

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this 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 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 dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this dissertation.

Signature:

Séverine P. Vogel

Date

Teaching Grammar Through Cultural Presentations: Investigating the Effects of a Guided
Inductive and a Deductive Approach on the Learning of Grammar and Culture in
Intermediate-Level College French

By

Séverine P. Vogel
Doctor of Philosophy

French & Educational Studies

Carol Herron
Advisor

George Engelhard Jr.
Committee Member

Robert Jensen
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

Date

Teaching Grammar Through Cultural Presentations: Investigating the Effects of a Guided
Inductive and a Deductive Approach on the Learning of Grammar and Culture in
Intermediate-Level College French

By

Séverine P. Vogel
Licence, Université Paris VII Denis Diderot, 2001
Maîtrise, Université Paris VII Denis Diderot, 2003
M.A., Miami University of Ohio, 2005

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 French & Educational Studies
2010

Abstract

Teaching Grammar Through Cultural Presentations: Investigating the Effects of a Guided Inductive and a Deductive Approach on the Learning of Grammar and Culture in Intermediate-Level College French

By Séverine P. Vogel

This study was designed to integrate culture into the teaching of grammar in an intermediate-level French course. It focused on eight grammatical structures taught via eight cultural topics. The purpose of this research was to investigate whether a guided inductive or a deductive instructional approach most effectively promoted the learning of the targeted forms as well as grammatical accuracy in writing tasks. The study also examined whether a guided inductive or a deductive approach that presented grammar in a cultural context would affect the retention of culture. Through a within-subjects design, this study compared the effects of a guided inductive approach (Adair-Hauck, Donato & Cumo-Johanssen, 2005; Herron & Tomasello, 1992) and a traditional deductive approach on students' short and long-term learning of grammatical structures and retention of cultural information. A secondary goal was to investigate students' preferences for each instructional approach, as well as their opinions regarding the integration of culture into grammar lessons.

The effects of the approaches on students' grammar performances were measured through a grammar pretest, immediate post-treatment tests, writing tasks, and a delayed posttest. Students' retention of culture was assessed via immediate post-treatment tests and a pretest/posttest comparison. Relationships between instructional preferences and performances were examined. The participants were 25 students enrolled in a third-semester French course. Findings indicated a significantly greater effect of the guided inductive approach on students' immediate grammar performances. Long-term analyses showed a significant improvement of grammar knowledge over time in both treatment conditions. Analyses of the culture pre/posttest indicated a significant improvement in cultural knowledge over time, but no interaction effect. A majority of students stated a preference for the deductive approach. No significant relationship between students' preference and performances were found. A majority of students enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context, although several expressed feelings of cognitive overload. The results of this study suggested that culture could be integrated into the study of grammar. They indicated that a collaborative approach to constructing rule explanations could benefit intermediate-level students' learning of grammar. Active involvement and hypothesis testing can lead to increased grammar performance in a foreign language classroom.

Teaching Grammar Through Cultural Presentations: Investigating the Effects of a Guided
Inductive and a Deductive Approach on the Learning of Grammar and Culture in
Intermediate-Level College French

By

Séverine P. Vogel
Licence, Université Paris VII Denis Diderot, 2001
Maîtrise, Université Paris VII Denis Diderot, 2003
M.A., Miami University of Ohio, 2005

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 French & Educational Studies
2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Pedagogical trends in foreign language teaching.....	2
Proficiency-oriented instruction.....	5
Standards for foreign language learning.....	8
Theoretical framework	10
Statement of the problem	11
Purpose of the study	13
Research questions	14
Definition of terms	15
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	17
The role of grammar instruction.....	17
Inductive vs. deductive teaching approaches	22
The audio-lingual inductive approach	22
Empirical studies	24
Grammar instruction at the intermediate-level	34
Language skills development and culture in FL instruction	35
Students' opinions on foreign language learning	46
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	49
Mixed methods research design.....	49
Rational.....	50
Implementation and priority	50
Participants and setting.....	51

Consent procedures and confidentiality	52
Classroom procedures	53
Target structures and cultural themes	54
Research design	55
Treatment procedures.....	56
Instruments	58
Background questionnaire	58
Grammar pretest and posttest.....	58
Culture pretest and posttest.....	59
Immediate grammar posttests	59
Immediate culture posttests.....	60
Delayed writing tasks.....	61
Preference and perception questionnaire	61
Quantitative Data Analyses	61
Research question 1	61
Research question 2	62
Research question 3	62
Research question 4	63
Research question 5	63
Research question 6 &7	63
Research question 8	64
Qualitative Data Analysis Phase	64
Data sources	64

