; Rosa & O'Neill, 1999; Selinger, 1975; Shaffer, 1989). Each approach has been found to be superior to the other in the outcomes of these studies. As such, results from this body of empirical studies that

evaluated the effectiveness of inductive and deductive teaching approaches based on actual student performance, are inconclusive.

One potential reason for the conflicting results of these projects could be that the inductive approach was operationalized in several different ways. For example, in Herron and Tomasello's study (1992), students practiced the target structure in a contextualized oral activity then filled in blanks in model sentences with the correct form of the target structure. Haight, Herron and Cole (2007), Haight (2008), and Piot, Herron, Cole and York (2008) each adopted a guided inductive approach wherein a scripted co-construction phase was used to lead students to hypothesize about rules. However, in another recent study (Erlam, 2003) students received inductive instruction though there was no explicit focus on form. Yet another inductive approach was employed in Selinger's 1975 investigation where the teacher presented the rule at the end of the lesson after students had been exposed to contextualized practice featuring the targeted grammar structure. In other projects (Robinson, 1996; Rosa & O'Neill, 1999) students were exposed to a contextualized lesson and then were instructed to look for the rule within the lesson. Yet another variation of the inductive approach was found in Shaffer's 1989 study where learners were exposed to contrasting examples of a structure and were then requested to write down what they perceived to be the underlying pattern that distinguished the dissimilar patterns. Interestingly, the teacher never verbalized the pattern in this project.

Other factors have certainly also contributed to the inconsistency in findings from the aforementioned projects. For example, the research designs of the projects varied in complexity, number of variables tested and data analysis techniques (Norris & Ortega,

2000; Shaffer, 1989; Erlam, 2003). Moreover while most studies' participants were adults, one project's participants were high school students. There were also a variety of SLs under review in this body of projects. Norris and Ortega (2000) reported that 46% of projects concerned English as the target language, while others investigated ESL, French, Japanese, and Spanish. Learner proficiency levels also varied among the studies. While Norris and Ortega (2000) grouped most participants ($n= 28$) in the category of low proficiency (zero to two semesters of SL study), the mid proficiency category (three to four semesters of previous SL study) contained 16 participants, the advanced level category (learners with 5 or more semester of previous study) contained 12 participants and a category defined as mixed ability contained 6 participants.

In addition to these investigations that evaluated somewhat similar deductive approaches and several sub-types of inductive approaches to grammar instruction, a significant chain of research has been undertaken at the elementary and intermediate college level that specifically compared the effects of the guided inductive approach to deductive approaches. In order of completion, Herron and Tomasello (1992) explored the effects of the guided inductive and deductive approaches on French 101 students' performance as they learned 10 targeted grammatical structures. The guided inductive teaching procedure for this study involved the instructor asking students a series of scripted questions in the form of a drill exercise where the targeted grammatical structures were embedded in a natural and authentic context. Students responded chorally to the drill-based questions providing practice of the targeted structures. At the completion of the oral activity, the teacher wrote a model sentence on the board with blanks in place of the targeted structure. She requested that the students chorally read the

sentence and fill in the blank as she simultaneously wrote the correct form in its rightful position in the sentence. The instructor never explicitly stated the rule that governed the grammatical pattern; however, the sentence completion activity provided the students with immediate feedback on their understanding of the structure.

The deductive condition for this investigation consisted of the teacher providing a completed model sentence on the board featuring the targeted grammatical structure. The teacher then briefly explained the grammatical rule governing the structure's pattern. This rule explanation was then followed by a drill activity identical to the one in the guided inductive condition.

The results of Herron and Tomasello's research (1992) favored the guided inductive condition in terms of learner outcomes for beginning French students in the case of the ten grammatical structures under evaluation. The investigators argued that the strength of their project was in the design of the guided inductive approach. This design enabled students to participate in active hypothesizing, and they were given immediate feedback to confirm or disprove their assumptions.

Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007) evaluated the differences in grammar performance among second-semester beginning French students exposed to guided inductive or deductive grammar presentations. This project assessed both short-term learning of eight grammatical structures and their long-term retention as measured by a post-test at the end of the semester. In the guided inductive and deductive conditions, the teaching procedure to practice orally the targeted structure mirrored the one previously described in Herron and Tomasello's (1992) study. In the guided inductive condition, the

rule explanation stage in the Haight et al. project incorporated the co-construction approach of the PACE model (Adair-Hauck, Donato & Cumo-Johanssen, 2005).

More specifically, the Haight, Herron and Cole (2007) study was designed to integrate the teaching of grammar with technology. For the guided inductive condition, grammar lessons involved use of *PowerPoint* presentations to engage students in a contextualized oral practice session to introduce the targeted grammar structure and to collaborate in rule analysis. The attention to focus and the co-construction stages were followed by a completion exercise that targeted the grammar pattern. The deductive condition used a similar *PowerPoint* presentation but began with the rule explanation and completion exercise followed by the same contextualized oral practice session. Results comparing these two approaches indicated a statistically significant favorable effect on students' short-term learning of the targeted structures for the guided inductive condition.

Haight's unpublished dissertation project (2008) continued this line of inquiry into the effectiveness of guided inductive and deductive instructional approaches on first-semester French students' learning and retention of 12 grammatical structures. Additionally, this project investigated the effectiveness of these two approaches on the learning and retention of deviations from linguistic patterns (also known as exceptions to the rule) for the same population of students. Employing a mixed methodology design, this project also investigated participants' preferences for instructional approach.

The guided inductive and the deductive teaching presentations for this project were identical in terms of design to those of Herron and Tomasello (1992) and Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007). One variation was instituted as the project also explored students' learning of deviations from linguistic patterns. The Garden Path technique was

used in addition to the guided inductive approach to lead students to overgeneralize a pattern previously practiced in the contextualized drill to also apply to a deviation from that pattern. The findings from this project indicated that the guided inductive approach was superior to the deductive approach in terms of students' short-term learning of the targeted structures. The qualitative analysis of student preferences for instructional type revealed that students preferred to learn via the deductive condition, receiving a rule explanation prior to contextualized practice. At the same time, the results of this project indicated that though students' preferences were for the deductive approach, a higher percentage of them performed better on an immediate test of grammatical understanding of the targeted structures learned in the guided inductive condition than in the deductive condition. The investigators recommended future research to explore this discrepancy between student preference and performance.

Piot, Herron, Cole, and York (2008) continued to investigate the guided inductive and deductive approaches on the teaching of grammar in college intermediate-level French. This investigation explored the effectiveness of the two instructional approaches on short-term and long-term learning of 10 grammatical structures in French 201 (third semester French). Also a mixed methodology project, this study featured a qualitative component that explored participants' preferences for instructional approach and whether a relationship existed between their stated preferences and test performance. Supporting the findings of the previous three studies, the results of Piot, Herron, Cole and York's investigation indicated that the guided inductive condition was superior to the deductive condition with respect to participants' short-term learning of the targeted structures. Additionally, and in concert with findings from Haight's (2008) project, 80% of

participants reported preferring to learn deductively. Again affirming the findings of Haight (2008), results from this project revealed a similar discrepancy between preference and performance as participants who reported that they preferred the deductive approach actually performed significantly better in the guided inductive condition.

Again, the guided inductive teaching procedure for this project was a similar design to that of Herron and Tomasello (1992), Haight, Herron and Cole (2007), Haight (2008), and Piot, Herron, Cole and York (2008). The current study continued this significant chain of research by investigating the most valuable means of delivering form-focused instruction in the communicative classroom. Maintaining the research objective of testing the guided inductive approach and the traditional deductive approach, the current study attempted to ascertain if the findings of effectiveness in favor of the guided inductive approach on the learning of French grammatical structures at the beginning and intermediate levels of study held true at the advanced level of study. This project also explored participant preferences for approach and evaluated the relationship between preference and performance.

As mentioned in the Statement of the Problem section, there is a lack of theoretical and empirical research addressing FL instruction at the advanced level of study. Potential reasons for this scarcity of research at the advanced level could relate to the minimal number of advanced language courses at the post-secondary level. This small number of advanced college French courses might relate to nominal requirements for FL study in high schools. Because the United States' system of education is decentralized, individual states mandate graduation requirements by subject. A review of state

requirements for graduation for the study of World Languages compiled by the National Council of State Supervision for Languages (NCSSL) (2008) revealed that only three of the fifty states enforce world language requirements. Further, these states, New Jersey, New York and Wyoming, had different requirements, none of which exceeded two years of study. A number of other states had established requirements ranging from “basic” proficiency to two years of study for future graduating classes in years 2012 and beyond, while some states had proposals to institute some sort of requirement to be voted upon at some unknown point in the future. Finally, states such as Georgia did not require any FL study for a basic diploma, but required college-bound students to complete two years of FL study in the same language (NCSSL, 2008).

Similar inconsistencies in requirements for FL study existed at the post-secondary level. According to the Modern Language Association (MLA) Survey of FL Entrance and Degree Requirements for the years 1994-95, 68% of four-year institutions and 23% of two-year institutions reported having some type of FL requirements for the earning of a Bachelors degree (Brod & Huber, 1996).¹ It should be noted that though these institutions reported requiring FL study, it is unknown how much FL study, in terms of number semesters of coursework these data represented.

While these percentages of institutions requiring FL study for graduation were indeed impressive, these statistics must be viewed in context. In 2006, the MLA reported that only “8.6 of enrollments of 100 total students attending post-secondary institutions were in modern language courses” (p. 37).² Introducing further inconsistencies into the

¹ Though the 1994-95 MLA report was a follow-up to identical data conducted in 1987-1988, no updated data are available from the MLA relevant to a more recent period.

² There are no data available on course enrollments in all subjects in U.S. institutions of higher learning. Further, students enrolled in more than one language course during the period under review might have

investigation of FL requirements at the post-secondary level were the internal variations in requirements within a single institution. While many degree programs within disciplines such as the Humanities and Social Sciences in U.S. colleges and universities required two years of FL study to earn a Bachelors degree, many other degree programs at the same institutions such as mathematics and natural sciences might not require FL study for degree attainment.

Though the MLA (2007) reported that FL enrollments in post-secondary institutions across the nation rose from 2002-2006 at 12.9%, reflecting an upward trend in language study, an emphasis on low-level language course offerings was also reported. Additionally, the MLA reported noted “the differential in enrollments in upper- and lower-level courses is dramatic” (p. 4.) As an example, for every nine enrollments in an introductory language course in Chinese, only two students were enrolled in an advanced course. For more commonly taught European languages, there were both small and large ratios: French 4:1; German 4:1, Italian 9:1; Spanish 5:1; Russian 8:3. These findings were supported by statistics from the American Council on Education (2005) which reported that the average number of FL courses taught at the undergraduate level was 4.4. This average likely represented the first- and second-year or beginning-level sequence of courses for any given language. Thus, from a curricular standpoint, having ample opportunities to develop high proficiency levels in a FL remains difficult.

In addition to institutional decisions requiring relatively minimal FL study and the few upper-level courses available to students who want to pursue advanced language study, from a linguistic standpoint developing high proficiency in a FL is difficult.

been counted two times. For this reason the report issues a ratio of language course enrollments to total students registered at post-secondary institutions.

According to the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines, a learner at the Advanced level of proficiency is able to consistently explain ideas and concepts in detail and to narrate fully and accurately in all time frames (ACTFL, 1982, 1999). As many as 480 hours of instruction are needed to reach the Advanced level of proficiency in French for native English speakers and a minimum of 1320 hours for languages not featuring use of the Roman alphabet such as Russian (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). With typical undergraduate language courses offering approximately three contact hours per week for two years, this time sequence results in only 180 hours of instruction.

In light of the difficulty of attaining advanced-level proficiency and the low numbers of advanced FL classes and learners, little theoretical or empirical research that investigated pedagogies at the advanced level exists (Zyzik, 2008). Other factors complicating conducting research with advanced learners relate to the heterogeneous nature of students in advanced classes. Frazer (1988) described advanced language classes as being composed of students from all levels of university standing and with a wide range of “interests, experience and intellectual sophistication” (p. 588). Moreover, while these students are grouped together because they have a similar level of overall competence, these competences may vary. For example, grammatical competence is quite different than textual competence or illocutionary competence (Omaggio Hadley, 2001).

Nonetheless, some projects investigated aspects of form focused instruction with advanced learners. Scott (1989) evaluated implicit and explicit teaching strategies and determined that explicit teaching strategies yielded greater learner performance. Scott’s deductive methodology involved students hearing explicit grammar presentations made

by the teacher for the two structures under evaluation. These rules were followed by the teacher modeling five example sentences containing the targeted structures. The implicit procedure exposed students to the targeted structures by presenting them embedded in a story multiple times. The outcome of this comparison indicated that students who were taught using the explicit approach featuring overt attention to rules performed better overall on written tests of grammar than did those who were taught implicitly with no attention to form.

Shelly (1993) described an inductive classroom technique that she employed in her advanced-level composition course that featured a significant emphasis on the study of grammar. This proficiency-oriented approach did not feature drill-based practice, but rather leading questions that probed students to expand and reformulate their knowledge of grammatical rules to include nuanced and sophisticated use of discourse-level communicative functions. The goal of this approach, according to Shelly, was to demonstrate, through purely inductive means, that grammar rules might become fossilized although in application, they were fallible and contingent. In this sense, fossilized meant that the rules became impervious to change, and students often overgeneralized these rules to contexts where decisions regarding which rule to apply were complex and delicate. Illustrating that simplified and previously learned schemata were often insufficient for the significant effort necessary to progress from lower-levels of language study to more advanced-levels necessitated, according to Shelly, a reformulation of rules.

The classroom procedure for Shelly's investigation involved the teacher calling students' attention to incorrect sentences (numbered 1 - 3) drawn from writing samples

from a previous assignment. Corresponding written corrections (numbered 4 - 6) were also provided for the students to review. Students were then given a third set of sentences (numbered 7-9). These sentences featured a sophisticated linguistic context where application of the simplified rule (students' previously held schemata that was inaccurately applied to sentences 1-3, but accurately applied to corrected sentences 4-6) would have led to ungrammatical sentences. Students were then asked to contrast sentences 7-9 with sentences 4-6. When students were informed that both sets of sentences were correct, the teacher asked them to explain why. Through a series of leading questions, students were led to discover the rule/context governing these finer points of grammar.

While Shelly concluded her article by stating that “elusive grammar questions...at this level are best addressed, not by teaching another prescriptive rule, but by nudging our students to develop ... flexible and sophisticated generalizations about language,” she did not provide any empirical evidence to support her use of this approach with advanced language learners (p. 767). She also did not compare use of this approach to a traditional deductive method, or any other type of inductive approach.

Another project by Zyzik and Polio (2008) investigated incidental focus on form in advanced-level Spanish literature courses that emphasized grammar review. According to the authors, incidental focus on form was described as techniques that drew learners' attention to grammatical form when the need arose. With this approach, the focus on form interventions were not planned and the research question for this project related to the best ways to categorize incidental focus on form occurrences based on their frequency and type.

The classroom procedures for this project involved the investigators videotaping the courses of three native teachers of Spanish literature. The investigators followed a taxonomy of form-focused instruction created by Ellis. This taxonomy subdivided form-focused instruction into three categories and designated four types of incidental focus on form. Based on analyses of three videotaped class sections, the investigators tallied the types of student-teacher interactions occurring in the lessons based on the Ellis taxonomy. The results of this project indicated that incidental focus on form did in fact occur in the classroom, but to varying degrees based on instructor. Also contingent on the individual instructor was the type of incidental focus on form recorded by the investigators.

The incidental nature of the approach under review for this project raised concerns regarding the generalizability of the findings. The instructors spontaneously responded to focus on form needs as they arose in the classroom, thereby making it difficult to replicate a similar project in other contexts. As was the case with the Shelly project, the investigators did not compare the incidental focus on form approach to any other inductive or deductive approach. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of incidental focus on form in a communicative advanced grammar course.

Another of the few published research projects addressing form focused instruction and advanced learners was Jankowska (1988). This project evaluated advanced learners' opinions of explicit grammar instruction. The participants in this project were 51 Polish university students of English as a FL. The students were asked to provide their opinions about the explicit learning of grammar on a written questionnaire. Jankowska reported that 98% of students indicated that they felt explicit learning of

grammar was “necessary in the process of FL learning” (p. 93). Students were also asked to indicate which type of explicit learning they preferred by selecting a sequence of classroom activities related to inductive and deductive processes. Jankowska reported that 60% of students preferred a deductive approach that was defined as “rule, examples, exercises”, while only 10% of students preferred in inductive approach that was defined as “examples, discovering the rule, no exercises” (p. 97). While this project provided interesting information from student’s perspectives, the findings could be considered merely anecdotal as no evidence of significance testing confirmed whether the students’ preferences among categories were statistically significant.

The implementation of the communicative language curriculum with its focus on improved proficiency supported research that addressed issues of how best to teach grammar to improve students’ learning. However, research on inductive and deductive approaches to grammar instruction at any level of study is limited. Additionally, after an extensive online search of peer-reviewed journals related to the topics of inductive and deductive approaches, applied linguistics, and second and FL teaching, the review of literature did not reveal any empirical research studies that examined the use and/or effects of inductive and deductive approaches of language instruction in an advanced-level grammar course.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Course Design

Forty-one students participated in this study. These students were enrolled in four sections of fourth-semester advanced French (Advanced Grammar and Composition, French 203) at a private suburban university during the Fall semester of 2009. Class sizes ranged from 9 to 15 students per course. Participants in this project self-selected the section of the course in which they would enroll. As a result, there was non-random assignment of the participants in the study.

The goal of the French 203 course was to develop interpretive language strategies and to review and practice grammatical forms in the context of authentic literary and cultural texts. Classroom activities were designed to improve students' abilities in both the communicative and presentational modes. The basis of the curriculum was two textbooks. One, *Identité, Modernité, Texte* introduced students to twentieth-century French and Francophone literature via authentic literary texts (Morris, Herron & Estin, 2004). The other, *Reprise: A French grammar review worktext*, was a comprehensive grammar review featuring a varied collection of exercises for the practice of grammatical structures and vocabulary (Stillman & Gordon, 2007). An additional component of the course was an interactive DVD program entitled *Jules et Jim: An interactive film companion to your French program*, based on a twentieth century novel (Capretz, 2006). Emphasis was placed on both oral and written communication with vocabulary and grammar taught in context. Culture was presented through readings, discussion, and other

interactive activities related to the *Jules et Jim* DVD and literary texts. Classroom cooperative activities included games, role-plays, and group assignments.

Participant Demographics

The sample ($n = 41$) included 33 females (80%) and 8 males (20%). In terms of university classification, 28 (68%) were freshmen, 11 were sophomores (27%), 1 was a junior (2%) and 1 was a senior (2%). Demographics of participants reflected a mixture of native (81%) and non-native speakers (19%) of English; however, all participants had near-native proficiency of English. A chi-square test was performed to determine if there were significant differences among the class sections in terms of university standing and gender. The results of this test indicated that there were no significant differences in relation to university standing chi-square ($1, N = 41$) = 14.00, $p = .122$, and gender chi-square ($1, N = 41$) = 5.52, $p = .138$. (See Table 1)

In terms of previous study of French, 31 participants (76 %) reported having studied French for 1 to 3 years in junior high. Thirty-nine students (95 %) of the sample indicated that they studied French from 1 to 4 years in high school. Additionally, 11 students (27 %) reported studying French for one semester at the university level. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences among the four class sessions in terms of previous years of French studied. No significant differences were detected, $F(1, 40) = .548$, $p = .653$ (see Table 1).

Although this sample of participants was not randomly selected, the two groups of participants were counterbalanced by an empirical *within subjects* design (Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992) described below. Three of the four sections of the course were taught by one experienced lecturer who has taught this course numerous

times and who was also the graduate teaching assistant supervisor for the course. One section of the course was taught by a graduate teaching assistant who had former college teaching experience. Additionally, she was trained in FL teaching methods and had sound teaching abilities as deemed by the supervisor of graduate teaching.

Instrumentation

Pre-test of Grammatical Knowledge. Participants' knowledge of each grammar structure was evaluated in this project via their performance on a pre-test at the beginning of the semester. The multiple-choice grammar pre-test was administered to participants before introduction of the treatment phase in order to assess the comparability of students' grammar knowledge across the three class sections. The grammar pre-test evaluated students' knowledge of the 10 grammatical structures that were taught and evaluated during the treatment phase. Two items on the test were devoted to evaluating each of the 10 grammar structures. As a result, the pre-test contained 20 total items and possible test scores ranged from 0 to 40 points (Appendix A).

Pre-test Questionnaire. In addition to the pre-test assessment of current grammar knowledge, students also completed a background questionnaire prior to the introduction of the treatment phase (Appendix B). Use of this instrument allowed the investigator to gather relevant data regarding students' demographics and their previous language learning experiences. The questionnaire included individual items requesting basic demographic information, such as age, native language, university classification, and gender. The questionnaire also contained items to elicit students' previous exposure to French, whether in the classroom or via international travel. Participants were also queried about any other languages they spoke or studied. Finally, this instrument, allowed

the researcher to understand details about the types of previous language instruction to which participants had been exposed. As a result, this instrument contained 17 items with a mix of open- and closed- ended items as well as multiple-choice items containing categorical options as responses.

Immediate Tests. Immediate tests designed to evaluate students' knowledge of the targeted grammatical structures were administered directly following their exposure to a treatment (See Appendix C). Given the advanced nature of learners' proficiency, a multiple competency type of assessment was developed for this project. The basis for selection of targeted grammatical structures for this project was related to students' understanding of complex sentences. As such, the investigator ensured that this knowledge was evaluated on the immediate tests by collaborating with other faculty to design an instrument that required students to both correctly manipulate the targeted structure as necessary, and to correctly match a dependent clause to its linguistically appropriate independent cause, and vice versa, based on the context of the instructions.