Data analysis	65
Reliability and validity	66
Researcher bias	66
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS	69
Quantitative Data Interpretation	69
Preliminary analyses: pretests differences	69
Preliminary analyses: instruments	69
Analyses of research questions	72
Question 1	72
Question 2	72
Question 3	74
Question 4	74
Question 5	75
Question 6	76
Question 7	76
Question 8	78
Qualitative Data interpretation.....	79
Open-ended responses interpretation	79
Question 6:	80
Preference of instructional approach	80
Opinions of the deductive approach	82
Opinions of the guided inductive approach	83
Question 7:	85

Preference	85
Grammar learning effects	87
Culture retention effects.....	90
Interviews	92
Perceptions of instruction in this study.....	93
Preference of instructional approach	99
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	105
Limitations	105
Analyses of results	109
Questions 1, 2 & 3	109
Questions 4 & 5	118
Questions 6, 7 & 8	121
Conclusion	129
REFERENCES.....	131
APPENDICES.....	142
Appendix A: Background questionnaire.....	142
Appendix B: Guided inductive and deductive lessons plans	143
Appendix C: Grammar pre/posttest	177
Appendix D: Culture pre/posttest	180
Appendix E: Immediate grammar posttests	186
Appendix F: Immediate culture posttests	190
Appendix G: Delayed writing tasks.....	193
Appendix H: Preference and perception questionnaire	194

Appendix I: Interview guide	196
Appendix J: Interview transcripts	197
Appendix K: First and second level codes.....	231
TABLES.....	233
Table 1: Student characteristics by course section	233
Table 2: Grammatical structures and associated cultural topics.....	234
Table 3: Equivalent times sample design.....	235
Table 4: Grammar and culture pretest means and standard deviations	236
Table 5: Grammar pretest and posttest items means and standard deviations.....	237
Table 6: Culture pretest and posttest items means and standard deviations	238
Table 7: Immediate grammar tests reliability and item difficulty	239
Table 8: Immediate culture tests item difficulty	240
Table 9: Paired <i>t</i> test results for the immediate grammar tests	241
Table 10: Paired <i>t</i> test results for the writing tasks (<i>n</i> = 14).....	242
Table 11: Paired <i>t</i> test results for the writing tasks (<i>n</i> = 22).....	243
Table 12: Correlations between performance on immediate grammar tests and writing tasks.....	244
Table 13: Grammar pretest and posttest means and standard deviations	245
Table 14: ANOVA results grammar	246
Table 15: Paired <i>t</i> test results for the immediate culture tests	247
Table 16: Culture pretest and posttest means and standard deviations.....	248
Table 17: ANOVA results culture	249

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The adoption of communicative language teaching in foreign language classrooms, along with the implementation of the *American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages' (ACTFL) Provisional Proficiency Guidelines* (1986 revised in 1999), has led to a considerable amount of research on the effects of grammar instruction on second and foreign language learning and acquisition. Grammar is no longer the organizing principal of the foreign language classroom, but remains nonetheless an integral component of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Omaggio Haddley, 2001). Teachers have been and continue to be faced with the issue of how to teach grammar most effectively within a communicative context. This question has been abundantly debated in the fields of applied linguistics, second language acquisition and among instructors for several decades. In addition, with the implementation of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st century* (1999), the field of foreign language education has seen an increased emphasis on the importance of culture in foreign language programs. As Kramsch (1993) stated, "Culture in language learning is not an expendable fifth skill, tacked on, so to speak, to the teaching of speaking, listening, reading, and writing" (p. 1). In accordance with Kramsch, many educators have stressed the importance of integrating the teaching of culture and language into the curriculum. A consensus on how to integrate most effectively culture and language in the classroom, however, remains an open debate. The present study

represented an attempt to integrate culture into the teaching of grammatical structures and to assess the most effective approach to presenting the targeted grammatical structures.

Pedagogical Trends in Foreign Language Teaching

A brief history of pedagogical trends in the teaching and learning of foreign languages provides essential background information on the various methods that have influenced the role of grammar in the classroom. Prior to the 1970s, three major methods fostered specific approaches to teaching grammar in foreign language classrooms (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). The grammar translation method, the direct method, and the audio-lingual method successfully dominated foreign language teaching prior to the rise of communicative language teaching methods. Below is a brief description of these teaching methods.

In the nineteenth century and through the beginning of the twentieth century, the grammar-translation method, originally used to teach Latin and Greek, was the most common method for teaching a foreign language. Grammar-translation was extensively based on the learning of grammar rules and on the memorization and translation of vocabulary lists. Little or no emphasis was given to oral skills and communication (Shrum & Glisan, 2005; Omaggio Hadley, 2001). The grammar-translation method relied on a deductive approach to teaching grammar, where students first learned the grammar rules by means of teacher explanations in grammatical terminology and then manipulated the targeted linguistic structures via mechanical exercises (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). Learning of the target language occurred primarily through memorization and translation.

In reaction to the grammar-translation method, the direct method emerged in the first half of the twentieth century and fostered an oral/aural approach to teaching foreign

languages. Learning a foreign language was no longer accomplished by translating sentences and vocabulary lists as in the grammar-translation classroom; instead, instruction involved a much greater aural/oral exposure to the target language (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). Students were exposed to the target language only, and lessons were often built around pictures of real-life situations in order to avoid translation. Students were to acquire grammar rules inductively through imitations and repetitions (Shrum & Glisan, 2005). The central role of grammar was de-emphasized, as the main goal of the direct method was to develop speaking skills and correct pronunciation.

Following the direct method, the audio-lingual method (also known as the army method) emerged after World War II in an effort to better train the military forces in foreign languages. With this teaching method, students were expected to be able to handle the target language at an unconscious, automatic level. This method relied on the use of stimulus-response techniques and on the memorization of dialogues. Language learning occurred mostly through habit formation and internalization, reflecting a behaviorist approach to language learning. Grammar rules were taught with an inductive approach where practice through pattern drills always preceded rule explanations if any (Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2005). The use of the target language was to be maintained at all times to make the foreign language classroom a “cultural island” (Omaggio Haddley, 2001, p. 111). Learners were rarely exposed to meaningful or contextualized input. Both the grammar-translation and the audio-lingual method greatly focused on forms and accuracy, but differed in the way the grammar was presented to students, deductively or through inductive strategies.

In the 1970s, communicative language teaching approaches grew in popularity. They emphasized context and meaning, stressing the importance of providing authentic input in real-world contexts. Learners were to attain communicative competence, defined as “the ability to function in a communicative setting by using not only grammatical knowledge but also gestures and intonation, strategies for making oneself understood” (Shrum & Glisan, 2005, p. 13). Communicative language teaching focused on all elements of communicative competence, including linguistic competence, discourse competence, sociocultural competence, and strategic competences (Canale & Swain, 1980). Communicative competence was not restricted to grammatical competence only. Grammar instruction was de-emphasized, as the focus shifted to what was being said (meaning) rather than how it was being said (form/grammar). Thus, immersion programs supporting a natural approach emerged with no emphasis on grammar instruction. Some scholars argued that explicit instruction of grammatical concepts was not necessary for language acquisition to take place (Krashen, 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Krashen’s view, although contested since the 1980s, has influenced the communicative approaches used in today’s foreign language classrooms. Foreign language instruction is currently geared towards providing students contextualized and meaningful input through which learners can engage in meaningful use of the target language (Shrum & Glisan, 2005). However, there were and are no specific approaches to teaching a foreign language for communication. There are, nonetheless, a set of guidelines and standards aimed at building a consensus and at defining the content and goals of foreign language instruction.

Proficiency-Oriented Instruction

In 1986, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) implemented its *Proficiency Guidelines* (ACTFL, 1986) which, according to Omaggio Hadley (2001), represented the “first attempt by the foreign language teaching profession to define and describe levels of functional competence” (p. 9). The *Proficiency Guidelines* emphasized the need for form-focused instruction in a meaningful context and established what students ought to know at various levels of the learning process for speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills.

Form-focused instruction is defined as “any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to induce language learners to pay attention to form” within a communicative framework (Ellis, 2001, pp. 1-2). Indeed, while communicative language teaching is widely accepted as the most popular method for foreign language teaching, Katz and Blyth (2008) expressed concerns as to the role of grammar in the communicative classroom: “Studies have suggested that communicative, entirely input-based programs may not provide guidance for students to acquire problematic elements of grammar” (p. 7). They defined instructional approaches that aim at finding a “middle ground position” by drawing students’ attention to form within a communicative framework as “an attempt to create ideal conditions for grammar learning” (p. 8). Because the absence of meaningful context in foreign language classrooms leads to focus on grammatical accuracy in isolation, many in the field of second and foreign language instruction have agreed that form-focused instructional approaches within a communicative context are most appropriate for the current goals of foreign language

instruction (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001, 2008b; Katz & Blyth, 2008; Omaggio Hadley, 2001).