As an example, test items numbered 1- 4 are presented in a column on the left side of the page and items numbered A-D are presented on the right side of the page. Each column contained both dependent and independent clauses; however, the physical layout of the clauses was not presented in matching order. In other words, clause 1 did not correspond to clause A. Further, the targeted grammar structure, or a choice of structures from which students were to choose, was embedded within a clause in either the numbered- or lettered-column items. Students were thus required to correctly choose or manipulate the targeted item, then to correctly join the two halves of the complex sentence together in order to receive full credit for any given item. To illustrate, a quiz

item used to assess students' knowledge of the conditional present tense asked students to correctly conjugate the verb in either the left or right column, then to match said clause with its mate in the other column. Each quiz featured four multi-competency items. Partial or full credit was awarded on the immediate tests with possible scores being 0, 1 or 2. The total point value of the quiz ranged from 0 to 8. See Figure 1 below for a translated sample of this instrument.

Activité # 7. Les pronoms relatifs où/dont	
Activity # 7. Relative pronouns où/dont	
<p>Imaginez maintenant qu'un de vos amis, qui n'a jamais voyagé à l'étranger, vient vous demander des conseils. Vous voulez le persuader que c'est avant tout Paris qu'il faut voir. Rédigez vos recommandations à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Ecrivez la forme du pronom exigée par le contexte.</p> <p><i>(Imagine that one of your friends, who has never traveled abroad, just asked for your travel advice. You want to persuade him that Paris is absolutely the city to visit. Provide your recommendations based on the sentence components found in the table below. In the left column find phrases that begin each sentence. Find the logical continuation of each beginning phrase in the right column. Finally write in the blank the correct form of the pronoun required based on the context of the sentence.)</i></p>	
<p>1. Tu verras un centre culturel de premier plan... <i>(You will see a first-rate cultural center...)</i></p> <p>2. N'oublie pas de te procurer le plan de Paris ... <i>(Don't forget to pick-up a map of Paris...)</i></p> <p>3. En outre, réserve-toi assez de temps pour admirer la cathédrale Notre-Dame ... <i>(Also, save enough time to admire the Notre Dame Cathedral...)</i></p> <p>4. Il faudrait aussi rendre visite au cimetière Père Lachaise, un des plus célèbres dans le monde ... <i>(You should also visit Père Lachaise cemetery, one of the most famous in the world...)</i></p>	<p>A. _____ (où /dont) parle Victor Hugo dans un de ses plus célèbres romans. <i>(that Victor Hugo spoke of in one of his most famous novels.)</i></p> <p>B. _____ (où /dont) sont enterrées de nombreuses personnes célèbres. <i>(where many famous people are buried.)</i></p> <p>C. _____ (où /dont) tu auras besoin chaque fois que tu voudras découvrir un des sites exceptionnels de la capitale des Lumières. <i>(that you will need each time that you would like to discover one of the exceptional sites of the City of Lights.)</i></p> <p>D. _____ (où /dont) on trouve plus de 150 musées et un nombre infini de monuments uniques. <i>(where there are more than 150 museums and an infinite number of unique monuments.)</i></p>

Figure 1 Translated immediate test sample

Post-test of Grammatical Knowledge and Questionnaire. Post-tests were conducted at the end of the semester. The multiple-choice grammar post-test was comprised of items identical to those tested in the grammar pre-test that were

administered at the beginning of the semester (see Appendix A). Students also completed a post-test preferences and perceptions questionnaire designed by the researcher where they responded to Likert scale and open-ended items related to their classroom learning experiences. This questionnaire contained six items that explored participants' opinions of the two instructional approaches featured in the study and of general features of grammar instruction. (See Appendix D).

Oral participant interviews. Interviews were conducted with 10 participants from the four class sections (approximately two per section) following the quantitative data collection phase. The researcher conducted each interview. These sessions were recorded on audio tapes and lasted between 10 to 15 minutes. The goal of the interviews was to discuss participants' preferences for each instructional approach (see Appendix E).

Mixed Methods Methodology

The data collection and analysis for this project featured a mixed methods design. Though previously shunned due to a perceived incompatibility in the theories and paradigms underlying quantitative and qualitative approaches, mixed methods projects are gaining ground in legitimacy among scholars and peer-reviewed academic journals. Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003) described mixed methods projects as those that employ quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques. The strength of such a combination relates to a notion that the biases inherent in either method could balance or cancel biases associated with the other method (Creswell, 2003; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Rationale

Creswell (2003) indicated that researchers undertaking mixed methods designs should clearly explain their rationales for the selection of this approach to answer their research questions. A mixed methods design was selected for this project in an effort to allow the researcher to demonstrate the relationship between type of instructional approach and student performance. The researcher also sought answers to exploratory questions related to student preference for both of the teaching approaches. Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003) lauded the possible efficacy of mixed methods research of this type by writing that “mixed methods are useful if they provide better opportunities to answer our research questions” (p. 14). One singular data collection and analysis approach, qualitative or quantitative, would not allow for successful inquiry of this type.

Additionally, the nature of classroom-based research generally presents numerous threats to internal and external validity. Using a mixed methods design allowed for the triangulation, or mutual validation, of data to create inductive inferences that were used to describe or explain empirical observations (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The goal of the mixed methods design for the current project was to allow the researcher to address the research questions with as much detail and nuanced attention as the data would allow.

Implementation and Priority

Mixed method studies are assigned a typology based on two criteria: the sequence in which the data are collected and the priority assigned to method (dominant, less dominant) (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). This project adhered to a qualitative/quantitative/qualitative sequencing, with priority given to the quantitative data. This sequencing of data collection and analysis reflected a hybrid form of the

explanatory typology. Qualitative data help to explain or elaborate quantitative results (Creswell, 2003). They provide useful insights and supplementary explanations when unexpected results arise from quantitative inquiry (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Further details about the instrumentation (pre-tests, post-tests, questionnaires and immediate tests) corresponding to this sequencing are found in the subheading titled Instrumentation.

Qualitative Data Analysis Method

Creswell (2003) advised that data analysis in mixed methodology projects should occur within both the qualitative and the quantitative phases. He also recommended to researchers whose projects fall within a mixed methods sequential typology that they should organize their reports into distinct sections or phases, with separate headings for each phase. In this way, the report mirrors the type of strategy chosen for the project. In the case of the current project, the results section featuring quantitative data analysis is followed by sections describing qualitative data analysis.

Qualitative Data Collection

The purpose of the qualitative analytical portion of this project was to partially address research question three where participant preferences were examined, and to address question four where student preferences were compared to their performance in each condition. This analysis appraised students' perceptions and preferences for instructional delivery, either guided inductive or deductive. Participant preferences were evaluated at the end of the study and responses were analyzed to determine if there was a relationship between student performance and their stated preference. These qualitative

data were analyzed to strengthen, clarify, and expand upon the quantitative data that was analyzed in response to questions one through three.

The instruments for the qualitative data collection were written questionnaires and oral participant interviews. The use of questionnaires supported the current project's mixed methodology approach and was of an intramethod design. Intramethod mixing is defined as "the concurrent or sequential use of a single method that includes both qualitative and quantitative components" (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 299). An intramethod questionnaire includes both open- and closed-ended items. Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003) indicated that an intramethod instrument of this nature results in a more accurate and complete depiction of the phenomenon under investigation as it provides multiple views of it. The pre-treatment questionnaire for the current project featured 17 closed-ended items and 5 open-ended items. The post-treatment questionnaire contained three closed-ended items and seven open-ended items.

In greater detail, the pre-study questionnaire collected student's demographic information such as age, gender, university classification and amount of previous French study. The post-test questionnaire contained four open-ended items that evaluated participants' general opinions about grammar instruction, their preferences for type of approach and their perspectives on the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

Ten interviews were conducted in the week immediately following the end of the treatment phase and quantitative data collection. The participants interviewed for this study were volunteers. In order to obtain as representative of a sample as possible, the researcher asked for two volunteers from each class section. Three participants volunteered from sections Y1 and Y2. Two participants from sections G and Y3

volunteered to be interviewed. The age of the interview participants ranged from 18 to 21. Seven of the interview participants were female and three were male. For reasons of confidentiality direct quotes from participants are attributed to Participant A through J. An interview guide is set forth in Appendix E.

The interviews were designed specifically to allow the research to gather further details about participants' comments from the post-test questionnaire. Using the semi-structured interviews in this way allowed for a nuanced understanding and clarification of respondents' opinions and preferences. The oral interviews provided supporting detail to the data collected in the written instruments as well as provided insights into the results of the quantitative analysis.

Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative analysis for this project were interpretive in nature and followed closely the guidelines for mixed methods research as outlined in Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003), Miles & Huberman (1994) and Creswell (2003). Emergent theme content analysis was the technique used to analyze participant responses to open-ended questions on the pre- and post-test participant questionnaires. Content analysis is a means of data analysis for narrative data where portions of the text are categorized based on the similarity of their meanings (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This technique allows the researcher to make inferences by systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

The content analysis technique was undertaken by the researcher's review of each participant's post-test questionnaire as well as each oral interview. These instruments were transcribed, and the transcriptions were analyzed and coded. Coding involved the

researcher combining the data into categories based on the descriptive information contained in the participants' responses (see Appendix F). These categories were assigned a code which was a visual and semantic tag that allowed the researcher to retrieve and interpret participant responses (Creswell, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This context-sensitive process of coding reflected the Grounded Approach (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The value of the Grounded Approach is that coding is an organic process where themes and concepts emerge from participant responses (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In contrast to coding based on pre-determined lists or ideas related to trends and movements prevalent in the literature related to a certain phenomenon, this spontaneous development of codes is rooted in the views and comments of the participants, not in abstract theory.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are important matters that require thoughtful consideration from the conception of a project through data collection and its analysis. Creswell (2003) emphasized that researchers should describe the steps taken to ensure the validity and accuracy of the results of their projects. In this study, several strategies were utilized to assist in assuring that the results of the project were indeed consistent with the data collected.

Triangulation. "A mutual verification of research results and a potential increase of validity produced by such a verification" is the primary goal of triangulation. (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, pg. 467). The nature of this project's mixed methods design increased the credibility and validity of the results. Methodological triangulation

was the procedural perspective employed in this study with the goal of mitigating the weaknesses inherent in either quantitative or qualitative research methods.

Presentation of the researcher's perspective. While researchers' personal beliefs and experiences help them extract meaning from data, they might also influence findings in unknown ways. In this light, Creswell (2003) and Haller & Kleine (2001) encouraged researchers to share relevant aspects of their lives that might influence their projects so that readers may make informed judgments about particular perspectives that come to bear on the project. As a researcher, my graduate training focused primarily on communicative language teaching. I taught classroom-based undergraduate French language courses using the PACE model of inductive teaching. I also taught using the deductive approach. I had limited exposure to inductive teaching approaches as a FL learner, while most of the classroom-based language learning experiences featured deductive presentational approaches.

Moreover, serving as the primary investigator and instructor for all treatments in the four class sections, as well as, creator of the *PowerPoint* lesson presentations, and co-creator of the teaching scripts, it was necessary for me to raise issues related to potential researcher bias and its potential effects on the validity of this project. My goal for this investigation was first to ensure that participants successfully learned the targeted grammar structures via communicative, meaning-based instruction in both approaches. The forms of peer support described below served to mitigate any potential researcher bias in this project.

Peer debriefing. This project relied on the use of colleagues to review and ask questions about the study, to ensure the accuracy of coding and transcriptions, to assist

with the scoring of the instruments and to comment on the findings. Any discrepancies were consulted upon and corrected. In a related fashion, peer scoring was also used as a form of accuracy check for the pre- and post-tests of grammatical knowledge and for each of the 10 immediate tests of knowledge of the targeted grammatical structure. This process involved the principal investigator creating an answer key for each instrument. The answer keys were verified by a native speaker of French for accuracy. Each instrument was scored according to the answer key, and the scores were entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The principal researcher then arranged to have 20% of the instruments re-scored by a peer, again based on use of the answer keys. As an extra measure of data verification, the peer scorer also input the scores of the 20% of the instruments that were re-scored into a blank Excel spreadsheet. The scores and the data entry were verified by a second peer in order to determine the agreement between the researcher and peer scorer.

Classroom Procedures

As the sample of participants for this project was not randomly selected, the four treatment groups were counterbalanced by an empirical *within subjects* design (Herron & Tomasello, 1992) described below. A quasi-experimental equivalent time samples design, a type of *within subjects* design, was used to compare students' learning of the targeted grammar structures in the two conditions as evaluated by their performance on immediate post-test scores. Each student in the course was exposed to both the deductive and guided inductive conditions an equal number of times. In this way, when evaluated across participants and structures, the results were counterbalanced. Each grammatical structure and each participant were represented equally in both conditions.

The three classes were randomly sorted into two groups (classes Y1 & Y2 and classes G and Y3). During the first week of this project, students in classes Y1 and Y2 received the deductive treatment for the first time. The other class learned the targeted grammar structure in the guided inductive condition. The next week, classes G and Y3 received the guided inductive treatment while classes Y1 and Y2 learned the structure in the deductive condition. In the weeks to follow, the class groups continued to rotate among the two conditions for a total of 9 times (see Table 1).

Table 1
Counterbalanced Design and Schedule of Treatment Order by Course Section

	Grammatical Pattern	Sections Y1 & Y2	Section G & Y3
structure 1	<i>Conditionnel présent</i>	Guided inductive	Deductive
structure 2	<i>Plus-que-parfait</i>	Deductive	Guided Inductive
structure 3	<i>Conditionnel passé</i>	Guided inductive	Deductive
structure 4	<i>Participe present</i>	Deductive	Guided Inductive
structure 5	<i>Futur antérieur</i>	Guided inductive	Deductive
structure 6	<i>Subjonctif présent</i>	Deductive	Guided Inductive
structure 7	<i>Pronoms relatifs simples</i>	Guided inductive	Deductive
structure 8	<i>Subjonctif passé</i>	Deductive	Guided Inductive
structure 9	<i>Discourse indirect</i>	Guided inductive	Deductive
structure 10	<i>Pronoms relatifs composés</i>	Deductive	Guided Inductive

For the guided inductive condition, the researcher visited the two sections scheduled to receive the treatment to present the targeted grammar structure. This presentation occurred using the guided inductive approach with the aid of *PowerPoint* on five occasions throughout the semester. The targeted grammar lesson began with a contextualized activity related to current events or popular culture with which all students were deemed to be familiar such as the tastes and preferences of Michael Jackson or the friendship of Oprah Winfrey and Gayle King. The lessons were illustrated by researcher-

prepared *PowerPoint* visuals that also included practice exercises (see Appendix G). This phase was followed by a rule construction stage, in which the researcher and student collaborated on the manner in which the targeted grammatical pattern functioned. The lesson concluded with the researcher advancing to a *PowerPoint* slide containing a model sentence with a blank in place of the targeted grammatical structure. Collaborations took the form of scripted, teacher-formulated guided questions accompanied by students' choral responses to the questions. Finally the researcher and students completed the model sentence by filling in the blank with the correct form of the targeted structure. Participants then took an immediate test to evaluate their understanding of the structure featuring four multiple-competency items described above.

On an alternating week, students in the class scheduled to receive the deductive treatment learned one grammar structure via the traditional deductive approach with the aid of *PowerPoint*. The lesson began with the researcher showing a *PowerPoint* slide featuring a model sentence with the targeted structure underlined. The researcher then provided an explanation of the grammar rule governing the structure's use. The grammar rule explanation was followed by the same *PowerPoint* contextualized practice activity as in the guided inductive condition. Participants then took an immediate test, the same as in the guided inductive condition, to evaluate their understanding of the structure featuring four multiple-competency items.

The 10 grammatical structures evaluated in this study were: 1) *le plus-que-parfait* (pluperfect), 2) *les pronoms relatifs simples* (simple relative pronouns), 3) *les pronoms relatifs composés* (compound relative pronouns), 4) *le participe présent/le gérondif* (present participle/gerund), 5) *le subjonctif présent* (present subjunctive), 6) *le subjonctif*

passé (past subjunctive), 7) *le futur antérieur* (future anterior), 8) *le conditionnel présent* (conditional present), 9) *le conditionnel passé* (conditional past), 10) *le discours indirect* (indirect speech). These structures were selected in collaboration with faculty members at the university who have taught this course for many semesters. Though French 203 students had likely received instruction related to each of these structures in previous courses, these structures were deemed to represent areas of continued difficulty for French 203 students. Furthermore, these structures lent themselves well to use within complex sentence structures, an important grammatical feature to master at the advanced French level. Unlike intermediate-level students who concentrate on sentence-level grammar, advanced-level students focus on mastery and use of more sophisticated discourse-level grammatical functions.

Consent Procedures and Confidentiality

This project was deemed exempt from Institutional Review Board guidelines for research involving human subjects at the study site. As a result, informed consent was not obtained for student and instructor participants who participated in this investigation. Participants were informed, however, that their performance on the grammar pre-test and post-test and on the weekly quizzes would have no effect on their course grades. Confidentiality of the participants' test and quiz performances and questionnaire responses were ensured. All instruments, including the grammar pre-test and post-test, quizzes, background, learning style, and preference questionnaires were coded using the participants' birthdates and home zip codes to protect students' identities.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

*Quantitative Results**Preliminary Quantitative Analyses: Pretest*

The sample size for this investigation was 41 participants divided among four class sections. Participating class sections were analyzed to determine if they were comparable in terms of participants' knowledge of the targeted grammatical structures at the outset of the project. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare the mean scores of the grammar pre-test of the four class sections included in the sample. The results of this comparison indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the four class sections in the sample on the grammar pre-test, $F(1, 40) = .807, p = .498$.

Preliminary Quantitative Analyses: Instruments

Additionally, an examination of the reliability of the instruments used in this project was completed as part of preliminary quantitative analyses. Item analyses were used to assess the performance of test items on the assumption that the overall quality of a test derives from the quality of its items (Nunnally, 1967). This analysis allowed the researcher to determine if the items comprising the pre-test, post-test and immediate quizzes were sufficiently crafted to gauge participant knowledge of the grammatical structures. Pre-test item difficulties ranged from .15 (item 1) to .63 (items 6 and 8), with a mean of .38 while post-test item difficulties ranged from .17 (item 11) to .71 (item 5), with a mean of .46 (see Table 2). The immediate test difficulties ranged from .87 (item 3, test 1) to 1.74 (item 1, test 1), with a mean of 1.32 (see Table 3).

These item difficulties represented expected thresholds for each type of instrument. For example in the case of the pre-test, participants had not yet had any exposure to the material, thus items tended to be more difficult. Conversely, at the post-test, participants had been exposed to the treatments and the items tended to be less difficult. Similarly, due to direct exposure to the grammar structures, the items for the immediate quizzes demonstrated relatively high rates of percent correct.

An internal consistency estimate of reliability was calculated for the 20 post-test items and for the thirty-two immediate test items. The post-test analysis yielded an alpha coefficient of .66. This alpha coefficient appears to be sufficiently large to indicate that the instrument was a reliable means of assessing students' knowledge of the grammar structures at the post-test. Additionally, the immediate test alpha coefficient ranged from .61 to .80. The coefficients for all 10 structures were above .60 (see Table 3). According to Gay (1980), coefficients that range "in the .60s and .70s are usually considered adequate for group prediction purposes" (p. 192).

Quantitative Analysis of Research Questions

To assess research question 1 (*Which instructional approach, deductive or guided inductive, will be more effective on advanced French students' short-term learning of grammatical structures?*) a paired-samples *t* test was conducted to compare participants' mean deductive immediate test scores and their mean guided inductive immediate test scores. In more detail, each participant received two scores based on their performance on immediate tests in each condition. The immediate test scores were averaged, thus resulting in two overall mean scores: one for the deductive condition; and one for the guided inductive condition. These scores were converted to a percentage of total points

related to the number of immediate tests participants complete in each condition. In other words, the total number of items correct was divided by the total number of structures for which the participant was present. Percentage scores were necessary because some respondents did not have scores for each structure. These percentage scores were then compared with the t test. The results of the paired samples t test indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of participants when they learned the structures in the deductive condition ($M = .66, SD = .17$) and when they learned the structures in the guided inductive condition ($M = .66, SD = .17$) as the t test result was not significant, $t(40) = -.097, p = .923$ (see Table 4).

The calculated effect size (Cohen's d) related to this research question was 0.0151. Though the current investigation did not yield a statistically significant result with respect to short-term learning of the targeted grammar structure, knowledge of the effect size is both useful and important. The effect size measures the strength of the relationship between immediate test performance and type of treatment. While there are varying opinions regarding how to interpret effect sizes, within the social sciences, one of the most accepted opinions is that of Cohen (1988) where d of 0.2 is indicative of a small effect, 0.5 a medium and 0.8 a large effect size.

To evaluate research question 2 (*Which instructional approach, deductive or guided inductive, will be more effective on advanced French students' long-term retention of grammatical structures?*) a 2 (deductive, guided inductive) X 2 (pre-test, post-test) repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to investigate the effect of the two teaching approaches on overall improvement in grammar knowledge over the course of the semester. This test was possible because each participant was

exposed to each condition and because each participant also had both pre- and post-test scores. Further, pre- and post-test scores were computed based on the condition in which participants learned a given structure. In other words, the researcher tracked the order in which each structure was learned by participant and by condition. Participants' pre- and post-test scores were thus derived based on the condition in which they learned each structure.

Pre-test and post-test means and standard deviations are presented in Table 5. The results of this analysis indicated a significant main effect for time, $F(1, 40) = 12.10$, $p = .001$. This outcome illustrated an improvement in students' overall grammar knowledge over the 15-week duration of the course. There was a significant interaction between method and time ($1, 40) = 4.276$, $p = .045$. This interaction indicated greater increases in means from pre-test (3.37) to post-test (4.51) for the guided inductive condition than for the deductive condition (3.88 to 4.22). These results represented a 33.8% increase for the guided inductive condition and an 8.5% increase for the deductive condition (see Table 6).