While the *Proficiency Guidelines* stressed the need for form-focused instruction, they did not impose or advise a methodology or approach for teaching. Omaggio Hadley (2001) proposed a set of working hypotheses or principles to direct instruction toward proficiency. She stressed the need to use the target language for purposeful activities in a context likely to be encountered in the target culture so that language learners would be able to interact with others in the target culture. She emphasized that instruction should attend to students' affective and cognitive needs and should promote cultural understanding. Finally, Omaggio Hadley emphasized the importance of developing accuracy, namely grammatical correctness, in proficiency instruction:

The development of accuracy should be encouraged in proficiency-oriented instruction. As learners produce language, various forms of instruction and evaluative feedback can be useful in facilitating the progression of their skills toward more precise and coherent language use [...] There is a role for form-focused instruction in a proficiency oriented approach, used in a judicious blend with communicative teaching practices (p. 99).

As Ellis (2008a) stated, “ultimately, learners need to develop knowledge of the rules that govern how language is used grammatically and appropriately ” (p. 1). Form-focused instruction aimed at developing accuracy can be carried out in a numbers of ways. Ellis (2008b) distinguished four options for form-focused instruction: (1) input-based options, where the learners are asked to manipulate the input provided to them. Such options include input enhancement, where the target structures are made visually salient, or input

flooding, where the input contains many examples of the target structure, (2) production options, where learners are induced to produce utterances in the target language using the target structure, (3) corrective feedback, which can be implicit by means of recast or explicit by means of explanations, and (4) explicit types of instruction, which include inductive or deductive presentations of grammatical rules.

In a deductive grammar lesson, the teacher first provides learners with an explicit rule explanation of the target structure. After the students are explained the rules, they practice using the structure in an application exercise (Ellis, 2008b). The lesson moves from a general perspective to specific examples. Conversely, in an inductive grammar lesson, a contextualized practice of the target structure occurs first. This activity is aimed at drawing learners' attention to a particular form from which the rule later surfaces. Focus on the rule occurs after an initial practice activity (Ellis, 2008b).

While there seems to be a consensus on how to implement a deductive approach, inductive instructional approaches have been implemented in various ways. Some rely on students to discover the rules by themselves (Shaffer, 1989). Others rely on focusing students' attention on the targeted grammatical structure through an oral practice session followed by the completion of model sentences (Herron & Tomasello, 1992). Adair-Hauck, Donato, and Cumo-Johansen (2005) developed a four-stage inductive approach to teaching grammar, the PACE model. PACE relies on the use of a story that serves to highlight a linguistic structure and its use in context. More precisely, *p* stands for *presentation* of the target form through a contextualized story where the structure appears repeatedly. After this initial input presentation, *attention* to form is given: the teacher focuses students' attention on a particular pattern of the language through a practice

session including several examples. In the *co-construction* phase, the instructor asks a series of guiding questions to engage learners in a collaborative understanding of the rule governing the target structure. Finally, instruction ends with an *extension* activity, which gives students the opportunity to practice the linguistic structure that has just been discussed.

The current investigation was designed to combine elements of the PACE model (Adair-Hauck et al., 2005), whereby teacher and students co-construct the grammar rule, with Herron and Tomasello's (1992) guided induction approach to teach eight grammatical structures. This study expands a significant chain of research that has investigated this hybrid model on students' learning of grammar in elementary, intermediate, and advanced-level college French classrooms (Dotson, 2010; Haight, Herron, & Cole, 2007; Haight, 2008; Vogel, Herron, Cole, & York, in press) while widening its focus to include a cultural component.

Standards for Foreign Language Learning

Indeed, today's foreign language instruction is not only geared toward achieving linguistic competence but also toward cultural understanding. At the time of the grammar-translation method, culture in the foreign classroom was largely limited to the study of literature and presented almost exclusively at advanced levels of instruction (Lafayette, 2000). During the 1970s, first and second year textbooks, based on the audio-lingual method, failed to integrate language teaching and culture into the curriculum (Lafayette, 2000). With a strong emphasis on communication and context in the 1980s, culture became an important element of foreign language learning and efforts were made to establish standards for the teaching and learning of culture along with the development

of communicative competence. The *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (ACTFL, 1996, revised 1999) were created to define a set of content goals for foreign language instruction that encompassed the learning of language and culture. The five content goals, also known as the five intertwined Cs (communication, cultures, connections, comparisons and communities), emphasized “learning language for communication with other people, gaining knowledge and understanding of other cultures, and accessing information from a wide range of disciplines” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 38). The five Cs focused on the importance of culture in the foreign language curriculum and the need to integrate language and culture instruction. Specifically, the content standards for culture underscored the need for students to learn about the practices of a culture – that is, patterns of behavior, and the products of that culture such as literature, painting, or the educational system. In other words, students should develop an understanding of the cultural framework or perspectives of the culture or cultures of the target language they are studying (ACTFL, 1999).