To evaluate research question 3 (*What are students' stated preferences in terms of instructional approach?*) frequency count distributions were collected from the post-test questionnaire to tally whether students preferred the deductive condition or the guided inductive condition. In order to gauge their preferences, participants were asked to read the following descriptions of the two instructional approaches on the post-test questionnaire:

Approach A: When learning grammar, the rules are explained entirely by the teacher first followed by practice.

Approach B: When learning grammar, practice of a grammatical structure occurs first followed by discovery, with the help of the teacher, of the rule of how to use the structure.

Next students were instructed to indicate their instructional method preference by circling one choice among a list of Likert-type scale responses with measures from “Strongly Prefer A” to “Strongly Prefer B”. For analysis purposes, values of 1 to 5 were assigned respectively to this scale. Sixty-one percent of participants reported strongly preferring Approach A (the deductive approach). An additional 29% reported that they mildly preferred Approach A. Two percent of respondents indicated a neutral preference for the two approaches. Similarly, 2% of participants indicated that they mildly preferred Approach B (the guided inductive approach). Finally, 5% of respondents reported that the inductive approach was their preferred instructional method.

To assess question 4 (*Is there a relationship between students' stated instructional preference and their grammar performance as measured by post-test scores?*) Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to assess if there was a statistically significant relationship between preferences for instructional approach as self-reported by participants on their post-test questionnaires and their grammar performance as measured by their post-test scores. The relationship between participant preference and guided inductive post-test performance was not statistically significant, $r(40) = .235, p = .138$. Similarly, the relationship between respondent preference and deductive post-test performance was not statistically significant, $r(40) = .290, p = .66$. These findings indicated an overall non-association of preference with post-test performance. The findings from research question 3 illustrated that a majority of

students (90%) reported that their preference, after exposure to both treatments, was to learn via the deductive approach. This preference resulted in a value of 1 or 2 on the Likert-type scale, or a mean preference score of 1.61. As a result, there was little variability in participant preferences for instructional method. This lack of variability most likely contributed to the lack of correlation between preference for instructional method and grammar performance on the post-test.

To assess question 5 (*Is there a relationship between students' stated instructional preference and their grammar performance as measured by immediate test scores?*) Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were also computed to address this research question. The results of this analysis illustrated that there was no statistically significant relationship between respondents' immediate guided inductive test scores and their stated preference for instructional method, $r(40) = .081, p = .625$. In a like manner, there was no statistically significant correlation between student's immediate deductive scores and their preference for approach, $r(40) = .101, p = .543$. Again, this lack of association is likely due to the minimal variability of respondents' preference scores.

Qualitative Results

To evaluate research question 3 (*What are students' stated preferences in terms of instructional approach*), the researcher collected participant responses to the post-test questionnaire and conducted semi-structured individual interviews with 10 respondents. As discussed in Chapter 3, the post-test questionnaire contained seven items that evaluated participants' general opinions about grammar instruction, their preferences for type of approach and their perspectives on the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. The semi-structured interviews were designed specifically to allow the

research to gather additional details about participants' comments from the post-test questionnaire. Using the semi-structured interviews in this way allowed for a nuanced explanation and clarification of respondents' opinions and preferences.

As the interviews were used primarily to gain a deeper and clearer understanding of student comments from the questionnaires, the results of these two instruments are co-mingled and will be presented together. In this way, a more integrated and thorough description of students' preferences and opinions is available. In cases where the source of a finding is useful for clarity, it has been included in this analysis. The data from these instruments were transcribed and transcriptions from each instrument were separately analyzed and coded for the emergence of major themes. For each instrument the researcher classified the data into categories based on similar descriptive information contained in participants' responses. These categories were assigned codes, or semantic tags making the data easy to combine. The codes from each instrument were compared and the researcher then collapsed similar first level-codes from each instrument into the overarching themes that will be discussed in detail below.

The Deductive approach

When analyzed in aggregate, participants' comments from the post-test questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews revealed their clear preference for the deductive approach to grammar instruction. Reasons for this preference clustered into six themes: (a) traditional learning, (b) error avoidance, (c) less confusion, (d) best approach for new material, (e) access to prior knowledge, and (f) boosted confidence.

Traditional Learning. Respondents reported preferring the deductive approach because it seemed familiar to them. Respondent C's response represents well many other

participants' opinions about their preference for the deductive approach: "It's the way I'm accustomed to learning." Further, participants described that other subjects such as math and science are traditionally taught deductively with teachers providing rules or formulas first, and subsequently providing examples for practice. Thus, the deductive approach to grammar instruction used in the current project represented a mode of learning that was familiar and accessible to students because they "know how to do it [follow a deductive type of lesson presentation]." This student's comment illustrated that there was no learning curve associated with the deductive condition. Most, if not all students, have experienced this approach for the majority of their academic careers. According to one student, "I believe I could learn better from the more traditional way [deductive approach]. I have lots of experience with this type of learning and do it well."

Error Avoidance. A concern about grammatical accuracy is another reason why participants reported preferring the deductive approach. Interested in "getting it right the first time", students expressed a desire to receive instruction about rules prior to manipulation of linguistic structures in speech or writing. Participants described a belief that initial receipt of rule instruction would enable them to avoid making errors. This error avoidance was also valued by participants as they expressed concern about forming bad habits, or making errors, if they did not have grammar rules prior to practice. Without rules, they were fearful of formulating inaccurate hypotheses about grammar rules and later having to "unlearn" these errors. Respondent I wondered: "What if I guess the wrong way to do it and think it's the right way? Then I'll have to re-train myself and might get really confused." Additionally, a few respondents believed that they would decrease future grammar errors if a teacher explained the rules from the outset, "If the

teacher tells us the rules first, I might not make a lot of mistakes. It will give me a good basis to start from.”

Access to prior knowledge. In addition to allowing participants to avoid producing errors, respondents also stated that the deductive approach to grammar instruction provided them with useful information in advance. This information, such as rules, and other grammatical labeling made some students more comfortable with the learning process. In this way, the rules served as a sort of advanced organizer, foreshadowing what would occur later in the lesson. It also enabled certain participants to associate previously learned grammar with the current lesson. For example, Student F described the following experience in her interview as she compared the process of learning deductively and with the guided inductive approach:

With the deductive lessons I had the name of the structure that we were going to study. If it was a structure I had learned before I could call-up my previous knowledge about it. For example with some of the jointly formed verb tenses [compound verbs] such as like the *futur antérieur* I remember thinking, ok here I need the future tense so I started thinking about how to conjugate my verbs in the future. With the other way that we learned [the guided inductive approach], I just had to look for patterns and hope I could figure it out. It was frustrating sometimes.

Boosted confidence. Participants described wanting access to rule-based explanations as it bolstered their confidence and enabled them to participate more fully in the practice that followed. They indicated that being provided rules prior to practice allowed them to know how the structure functioned, or what the correct sentence structure should be, “It’s

important for me to know how sentences are constructed. That's the way my brain works." As a result, these participants explained that they felt more prepared to take part in the choral repetition activity, "I liked the rules because they showed me what the response should look like. I wasn't totally lost when we were making the sentences."

Less Confusion. Perhaps related to each of the previous themes was a sentiment that the deductive approach is generally less confusing and thus preferred by many respondents. Described by participants as clear, straight-forward and familiar, the rule-based deductive approach was more appealing as they endeavored to understand how, why and when a linguistic structure was used. Several respondents lauded the deductive approach for providing clarifying information about how the grammar structure functions, all prior to any type of required practice. For example, "It's nice to know from the beginning how the grammar works. This information makes the rest of the lesson less confusing and easy to follow."

This desire for clarity was expounded upon in several interviews, as participants believed the deductive approach was "better" than the guided inductive approach when learning material for the first time. Similarly, respondents described that if students have no base of knowledge when learning a new structure, teacher-led explanation of the rules provides a foundation for learning new material through the introduction of rules. Respondent C noted, "It's the most practical if you have never seen a structure before. I think the rules first way is best if you're learning something for the first time."

Disadvantages to the Deductive Approach

Though most respondents preferred the deductive approach, respondents also described disadvantages to its use. The two primary disadvantages stated by respondents were: (a) difficulty of rule application and (b) teacher-focused instruction.

Difficulty of rule application. Several respondents expressed that the deductive approach seemed mechanized. Decrying receipt of a long list of often complex grammatical rules at the outset of the grammar presentation, students reported relying on memory to store the grammatical information for later application in the practice phase of the lesson, “Sometimes I couldn’t keep up with all the rules at the beginning. I couldn’t remember them.” As a result, the deductive approach was associated with memorization techniques and some respondents found this unfavorable, “If I have to just memorize the rules, I would rather use note cards than listen to the teacher just rattle them off”.

Teacher-focused instruction. Though some students valued the role of the teacher in enabling them to avoid errors and bad habits, others described the prominent role of the teacher as a disadvantage of the deductive approach. One student explained, “You are dependent on the teacher to teach you all the rules rather than discovering them for yourself.” An emphasis on teacher-driven explanations of grammar rules contributed to this approach being described as a more passive way of learning. Some students indicated that this passivity made them generally feel “less responsible for their learning.”

The Guided Inductive Approach

While most respondents preferred the deductive approach, a few expressed favoring the guided inductive approach. Themes related to this preference are: (a) learner engagement, (b) naturalness, (c) context, and (d) best approach for review.

Learner engagement. Participants who favored the inductive approach stated that it was primarily because of its active nature. Participants believed that the effort students must put forth to discover and understand grammatical patterns could lead to a deeper understanding of the structure, and they appreciated this “struggle.” Additionally, some respondents experienced a more thorough processing of the grammatical material via the guided inductive approach. For them, the guided inductive approach allowed students to experience the structure “at work” prior to considering any rules associated with it.

Student engagement was also attributed to the effectiveness of the guided inductive condition. Participants indicated that the process of “figuring out the rules” forces students to think for themselves without first relying on teacher explanations. With the teacher asking guiding questions in the co-construction phase of the lessons, students’ active participation in discovering and understanding grammatical rules was valued by some respondents. Some students believed that their increased engagement was linked to easier retention of the material. One participant stated, “It’s easier to remember the rules later if you have practiced them before learning them.”

Naturalness. Certain respondents described the inductive approach as natural. As a result, these respondents indicated that it was easier to learn this condition. When asked to clarify their meaning of the word “natural” during interviews, participants shared similar definitions. Respondent F described natural learning as similar to the way children learn their first language. She further explained that the focus of the guided inductive approach was on practice of the targeted structure instead of being distracted by an emphasis on learning rules. Respondent H mentioned a similar notion as he indicated that, while the guided inductive learning is likely slower in pace than deductive learning, it occurs in

much the same way that first language learning does in children, by listening and observing with no attention to rules.

In a related description of naturalness, Respondent I described an advantage of the guided inductive approach as follows, “After repeating the structure over and over again, it becomes kind of second nature. It just sounds right in my ear after a while.” Similar data from questionnaires indicated that, when participants learned via the guided inductive approach, structures became embedded in their minds after practice of the model sentences.

Context. Some respondents indicated that the realistic setting of contextualized examples aided in their understanding. For example, “The examples really showed me how to actually use the grammar. Instead of just having a rule I could see how it [the targeted grammar structure] actually is used.” Similarly, a few respondents reported that it was easier to understand how to apply and use structures as students were initially exposed to them via an authentic, realistic application. Participant F described the following during the individual interview: “The practice examples [from the guided inductive approach] showed me how the grammar actually worked... you know, the way people would really say it.”

Best for review. Other interview respondents preferred this method for the review of formerly learned material. These students explained that if the structure under review was material that participants had learned previously, their exposure to practice sentences, followed by teacher-led guiding questions about the rule for the structure was valued. Respondent E mentioned, “It was ok to just throw me into the lesson with no rules if I had already learned the structure before.” As students already had a base of knowledge

related to the structure, they reported that they did not feel lost or frustrated with the lack of rules associated with the guided inductive approach. In terms of review, they also mentioned that learning inductively triggered memories of grammatical knowledge that they had learned before. As an example, Respondent F described, “Since I already know the rules about the grammar, I don’t wanna (sic) see them again. Going right to the practice part made me remember the grammar from before.” Another respondent summarized that this approach allows students to think critically about what they already know. As a result, the guided inductive condition was credited with being most effective for the review of grammatical material.

Disadvantages of the Guided Inductive approach

Students’ opinions regarding disadvantages to the guided inductive approach centered on one primary theme, lack of clarity.

Lack of clarity. Many respondents cited a lack of clear rule explanations as a disadvantage of the guided inductive approach. In a related way, students felt that this approach was less organized and difficult to follow because the rules were not presented initially. There was no organizing or guiding information at the outset of the lesson and some participants explained that this lack of clarity was frustrating and made the grammar presentations unpleasant. Participants reported being unsure of how to use the rules and thus unable to participate in the choral repetitions, “Sometimes I had no idea what [the teacher] was saying. I just got frustrated and tuned out.”

This lack of clarity also contributed to students who blindly followed the teacher or copied their classmates’ responses during the choral repetition of examples. Unable to discern the pattern governing a structure’s use, some respondents could not complete the

oral practice comprising the Attention to Form phase of the PACE model of language instruction used in this project. A few participants mentioned that when the guided inductive approach was used to teach structures that they had never learned before, they felt “thrown in” and “blind-sided” by the lesson. These participants did not feel that they had enough background knowledge to understand the patterns presented in relation to new material.

Some respondents also indicated that the guided inductive approach seemed “backwards” to them. These respondents mentioned that this approach was less useful because they did not understand how the rules of the targeted grammar structure functioned. As a result, they felt they were blindly following the teacher, mimicking the model sentences rather than truly manipulating the structure based on their own understanding. They also mentioned that this approach felt more like they had memorized a pattern rather than having developed control of the grammar structure under review. This uncertainty was underscored by other participants who mentioned that the guided inductive approach seemed disjointed and too rapid as the lack of understanding of the rules governing a structure’s use led to a decrease in confidence in participating in the choral repetition.

In summary, the results of post-study questionnaires and individual interviews revealed that students preferred the deductive approach to grammar instruction associated with the current project. Deemed traditional and familiar, students were most comfortable with the deductive condition because they were accustomed to learning this way. They found the deductive approach to be clear as they relied on explicit instruction based on rules at the outset of the lessons. Participants felt that the rule-intensive design of the

deductive approach would prevent them from developing adverse learning habits such as making grammatical errors. At the same time, students saw value to learning via the guided inductive approach, particularly for previously learned material. An initial emphasis on practice rather than rules was seen as a means of activating previous knowledge about grammatical material. Students also described favoring the active nature of the guided inductive approach as they appreciated the learner engagement inherently involved in discovering grammatical rules after practice.

CHAPTER 5

LIMITATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to investigate the effects of deductive and guided inductive approaches on the learning of grammar in an advanced French grammar course. Specifically this study compared the effects of these two pedagogical conditions by measuring students' grammar performance on immediate and delayed post-tests of advanced-level linguistic structures. This project also investigated whether students preferred to learn via the guided inductive or deductive approach, and whether there was a relationship between their stated instruction delivery preference and their short- and long-term grammar performance.

Limitations

The nature of classroom-based research presented a number of threats to the internal and external validity of this research project. As a result, the implications of such threats should be considered when drawing conclusions about the results of the data analysis.

Sampling

Threats to the external validity of this study were primarily due to the nature of the sample groups. Participants in this study were drawn from a convenience sample and were not randomly selected. Non-random selection of a sample contributes to sampling error. This limitation is common to classroom research and was unavoidable in the current study. The non-random selection of the sample from a more general population, as well as the lack of random assignment of participants to each of the two treatment conditions, were offset by use of the equivalent time samples *within-subjects* research

design. Each student was exposed to each condition an equal number of times and thus served as his or her control.

Non-random assignment of this project's sample may also raise questions related to the equivalence of the groupings of participants at the outset of the project. As explained in the previous section, the one-way ANOVA analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences among the classroom sections evaluated in this project prior to the administration of the grammar pre-test.

Generalizability

Also related to the lack of random assignment of the sample of participants is a threat to the population validity of this project. It should be noted that the results of this study may not be generalizable to contexts and settings beyond the one in which it was conducted. In terms of the context of the current project, this study tested only one type of deductive approach, one that is traditional and prevalent in many FL classrooms. On the other hand, the type of inductive approach that was evaluated in this project was a blend of two others: the guided inductive approach (Herron & Tomasello, 1992) and the PACE model (Adair-Hauck, Donato & Cumo-Johanssen, 2005). As a result of this focus on a specific type of inductive approach, the results of this project may not be generalizable to other contexts where a different inductive approach may be considered.

In a related way, this study evaluated students' grammar performance on written pre-, post- and immediate tests. It did not investigate their performance on tasks related to oral, aural, reading or discourse-level writing skills. Further, this project evaluated academic outcomes on a selected group of 10 grammatical structures with advanced grammar students. It should be noted that these structures, while relevant to the French

203 context and this project, and illustrative of a broad range of linguistic patterns, are by no means representative of all French grammar. Additionally, grammatical structures have varying syntactic functions and morphological structures that contribute to their complexity. As such, some structures may lend themselves to one instructional approach over the other. Hammerly (1975) suggested that some structures may be learned more effectively with the deductive condition while others with the inductive condition.

Procedural

Another relevant limitation of this project concerns personological validity. This threat to external validity of the project relates to “an interaction between possible treatment effects and specific characteristics of subjects” (Haller & Kleine, 2001). In other words, as students prefer certain instructional approaches over others, it is possible that they might have had negative reactions to either the deductive or guided inductive presentational approaches. This possible condition aversion was mitigated by use of the *within-subjects* research design. Each student was exposed to each condition an equal number of times and thus potential preferences for either method were counterbalanced.

Ecological

Ecological effects related to the particular process and procedures of this project included test-wiseness or test sensitization. These effects could limit the applicability of this project to other contexts. For example, over the course of the project, participants could become accustomed to their repeated exposure to the two conditions and this repetition could have an affect on their performance over time.

Students’ previous knowledge of French was an additional ecological effect. The university at which this project was conducted did not assign students to language course

levels based on their performance on a placement test. Often advanced language students in college-level courses have had varying levels of previous exposure to the language in high school or other college courses. However, for the current study, analysis of the pre-test means illustrated that the three sections under evaluation were comparable in terms of their knowledge of French grammar prior to their exposure to either of the conditions.

Design

A limitation of this research related to its design was the possible presence of carryover effects. These effects may exist when early treatments continue to have an influence after a test has been administered and thus affect later treatments (Keppel, 1991; Mills, Herron & Cole, 2004). SL researchers commonly reduce carryover effects by allowing time to elapse between treatments. In the current study, the targeted grammar structures were taught at least one week apart.

The potential for researcher bias also raises concerns regarding the validity of this project. The principal investigator served in many roles for this project including co-creator of the PowerPoint presentations and teaching scripts and instructor of the classroom treatments. Despite this involvement, the researcher made a concerted effort to acknowledge and limit her biases while observing the experiences and performance of participants in the course. Though this research had as its goal to evaluate guided inductive and deductive approaches to grammar instruction, the primary aim of the courses involved in this investigation was to ensure that students learned French using a communicative approach with contextualized materials and authentic language use. The quantitative findings from this project indicated that learning indeed occurred in these courses.

In spite of these limitations, it should be emphasized that a significant strength of the study's design was that the principal investigator taught the classroom treatments for each of the four sections. As a result, the investigator was able to ensure that the classroom procedures for each section were identical. Overall consistency of this nature eliminated the possibility of variation in terms of presentation style, tone of voice or intonation that could have affected the outcome of this project. Moreover the investigator videotaped herself teaching the treatment phases. A peer reviewed the recordings to ensure that one approach was not favored over the other.

Another important strength of this project was that all materials, such as PowerPoint presentations and quizzes, were integrated into the overall structure of the course. Similarly, the lessons comprising the two instructional approaches were crafted using contemporary cultural references that provided students with access to authentic examples in a meaningful, relevant context.

Analysis of Research Questions

The results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses of this project are important contributions to the debate of whether guided inductive or deductive teaching approaches are more effective in terms of learner outcomes in proficiency-oriented FL classrooms guided by communicative language teaching philosophies. Also of importance, the current study provides much needed information about student performance and preferences at the advanced level of French study. The outcomes from the current study both affirm and contradict the findings of other projects that have addressed this debate. Supported by theories of learning and SLA, these results are relevant and applicable to both researchers and classroom teachers alike.

Each research question will be discussed in order; however, the qualitative results from research question 3 provide useful insights that clarify, corroborate and support the outcomes of the quantitative results from this project. Thus, these qualitative findings will be integrated throughout the discussion of these analyses to provide the reader with a complete and nuanced interpretation of the results.

Research question 1: Which instructional approach, deductive or guided inductive, is more effective on advanced French students' short-term learning of grammatical structures?

Findings from research question 1 indicated that no significant differences were found between conditions for short-term learning of the targeted grammar structures. Both the deductive and guided inductive instructional approaches were effective in the short-term learning of 10 grammatical patterns in French by advanced level French college students. Reasons that the two conditions appeared to be effective in terms of short-term grammar performance are unknown; however, perhaps the review-nature of the grammatical structures might play a role in these non-significant findings. The linguistic structures selected for inclusion in this project were chosen based on their level of complexity and for the reason that they represented continued areas for improvement in students' oral and written production. Even so, it is likely that the majority of participants in this project had previously been exposed to the targeted grammar structures as the mean number of years of previous French study was approximately five years, with the range being from two to nine years. Since participants had potentially previously learned this material, it is possible that students performed with no significant differences on their immediate grammar quizzes regardless of the condition in which they

learned the grammatical structure. In other words, since the lessons marked a review of previously learned material, the consequence of the two conditions was nominal.