As the *Standards* (ACTFL, 1996, 1999) stressed culture and the need to integrate language learning and culture instruction, cultural material could constitute a meaningful and contextualized presentational context to introduce new grammatical structures. Lafayette (1988) suggested that a way to integrate language and culture was to try and present a cultural topic in conjunction to closely related grammatical content whenever possible. He believed that it was important to use cultural contexts for language activities, including those that focused on specific grammatical forms, the purpose of this study.

Cultural content can be used as presentational material within the framework of the PACE model of instruction to teach grammar (Adair-Hauck et al., 2005). In this

guided participatory model for grammar instruction, the topic of the presentational material is left up to the teacher. The *p* can be, for example, a video, a poem, or a song. In the current investigation, the targeted grammatical structures were embedded in cultural information thematically related to the authentic cultural information from the curriculum. Thematic aspects of France and Francophone countries were taught that encompassed both products and practices of these cultures, such as elements of history, geography, architecture, and everyday practices. The grammar was presented either deductively or with a guided inductive approach to each class, but the cultural information remained the same in both conditions.

Theoretical Framework for the Guided Inductive Approach

The guided inductive approach investigated in this study combined elements of Herron and Tomasello's (1992) guided induction model, as well as elements of the PACE model where students and teacher collaboratively co-construct the grammatical rule. The guided inductive approach presented in this study is grounded in cognitive and sociocultural theories of language learning. Cognitive perspectives on second language learning posit that learning is the result of mental activity, an active process that requires the engagement of the student rather than mere exposure to external stimuli. Learners must engage and actively participate in meaningful learning tasks, and knowledge is constantly constructed and restructured as proficiency develops (Ausubel, 1968; McLaughlin 1987). From a sociocultural perspective, the work of Vygotsky (1978) has had a substantial impact on a variety of research fields including second and foreign language learning. Sociocultural theory, and particularly Vygotskian theory, posits that learning occurs through interactions and collaboration in social settings. The zone of

proximal development (ZDP), defined as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86), has been particularly influential in second language learning. Within sociocultural theory, the concept of mediation plays a critical role in the learning process. Cognitive functions such as reasoning or attention are mediated activities in which the learner participates (Swain, 2000). As Lantolf (2000) pointed out, “novices do not merely copy the experts’ capabilities, rather they transform what the expert offers them as they appropriate it” (p. 17). In second and foreign language educational settings, mediation can take on several forms, whether it is a person, a textbook, or technologically enhanced materials. Adair-Hauck and Donato (2002a) drew on Vygotskian theory to explain how scaffolding, or the interaction between expert and learner in a problem-solving task, may help foreign language learning by providing students with the opportunity to reflect upon the language they are learning under the guidance of the instructor. The learner acquires language with the guidance of an adult expert, suggesting that instructors play an important role in the learning process. The PACE model (Adair-Hauck et al., 2005) reflects this vision of foreign language learning. A key aspect of the PACE model and the hybrid model under investigation in this study is the co-construction phase during which the teacher mediates learning through guiding questions in the elaboration of the grammatical rule.

Statement of the Problem

While focusing on form in a contextualized and communicative context is considered the most favorable approach to teaching a foreign language, Katz and Blyth

(2008) stressed that the way grammar is presented in foreign language textbooks remains outdated, and consists too often of “dry, traditional, and tedious explanations” (p. 5). While Frantzen (1998) concurred that “grammar should not be practiced devoid of context,” she also highlighted the important fact that “culture should not be treated as if it were divorced from the target language,” encouraging the integration of the formal study of grammatical forms with culture in foreign language classrooms (p. 134). Even though the *Standards* have made a solid advancement toward such goal, culture often remains isolated from grammatical content in many foreign language textbooks or is taught in English, thus missing the opportunity to use culture to teach the language (Ballman, 1997; Frantzen, 1998; Grim, 2008).

In addition to the paucity of empirical research on the integration of grammar and cultural teaching in the early stages of foreign language instruction (Grim, 2008), particular types of form-focused instruction implemented within a cultural presentation remain to be further explored. Since the PACE model of instruction can encompass both grammar and culture, it is important to further investigate the effect of this guided inductive model on the learning of both grammar and culture. Much of the literature focusing on the PACE model has described how to implement it in foreign language classrooms in order to meet the goals of the *Standards*' five Cs (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002a). Authors have provided examples of how to teach grammar through oral traditions of storytelling (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002b; Chrysostome, 2000) or through literary texts (Paesani, 2005). However, empirical classroom research on the learning of grammar and culture via PACE has seldom been conducted. Previous research has focused on the learning of grammatical structures only (Dotson, 2010; Haight, 2008;