This current finding of no significant differences between the two conditions on the short-term learning of grammar from the current project contrasts with results from Herron and Tomasello (1992), Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007), Haight (2008), and Piot, Herron, Cole, and York (2008). These latter four projects revealed that the guided inductive condition was superior to the deductive condition in terms of short-term learner performance as measured by immediate test scores. Potential reasons for a divergence in findings are numerous. While sharing many similarities, such as using the within-subjects equivalent time samples design, evaluating adult learners in college-level courses, and testing the same types of conditions (deductive and guided inductive based on the PACE model), these projects had other distinguishing features. For example, each of the five projects used different test formats for the immediate quizzes. Additionally, these projects were conducted in different levels of study, ranging from the beginning to advanced level. As a result, the complexity and type of structures evaluated by each project varied. Finally, the amount of previous French study for the participants in these projects was different. It is likely that students enrolled in beginning French - the level evaluated in Herron & Tomasello (1992), Haight, et al. (2007), and Haight (2008) – had little familiarity with the targeted structures. In contrast, students in the current project reported a minimum of 2 years of previous French study. Also of importance, beginning level students with limited previous French instruction likely experienced their first exposure to the targeted grammar structures in these related projects. Therefore, the

nature of exposure to the grammatical material, whether first-time, or review, could have influenced each condition's effects on learner outcomes.

Findings from the qualitative results of this project provide additional insight related to the outcome of research question 1. Qualitative findings suggested contradictory views about students' perceptions of deductive and guided inductive approaches and spoke to the highly subjective nature of students' preferences. Even when describing advantages of the deductive method, respondents offered contrasting views for *why* deductive learning was advantageous. For example, Participant F indicated that the rule-based nature of the deductive condition served as a valuable type of advanced organizer allowing her to activate her schemata of *previously learned* information. At the same time, another participant explained that the deductive approach was best when learning *new* material because the rules offered at the beginning of the lesson were helpful at first exposure to a grammatical structure. Such a juxtaposition of characteristics could support the finding of non-significance for research question 1, as the benefits and disadvantages of the two approaches counterbalance each other, leading both conditions to provide equal results in terms of short-term learning.

Research question 2: Which instructional approach, deductive or guided inductive, is more effective on advanced French students' long-term retention of grammatical structures?

Analysis of the 2 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA indicated statistically significant results in two areas. First, this test revealed that long-term learning occurred in both conditions over the course of the semester, thus demonstrating that students made significant performance gains during the 15-week term. This finding supports results

from Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007), Haight (2008), and Piot, Herron, Cole, and York (2008) as each study also reported statistically significant main effects for time, again illustrating overall improvement in grammar knowledge during the course of the semester. Though it is apparent that learning indeed occurred, it is not possible to attribute increases in learning to either of the two conditions. Instead, the improvements in grammar performance are linked to both approaches. This finding is important in the context of classroom-based research as of primary importance is that students indeed learn French despite the outcome of the research project.

The repeated measures ANOVA also revealed that there was a significant interaction effect between type of approach and time. Otherwise stated, this interaction indicated greater increases in means from pre-test (3.37) to post-test (4.51) for the guided inductive condition, or a 33.8% increase, than for the deductive condition (3.88 to 4.21), only an 8.5% increase. These results indicated a significantly greater increase in learning from pre- to post-test for students in the inductive treatment condition than for those in the deductive condition.

Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007) reported a similar finding. Their project revealed a trend approaching significance based on a greater increase in pre- to post-test scores for the guided inductive condition. The similarity in findings between the current project and the Haight, et al. study suggested that the guided inductive approach facilitated greater increases in pre-to post-test scores among a range of study-related characteristics, including the beginning French students with an average 1.5 years of previous study and the advanced French students with an average 5 years of previous study. The divergence in these participant characteristics highlighted a benefit of the guided inductive approach

for long-term increases in grammatical performance over the course of the semester, whether students were novice learners, or experienced with French study.

Additionally, these results suggested that the guided inductive approach to grammar instruction might be well-suited to a variety of different grammatical structures, and different types of material, either newly presented to students, or review material. For example, with the beginning level evaluated in the Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007) project, it is likely that the targeted grammatical structures were new to students. Still, this project yielded a trend approaching significance for increases in pre- to post-study scores in the long-term learning of this material. Conversely, students in the current project reported an average of 5 years of previous French study; however, there was a related finding of significant increases in pre- to post-test scores for the guided inductive condition.

Cognitive theories of education as applied to language learning also support the analysis of these results. Purported by Ausubel (1968), Ellis (1985) and McLaughlin (1987, 1990), cognitive theories such as constructivism stress the accumulation of knowledge as a process where learners should be engaged in developing critical thinking and analysis skills. Associated with active learning, or learning by doing, students are viewed as autonomous agents responsible for discovering answers and producing their own interpretations. Constructivist theories also describe learners' abilities to create and re-create organizational schema of information as they are exposed to it (Brown, 2001). In its application to language learning in particular, constructivists explain that learners are said to experience a process whereby they organize information into internal representations that undergo continuous restructuring as proficiency develops.

McLaughlin summarizes this learning theory when he states, “The learner also has to impose an organizational structure on the new information that is constantly being added to the system” (1987, p. 134). As additional information is learned, the existing information is restructured to accommodate what is new.

Cognitive theory seems particularly applicable to the notion that the guided inductive approach promoted long-term gains in grammar knowledge regardless of participants’ level of instruction. It is possible that outcomes from the current project are illustrative of the continuous process of restructuring that occurs as learners’ proficiency improves. Further research should be conducted with advanced learners to investigate how they retain information and the ways in which guided inductive approach might improve retention over time.

Qualitative results from the current project also relate to cognitive theories of language learning and the significant results of this research question. Highlighting the discovery nature of the guided inductive condition, the theme of “learner engagement” emerged from participant comments on the post-test questionnaire and in individual interviews as an important advantage of this approach. Respondents mentioned that the guided inductive approach required that they “struggle” to discover the rules for themselves. It is possible that the difficulties students faced as they co-constructed the rule with the teacher are illustrative of internal processes such as the restructuring of information that is key to the cognitive theories of language learning.

Finally, given that the guided inductive approach evaluated in this project included the PACE model of grammar instruction, it is important to note that the finding favoring the guided inductive condition for significant gains in grammar performance

between pre- and post-tests is supported by sociocultural theory. Associated with Vygotsky (1986), sociocultural theory describes learning as a social process heavily rooted in mediation. Vygotsky argues that cognitive skills develop as students engage a competent expert during learning activities. In this way, meaning is created socially, through interaction. The co-construction phase of the PACE model, whereby learners were led to generalize and predict grammatical patterns by the teacher's use of guided questions, illustrates this process, highlighting the interpersonal nature of PACE.

Research question 3: What are students' stated preferences in terms of instructional approach?

Results of the post-project questionnaire indicated that 90 percent of respondents preferred to learn the targeted grammar structures deductively, by first learning the rule and then practicing the rule with contextualized examples. Open-ended participant comments from the post-test questionnaire and from individual interviews supported this finding. Many participants indicated that they preferred the deductive approach because it was the traditional way that they have always learned. As a result, respondents reported being most familiar and comfortable with this approach. Similarly, students mentioned that learning via the deductive approach enhanced their confidence to participate in class. Having initial access to the grammar rules made participants feel as if they could more fully participate in choral repetition during the co-construction phase because they knew what the correct answer should be.

Participants' preference for a learning environment featuring an approach to grammar instruction that was comfortable is illustrative of Krashen's affective filter hypothesis (1982). As a component of his Monitor Model, Krashen describes that the

optimal conditions for the noticing of comprehensible input by language learners is for learning to take place in a low-anxiety environment. He further asserts that students should be highly motivated and have a positive attitude towards the learning task. In that a majority of participants (90 %) preferred the explicit grammar rules of the deductive condition, it appears that this approach met their affective needs even if only from the point of view of personal preference.

In light of significant findings favoring the guided inductive condition for improved long-term gains in grammar performance between pre- and post-tests, further research is needed to evaluate students' affective concerns against any potential increase of the affective filter that the guided inductive condition might cause. For example, the qualitative findings indicated that students felt they had to "struggle" when learning with the guided inductive approach. While they felt that this level of engagement was an overall benefit of this approach because it led to a deeper understanding of grammatical material, it also implied increased anxiety and potentially other unpleasant emotions such as frustration which could lead to decreased motivation (Brown, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2005). Thus, further research could assist teachers and researchers in understanding how to balance affective concerns against the engagement-oriented aspects of this approach.

It is difficult to directly compare the quantitative results of research question 3 from the current project to other similar research in the area of students' stated preferences. Other projects framed preference questions in different ways. For example, Haight (2008) and Piot, Herron, Cole, and York (2008) gauged preference by asking students the following: "When learning grammatical structures in a FL classroom do you prefer having the rule explained completely by the teacher or do you prefer guessing how

the grammatical pattern works with some guidance from the teacher?" While the overall content of this question is similar to the one used in the current project where students indicated their preference for *either* the deductive or guided inductive approach, it did not force a choice between the two approaches. Nonetheless, 73% of participants in the Haight (2008) study preferred having the rule explained completely by teacher (the deductive condition) while 27% preferred guessing (the guided inductive condition). Similarly, 80% of respondents preferred deductive in the Piot et al. project and 15% preferred the guided inductive condition. Future projects continuing this stream of research might consider adopting a standard question to gauge preference so that accurate comparisons across projects can be made.

Research question 4: Is there a relationship between students' stated instructional preference and their grammar performance as measured by post-test scores?

The relationship between participant preference for approach and their guided inductive post-test performance was not statistically significant. Similarly, preference scores did not correlate with participants' deductive post-test scores. These findings indicated an overall non-association of preference with post-test performance. As 90% of students indicated that they preferred the deductive approach, this non-association was likely due to an absence in variability of preference scores.

Interestingly, student performance over the course of the semester improved significantly more from the pre-test to the post-test when students learned the grammatical structure in the guided inductive condition. As a result, there is an inconsistency between students' stated preference for the deductive condition and their improved long-term performance when they learned in the guided inductive condition.

Further, though they expressed a clear preference for deductive learning of the targeted grammatical structures, the qualitative analyses revealed that participants could also articulate a number of advantages to the guided inductive approach. These advantages included the active nature of this approach which leads to a notable amount of student engagement, the use of realistic examples that increase understanding, and the naturalistic setting of providing examples without rules that simulates first language learning.

Analysis of this research question supported findings from Haight (2008) and Piot, Herron, Cole, and York (2008). These projects also reported inconsistencies between learners' stated preferences and their performance. Reasons for this discrepancy between preference and performance are unknown; however, based on the results of these three projects, it can now be stated that this dissonance occurs at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of college-level French study. Findings from Haight (2008) indicated that participants in the project had different learning styles. Though the question of individual learning styles was not explored in her study, the results from the qualitative phase of Haight's mixed methodology design revealed that individuals indeed had different opinions about which approach to grammar instruction they preferred.

A similar conclusion about differences in learning styles could be drawn from the current study as participants expressed seemingly contradictory opinions about reasons why they preferred either the deductive or guided inductive approach while their performance was significantly better in the guided inductive condition over the course of the semester. For example, participants indicated that an advantage of the deductive approach was that it was best when learning new material. At the same time, participants described that it was best for accessing prior knowledge. Still further complicating one's

understanding of these preferences was the notion that participants also indicated that inductive approach was best for the review of previously learned material. Therefore, there were conflicting reasons for preference by conditions and across conditions. While this is an interesting hypothesis, further research is necessary to explore differences in learning styles and their effects on deductive and guided inductive learning of French grammatical structures.

Research question 5: Is there a relationship between students' stated instructional preference and their grammar performance as measured by immediate test scores?

The results of this research question did not indicate that there was any correlation between student preference for instructional method and grammar performance on the immediate tests. As was the case with research question 4, this lack of correlation was likely due to the absence of variability in student preferences.

A lack of significant differences between the two instructional approaches in terms of immediate test performance is intriguing in light of students' overwhelming indication that they preferred to learn French grammar deductively. The strong preference for deductive learning was revealed in the quantitative findings and corroborated by the qualitative results. It is unclear, though, why this preference was not also manifested in the short-term grammar performance of the participants. As previously mentioned, perhaps the benefits and deficiencies of each method counterbalanced each other.

Further research should be conducted to explore the relationship between student preferences and their actual performance. It could be useful to investigate affective factors that might influence the approaches that students prefer. For example, an examination of learning styles could provide useful insight into particular characteristics

that might lend themselves to certain instructional delivery preferences. Linking learning style classifications to performance data could also lead to an understanding of the types of students who learn best via a guided inductive method, or the ways in which teachers might design their courses to appeal to the preferences and sensibilities of a wide range of personalities and learning styles.

Conclusion

This research project was designed to continue a stream of research that has provided empirical evidence revealing that the guided inductive approach to grammar instruction has positive effects on students' short- and long-term grammar performance in college-level French courses. The current project's findings specifically indicated that advanced students made significant gains in grammar performance from pre- to post-test when they were first exposed to the grammatical material via the guided inductive condition. This outcome is particularly important as it extends the focus of previous projects from the beginning and intermediate levels now to the advanced level of college French study. Future projects should continue to investigate the effects of the guided inductive approach with different levels of learners. A longitudinal project following learners as they progress from beginning to advanced levels of study could provide valuable insights on the ways in which the guided inductive approach might suit their affective and linguistic needs over time. Future research should also investigate the effects of the guided inductive approach on different grammatical structures and in other populations, such as K-12 environments. Also of importance would be to investigate the effects of guided induction using the PACE model with other macro skills such as written format or oral formats.

Based on the results from this project, classroom teachers should consider crafting classroom presentations of grammatical material using the guided inductive approach. This suggestion could pose difficulties for teachers as most textbooks still teach grammar inductively. Additionally, teachers have many demands on their class preparation time and oral drills based on the guided inductive approach must be created anew. However, teachers should consider that the presentation materials used in this project were contextualized activities related to current events or popular culture such as a hypothetical campus visit by President Obama, or societal expectations in the lives of Princes William and Harry. Lessons were illustrated by researcher-prepared *PowerPoint* visuals that also included practice exercises. These lessons were not tied to any specific curriculum and could be re-used many times. Once created, these materials would be a valuable teaching tool and could be widely shared among faculty at an institution. The results of this project indicate that this investment in creativity and innovation would be worthwhile for students at any level of study.

References

- Abraham, R. (1985). Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 689-702.
- ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. (1982). Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. (1999). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st Century*. (1996). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Adair-Hauck, B., & Donato, R. (2000). Using a story-based approach to teach grammar. In J.L. Shrum & E.W. Glisan (Eds.), *Teacher's handbook: contextualized language instruction*, (146-171). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Adair-Hauck, B., Donato, R., & Cumo-Johanssen, P. (2005). Using a story-based approach to teach grammar. In J. Shrum & E. Glisan (Eds.), *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (3rd ed.) (pp.189-213). Boston: Thomson Heinle.
- Aski, K.M. (2003). Foreign language textbook activities: Keeping pace with foreign language acquisition research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 57-64.
- Ausubel, D. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longmann, Inc..

- Brod, R., & Huber, B. (1996). The MLA Survey of Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, 1994-95. *ADFL Bulletin* 28.1, 35-43.
- Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania* 77, 262-274.
- Capretz, P. (2006). *Jules et Jim* Interactif DVD-ROM: An Interactive Film Companion to Your French Program, 1st Edition. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second language and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 25, 459-480.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornveit, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 31, 141-152.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chastain, K. (1976). *Developing second language skills: Theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., & Souberman, E. (1978). *L.S. Vygotsky Mind in Society: The Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeKeyser, R. (1994). Implicit and explicit learning of L2 grammar: A pilot study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 188-194.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eigler, F. (2001). Designing a third-year German course for a content-oriented, task-based curriculum. *Teaching German*, 34, 107-118.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). SLA and language pedagogy: An educational perspective. *Studies in second language acquisition* 19, 69-92.
- Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 39-60.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 242-260.
- Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communication about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 605-628.

- Frazer, S. (1988). Student interest and input in Advanced Language Courses. *The French Review*, 61, 587-592.
- Gay, L.R. (1980). *Educational Evaluation & Measurement*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Haight, C., Herron, C., & Cole, S.P. (2007). The effects of deductive and guided inductive instructional approaches on the learning of grammar in the elementary foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 288-310.
- Haight, C. (2008). The effects of guided inductive, deductive, and garden path instructional approaches and techniques on the learning of grammatical patterns and deviations in the beginning-level foreign language classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Haller, E. & Klein, P. (2001). *Using Educational Research: A school administrator's guide*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Hammerly, H. (1975). The deduction/induction controversy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59, 15-18.
- Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *The French Review*, 65, 708-718.
- Hossein, N. & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- Jankowska, A. (1988). The advanced students' motivation for explicit learning of grammar. *Glottodidactica*, 24, 85-94.

Johnson, R., & Onweugbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.

Katz, S. & Blyth, C.S. (2008) What is grammar? In S. Katz and J. Watzinger-Tharp (Eds.) *Conceptions of L2 grammar: Theoretical approaches and their application in the L2 classroom*. Boston: Heinle.

Keppel, C. (1991). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

Lantolf, J. (2006). *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 1, 67-109.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1995). On the teaching and learning of grammar: Challenging the myths. In Eckman, F. (ed.) *Second Language Acquisition (pp.131-160)*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 359-382.

Long, M. (1991b). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39-52)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Long, M. (1997) Focus on form in task-based language teaching. Presentation at the Fourth Annual McGraw Hill Teleconference in Second Language Teaching. Available: [<http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/foreignlang/top.htm>]
- acquisition and second language learning. *Language Learning* 31, 493-502.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996).
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). 'Conscious' versus 'unconscious learning'. *TESOL Quarterly* 24, 617-34.
- Mills, N. Herron, C. & Cole, S. (2004). Teacher-assisted versus Individual Viewing of Foreign Language Video: Relation to Comprehension, Self-efficacy and Engagement. *Calico Journal*, 21(2), 1-26.
- Miles & Huberman (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Modern Language Association of America, (2007). *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. Retrieved May 15, 2009 from http://www.mla.org/pdf/forlang_news_pdf.pdf
- Morris, M, Herron, C. & Estin, C. (2004). *Identité, Modernité, Texte*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- National Council for State Supervisors of Foreign Language (2008). *States with or considering high school graduation requirements of all students February 2008*. Retrieved on 3/11/2008 from http://www.ncssfl.org/reports2/view_state_responses.php

National standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century.

Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Does type of instruction make a difference?

Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language Learning*, 51, 157-213.

Nunnally, J. (1967). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston: Thomson Heinle.

Pienemann, M. (1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (Eds.) *Modeling and assessing second language development*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Piot, S. Herron, C., Cole, S. York, H. (2009). The effectiveness of a guided inductive versus a deductive approach on the learning of grammar in the intermediate-level college French classroom. Manuscript under review. Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search conditions, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 27-67.

Rosa, R., & O'Neill, M.D. (1999). Explicitness, intake, and the issue of awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 511-556.

- Rubin, H. & Rubin, I. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Savignon, S. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Seliger, H.W. (1975). Inductive method and deductive method in language teaching: A re-examination. *IRA*, 13, 1-18.
- Scott, V. (1989). An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 14-22.
- Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 395-403.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 159-168.
- Shelly, S. (1993). Rule reformation at the advanced level. *The French Review*, 66, 760-768.
- Shrum, J., & Glisan, E. (2005). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal Behavior*. Acton, MA: Copley Publishing Group.
- Stillman, D. & Gordon, R. (2007). *Reprise: A French grammar worktext*. (2nd ed.) City, McGraw Hill.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Wiemann, J. & Cacklund, P. (1980). Current theory and research In communicative competence. *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 185-199.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Galloway and B. Richards (Eds.) *Input and interaction in language acquisition* (pp. 219-249) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zykik, E. & Polio, C. (2008). Incidental focus on form in university Spanish literature courses. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 53-70.

APPENDIX A

Pre-Test/ Post-Test of Grammatical Knowledge

Code postal _____ Jour de naissance _____

La grande nouvelle

1. Ce matin tout paraissait différent grâce à l'enveloppe bleue qui _____ la veille.
 - a. est arrivée
 - b. était arrivée
 - c. arrivait
 - d. arriva

2. Même si sa mère lui a dit qu'il _____ la lettre dans quelques mois, le fait de l'avoir réellement entre ses mains l'a rendu fou de joie.
 - a. recevra
 - b. reçoit
 - c. a reçu
 - d. recevrait

3. C'était bien une réponse pour le travail _____ Pierre s'intéressait depuis longtemps.
 - a. où
 - b. dont
 - c. auquel
 - d. à laquelle

4. Le jeune homme était content que l'employé de la poste _____ cette lettre mardi dernier.
 - a. a déposé
 - b. avait déposé
 - c. ait déposé
 - d. soit déposé

5. Dans les rues les passants marchaient _____ comme toujours mille problèmes à résoudre.
 - a. avaient
 - b. avoir
 - c. ayant
 - d. ont eu

6. « Ils _____ être aussi ravis que moi s'ils recevaient une lettre comme la mienne, » se disait le jeune homme.
- pourront
 - pourraient
 - pouvaient
 - auraient pu
7. Suite à la grande nouvelle qu'il _____ avec tant de joie, Pierre se sentait la personne la plus heureuse au monde.
- a appris
 - ait appris
 - apprenait
 - avait apprise
8. Il ressentait le besoin de garder son secret juste pour lui, au moins pour quelques temps, avant que ses parents ou ses amis ne l' _____.
- apprenaient
 - apprendront
 - apprennent
 - apprendraient
9. Pierre savait bien que tous ses amis _____ heureux pour lui, si au moins l'un d'entre eux avait appris par hasard la nouvelle.
- auraient été
 - seraient
 - avaient été
 - seront
10. Pressé, Pierre traversait les quartiers de la ville au moment _____ sa mère commença sa longue journée de travail.
- dont
 - qui
 - où
 - que
11. Pierre sourit : sa mère saura la nouvelle aussitôt qu'elle _____ son visage.
- verra
 - aurait vu
 - va voir
 - aura vu
12. Même s'il avait voulu lui cacher quelque chose, il _____ le faire.
- ne pouvait pas
 - ne pourrait pas
 - n'aurait pas pu

d. n'avait pas pu

13. Dans les rues, tous les gens semblaient ravis que la lettre désirée _____.

- a. sera arrivé
- b. sera arrivée
- c. soit arrivée
- d. arrivera

14. Les marchands lui souriaient _____ les portes de leurs boutiques.

- a. ouvrir
- b. en ouvrant
- c. ouvriraient
- d. avaient ouvert

15. Soudain, il pensa au club de français, une association intéressante _____ il avait souvent participé.

- a. à laquelle
- b. dont
- c. auquel
- d. où

16 Il s'est dit que dans quelques jours seulement, il _____ s'habituer à sa nouvelle vie.

- a. doit
- b. devrait
- c. aura dû
- d. a dû

17. Lorsqu'il _____, les choses ne seront plus les mêmes.

- a. soit parti
- b. part
- c. partirait
- d. sera parti

18. Hélas, il faudra bientôt quitter cette ville ensoleillée _____ il gardera pour toujours un doux souvenir.

- a. où
- b. que
- c. qui
- d. dont

19. Mes amis _____ contents s'ils recevaient de bonnes nouvelles à propos de mon succès, se dit Pierre.

- a. seraient
- b. seront
- c. étaient

d. auraient été

20. Pierre pensait faire tout son possible afin que le monde entier _____ un jour son nom.

- a. saurait
- b. va savoir
- c. aura su
- d. sache

High School	_____	_____	_____
College/University	_____	_____	_____
In France or in a French Speaking Country	_____	_____	_____

12. Have you ever spent time or lived in a French speaking country? ___ yes ___ no

 Countr(ies): _____ Length of stay: _____

13. If you have studied a foreign language other than French, please indicate the language and the number of years studied below.

Language: _____ Number of years studied: _____

Language: _____ Number of years studied: _____

APPENDIX C

Immediate Tests

Activité # 1. Le conditionnel présent

Imaginez-vous maintenant que Sasha et Melia accompagnent leurs parents dans le voyage à Atlanta. Construisez des phrases à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous qui décrivent leur découverte de la ville et de ses curiosités. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. Si elles faisaient beaucoup de promenades à pied ...</p> <p>2. Si les filles voulaient apprendre plus sur l'histoire de Coca-Cola...</p> <p>3. Si Sasha et Melia parlaient de leur nouvelle école</p> <p>4. Et si leur père avait un peu de temps libre ...</p>	<p>A. ... tout le monde _____ (écouter) avec beaucoup d'attention.</p> <p>B. ... il _____ (envoyer) sans doute une belle carte postale à sa belle-mère.</p> <p>C. ...Sasha et Melia _____ (connaître) mieux Atlanta.</p> <p>D. ... elles _____ (devoir) visiter le complexe magnifique qui se trouve au centre de la ville.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Activité # 2. Le plus-que-parfait

Parlons maintenant du succès de l'équipe féminine de natation. Construisez des phrases à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. Au moment de la réception des médailles les nageuses américaines ont déclaré aux journalistes ...</p>	<p>A. ... que la nageuse _____ (franchir) la ligne d'arrivée parmi les premiers.</p>
<p>2. Les amis de Dara Torres n'ont pas pu retenir leurs larmes de joie en apprenant ...</p>	<p>B. ... c'est parce qu'elle _____ (s'entraîner) auparavant avec beaucoup de détermination et persévérance.</p>
<p>3. À la fin des Jeux olympiques toutes les nageuses étaient fatiguées mais heureuses ...</p>	<p>C. ... qu'elles _____ (devoir) faire beaucoup d'efforts pour obtenir cette victoire.</p>
<p>4. Si Dara Torres a remporté trois médailles d'argent lors des Jeux olympiques de Pékin ...</p>	<p>D. ... car elles _____ (obtenir) de très bons résultats.</p>

Activité # 3. Le conditionnel passé

Imaginez-vous maintenant une belle île dans l'océan Pacifique... ensoleillée, tropicale, pittoresque et déserte! Qu'est-ce que *vos amis*, à vous, auraient-ils fait s'ils avaient appris qu'ils allaient se retrouver sur cette île pour une période indéterminée? Construisez des phrases à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. Si on leur avait demandé de ne prendre qu'un seul livre sur l'île ...</p>	<p>A. ...vos amis _____ (se donner) la peine d'apprendre la langue des aborigènes.</p>
<p>2. S'ils n'avaient eu à leur disposition ni cuisine, ni aliments...</p>	<p>B. ... ils _____ (étudier) la botanique pour savoir quelles plantes sauvage ils pouvaient manger.</p>
<p>3. Si vos amis avaient eu suffisamment de temps avant ce voyage exotique ...</p>	<p>C. ... ils _____ (choisir) probablement le roman sur les aventures de Robinson Crusoé.</p>
<p>4. S'ils avaient dû rester sur cette île pour une période de temps plus longue ...</p>	<p>D. ...ils _____(ne pas pouvoir) préparer leurs plats préférés ...</p>

Activité # 4. Le participe présent

Maintenant, imaginez que vous donnez des conseils à *votre* frère cadet. Comme il s'agit cette fois de la vie réelle, vos conseils seront à la fois intelligents et utiles. Construisez des phrases à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. On peut facilement attraper un rhume ...</p>	<p>A. ... en _____ (apprendre) d'une façon adéquate les nouvelles règles de grammaire.</p>
<p>2. Tu arriveras toujours à temps et tu développeras une excellente discipline personnelle...</p>	<p>B. ... en _____ (agir) toujours avec honnêteté et discrétion.</p>
<p>3. On arrive à parler et écrire correctement dans n'importe quelle langue...</p>	<p>C. ... en _____ (sortir) les cheveux mouillés après avoir fait de la natation.</p>
<p>4. Tu produiras partout une bonne impression...</p>	<p>D. ... en _____ (partir) de bonne heure.</p>

Activité # 5. Le futur antérieur

Parlons maintenant de la santé des athlètes qui est, certainement, la chose la plus précieuse et à la fois la plus fragile. Il faut donc la soigner. Complétez les remarques suivantes à partir d'éléments du tableau. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. Tout athlète interrompra le match et fera venir le médecin ...</p>	<p>A. ... quand ils _____ (comprendre) que trop de soleil peut être dangereux.</p>
<p>2. Un joueur reprendra son entraînement et reviendra aux tournois importants...</p>	<p>B. ... dès qu'ils _____ (respecter) un programme d'entraînement raisonnable et un régime alimentaire bien défini.</p>
<p>3. Les joueurs de tennis mettront plus de crème solaire</p>	<p>C. ... aussitôt qu'il _____ (sentir) une douleur aiguë dans une région du corps.</p>
<p>4. Tous les sportifs maintiendront une bonne forme ...</p>	<p>D. ... lorsqu'il _____ (se remettre) de son mal au genou.</p>

Activité # 6. Le subjonctif présent

Imaginez maintenant que vous devez offrir de bons conseils à un nouvel étudiant d'Emory, basés sur votre expérience personnelle. Rédigez vos recommandations à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. À Emory, il faut étudier systématiquement ...</p> <p>2. Le professeur doit vérifier la cohérence des idées...</p> <p>3. Dans une classe de français on doit bien analyser le contexte ...</p> <p>4. Les étudiants sont censés réussir un nombre de cours obligatoires...</p>	<p>A. ... afin qu'on _____ (comprendre) l'emploi d'une certaine structure grammaticale.</p> <p>B. ... avant que leurs parents _____ (pouvoir) célèbrer la fin de leurs études et la réception de leurs diplômes.</p> <p>C. ... afin qu'on _____ (recevoir) de bonnes notes, mais et de bonnes connaissances.</p> <p>D. ... avant que l'étudiant _____ (rendre) son devoir final.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Activité # 7. Les pronoms relatifs où/dont

Imaginez maintenant qu'un de vos amis, qui n'a jamais voyagé à l'étranger, vient vous demander des conseils. Vous voulez le persuader que c'est avant tout Paris qu'il faut voir. Rédigez vos recommandations à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Ecrivez la forme du pronom exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. Tu verras un centre culturel de premier plan...</p> <p>2. N'oublie pas de te procurer le plan de Paris ...</p> <p>3. En outres, réserve assez de temps pour admirer la Tour Eiffel...</p> <p>4. Il faudrait aussi rendre visite au cimetière Père Lachaise, un des plus célèbres dans le monde ...</p>	<p>A. _____ dont l'image majestueuse est devenue le symbole de la capitale.</p> <p>B. _____ sont enterrées des personnes célèbres.</p> <p>C. _____ tu auras besoin chaque fois que tu voudras découvrir un site exceptionnel.</p> <p>D. _____ on trouve plus de 150 musées et un nombre infini de monuments.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Activité # 8. Le subjonctif passé

Imaginez maintenant qu'un couple d'acteurs âgés, Madame et Monsieur Dupont, sont en train de réfléchir aux trente ans qu'ils ont passés ensemble. Comme d'habitude, leur mémoire a gardé de la vie antérieure des moments heureux, mais aussi des moments tristes. Essayez de retracer les réflexions de ces personnes. Rédigez des phrases à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

1. Monsieur Dupont est particulièrement heureux ...	A. ... que leurs enfants _____(rester) seuls pendant les nombreuses tournées de leur troupe théâtrale.
2. Madame Dupont est aussi contente ...	B. ... que les membres de leur troupe théâtrale leur _____ (rendre) hommage au commencement d'un spectacle à l'occasion de la retraite des Dupont.
3. Les Dupont regrettent ...	C. ... que son futur mari _____ (venir) ce soir-là au spectacle dans lequel elle faisait son début théâtral.
4. Ils sont ravis cependant ...	D. ... qu'un mois après cette rencontre mémorable le couple _____ (prendre) la décision de se marier.

Activité # 9. Le Discours Indirect

Imaginez maintenant que vous avez assisté à la première séance d'un cours de français avancé. Le professeur vient de présenter le programme du cours et de répondre aux questions des étudiants. Vous devez maintenant raconter les moments les plus importants de cette séance introductive. Rédigez vos phrases à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Mettez les verbes entre parenthèses à la forme exigée par le contexte.

1. Le prof a annoncé aux étudiants que de temps en temps...	A. ... le professeur _____ (rendre) toujours les devoirs au début de chaque classe.
2. L'assistant du professeur a expliqué que...	B. ... le professeur _____ (évaluer) à la fin du cours toutes les compétences acquises durant le semestre.
3. Pour la note de fin de cours le syllabus a mentionné que...	C. ... ils _____ (écrire) en classe des rédactions spontanées sur des sujets liés au programme du cours.
4. On a indiqué aux étudiants que...	D. ... ils _____ (travailler) sur le vocabulaire nouveau, les structures

	grammaticales apprises et les extraits littéraires étudiés.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------

Activité # 10. Les pronoms relatifs composés

Imaginez maintenant que vous êtes en train de faire vos devoirs à Woodruff. Vous faites une pause, pendant laquelle vous écrivez un petit mot à votre ami français. Rédigez votre lettre à partir d'éléments du tableau ci-dessous. Pour chaque début de phrase dans la colonne à gauche trouvez la continuation logique de celle-ci dans la colonne à droite. Ecrivez la forme du pronom exigée par le contexte.

<p>1. Je viens de trouver un article sur l'existentialisme...</p> <p>2. Il faut bien que je finisse aujourd'hui ma composition pour le cours de français ...</p> <p>3. C'était un extrait de la pièce « Huis Clos »...</p> <p>4. Je veux analyser dans mon devoir la brillante thèse de Sartre sur la liberté ...</p>	<p>A. dont l'auteur est Sartre et _____ je dois bien réfléchir avant de rédiger ma rédaction.</p> <p>B. _____ je m'intéresse depuis longtemps.</p> <p>C. _____ je pourrais faire référence dans mon devoir écrit pour mieux argumenter mes idées sur la pièce « Huis Clos » de Sartre.</p> <p>D. _____ je travaille depuis le début de la semaine.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

APPENDIX D

Post-test Questionnaire

Birthdate mm/dd//yy _____

Zipcode _____

Please answer the following questions using as much detail as possible.

1. What, if any, are the advantages of learning a rule before practicing a grammatical structure?

Disadvantages?

2. What, if any, are the advantages of practicing use of a grammatical structure before discovering the rule of how to use the structure with the help of your teacher?

Disadvantages?

3. Please review these descriptions of two approaches to learning grammar:

Approach A: When learning grammar, the rules are explained entirely by the teacher first, followed by practice.

Approach B: When learning grammar, practice of the grammatical structure occurs first, followed by discovery, with the help of the teacher, of the rule of how to use the structure.

4. *Indicate your relative preference for teaching method A or teaching method B by circling a choice below:*

Strongly prefer A
Mildly prefer A
No Preference
Mildly prefer B
Strongly prefer B

APPENDIX E

Oral Interview Guide

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. Your answers to the following questions will help me to better understand your experiences in French 203 this semester. This interview will be recorded so that I can later code your answers and compare them to those of other students. Your identity will remain confidential.

1. What was your overall impression of the grammar instruction you received in French 203 this semester?
2. Prior to this course, had you ever taken a university French course?
3. You were taught French grammatical structures using two different approaches, a guided inductive approach, and a deductive approach. Did you notice any distinguishing characteristics of the two approaches?
4. Which instructional approach did you prefer for learning French grammar; did you prefer to be taught the rule before or after practice? Explain.
5. In your opinion, are there any advantages or disadvantages to learning grammar deductively, with explicit explanations of the rules? What about using the guided inductive approach where the instructor asks questions to lead you to discover the rule?
6. In which instructional approach do you feel you best learned grammar? Why?
7. In the written questionnaires that students completed for this project, some students mentioned that the practice first approach seemed more natural to them. What do you think they meant by this?

APPENDIX F

First and Second Level Coding for Post-Study Questionnaire & Interview Data

1. Deductive- Advantages
2. Deductive- Disadvantages
3. Guided Inductive- Advantages
4. Guided Inductive- Disadvantages

Act- Active
 Bef-Before
 Bestnew- best for new
 Bestrev- Best for review
 Blind- Blindly following teacher
 BooCon- Confidence
 Bor- Boring
 Clr- Clear
 Comfo- Comfortable
 Confu- Confusing
 Constr-Shows how to construct sentences
 Contx- Context
 Distr-Distracting
 Easy- Easiest way to learn
 Easapply-Easy to apply rules later
 Engag- Learner engaged
 Equ- equation
 Ex- Examples
 Err- Error
 Fas- Fast, quick
 Frus- Frustrating
 Knoadv- Know in advance
 L1- first language learners

Like- Like
 Prac- practice
 Pref- Prefer
 Prev- Previous
 Mem- Memorize
 Nat- Natural
 Noclear-not clear
 Noconf- not confusing
 Nogues- No need to guess
 Norulway- Rules don't get in the way
 Realwld- Real-world
 Rem- Remember
 Rep-Repeat
 Rev- Review
 Rule1-rule first
 Sett-setting
 Slo-slower
 Struc-Shows how sentences are structured
 Strugg- struggle
 Teachrule- teacher explains rule
 Think- forces you to think for yourself
 Trad- Traditional learning

APPENDIX G

Teaching Scripts

Le conditionnel présent DEDUCTIVE

Quand on examine la brillante campagne électorale du nouveau président des Etats-Unis, on se rend vite compte du rôle que le voyage joue dans la vie politique. Obama visitera beaucoup de villes et fera la connaissance de beaucoup de personnes. Et s'il venait un jour à Atlanta? Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent ce qui pourrait se passer pendant ce voyage hypothétique. Essayez d'expliquer ce que le président ferait pendant ce voyage. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (DEDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il voudrait aller (vouloir aller) au Centre historique *Martin Luther King Jr.*
2. Les étudiants d'Emory rencontreraient (rencontrer) des journalistes politiques si Obama visitait le campus.
 - « Si » c'est le mot spécifique qui signale la nature hypothétique de l'événement.
 - On trouve dans la partie de la phrase qui commence avec « si » une condition. La forme temporelle du verbe dans cette partie de la phrase c'est l'imparfait.
 - Maintenant, observez bien les formes verbales soulignées : pour conjuguer les verbes qui indiquent le résultat d'une condition, on emploie le conditionnel présent. Le conditionnel présent se forme du radical du futur du verbe utilisé auquel on ajoute les terminaisons de l'imparfait.
 - Faisons maintenant la conclusion : la partie de la phrase, qui commence avec « si » et où le verbe est conjugué à l'imparfait, c'est la subordonnée conditionnelle et l'autre partie de la phrase avec le conditionnel présent c'est la principale.

Exemple 1:

T: Par exemple, si Obama venait à Atlanta, il visiterait Stone Mountain ou l'Aquarium?

T: Il visiterait l'Aquarium. Répétez.

Ss: Il visiterait l'Aquarium.

T: Oui, il visiterait l'Aquarium.

Exemple 2

T: Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il verrait peu de circulation ou beaucoup de circulation ?

T: Il verrait beaucoup de circulation. Répétez.

Ss: Il verrait beaucoup de circulation.

T: Oui, il verrait beaucoup de circulation.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il rendrait visite à *Emory* ou à *Georgia Tech*?
Il rendrait visite à *Emory*.
2. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il mangerait à *McDonald's* ou à *The Varsity*?
Il mangerait à *The Varsity*.
3. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il voudrait aller au zoo ou au Centre historique *Martin Luther King Jr.*?
Il voudrait aller au Centre historique *Martin Luther King Jr.*
4. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il sortirait le soir avec sa femme Michelle ou avec le maire Shirley Franklin?
Il sortirait le soir avec sa femme Michelle.
5. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il ferait du shopping à *Atlantic Station* ou à *Lenox Mall*?
Il ferait du shopping à *Atlantic Station*.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples

Exemple 3

T: Les étudiants d'Emory, ils parleraient au président ou à son assistant si Obama visitait le campus?

T: Ils parleraient au président. Répétez

Ss: Ils parleraient au président.

T: Oui, ils parleraient au président.

Exemple 4

T: Les étudiants d'Emory, ils poseraient des questions intelligentes ou banales après le discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus ?

T: Ils poseraient des questions intelligentes. Répétez

Ss : Ils poseraient des questions intelligentes.

T : Oui, ils poseraient des questions intelligentes.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

6. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils iraient en classe ou au discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus?
Ils iraient au discours présidentiel.
7. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils seraient patients ou impatients d'écouter le discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus?
Ils seraient impatients d'écouter le discours présidentiel.
8. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils produiraient une bonne ou une mauvaise impression si Obama visitait le campus?
Ils produiraient une bonne impression.
9. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils écouterait attentivement ou non-attentivement le discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus?
Ils écouterait attentivement le discours présidentiel.
10. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils rencontreraient des journalistes politiques ou des journalistes sportifs si Obama visitait le campus?
Ils rencontreraient des journalistes politiques.

Le conditionnel présent INDUCTIVE

Quand on examine la brillante campagne électorale du nouveau président des Etats-Unis, on se rend vite compte du rôle que le voyage joue dans la vie politique. Obama visitera beaucoup de villes et fera la connaissance de beaucoup de personnes. Et s'il venait un jour à Atlanta? Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent ce qui pourrait se passer pendant ce voyage hypothétique. Essayez d'expliquer ce que le président ferait pendant ce voyage. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Exemple 1:

T: Par exemple, si Obama venait à Atlanta, il visiterait Stone Mountain ou l'Aquarium?

T : Il visiterait l'Aquarium. Répétez.

Ss: Il visiterait l'Aquarium.

T: Oui, il visiterait l'Aquarium.

Exemple 2

T : Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il verrait peu de circulation ou beaucoup de circulation ?

T : Il verrait beaucoup de circulation. Répétez.

Ss : Il verrait beaucoup de circulation.

T : Oui, il verrait beaucoup de circulation.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

11. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il rendrait visite à *Emory* ou *Georgia Tech*?

Il rendrait visite à *Emory*.

12. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il mangerait à *McDonald's* ou à *The Varsity*?

Il mangerait à *The Varsity*.

13. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il voudrait aller au zoo ou au Centre historique *Martin Luther King Jr.*?

Il voudrait aller au Centre historique *Martin Luther King Jr.*

14. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il sortirait le soir avec sa femme Michelle ou avec le maire Shirley Franklin?

Il sortirait le soir avec sa femme Michelle.

15. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il ferait du shopping à *Atlantic Station* ou à *Lenox Mall*?

Il ferait du shopping à *Atlantic Station*.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples

Exemple 3

T: Les étudiants d'Emory, ils parleraient au président ou à son assistant si Obama visitait le campus?

T : Ils parleraient au président. Répétez

Ss: Ils parleraient au président.

T: Oui, ils parleraient au président.

Exemple 4

T : Les étudiants d'Emory, ils poseraient des questions intelligentes ou banales après le discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus ?

T : Ils poseraient des questions intelligentes. Répétez

Ss : Ils poseraient des questions intelligentes.

T : Oui, ils poseraient des questions intelligentes.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

16. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils iraient en classe ou au discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus?

Ils iraient au discours présidentiel.

17. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils seraient patients ou impatients en écoutant le discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus?

Ils seraient patients en écoutant le discours présidentiel.

18. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils feraient bonne ou mauvaise impression si Obama visitait le campus?

Ils feraient bonne impression.

19. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils écouterait attentivement ou non-attentivement le discours présidentiel si Obama visitait le campus?

Ils écouterait attentivement le discours présidentiel.

20. Les étudiants d'Emory, ils rencontreraient des journalistes politiques ou des journalistes sportifs si Obama visitait le campus?

Ils rencontreraient des journalistes politiques.

Rule Construction (INDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Si Obama venait à Atlanta, il _____(vouloir aller) au Centre historique *Martin Luther King Jr.*

2. Les étudiants d'Emory _____(rencontrer) des journalistes politiques si Obama visitait le campus universitaire.

- Quel est le mot spécifique qui signale la nature hypothétique de l'événement?
- Qu'est-ce qu'on trouve dans la partie de la phrase qui commence avec « si » -- une *condition* ou le *résultat* de cette condition? Quelle est la forme temporelle du verbe dans cette partie de la phrase?