Haight, et al., 2007; Vogel, et al., in press). Building upon a chain of research on deductive and guided inductive approaches, the current study sought to widen its focus by investigating the effects of these instructional approaches within a cultural context on the learning of both grammar and culture. With a renewed stress on accuracy and cultural knowledge, it is important to continue to investigate the best ways to achieve these objectives in foreign language classrooms.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to integrate culture into the teaching of grammatical forms in an intermediate-level French course, French 201. Its primary purpose was to investigate (1) the type of instructional approaches to teaching grammar that most effectively promotes the learning of those grammatical forms in the short and long-term, (2) the type of instructional approaches to teaching grammar that most effectively promotes grammatical accuracy in writing tasks, and (3) whether different types of form-focused instruction also affect the retention of the cultural content presented. Specifically, this study compared through a within-subjects design the effects of a guided inductive approach (Adair-Hauck et al., 2005; Herron & Tomasello, 1992) and a traditional deductive approach on student learning of French grammatical structures presented via cultural topics. The present investigation was conducted over the course of one semester and focused on a set of eight grammatical structures taught via eight cultural topics. A secondary goal of this study was to investigate students' opinions and preferences for each instructional approach as well as their perceptions regarding the integration of culture into grammar lessons. A mixed methods research design was implemented in this investigation. Quantitative data were collected through grammar and culture pretests,

immediate tests, and posttests. Qualitative data were collected through a post study preference and perception questionnaire and oral interviews.

Research Questions

The current study addressed the following eight research questions:

1. What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' short-term learning of eight grammatical structures?
2. What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' accurate use of the target structures in a delayed writing task?
3. What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' long-term learning of eight grammatical structures (over the course of a semester)?
4. What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' short-term retention of cultural information?
5. What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' long-term retention of cultural information (over the course of a semester)?
6. What are intermediate students' preferences and opinions regarding the two instructional approaches to teaching grammar?
7. What are students' perceptions of integrating grammar and culture instruction?

8. Is there a relationship between students' instructional preference and their performances on grammar and culture tests?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions of terms will be used:

Deductive approach. A deductive grammar lesson involves providing learners with an explicit rule before the structure is practiced in an application exercise (Ellis, 2008b). The lesson moves from a general perspective to particular examples.

Inductive approach. An inductive approach is a form of explicit instruction that aims at drawing learners' attention to a specific form first through a functional activity or examples from which the rule later surfaces. Practice of the structure occurs before the rule (Ellis, 2008b).

Guided inductive approach. The guided inductive approach featured in this study involves student-teacher collaboration on the construction of a grammatical rule after a functional practice has occurred.

Foreign and second language. The terms foreign language and second language have been used interchangeably; however, a distinction must be made. Second language learners have the opportunity to encounter the target language in great quantities outside of the classroom. Foreign language learners, on the other hand, receive input in the target language primarily in the classroom and have few chances to use the language in their everyday environment (Ellis, 2008b). For example, French students learning English in the United States are learners of a second language while English students learning French in the United States are learners of a foreign language. Some researchers prefer to

distinguish various settings, such as educational or natural settings (Ellis, 2008b). This study dealt with foreign language learning in an educational setting.

Acquisition and learning. Although these two terms have been used interchangeably in the literature, a distinction should be made. Krashen (1982) defined learning as a conscious process that is intentional and explicit. Acquisition, according to Krashen, is a subconscious process that occurs implicitly or incidentally. Because this study dealt with instructional approaches in a foreign language classroom setting, the term learning refers to a conscious process of learning linguistic forms as well as enhancing cultural knowledge.

Cultural knowledge. Lange (2000) referred to cultural knowledge as the acquisition of facts and information and cultural understanding as the ability to interpret and extrapolate from those facts. In this study, the operational definition of culture included cultural understanding as well as the accumulation of specific facts. Students were asked to identify cultural information (facts) and to infer from those facts in order to show understanding of the cultural perspective presented.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Pedagogical methods in foreign language instruction have oscillated between those that strictly focus on forms and those that emphasize meaning only. Foreign language research pertaining to grammar instruction has been characterized by two distinct trends: the first raised the question of whether formal grammar instruction had an effect on language learning and acquisition, while the second has asked whether different approaches to teaching grammar could make a difference on students' learning and acquisition. In line with these trends, the first section of this chapter will briefly revisit the debate on whether grammar should be explicitly taught in foreign language classrooms, while the second section will focus specifically on deductive and inductive approaches to teaching grammar and their differentiated effect on student learning. Finally, this chapter will focus on the integration of language and culture in foreign language teaching and examine the issue of students' preference regarding learning a foreign language grammar.

The Role of Grammar Instruction

With the rise of communicative approaches to teach foreign languages, researchers started to question the role of formal or explicit grammar instruction on second and foreign language learning. Explicit instruction is defined as drawing students' attention to rules during the learning process, while implicit instruction is aimed at enabling learners to infer rules without awareness (Ellis, 2008b). Krashen (1982) claimed that one acquires another language by focusing on meaning only and not on form. His

input hypothesis was grounded in the notion that what is required for second language acquisition to take place is exposure to “comprehensible input” that is a little beyond a learner’s current level (Krashen, 1983, p. 32). Comprehensible input was for Krashen the only condition necessary for language acquisition to occur. In *The Natural Approach*, Krashen and Terrell (1983) encouraged an immersion model for teaching language and rejected grammar instruction, arguing that formal or explicit grammar instruction could only result in learned competences, not in acquisition. For Krashen, learned competences, or the use of conscious rules, could only serve as a “Monitor” (Krashen, 1994, p. 45). In other words, learned rules can serve to edit or correct one’s utterances, but cannot be incorporated into one’s implicit knowledge of the language. With learned competences, one can only talk about the language. Krashen’s theory of language acquisition was deemed very similar to the first language acquisition processes, which, critics have argued, may be less applicable to second and foreign language adult learners than other methods.

In an effort to explore the most effective ways for adults to learn another language, the question of whether grammar should formally be taught in educational settings was investigated. Many researchers in fact challenged Krashen’s claim that language acquisition was an implicit process that relied only on comprehensible input. These challenges started after findings showed that even after several years of exposure to French through full immersion and content instruction in Canadian immersion programs, students still did not reach native speaker accuracy (Swain, 1984). Research suggested that implicit instruction that focused strictly on meaning-oriented tasks did not provide all that was needed for the development of language proficiency. Focus on

meaning only in Canadian immersion programs was shown to lead to the fossilization of grammatical errors and to be unlikely to help learners develop nativelike grammatical competence in the target language (Swain, 1984, 1998). On the other hand, Harley (1989) showed that a focus on linguistic forms within a French immersion program was beneficial, and that the effect of instruction was durable.

Research conducted in more traditional college foreign language classrooms also showed the need for some explicit grammar instruction. For example, Scott (1989, 1990) investigated the effectiveness of explicit and implicit strategies on the acquisition of French grammatical structures in an advanced conversation class. The implicit treatment followed a natural approach where students were unaware of the grammatical structures embedded in a text that the teacher read to them. Scott's first study (1989) concluded that implicit instruction did not increase the students' mastery of the target structures as much as the explicit condition featuring teacher explanations did. Scott replicated her study a year later, changing the implicit condition by making students aware of the presence of the targeted grammatical structure. Thus, the study moved towards explicit instruction with a different, yet present, focus on the targeted form in each treatment condition. In both studies, explicit instruction with rule explanations first led to increased grammar performances.

In order to assess the general benefit of form-focused instruction in comparison to implicit types of instruction, Norris and Ortega (2000) reviewed all available studies published between 1980 and 1998 on the effectiveness of different types of instruction. The use of meta-analytic techniques to summarize and interpret the findings of 77 research studies led them to conclude that explicit types of instruction seemed more

effective on student learning of linguistic forms than implicit instructional techniques with focus on meaning only.

Despite Krashen's position and the influence he has exerted in the field of second language acquisition, many researchers have agreed that explicit instruction, or form-focused instruction, does make a difference and can benefit and facilitate the learning of a second or foreign language (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002a; Aski, 2005; DeKeyser, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 1997, 2001, 2002, 2008b; Fotos, 1993; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Long, 1983; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Robinson, 1996; Scott, 1989, 1990). Some researchers even added that explicit instruction could especially benefit adult learners (Celce-Murcia, 1991) and was in fact critical for language learners to make progress (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002a). In response to the question, "Does instruction make a difference?" Long (1983) replied, "Put rather crudely, instruction is good for you, regardless of your proficiency level, of the wider linguistic environment in which you receive it and of the type of test you are going to perform on" (p. 379). Celce-Murcia (1991) further argued that proficiency, age, and the educational background of students are important variables to take into consideration when discussing the need for grammar instruction. She stated that "when teaching literate young adults who are in college and at the high intermediate proficiency level, some focus on form is essential if the teacher wants to help the students successfully complete their composition requirement. The importance of a reasonable degree of grammatical accuracy in academic or professional writing cannot be overstated" (p. 465).