- Maintenant, attention : comment faut-il conjuguer les verbes qui indiquent le résultat de la condition?
- Faisons maintenant la conclusion: 1) quelle est la forme du verbe dans la subordonnée conditionnelle introduite par « si » et qui représente une condition ? 2) et dans la principale quelle est la forme du verbe qui représente le résultat hypothétique de cette condition ?
- Maintenant complétons ces phrases ensemble.

Le plus-que-parfait DEDUCTIVE

L'été dernier aux Jeux Olympiques à Pékin, le nageur Michael Phelps a gagné huit médailles d'or. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, qu'est-ce qu'il avait *déjà* fait ? Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent ce qui s'était passé à Pékin avant la fin des Jeux. Essayez d'expliquer ce que le nageur avait *déjà* fait avant de gagner sa dernière médaille. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

1. Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael était arrivé (arriver) en Chine par avion.
2. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient assisté (assister) aux compétitions de gymnastique.
 - Faites attention à l'**ordre chronologique** des événements. Dans la première phrase, l'événement dans « Michael était arrivé en Chine par avion » s'est passé en premier, avant l'événement « Michael a gagné la huitième médaille ».
 - Et dans la deuxième phrase, l'événement « les nageurs américains avaient assisté aux compétitions de gymnastique » s'est aussi passé en premier, avant celui de la cérémonie de clôture.
 - La forme qui exprime une action qui précède une autre action dans le passé s'appelle le **plus-que-parfait**. On forme le plus-que-parfait de l'imparfait des verbes auxiliaires « avoir » ou « être » en ajoutant le participe passé du verbe conjugué.

Je vous donne des exemples :

Exemple 1

T : Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael était arrivé en Chine par avion ou en bateau?

T : Il était arrivé en avion. Répétez

Ss: Il était arrivé en avion.

T: Oui, il était arrivé en avion.

Exemple 2

T : Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur ou avec sa mère ?

T : Il avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur. Répétez

S : Il avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur.

T : Oui, il avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael, avait mangé à McDonald's ou dans un restaurant chinois?
Il avait mangé dans un restaurant chinois.
2. Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael, avait participé dans la cérémonie d'ouverture ou dans la cérémonie de clôture?
Il avait pris part dans la cérémonie d'ouverture.
3. Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael, avait passé beaucoup de temps dans le gymnase ou dans la piscine ?
Il avait passé beaucoup de temps dans la piscine.
4. Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael, avait admiré la Grande Muraille ou le Palais Impérial ?
Il avait admiré le Palais Impérial.
5. Avant d'avoir gagné la huitième médaille, Michael, avait beaucoup nagé ou beaucoup fait de l'athlétisme?
Il avait beaucoup nagé.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples.

Exemple 3

T : Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient salué les fans ou les journalistes ?

T: Ils avaient salué les fans. Répétez.

S : Ils avaient salué les fans.

T : Oui, ils avaient salué les fans.

Exemple 4

T : Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe française ou de l'équipe américaine?

T : Ils s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe américaine. Répétez.

S : Ils s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe américaine.

T : Oui, ils s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe américaine.

6. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains s'étaient couchés tôt ou tard?

Ils s'étaient couchés tôt.

7. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient écrit à leurs familles ou à leurs professeurs ?
Ils avaient écrit à leurs familles.
8. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient acheté des souvenirs chers ou bons marché ?
Ils avaient acheté des souvenirs bon marché.
9. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient assisté aux matchs d'escrime ou aux compétitions de gymnastique ?
Ils avaient assisté aux compétitions de gymnastique.
10. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains étaient montés en haut de La Grande Muraille ou l'escalier dans leur hôtel ?
Ils avaient monté l'escalier dans leur hôtel.

Le plus-que-parfait INDUCTIVE

L'été dernier aux Jeux Olympiques à Pékin, le nageur Michael Phelps a gagné huit médailles d'or. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, qu'est-ce qu'il avait *déjà* fait ? Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent ce qui s'était passé à Pékin avant la fin des Jeux. Essayez d'expliquer ce que le nageur avait *déjà* fait avant de gagner sa dernière médaille. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Exemple 1

T : Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael était arrivé en Chine par avion ou en bateau ?

T : Il était arrivé en avion. Répétez

Ss: Il était arrivé en avion.

T: Oui, il était arrivé en avion.

Exemple 2

T : Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur ou avec sa mère ?

T : Il avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur. Répétez

S : Il avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur.

T : Oui, il avait planifié sa stratégie avec son entraîneur.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

11. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael, avait mangé à McDonald's ou dans un restaurant chinois ?

Il avait mangé dans un restaurant chinois.

12. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael, avait participé dans la cérémonie d'ouverture ou dans la cérémonie de clôture?

Il avait pris part dans la cérémonie d'ouverture.

13. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael, avait passé beaucoup de temps dans le gymnase ou dans la piscine ?

Il avait passé beaucoup de temps dans la piscine.

14. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael, avait admiré la Grande Muraille ou le Palais Impérial ?

Il avait admiré le Palais Impérial.

15. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael, avait beaucoup nagé ou beaucoup fait de l'athlétisme?

Il avait beaucoup nagé.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples.

Exemple 3

T : Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient salué les fans ou les journalistes ?

T : Ils avaient salué les fans. Répétez.

S : Ils avaient salué les fans.

T : Oui, ils avaient salué les fans.

Exemple 4

T : Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe française ou de l'équipe américaine?

T : Ils s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe américaine. Répétez.

S : Ils s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe américaine.

T : Oui, ils s'étaient habillés en uniformes de l'équipe américaine.

16. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains s'étaient couchés tôt ou tard?

Ils s'étaient couchés tôt.

17. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient écrit à leurs familles ou à leurs professeurs ?

Ils avaient écrit à leurs familles.

18. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient acheté des souvenirs chers ou bon marché ?

Ils avaient acheté des souvenirs bon marché.

19. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient assisté aux matchs d'escrime ou aux compétitions de gymnastique ?
Ils avaient assisté aux compétitions de gymnastique.
20. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains avaient monté La Grande Muraille ou l'escalier dans leur hôtel ?
Ils avaient monté l'escalier dans leur hôtel.

Rule Construction

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Avant de gagner la huitième médaille, Michael _____ (arriver) en Chine par avion.
2. Avant la cérémonie de clôture, les nageurs américains _____ (assister) aux compétitions de gymnastique.

- Faites attention à l'**ordre chronologique** des événements. Dans la première phrase, qu'est-ce qui s'est passé en premier - est-ce que Michael a gagné la huitième médaille ou est-ce qu'il est arrivé en Chine par avion ?
- Et dans la deuxième phrase, quel événement s'est passé en premier - la cérémonie de clôture ou les compétitions de gymnastique ?
- Comment conjuguez-vous le verbe qui exprime une action qui précède une autre action dans le passé ? Comment formez-vous cette forme temporelle ?
- Faisons la conclusion : 1) quelle est la forme du verbe qui exprime une action qui précède une autre action dans le passé ?
- Maintenant complétons les phrases ensemble.

Conditionnel passé DEDUCTIVE

La série télévisée *Friends* présente le quotidien de six personnages formant une bande d'amis. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent des scènes imaginaires de la vie de ces gens au moment où ils ne sont plus ensemble. Essayez d'expliquer ce qu'ils auraient pu faire si les conditions avaient été différentes.

Rule Construction (DEDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel serait sortie (sortir) avec Chandler.
 2. Ces amis auraient acheté (acheter) des maisons luxueuses, s'ils avaient été plus âgés.
- Comme vous le savez déjà, le mot « si » signale la nature hypothétique de l'événement.

- Notez bien : dans ces deux phrases, il s'agit d'un événement hypothétique *passé*.
- Dans la partie de la phrase qui commence avec « si » on trouve la *condition* de l'événement. Le verbe qui exprime la condition est conjugué au plus-que-parfait.
- Maintenant, observez bien les formes verbales soulignées. La forme qui indique le résultat de la condition s'appelle le conditionnel passé.
- On forme le conditionnel passé des verbes auxiliaires « avoir » ou « être » au conditionnel présent en ajoutant le participe passé du verbe conjugué.
- La partie de la phrase, qui commence avec « si » et où le verbe est conjugué au plus-que-parfait, c'est la subordonnée conditionnelle et l'autre partie de la phrase avec le conditionnel passé, c'est la principale.

Exemple 1

T : Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait vécu avec ses parents ou toujours avec ses amis ?

T : Elle aurait toujours vécu avec ses amis. Répétez.

S : Elle aurait toujours vécu avec ses amis.

T : Oui, elle aurait toujours vécu avec ses amis.

Exemple 2

T : Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait été rousse ou blonde ?

T : Elle aurait été rousse. Répétez.

S : Elle aurait été rousse.

T : Oui, elle aurait été rousse.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez :

1. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel serait sortie avec Chandler ou avec Ross?
Elle serait sortie avec Chandler.
2. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait choisi de continuer ses études à Emory ou à Yale?
Elle aurait choisi de continuer ses études à Emory.
3. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait fait du shopping dans des boutiques chères ou à Target ?
Elle aurait fait du shopping à Target.
4. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait aimé voyager à Paris où à Berlin ?

Elle aurait aimé voyager à Berlin.

5. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel serait mariée ou seule ?
Elle serait mariée.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples.

Exemple 3

T : Les amis auraient toujours habité le même appartement ou des appartements séparés, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?

T : Répétez, Ils auraient habité des appartements séparés.

S : Ils auraient habité des appartements séparés.

T : Oui, Ils auraient habité des appartements séparés.

Exemple 4

T : Les amis auraient été plus actifs ou plus passifs, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?

T : Répétez, Ils auraient été plus passifs.

S : Ils auraient été plus passifs.

T : Oui, Ils auraient été plus passifs.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez :

6. Les amis auraient pris leur café chez eux ou à Central Perk, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient pris leur café chez eux.
7. Les amis seraient allés en vacances à Panama City ou à Fiji, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils seraient allés en vacances à Fiji.
8. Les amis auraient joué au tennis ou aux échecs, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient joué aux échecs.
9. Les amis auraient été contents ou mécontents de leurs carrières, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient été contents de leurs carrières.
10. Les amis auraient acheté des maisons luxueuses ou pauvres, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient acheté des maisons luxueuses.

Conditionnel passé INDUCTIVE

La série télévisée *Friends* présente le quotidien de six personnages formant une bande d'amis. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent des scènes imaginaires de la vie de ces

gens au moment où ils ne sont plus ensemble. Essayez d'expliquer ce qu'ils auraient pu faire si les conditions avaient été différentes.

Exemple 1

T : Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait vécu avec ses parents ou toujours avec ses amis ?

T : Elle aurait toujours vécu avec ses amis. Répétez.

S : Elle aurait toujours vécu avec ses amis.

T : Oui, elle aurait toujours vécu avec ses amis.

Exemple 2

T : Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait été rousse ou blonde ?

T : Elle aurait été rousse. Répétez.

S : Elle aurait été rousse.

T : Oui, elle aurait été rousse.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez :

11. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel serait sortie avec Chandler ou avec Ross?
Elle serait sortie avec Chandler.
12. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait choisi de continuer ses études à Emory ou à Yale?
Elle aurait choisi de continuer ses études à Emory.
13. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait fait du shopping dans des boutiques chères ou à Target ?
Elle aurait fait du shopping à Target.
14. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel aurait aimé voyager à Paris où à Berlin ?
Elle aurait aimé voyager à Berlin.
15. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel serait mariée ou seule ?
Elle serait mariée.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples.

Exemple 3

T : Les amis auraient toujours habité le même appartement ou des appartements séparés, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?

T : Répétez, Ils auraient habité des appartements séparés.

S : Ils auraient habité des appartements séparés.

T : Oui, Ils auraient habité des appartements séparés.

Exemple 4

T : Les amis auraient été plus actifs ou plus passifs, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?

T : Répétez, Ils auraient été plus passifs.

S : Ils auraient été plus passifs.

T : Oui, Ils auraient été plus passifs.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez :

16. Les amis auraient pris leur café chez eux ou à Central Perk, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient pris leur café chez eux.
17. Les amis seraient allés en vacances à Panama City ou à Fiji, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils seraient allés en vacances à Fiji.
18. Les amis auraient joué au tennis ou aux échecs, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient joué aux échecs.
19. Les amis auraient été contents ou mécontents de leurs carrières, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient été contents de leurs carrières.
20. Les amis auraient acheté des maisons luxueuses ou pauvres, s'ils avaient été plus âgés ?
Ils auraient acheté des maisons luxueuses.

Rule Construction (INDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

3. Si on avait pu réécrire le scénario, Rachel _____ (sortir) avec Chandler.
 4. Ces amis _____ (acheter) des maisons luxueuses, s'ils avaient été plus âgés.
- Rappelez-vous : quel est le mot spécifique qui signale la nature hypothétique de l'événement?
 - Dans ces deux phrases, s'agit-il d'un événement hypothétique *présent* ou *passé* ?
 - Qu'est-ce qu'on trouve dans la partie de la phrase qui commence avec « si » -- une *condition* ou le *résultat* de cette condition? Quelle est la forme temporelle du verbe dans cette partie de la phrase?

- Maintenant, attention: comment conjuguez-vous les verbes qui indiquent le résultat de la condition? Reconnaissez-vous la forme du verbe auxiliaire ? Quelle forme prend le verbe conjugué ?
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: 1) quelle est la forme du verbe dans la subordonnée conditionnelle introduite par « si » ? 2) et dans la principale ?

Maintenant complétons les phrases ci-dessus ensemble.

Le participe présent/le gérondif- DEDUCTIVE

Noblesse oblige !! Le prince William veut donner des conseils pratiques à son frère cadet Harry à propos de la bonne représentation de la dynastie royale. En plus, la reine Elizabeth explique aux princes ce qu'il ne faut pas faire pendant un bal royal au palais Buckingham. Vous allez voir des photos qui illustrent les choix divers qui se présentent dans la vie de ces deux frères. Essayez d'expliquer ce qu'ils doivent faire en vue de répondre aux exigences de leur haut statut social. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (DEDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Il aura du succès en s'habillant (s'habiller) bien.
 2. Ils dansent en réfléchissant (réfléchir) à l'avenir de l'Angleterre.
- Dans le premier exemple, la partie subordonnée de la phrase répond à la question *de quelle manière*, ou *comment* Harry aura du succès.
 - Et dans le deuxième exemple, les deux actions, celle de « danser » et celle de « réfléchir » sont des *actions simultanées*.
 - Maintenant, observez bien les formes verbales soulignées. On transforme le verbe qui indique la **manière** ou **deux actions simultanées** en remplaçant la terminaison **-ons** de la forme de l'indicatif présent par la terminaison **-ant**. La préposition « en » précède toujours cette forme verbale.
 - Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: la forme du verbe dans la partie subordonnée de la phrase introduite par la préposition « en » c'est le gérondif. Le gérondif ne varie pas par rapport au sujet de la phrase.

Exemple 1

T : Harry, aura du succès en joignant l'armée ou un groupe de musique rock ?

T :, Il aura du succès en joignant l'armée. Répétez.

S : Il aura du succès en joignant l'armée.
 T : Oui, il aura du succès en joignant l'armée.

Exemple 2

T : Harry aura du succès en lisant des livres classiques or modernes ?
 T : Il aura du succès en lisant des livres modernes. Répétez.
 S : Il aura du succès en lisant des livres modernes.
 T : Oui, Il aura du succès en lisant des livres modernes.

Maintenant c'est à vous, continuez:

1. Harry aura du succès en choisissant une école militaire ou une école de ballet ?
 Il aura du succès en choisissant une école militaire.
2. Harry aura du succès en s'habillant bien ou mal ?
 Il aura du succès en s'habillant bien.
3. Harry aura du succès en jouant aux jeux vidéo ou des instruments de musique ?
 Il aura du succès en jouant des instruments de musique.
4. Harry aura du succès en faisant de l'escrime ou de la boxe ?
 Il aura du succès en faisant de l'escrime.
5. Harry, aura du succès en vivant dans le château de Buckingham ou dans un appartement ordinaire ?
 Il aura du succès en vivant dans le château de Buckingham.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

T : William et Harry, dansent au bal royal en faisant attention aux invités ou aux passants dans la rue ?
 T : Ils dansent en faisant attention aux invités. Répétez.
 S : Ils dansent en faisant attention aux invités.
 T : Oui, ils dansent en faisant attention aux invités.

Exemple 4

T : William et Harry dansent au bal royal en disant « bonsoir » à leur père ou à la reine?
 T : William et Harry dansent en disant « bonsoir » à la reine. Répétez.
 S : William et Harry dansent en disant « bonsoir » à la reine.
 T : Oui, William et Harry dansent en disant « bonsoir » à la reine.

6. William et Harry dansent au bal royal en portant un smoking ou un jean ?
 Ils dansent en portant un smoking.

7. William et Harry dansent au bal royal en conversant avec les serveurs ou les invités ?
Ils dansent en conversant avec les invités.
8. William et Harry, dansent au bal royal en parlant fort ou à voix basse?
Ils dansent en parlant à voix basse.
9. William et Harry dansent au bal royal en écoutant la musique de l'orchestre ou la musique des Beatles ?
Ils dansent en écoutant la musique de l'orchestre.
10. William et Harry, dansent au bal royal en réfléchissant à l'avenir de l'Allemagne ou de l'Angleterre ?
Ils dansent en réfléchissant à l'avenir de l'Angleterre.

Le participe présent/le gérondif- INDUCTIVE

Noblesse oblige !! Le prince William veut donner des conseils pratiques à son frère cadet Harry à propos de la bonne représentation de la dynastie royale. En plus, la reine Elizabeth explique aux princes ce qu'il ne faut pas faire pendant un bal royal au palais Buckingham. Vous allez voir des photos qui illustrent les choix divers qui se présentent dans la vie de ces deux frères. Essayez d'expliquer ce qu'ils doivent faire en vue de répondre aux exigences de leur haut statut social. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Exemple 1

T : Harry, aura du succès en joignant l'armée ou un groupe de musique rock ?

T :, Il aura du succès en joignant l'armée. Répétez.

S : Il aura du succès en joignant l'armée.

T : Oui, il aura du succès en joignant l'armée.

Exemple 2

T : Harry aura du succès en lisant des livres classiques or modernes ?

T : Il aura du succès en lisant des livres modernes. Répétez.

S : Il aura du succès en lisant des livres modernes.

T : Oui, Il aura du succès en lisant des livres modernes.

Maintenant c'est à vous, continuez :

11. Harry aura du succès en choisissant une école militaire ou une école de ballet ?
Il aura du succès en choisissant une école militaire.
12. Harry aura du succès en s'habillant bien ou mal ?
Il aura du succès en s'habillant bien.
13. Harry aura du succès en jouant aux jeux vidéo ou des instruments de musique ?

Il aura du succès en jouant des instruments de musique.

14. Harry aura du succès en faisant de l'escrime ou de la boxe ?
Il aura du succès en faisant de l'escrime.

15. Harry, aura du succès en vivant dans le château de Buckingham ou dans un appartement ordinaire ?
Il aura du succès en vivant dans le château de Buckingham.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

T : William et Harry, dansent au bal royal en faisant attention aux invités ou aux passants dans la rue ?

T : Ils dansent en faisant attention aux invités. Répétez.

S : Ils dansent en faisant attention aux invités.

T : Oui, ils dansent en faisant attention aux invités.

Exemple 4

T : William et Harry dansent au bal royal en disant « bonsoir » à leur père ou à la reine?

T : William et Harry dansent en disant « bonsoir » à la reine. Répétez.

S : William et Harry dansent en disant « bonsoir » à la reine.

T : Oui, William et Harry dansent en disant « bonsoir » à la reine.

16. William et Harry dansent au bal royal en portant un smoking ou un jean ?
Ils dansent en portant un smoking.

17. William et Harry dansent au bal royal en conversant avec les serveurs ou les invités ?
Ils dansent en conversant avec les invités.

18. William et Harry, dansent au bal royal en parlant fort ou à voix basse?
Ils dansent en parlant à voix basse.

19. William et Harry dansent au bal royal en écoutant la musique de l'orchestre ou la musique des Beatles ?
Ils dansent en écoutant la musique de l'orchestre.

20. William et Harry, dansent au bal royal en réfléchissant à l'avenir de l'Allemagne ou de l'Angleterre ?
Ils dansent en réfléchissant à l'avenir de l'Angleterre.

Rule Construction (INDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

3. Il aura du succès _____ (s'habiller) bien.

4. Ils dansent _____ (réfléchir) à l'avenir de l'Angleterre.

- Dans le premier exemple, est-ce que Harry, le sujet, a déjà obtenu le succès ? Ou est-ce qu'il s'agit plutôt de *comment, de quelle manière* il peut l'obtenir ?
- Et dans le deuxième exemple, qu'est-ce que la forme verbale exprime -- une action passée ou une action qui a lieu *en même temps* avec celle de « danser » ?
- Avez-vous reconnu la terminaison du verbe qui indique la **manière** ou **deux actions simultanées**? Quelle préposition faut-il placer devant ce verbe ?
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: 1) quelle est la forme du verbe dans la partie subordonnée de la phrase introduite par la préposition « en » ? Le gérondif, varie-t-il par rapport au sujet de la phrase ?
- Maintenant complétons les phrases ensemble.

Le futur antérieur- DEDUCTIVE

Les sœurs Venus et Serena voyageront à Paris en mars 2010. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent ce qui se passera pendant leur voyage. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements au futur. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (DEDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà visité (visiter) le Musée d'Orsay.
2. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé (parler) aux journalistes sportifs.
 - L'action dans ces phrases aura lieu à l'avenir.
 - Dans la première phrase l'ordre chronologique des deux actions est ceci : elles visiteront le Musée d'Orsay d'abord, et puis, elles quitteront Paris.
 - Dans la deuxième phrase, l'ordre chronologique des deux actions est ceci : elles arriveront à l'hôtel d'abord, et puis, elles téléphoneront à leur famille.
 - Faisons maintenant la conclusion : La forme qui exprime une action antérieure s'appelle le futur antérieur. On forme le futur antérieur du futur simple des verbes auxiliaires « avoir » ou « être » en ajoutant le participe passé du verbe conjugué.

Je vous donne des exemples :

Exemple 1

T : Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel ou de l'Arc de Triomphe ?

T : Elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel. Répétez.

S : Elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel.

T : Oui, elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel

Exemple 2

T : Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin de Luxembourg ou dans le jardin des Tuileries ?

T : Elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin des Tuileries. Répétez.

S : Elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin des Tuileries.

T : Oui, elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin des Tuileries.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà visité le Louvre ou le Musée d'Orsay ?

Elles auront déjà visité le Musée d'Orsay.

2. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà mangé dans un restaurant chic, ou dans un café bon marché ?

Elles auront déjà mangé dans un restaurant chic.

3. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles se seront déjà habillées en Chanel ou en Hermès ?

Elles se seront déjà habillées en Hermès.

4. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles seront déjà allées au Quartier Latin à pied ou en taxi ?

Elles seront déjà allées au Quartier Latin à pied.

5. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà joué des matchs de football ou des matchs de tennis ?

Elles auront déjà joué des matchs de tennis.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples.

Exemple 3

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs ou de mode ?

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs. Répétez.

S : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs.

T : Oui, elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs.

Exemple 4

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le dîner ou le petit déjeuner ?

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le petit déjeuner. Répétez

S : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le petit déjeuner.

T : Oui, elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le petit déjeuner.

6. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront trouvé la banque ou le stade?
Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront trouvé le stade.

7. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles se seront entraînées au gymnase ou à la piscine?
Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles se seront entraînées au gymnase.

8. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront téléphoné à leurs amis ou à leur famille ?
Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront téléphoné à leur famille.

9. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles seront arrivées au stade ou à l'hôtel ?
Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles seront arrivées au stade.

10. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront bu de l'Evian ou de Volvic ?
Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront bu de Volvic.

Le futur antérieur- INDUCTIVE

Les sœurs Venus et Serena voyageront à Paris en mars 2010. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent ce qui se passera pendant leur voyage. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements au futur. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Je vous donne des exemples :

Exemple 1

T : Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel ou de l'Arc de Triomphe ?

T : Elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel. Répétez.

S : Elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel.

T : Oui, elles seront déjà montées en haut de la Tour Eiffel

Exemple 2

T : Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin de Luxembourg ou dans le jardin des Tuileries ?

T : Elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin des Tuileries. Répétez.

S : Elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin des Tuileries.

T : Oui, elles se seront déjà promenées dans le jardin des Tuileries.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà visité le Louvre ou le Musée d'Orsay ?

Elles auront déjà visité le Musée d'Orsay.

2. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà mangé dans un restaurant chic, ou dans un café bon marché ?

Elles auront déjà mangé dans un restaurant chic.

3. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles se seront déjà habillées en Chanel ou en Hermès ?

Elles se seront déjà habillées en Hermès.

4. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles seront déjà allées au Quartier Latin à pied ou en taxi ?

Elles seront déjà allées au Quartier Latin à pied.

5. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles auront déjà joué des matchs de football ou des matchs de tennis ?

Elles auront déjà joué des matchs de tennis.

Attention on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples.

Exemple 3

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs ou de mode ?

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs. Répétez.

S : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs.

T : Oui, elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront parlé aux journalistes sportifs.

Exemple 4

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le dîner ou le petit déjeuner ?

T : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le petit déjeuner. Répétez

S : Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le petit déjeuner.

T : Oui, elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront pris le petit déjeuner.

6. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront trouvé la banque ou le stade ?
Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront trouvé le stade.

7. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles se seront entraînées au gymnase ou à la piscine?

Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles se seront entraînées au gymnase.

8. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront téléphoné à leurs amis ou à leur famille ?

Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront téléphoné à leur famille.

9. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles seront arrivées au stade ou à l'hôtel ?

Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles seront arrivées au stade.

10. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront bu de l'Evian ou de Volvic ?

Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles auront bu de Volvic.

Rule Construction

Regardez ces phrases :

1. Quand elles quitteront Paris, elles _____ déjà _____ (visiter) le Musée d'Orsay.

2. Elles joueront au tennis aussitôt qu'elles _____ _____ (parler) aux journalistes sportifs.

- L'action dans ces phrases aura lieu quand? Au passé, à l'avenir ?
- Dans la première phrase quel est l'ordre chronologique des deux actions? Est-ce qu'elles quitteront Paris d'abord, ou est-ce qu'elles visiteront le Musée d'Orsay?
- Dans la deuxième phrase, quel est l'ordre chronologique des deux actions? Est-ce qu'elles téléphoneront à leur famille d'abord, ou est-ce qu'elles arriveront à l'hôtel?
- Comment conjuguez-vous le verbe qui indique une action antérieure? Utilisez-vous un verbe ou deux ? Quelle forme prend le verbe auxiliaire ? Et le verbe conjugué ?
- Maintenant, complétons les phrases ensemble.

Le subjonctif présent- DEDUCTIVE

Oprah Winfrey et Gayle King sont les meilleures amies du monde. Elles partagent ensemble des moments précieux. En plus, les amies partent souvent en voyage pour passer de temps avec les enfants de Gayle. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent leur vie quotidienne. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (Deductive) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle aille (aller) à l'opéra.

Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle apprennent (apprendre) l'histoire américaine.

- Dans la première phrase, la conjonction qui précède la subordonnée est **avant que**. Cette conjonction exprime le *temps* de l'action.
- Et dans la deuxième phrase, la conjonction qui précède la subordonnée est **afin que**. Cette conjonction exprime le *but* de l'action.
- Notez : le sujet du verbe de la principale et le sujet du verbe de la subordonnée sont différents.
- Maintenant, attention ! Pour conjuguer les verbes qui suivent les conjonctions exprimant le temps et le but de l'action on emploie le subjonctif présent. Le subjonctif présent se forme du radical de la troisième personne pluriel de l'indicatif auquel on ajoute les terminaisons de -e, -es, -e, -ions, -iez, -ent. Certains verbes irréguliers reçoivent un radical spécial.
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: 1) le subjonctif est la forme du verbe qui suit certaines conjonctions de temps et de but.

Exemple 1

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa maison ou de sa voiture ?

T Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa voiture.

S Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa voiture.

T Oui, Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa voiture.

Exemple 2

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant ou au studio ?

T : Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant.

S : Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant.

T : Oui, Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez :

1. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle aille à l'opéra ou au supermarché ?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle aille à l'opéra.
2. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle fasse la cuisine ou la vaisselle?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle fasse la vaisselle.
3. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui prépare un petit déjeuner ou un dîner de fête ?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui prépare un dîner de fête.
4. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui demande de réarranger la salle à manger ou la chambre?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui demande de réarranger la chambre.
5. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui offre à boire du thé ou du coca?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui offre à boire du thé.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

Et comme deuxième type d'exemple,

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes connues ou inconnues ?

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes inconnues. Répétez.

S : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes inconnues.

T : Oui, les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes inconnues.

Exemple 4

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales ou des lettres ?

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales. Répétez.

S : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales.

T : Oui, Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez :

6. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle mangent dans des restaurants chic ou au MacDo ?
Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle mangent dans des restaurants chic.

7. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle achètent des vêtements ou des souvenirs?
Les deux amies voyagent ensemble avant que les enfants de Gayle achètent des souvenirs.
8. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle apprennent l'histoire de leur famille ou l'histoire américaine ?
Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle apprennent l'histoire américaine.
9. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle rendent visite à leur famille ou à leurs amis ?
Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle rendent visite à leurs amis.
10. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle découvrent la cuisine internationale ou la cuisine locale ?
Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle découvrent la cuisine internationale.

Le subjonctif présent- INDUCTIVE

Oprah Winfrey et Gayle King sont les meilleures amies du monde. Elles partagent ensemble des moments précieux. En plus, les amies partent souvent en voyage pour passer de temps avec les enfants de Gayle. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent leur vie quotidienne. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Exemple 1

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa maison ou de sa voiture ?

T Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa voiture.

S Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa voiture.

T Oui, Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui téléphone de sa voiture.

Exemple 2

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant ou au studio ?

T : Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant.

S : Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant.

T : Oui, Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle l'accompagne au restaurant.

Continuez :

11. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle aille à l'opéra ou au supermarché ?

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle aille à l'opéra.

12. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle fasse la cuisine ou la vaisselle?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle fasse la vaisselle.
13. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui prépare le petit déjeuner ou un dîner de fête ?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui prépare un dîner de fête.
14. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui demande de réarranger la salle à manger ou la chambre?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui demande de réarranger la chambre.
15. Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui offre à boire du thé ou du coca?
Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle lui offre à boire du thé.

Attention, on change un peu :

Exemple 3

Et comme deuxième type d'exemple,

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes connues ou inconnues ?

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes inconnues. Répétez.

S : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes inconnues.

T : Oui, les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle puissent prendre des routes inconnues.

Exemple 4

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales ou des lettres ?

T : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales. Répétez.

S : Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales.

T : Oui, Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle envoient des cartes postales.

16. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle mangent dans des restaurants chic ou au MacDo ?
Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle mangent dans des restaurants chic.
17. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle achètent des vêtements ou des souvenirs?

Les deux amies partent ensemble en voyage avant qu'elles achètent des souvenirs.

18. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle apprennent l'histoire de leur famille ou l'histoire américaine ?

Les deux amies partent ensemble en voyage afin que les enfants de Gayle apprennent l'histoire américaine.

19. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle rendent visite à leur famille ou à leurs amis ?

Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle rendent visite à leurs amis.

20. Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle découvrent la cuisine internationale ou la cuisine locale ?

Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle découvrent la cuisine internationale.

Rule Construction (INDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

Oprah s'habille élégamment avant que Gayle _____ (aller) à l'opéra.

Les deux amies voyagent ensemble afin que les enfants de Gayle _____ (apprendre) l'histoire américaine.

- Dans la première phrase, quelle est la conjonction qui précède la subordonnée ? Cette conjonction exprime-t-elle le temps de l'action ou le but de l'action ?
- Et dans la deuxième phrase, quelle est la conjonction qui précède la subordonnée ? Cette conjonction exprime-t-elle le temps de l'action ou le but de l'action ?
- Quel est le sujet de la phrase principale ? Quel est le sujet de la subordonnée ? Est-ce qu'ils sont les mêmes ou sont-ils différents ?
- Maintenant, attention ! Comment conjuguez-vous les verbes qui suivent les conjonctions exprimant le temps et le but de l'action ? Reconnaissez-vous le radical de ces verbes ? Et les terminaisons ? Attention, certains verbes irréguliers reçoivent un radical spécial.
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: 1) quelle est la forme du verbe qui suit certaines conjonctions de temps et de but ?

Complétons les phrases ensemble.

Des pronoms relatifs **où/dont** - DEDUCTIVE

Atlanta est une ville moderne et internationale. Elle est gouvernée par Shirley Franklin, la première femme-maire dans l'histoire de la ville. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent des événements dans la vie de la ville d'Atlanta et de ses habitants. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (Deductive)

Regardons ces exemples ensemble.

Atlanta c'est une ville. Dans cette ville, les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.
Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.

Atlanta c'est une ville. Le maire de cette ville est Shirley Franklin.
Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

- Dans le premier exemple il y a une phrase principale et une phrase subordonnée.
- Le pronom qui relie ces deux phrases et qui évite la répétition du nom « la ville » c'est le pronom « **où** ». Il remplace un mot placé avant lui et il indique un complément de lieu.
- Dans le deuxième exemple, il y a une phrase principale et une phrase subordonnée.
- Le pronom qui relie ces deux phrases et qui évite la répétition du nom « la ville » c'est le pronom « **dont** ». Il remplace un mot placé avant lui et il indique un complément d'un nom suivi de « de ».
- Faisons maintenant la conclusion : le pronom « **où** » indique un complément de lieu. Le pronom « **dont** » indique un complément d'un nom suivi de « de ». Les deux pronoms remplacent un mot placé devant eux pour éviter la répétition d'un nom.

Je vous donne des exemples :

Exemple 1

Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture ou à vélo ?
T Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture. Répétez.
S Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.
T Oui, Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.

Exemple 2

Atlanta c'est une ville où on peut faire ses études à Emory ou à Yale ?
T Atlanta c'est une ville où on peut faire ses études à Emory. Répétez.
S Atlanta c'est une ville où on faire ses études à Emory.
T Oui, Atlanta c'est une ville où on faire ses études à Emory.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Atlanta c'est une ville où la majorité parle français ou anglais ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où la majorité parle anglais.
2. Atlanta c'est une ville où la circulation est intense ou lente ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où la circulation est intense.
3. Atlanta c'est une ville où il neige beaucoup ou peu ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où il neige peu.
4. Atlanta c'est une ville où il y a beaucoup de gratte-ciel ou beaucoup de petites maisons ? Atlanta c'est une ville où il y a beaucoup de gratte-ciel.
5. Atlanta c'est une ville où on trouve le Louvre ou le musée *High* ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où on trouve le musée *High*.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

Et comme deuxième type d'exemple,

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin ou Michael Bloomberg ?

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

S : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

T : Oui, Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

Exemple 4

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind* ou dans *Les Misérables* ?

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind*.

S : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind*.

T : Oui, Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind*.

6. Atlanta c'est la ville dont les habitants fréquentent souvent *Broadway* ou *Fox Theatre* ?
Atlanta c'est la ville dont les habitants fréquentent souvent *Fox Theatre*.
7. Atlanta c'est la ville dont on écrit souvent dans *Atlanta Journal Constitution* ou dans *New York Daily News* ?
Atlanta c'est la ville dont on écrit souvent dans *Atlanta Journal Constitution*.
8. Atlanta c'est la ville dont on parle souvent à *CNN* ou à *TV5* ?
Atlanta c'est la ville dont on parle souvent à *CNN*.

9. Atlanta c'est la ville dont la description se trouve dans l'atlas de Californie ou de Géorgie?
Atlanta c'est la ville dont la description se trouve dans l'atlas de Géorgie.
10. Atlanta c'est la ville dont vous allez garder un bon ou mauvais souvenir ?
Atlanta c'est la ville dont nous allons garder un bon souvenir.

Des pronoms relatifs où/dont - INDUCTIVE

Atlanta est une ville moderne et internationale. Elle est gouvernée par Shirley Franklin, la première femme-maire dans l'histoire de la ville. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent des événements dans la vie de la ville d'Atlanta et de ses habitants. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Je vous donne des exemples :

Exemple 1

Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture ou à vélo ?
T Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture. Répétez.
S Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.
T Oui, Atlanta c'est une ville où les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.

Exemple 2

Atlanta c'est une ville où on peut faire ses études à Emory ou à Yale ?
T Atlanta c'est une ville où on peut faire ses études à Emory. Répétez.
S Atlanta c'est une ville où on faire ses études à Emory.
T Oui, Atlanta c'est une ville où on faire ses études à Emory.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

11. Atlanta c'est une ville où la majorité parle français ou anglais ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où la majorité parle anglais.
12. Atlanta c'est une ville où la circulation est intense ou lente ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où la circulation est intense.
13. Atlanta c'est une ville où il neige beaucoup ou peu ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où il neige peu.
14. Atlanta c'est une ville où il y a beaucoup de gratte-ciel ou beaucoup de petites maisons ? Atlanta c'est une ville où il y a beaucoup de gratte-ciel.
15. Atlanta c'est une ville où on trouve le Louvre ou le musée *High* ?
Atlanta c'est une ville où on trouve le musée *High*.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

Et comme deuxième type d'exemple,

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin ou Michael Bloomberg ?

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

S : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

T : Oui, Atlanta c'est la ville dont le maire est Shirley Franklin.

Exemple 4

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind* ou dans *Les Misérables* ?

T : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind*.

S : Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind*.

T : Oui, Atlanta c'est la ville dont le nom a été mentionné dans *Gone With the Wind*.

16. Atlanta c'est la ville dont les habitants fréquentent souvent *Broadway* ou *Fox Theatre* ?

Atlanta c'est la ville dont les habitants fréquentent souvent *Fox Theatre*.

17. Atlanta c'est la ville dont on écrit souvent dans *Atlanta Journal Constitution* ou dans *New York Daily News* ?

Atlanta c'est la ville dont on écrit souvent dans *Atlanta Journal Constitution*.

18. Atlanta c'est la ville dont on parle souvent à *CNN* ou à *TV5* ?

Atlanta c'est la ville dont on parle souvent à *CNN*.

19. Atlanta c'est la ville dont la description se trouve dans l'atlas de Californie ou de Géorgie ?

Atlanta c'est la ville dont la description se trouve dans l'atlas de Géorgie.

20. Atlanta c'est la ville dont vous allez garder un bon ou mauvais souvenir ?

Atlanta c'est la ville dont nous allons garder un bon souvenir.

Rule Construction (**Inductive**)

Regardons ces deux exemples ensemble.

Atlanta, c'est une ville. Dans cette ville, les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.

Atlanta, c'est une ville ____ les habitants préfèrent se déplacer en voiture.

Atlanta, c'est une ville. Le maire de cette ville est Shirley Franklin.

Atlanta c'est une ville _____ le maire est Shirley Franklin.

- Dans le premier exemple est-ce qu'il y a une phrase principale ? Est-ce qu'il y a une phrase subordonnée ?

- Quel est le pronom qui relie ces deux phrases et qui évite la répétition du nom « la ville » ? Ce pronom « où », remplace-t-il un mot placé avant lui ou après lui ? Indique-t-il un complément de lieu ?
- Dans le deuxième exemple, est-ce qu'il y a une phrase principale ? Est-ce qu'il y a une phrase subordonnée ?
- Quel est le pronom qui relie ces deux phrases et qui évite la répétition du nom « la ville » ? Ce pronom « dont », remplace-t-il un mot placé avant lui ou après lui ? Indique-t-il un complément d'un nom suivi de « de » ?
- Faisons maintenant la conclusion : quel est le pronom qui indique un complément de lieu ? Et quel pronom indique un complément d'un nom suivi de « de » ? Les deux pronoms remplacent un mot placé dans quelle position dans la phrase ?
- Complétons les deux exemples ensemble.

Le subjonctif passé - Deductive

Paris Hilton est héritière de la fortune de la famille Hilton. Elle est aussi amie de Nicole Richie. Les deux stars mènent un mode de vie peu ordinaire. Elles réfléchissent aux expériences quotidiennes qu'elles ont vécues pendant le tournage de la série télévisée *The Simple Life*. Paris considère aussi des choses dont elle est contente et dont elle est plutôt déçue. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (DEDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Nicole est contente que Paris soit née (naître) dans une famille riche.
2. Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit (interdire) d'aller en boîte de nuit.

- Dans les deux exemples, les mots « contente » et « déçue » dans la principale expriment un sentiment ou un état d'esprit.
- Notez : le sujet du verbe de la principale et le sujet du verbe de la subordonnée sont différents.
- L'action de la subordonnée est *antérieure* par rapport à celle de la principale. Ainsi, dans ces phrases il s'agit d'un événement passé dans la vie de Paris.
- Rappelez-vous : si le verbe de la principale exprime un sentiment, un souhait ou un état d'esprit, le verbe de la subordonnée se conjugue au subjonctif.

- Et si l'action de la subordonnée *a lieu avant* l'action de la principale, on emploie une forme verbale composée, qui consiste du verbe auxiliaire avoir ou être au subjonctif présent et le participe passé du verbe.
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: Si la principale contient une expression de sentiment, de souhait ou d'un état d'esprit et la subordonnée exprime une action *antérieure* par rapport à la principale, alors le verbe de la subordonnée prend la forme du *subjonctif passé*.

Exemple 1

T : Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre, ou dans une famille ordinaire ?

T : Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre. Répétez.

S : Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre.

T : Oui, Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre.

Exemple 2

T : Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps en prison ou avec leurs amis ?

T : Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps avec leurs amis. Répétez.

S : Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps avec leurs amis.

T : Oui, Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps avec leurs amis.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Nicole est contente que le grand-père de Paris soit devenu riche ou pauvre?
Nicole est contente que le grand-père de Paris soit devenu riche.
2. Nicole est contente que Paris ait conduit une voiture de luxe ou une voiture bon marché ?
Nicole est contente que Paris ait conduit une voiture de luxe.
3. Nicole est contente que Paris se soit bien habillée ou mal habillée?
Nicole est contente que Paris se soit bien habillée.
4. Nicole est contente que Paris ait fait du shopping chez Gucci ou chez Luis Vuitton ?
Paris est contente que Paris ait fait du shopping chez Luis Vuitton.
5. Nicole est contente que Paris ait reçu beaucoup de compliments ou beaucoup de critique? Paris est contente qu'elle ait reçu beaucoup de compliments.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples:

Exemple 3

T : Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit ou à l'Opéra ?
 T : Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit. Répétez.
 S : Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit.
 T : Oui, Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit.

Exemple 4

T : Paris est déçue que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage ou à ses études ?
 T : Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage. Répétez.
 S : Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage.
 T : Oui, Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

6. Paris est déçue que ses parents aient parfois acheté de grands hôtels ou de petits hôtels ?
 Paris est déçu que ses parents aient parfois acheté de petits hôtels.
7. Paris est déçue que ses parents se soient fâchés contre sa sœur ou contre elle ?
 Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient fâchés contre elle.
8. Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient donné des ordres ou des cartes de crédit ?
 Paris est déçu que ses parents lui aient donné des ordres.
9. Paris est déçue que ses parents soient restés contents ou mécontents de ses « exploits » ?
 Paris est déçu que ses parents soient restés mécontents de ses « exploits ».
10. Paris est déçue que ses parents l'aient vue dans une émission télévisée ou dans une vidéo scandaleuse ?
 Paris est déçu que ses parents l'aient vue dans une vidéo scandaleuse.

Le subjonctif passé INDUCTIVE

Paris Hilton est héritière de la fortune de la famille Hilton. Elle est aussi amie de Nicole Richie. Les deux stars mènent un mode de vie peu ordinaire. Elles réfléchissent aux expériences quotidiennes qu'elles ont vécues pendant le tournage de la série télévisée *The Simple Life*. Paris considère aussi des choses dont elle est contente et dont elle est plutôt déçue. Essayez d'expliquer ces événements. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Exemple 1

T : Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre, ou dans une famille ordinaire ?
 T : Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre. Répétez.
 S : Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre.
 T : Oui, Nicole est contente que Paris soit née dans une famille célèbre.

Exemple 2

T : Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps en prison ou avec leurs amis ?

T : Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps avec leurs amis. Répétez.

S : Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps avec leurs amis.

T : Oui, Nicole est contente que Paris ait passé du temps avec leurs amis.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Nicole est contente que le grand-père de Paris soit devenu riche ou pauvre?
Nicole est contente que le grand-père de Paris soit devenu riche.
2. Nicole est contente que Paris ait conduit une voiture de luxe ou une voiture bon marché ?
Nicole est contente que Paris ait conduit une voiture de luxe.
3. Nicole est contente que Paris se soit bien habillée ou mal habillée?
Nicole est contente que Paris se soit bien habillée.
4. Nicole est contente que Paris ait fait du shopping chez Gucci ou chez Luis Vuitton ?
Paris est contente que Paris ait fait du shopping chez Luis Vuitton.
5. Nicole est contente que Paris ait reçu beaucoup de compliments ou beaucoup de critique? Paris est contente qu'elle ait reçu beaucoup de compliments.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples:

Exemple 3

T : Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit ou à l'Opéra ?

T : Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit. Répétez.

S : Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit.

T : Oui, Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient interdit d'aller en boîte de nuit.

Exemple 4

T : Paris est déçue que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage ou à ses études ?

T : Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage. Répétez.

S : Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage.

T : Oui, Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient opposés à son mariage.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Paris est déçue que ses parents aient parfois acheté de grands hôtels ou de petits hôtels ?
Paris est déçu que ses parents aient parfois acheté de petits hôtels.

2. Paris est déçue que ses parents se soient fâchés contre sa sœur ou contre elle ?
Paris est déçu que ses parents se soient fâchés contre elle.
3. Paris est déçue que ses parents lui aient donné des ordres ou des cartes de crédit ?
Paris est déçu que ses parents lui aient donné des ordres.
4. Paris est déçue que ses parents soient restés contents ou mécontents de ses « exploits » ?
Paris est déçu que ses parents soient restés mécontents de ses « exploits ».
5. Paris est déçue que ses parents l'aient vue dans une émission télévisée ou dans une vidéo scandaleuse ?
Paris est déçu que ses parents l'aient vue dans une vidéo scandaleuse.

Rule Construction (INDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

Nicole est contente que Paris _____ (naître) dans une famille riche.

Paris est déçu que ses parents lui _____ (interdire) d'aller en boîte de nuit.

- Dans les deux exemples, trouvez-vous des mots qui expriment un sentiment ou une attitude de l'esprit ?
- Dans la première phrase quel est l'ordre chronologique des deux actions? Est-ce que Paris est contente d'abord, or est-ce qu'elle est née d'abord?
- Et dans la deuxième phrase, quel est l'ordre chronologique des deux actions? Est-ce que les parents de Paris ne lui ont pas permis d'aller en boîte de nuit d'abord, ou est-ce qu'elle est déçue d'abord ?
- Quel est le sujet de la phrase principale ? Quel est le sujet de la subordonnée ? Est-ce qu'ils sont les mêmes ou sont-ils différents ?
- Comment conjuguez-vous les verbes qui suivent des expressions de sentiments, de souhaits ou d'attitude de l'esprit ? Et quand l'action dans la subordonnée a lieu avant l'action dans la principale, comment conjuguez-vous le verbe ? Utilisez-vous le subjonctif passé ou le subjonctif présent?
- Quelle forme prend le verbe auxiliaire ? Et le verbe conjugué ?
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: 1) quelle est la forme du verbe qui suit une expression de sentiment, de souhait ou d'un état d'esprit quand la subordonnée exprime une action *antérieure* par rapport à la principale?

Le discours indirect DEDUCTIVE

Tiger Woods, le champion de golf, voyage beaucoup. Sa femme vient d'apprendre les détails de l'itinéraire de son futur voyage à la compétition « Masters », qui aura lieu à Augusta, en Géorgie. Quand Vijay Singh, un autre joueur de golf décide de voyager avec Tiger, la femme de Tiger explique à l'épouse de Vijay les détails de l'itinéraire.

Rule Construction (Deductive)

1. Tiger a dit qu'il resterait (rester) dans un hôtel de luxe.
 2. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient (célébrer) leurs victoires.
- Dans ces deux exemples, il s'agit des *paroles rapportées* et non pas d'une citation *directe* des paroles d'une personne.
 - La phrase principale contient les paroles rapportées d'une personne. Le verbe « dire » indique que les paroles sont rapportées par la femme de Tiger.
 - La forme temporelle du verbe introductif de la principale est le *passé*.
 - Et dans la phrase subordonnée, il s'agit d'un événement *futur*. Alors vous conjuguez le verbe au conditionnel présent.
 - Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: Quand vous rapportez les paroles d'une personne dans une proposition subordonnée, vous employez le *discours indirect*. Si le verbe introductif dans la proposition principale est au *passé*, et l'événement dans la subordonnée est au *futur*, alors le verbe de la subordonnée prend la forme du *conditionnel présent*.

T : Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport ou de l'hôtel ?

T : Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport. Répétez

S : Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport.

T : Oui, Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport.

T : Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe ou dans un hôtel bon marché ?

T : Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe. Répétez

S : Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe.

T : Oui, Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Tiger a dit qu'il arriverait à l'hôtel à vélo ou en taxi?
Tiger a dit qu'il arriverait à l'hôtel en taxi.

2. Tiger a dit qu'il porterait des bagages lourds ou légers?
Tiger a dit qu'il porterait des bagages lourds.
3. Tiger a dit qu'il mangerait avec ses compétiteurs ou tout seul?
Tiger a dit qu'il mangerait tout seul.
4. Tiger a dit qu'il s'habillerait en costume ou en short?
Tiger a dit qu'il s'habillerait en short.
5. Tiger a dit qu'il passerait son temps libre à l'hôtel ou au tournoi de golf ?
Tiger a dit qu'il passerait son temps libre à l'hôtel.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

- T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leur prix ou de leurs admirateurs après la compétition ?
 T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leurs admirateurs. Répétez
 S : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leurs admirateurs.
 T : Oui, Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leurs admirateurs.

Exemple 4

- T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient sûrement leur échec ou leur victoire ?
 T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient leur victoire. Répétez.
 S : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient leur victoire.
 T : Oui, Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient leur victoire.
6. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se sentiraient certainement fatigués ou animés ?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se sentiraient fatigués.
 7. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils auraient sûrement soif ou faim ?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils auraient faim.
 8. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se coucheraient avant minuit ou après minuit?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se coucheraient avant minuit.
 9. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils parleraient aux journalistes ou aux fans?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils parleraient aux fans.
 10. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils voudraient se reposer ou s'entraîner ?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils voudraient se reposer.

Tiger Woods, le champion de golf, voyage beaucoup. Sa femme vient d'apprendre les détails de l'itinéraire de son futur voyage à la compétition « Masters », qui aura lieu à Augusta, en Géorgie. Quand Vijay Singh, un autre joueur de golf décide de voyager avec Tiger, la femme de Tiger explique à l'épouse de Vijay les détails de l'itinéraire.

T : Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport ou de l'hôtel ?

T : Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport. Répétez

S : Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport.

T : Oui, Tiger a dit qu'il téléphonerait de l'aéroport.

T : Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe ou dans un hôtel bon marché ?

T : Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe.

S : Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe.

T : Oui, Tiger a dit qu'il resterait dans un hôtel de luxe.

Maintenant, c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. Tiger a dit qu'il arriverait à l'hôtel à vélo ou en taxi?
Tiger a dit qu'il arriverait à l'hôtel en taxi.
2. Tiger a dit qu'il porterait des bagages lourds ou légers?
Tiger a dit qu'il porterait des bagages lourds.
3. Tiger a dit qu'il mangerait avec ses compétiteurs ou tout seul?
Tiger a dit qu'il mangerait tout seul.
4. Tiger a dit qu'il s'habillerait en costume ou en short?
Tiger a dit qu'il s'habillerait en short.
5. Tiger a dit qu'il passerait son temps libre à l'hôtel ou au tournoi de golf ?
Tiger a dit qu'il passerait son temps libre à l'hôtel.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leur prix ou de leurs admirateurs après la compétition?

T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leurs admirateurs. Répétez

S : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leurs admirateurs.

T : Oui, Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils prendraient des photos de leurs admirateurs.

Exemple 4

T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient sûrement leur échec ou leur victoire ?

T : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient leur victoire. Répétez.

S : Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient leur victoire.

T : Oui, Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils célébreraient leur victoire.

6. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se sentiraient certainement fatigués ou animés ?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se sentiraient fatigués.
7. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils auraient surement soif ou faim ?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils auraient faim.
8. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se coucheraient avant minuit ou après minuit?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils se coucheraient avant minuit.
9. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils parleraient aux journalistes ou aux fans?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils parleraient aux fans.
10. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils voudraient se reposer ou s'entraîner ?
Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils voudraient se reposer.

Rule Construction (INDUCTIVE) Example sentences appear on PPT.

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

2. Tiger a dit qu'il _____ (rester) dans un hôtel de luxe.
2. Tiger et Vijay ont dit qu'ils _____ (célébrer) leurs victoires.

- Dans ces deux exemples, est-ce qu'on cite *directement* les paroles d'une personne ou est-ce qu'il s'agit des *paroles rapportées* ?
- Quelle partie de la phrase contient les paroles rapportées d'une personne – la subordonnée ou la principale ? Quel est le verbe introductif de la principale qui indique que les paroles sont rapportées par la femme de Tiger ?
- Quelle est la forme temporelle du verbe introductif de la principale – le présent ou le *passé*?
- Et dans la principale, s'agit-il d'un événement présent ou *futur* ? Comment en conjuguez-vous le verbe ? Avez-vous reconnu le radical ? Et les terminaisons ?
- Faisons maintenant la **conclusion**: Quand vous rapportez les paroles d'une personne dans une proposition subordonnée, vous employez quelle forme verbale ? Le verbe introductif dans la proposition principale est au *présent* ou au *passé* ? Et l'événement dans la subordonnée est au *futur* ou au *présent* ? *Donc*, le verbe de la subordonnée prend quelle forme?
- Complétons ces phrases ensemble.

Les pronoms relatifs composés DEDUCTIVE

Michael Jackson a été un des plus célèbres musiciens du monde. Avant sa mort inattendue il a donné une interview à Barbara Walters à propos de sa vie. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent quelques préférences du « roi de la pop ». Essayez d'expliquer ce qui lui a plu. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Rule Construction (Deductive)

Regardons ces deux exemples ensemble.

- C'est la musique classique. Michael s'est intéressé à la musique classique.
- C'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé.

- C'est un dîner luxueux. Michael Jackson a participé au dîner luxueux.
- C'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

- Dans le premier exemple, la phrase principale c'est « C'est la musique classique... ». Et la phrase subordonnée c'est « à laquelle il s'est intéressé ».
- Le nom de la principale que la proposition subordonnée explique c'est « la musique ». Le pronom qui nous permet d'éviter la répétition du nom « la musique » dans la subordonnée c'est « laquelle ».
- La préposition qui précède ce pronom c'est « à ». Le mot dans la phrase subordonnée qui exige l'emploi de la préposition « à » c'est « s'intéresser ».
- Dans le deuxième exemple, la phrase principale c'est « C'est un dîner luxueux ou simple... ». La phrase subordonnée c'est « auquel Michael Jackson a participé ».
- Le nom de la principale que la proposition subordonnée explique c'est « un dîner ». Le pronom qui nous permet d'éviter la répétition du nom « un dîner » dans la subordonnée c'est « auquel ».
- Ce pronom, remplace un complément précédé par la préposition « à ». Le mot dans la phrase subordonnée qui exige l'emploi de cette préposition c'est « participé ».
- Faisons maintenant la conclusion : l'emploi des pronoms « laquelle » et « auquel » nous permet d'éviter la répétition des noms. Certains verbes exigent la contraction de la préposition « à » avec ces pronoms.

Exemple 1

T : C'est la musique rock ou classique à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?

T : C'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé. Répétez.

S : C'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé.

T : Oui, c'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé.

Exemple 2

T : C'est la littérature classique ou moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé?

T : C'est la littérature moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé. Répétez.

S : C'est la littérature moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.

T : Oui, c'est la littérature moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

1. C'est la cuisine italienne ou française à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est la cuisine italienne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
2. C'est la culture allemande ou américaine à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est la culture américaine à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
3. C'est l'histoire de l'art ou de la musique *Motown* à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est l'histoire de la musique *Motown* à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
4. C'est la peinture de Degas ou de Michelange à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ? C'est la peinture de Degas à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
5. C'est l'œuvre de Beckett ou de Sartre à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est l'œuvre de Beckett à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

T : C'est un dîner luxueux ou simple auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?

T : C'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

S : C'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

T : Oui, c'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

Exemple 4

T : C'est un concert international ou local auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?

T : C'est un concert local auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

S : C'est un concert local auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

T : Oui, c'est un concert local auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

6. C'est un événement de bienfaisance pour CARE ou le Croix Rouge auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un événement de bienfaisance pour CARE auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
7. C'est un spectacle de danse classique ou de danse « pop » auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un spectacle de danse « pop » auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

8. C'est un entretien avec Barbara Walters ou Ryan Seacrest auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un entretien avec Barbara Walters auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
9. C'est un anniversaire pour son père Joe ou son fils Blanket auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un anniversaire pour son fils Blanket auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
10. C'est un film ennuyeux ou captivant auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un film captivant auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

Des pronoms relatifs composés- INDUCTIVE

Michael Jackson a été un des plus célèbres musiciens du monde. Avant sa mort inattendue il a donné une interview à Barbara Walters à propos de sa vie. Vous allez voir des photos qui décrivent quelques préférences du « roi de la pop ». Essayez d'expliquer ce qui lui a plu. Ecoutez et répondez aux questions.

Exemple 1

- T : C'est la musique rock ou classique à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
 T : C'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé. Répétez.
 S : C'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé.
 T : Oui, c'est la musique classique à laquelle il s'est intéressé.

Exemple 2

- T : C'est la littérature classique ou moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
 T : C'est la littérature moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé. Répétez.
 S : C'est la littérature moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
 T : Oui, c'est la littérature moderne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.

Maintenant c'est à vous. Continuez.

21. C'est la cuisine italienne ou française à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est la cuisine italienne à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
22. C'est la culture allemande ou américaine à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est la culture américaine à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
23. C'est l'histoire de l'art ou de la musique *Motown* à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est l'histoire de la musique *Motown* à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.
24. C'est la peinture de Degas ou de Michelange à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ? C'est la peinture de Degas à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.

25. C'est l'œuvre de Beckett ou de Sartre à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé ?
C'est l'œuvre de Beckett à laquelle Michael Jackson s'est intéressé.

Attention, on change un peu. Je vous donne d'autres exemples :

Exemple 3

- T : C'est un dîner luxueux ou simple auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
T : C'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
S : C'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
T : Oui, c'est un dîner luxueux auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

Exemple 4

- T : C'est un concert international ou local auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
T : C'est un concert local auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
S : C'est un concert local auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
T : Oui, c'est un concert local auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

26. C'est un événement de bienfaisance pour CARE ou le Croix Rouge auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un événement de bienfaisance pour CARE auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
27. C'est un spectacle de danse classique ou de danse « pop » auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un spectacle de danse « pop » auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
28. C'est un entretien avec Barbara Walters ou Ryan Seacrest auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un entretien avec Barbara Walters auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
29. C'est un anniversaire pour son père Joe ou son fils Blanket auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un anniversaire pour son fils Blanket auquel Michael Jackson a participé.
30. C'est un film ennuyeux ou captivant auquel Michael Jackson a participé ?
C'est un film captivant auquel Michael Jackson a participé.

Rule Construction (Inductive)

Regardons ces deux exemples ensemble.

- C'est la musique classique. Michael s'est intéressé à la musique classique.
- C'est la musique classique _____ il s'est intéressé.

- C'est un dîner luxueux. Michael Jackson a participé au dîner luxueux.
- C'est un dîner luxueux _____ Michael Jackson a participé.

- Dans le premier exemple quelle est la phrase principale ? Quelle est la phrase subordonnée ?
- Quel est le nom de la principale que la proposition subordonnée explique? Quel est le pronom qui nous permet d'éviter la répétition du nom « la musique » dans la subordonnée ?
- Avez-vous reconnu la préposition qui précède ce pronom ? Quel est le mot dans la phrase subordonnée qui exige l'emploi de la préposition « à » ?
- Dans le deuxième exemple, quelle est la phrase principale ? Quelle est la phrase subordonnée ?
- Quel est le nom de la principale que la proposition subordonnée explique? Quel est le pronom qui nous permet d'éviter la répétition du nom « un dîner luxueux » dans la subordonnée ?
- Ce pronom, est-ce qu'il remplace un complément précédé par la contraction « au » ? Quel est le mot dans la phrase subordonnée qui exige l'emploi de cette contraction?
- **Maintenant, complétons les deux exemples ensemble.**

Table 1

Sample Student Characteristics by Class

Characteristics	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
Gender				
Number of Females	9	13	6	5
Number of Males	4	1	0	3
University classification				
Freshmen	11	6	4	7
Sophomore	2	7	2	0
Junior	0	0	0	1
Senior	0	1	0	0
Graduate Student	0	0	0	0
Years Experience				
Mean	4.92	5.14	1.17	4.38
Standard Deviation	1.19	1.61	1.47	1.50

Table 2

Grammar Pretest and Posttest Items Means and Standard Deviations (N = 41)

Structures	Items	<i>Pretest</i>		<i>Posttest</i>	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
S1	6	.63	.488	.62	.471
	19	.49	.506	.49	.506
S2	1	.15	.358	.24	.435
	7	.22	.419	.22	.419
S3	9	.27	.449	.44	.502
	12	.46	.505	.56	.502
S4	11	.20	.401	.17	.381
	17	.17	.381	.27	.449
S5	5	.59	.499	.71	.461
	14	.59	.499	.66	.480
S6	8	.34	.480	.29	.461
	20	.32	.471	.54	.505
S7	4	.17	.381	.39	.494
	13	.39	.494	.59	.499
S8	10	.39	.494	.56	.502
	18	.32	.471	.22	.419
S9	3	.41	.499	.51	.506
	15	.51	.506	.59	.499
S10	2	.29	.461	.22	.419
	16	.27	.449	.44	.502

Table 3

Immediate Grammar Test Reliability and Item Difficulty (N = 41)

Grammar Tests	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Full Credit	Partial Credit	Cronbach's Alpha
Test 1	1	1.74	.442	.71	.24	.61
	2	1.54	.600	.56	.34	
	3	.87	.833	.27	.29	
	4	1.03	.537	.49	.32	
Test 2	1	1.42	.692	.46	.32	.77
	2	1.33	.752	.44	.29	
	3	1.47	.654	.49	.32	
	4	1.14	.539	.22	.56	
Test 3	1	1.05	.677	.24	.54	.80
	2	1.03	.768	.29	.42	
	3	1.70	.516	.71	.24	
	4	1.43	.781	.56	.22	
Test 4	1	1.72	.454	.63	.24	.62
	2	1.58	.604	.56	.27	
	3	1.31	.525	.29	.56	
	4	1.36	.543	.34	.51	
Test 5	1	1.46	.637	.51	.29	.68
	2	1.35	.789	.49	.24	
	3	1.32	.784	.46	.27	
	4	1.24	.641	.32	.49	
Test 6	1	1.13	.704	.29	.46	.73
	2	1.45	.602	.46	.42	
	3	1.11	.798	.34	.34	
	4	1.08	.784	.32	.37	
Test 7	1	1.28	.659	.20	.37	.72
	2	1.11	.622	.20	.37	
	3	1.39	.688	.32	.39	
	4	1.36	.639	.22	.42	
Test 8	1	.89	.758	.34	.44	.78
	2	.89	.758	.22	.42	
	3	1.20	.719	.44	.34	
	4	1.00	.728	.39	.42	
Test 9	1	1.35	.824	.52	.20	.64
	2	1.08	.862	.37	.24	
	3	1.73	.560	.71	.15	
	4	1.57	.647	.59	.24	
Test 10	1	1.63	.633	.66	.20	.67
	2	1.55	.504	.51	.42	
	3	1.63	.633	.66	.20	
	4	1.45	.555	.44	.46	

Table 4

Paired samples t Test Results for Immediate Quizzes (N = 41)

Method	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>p</i>
Guided Inductive Score	66.42	17.18	-.135	0.0151	.893
Deductive Score	66.71	17.71			

Table 5

ANOVA Results of Grammar Pre-test and Post-test (N = 41)

Source	df	SS	MS	F	η^2	p
Time	1	22.69	22.69	12.10	.232	.001
Error	40	75.06	1.88			
Method	1	.494	.494	.066	.002	.798
Error	40	1.176	.044			
Time*Method	1	6.64	6.64	4.28	.097	.045
Error	40	62.11	1.55			

Table 6

Grammar Pre- and Post-test Means and Standard Deviations by Condition (N = 41)

Method	Pre-test		Post-test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Guided Inductive	3.37	2.03	4.51	2.10
Deductive	3.88	2.26	4.22	2.60