While input, and even great quantities of input in the target language, is considered essential to the learning process, it has been agreed that input alone is not

enough. Rather, learners' attention must be drawn to specific forms of the language that encode meaning (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Schmidt, 1995; VanPatten, 2007).

Attention and noticing along with input are essential for second language learning to occur (Ellis, 1994). Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1995) stated that learners must consciously attend to the input if the input is to be processed. In this vein, some scholars claimed that output, or the language produced by learners, was also part of the learning and acquisition process. Swain (1985) argued that when learners must make efforts to ensure that their output is understandable or "comprehensible," acquisition might be fostered. Swain (1985, 2000) also argued that output might have a noticing function. As learners try to produce the target language, they may realize that they do not know how to precisely express the meaning they wish to convey, therefore prompting them to focus their attention to some of the linguistic problems or gaps that they may have. In addition, producing language either in writing or speaking enables learners to make and test hypotheses about the linguistic forms under study (Swain, 2000). Swain's initial definition of output has been expanded to include its operation as a socially constructed tool that she called "collaborative dialogues," defined as a "dialogue in which speakers are engaged in problem solving and knowledge building" (Swain, 2000, p. 102).

Various types of instructional approaches aimed at drawing students' attention to form are considered more effective than meaning-only oriented approaches (Katz & Blyth, 2008). With a rather widespread consensus on the role of form-focused instruction on language learning outcomes, the question shifted from whether to teach grammar to how to focus on grammar most effectively in today's communication-oriented classrooms.

Inductive vs. Deductive Teaching Approaches

As previously mentioned, form-focused instruction can be carried out in various ways and can target various aspect of the foreign language. The discussion of interest in the present study is when and how to introduce grammatical rules to foreign language learners. Should rules be introduced before a contextualized practice of the linguistic structure (a deductive approach) or should rules be introduced after a functional practice of the linguistic forms (an inductive approach)?

The audio-lingual inductive approach. Divergence on the possible effectiveness of either a deductive or an inductive approach was highlighted in the 1960s. Chastain and Woerdehoff (1968) compared the habit formation audio-lingual method, an inductive approach, to the cognitive code-learning method, a deductive approach featuring rule explanations, on the performance in all four skill areas of students learning Spanish as a foreign language. The results of this study showed a significant difference in favor of the audio-lingual method in enhancing students' imitative ability. The researchers found a significant difference on reading scores for students in the deductive method treatment condition. While there were no significant differences established regarding students' writing, speaking and comprehension of Spanish, the results led the investigators to "favor" the deductive approach (p. 279). In the early 1970s, the *Pennsylvania Project*, on the other hand, revealed that the traditional deductive approach produced the same results as the audio-lingual method (Hammerly, 1975). Hammerly argued that from then on, a divide among supporters of each method grew stronger, leaving little room for a "middle ground" position (p. 15). Hammerly, however, stated that such a dichotomy was "unnecessary" (p. 16), as he believed some structures – simple structures – may be

learned inductively, while more difficult structures may require more explicit explanations.

The inductive teaching model of the audio-lingual method was based on a behaviorist approach to language learning. Learning occurred through imitation and habit formation and therefore required little understanding or comprehension of the target structures. With such an inductive model, students learned a structure with multiple rote examples until they were able to use the structure automatically and mechanically. Shaffer (1989) described it as an inadequate way to teach a language for communication and argued that while students may have learned grammatical forms through imitation and repetition, they may not have been aware of what they were learning.

The behaviorist view of language learning became in fact widely rejected in the field of second language acquisition in the 1970s on the grounds that learners could not internalize a linguistic system on the tenant of mere conditioning (Van Patten & Williams, 2007). While there is no unified theory of language learning, many theorists believe that the language learner is one who should construct and actively participate in meaningful learning tasks (Ausubel, 1968; Ellis, 1990; McLaughlin, 1987). Cognitive perspectives on second language learning, unlike behaviorism, view learning as the result of mental activity, an active process that requires the engagement of the student rather than a habit formation process resulting from external stimuli. Language learners have to pay attention to aspects and forms of the language they are trying to understand and produce (Lightbown & Spada, 1993). Cognitive theory stresses that in order to develop second language proficiency learners must practice, automate, integrate and constantly restructure their existing knowledge as proficiency evolves (McLaughlin, 1987). While

cognitive processes were associated with a rule explanation approach, Shaffer (1989) argued that inductive teaching/learning could put higher levels of cognitive demand on the learners by encouraging students to make and test hypotheses about the rules governing grammatical structures, as opposed to mechanically learning how to use them through habit formation. Moving beyond a behaviorist approach, foreign language learning has also been considerably influenced by constructivist theories of learning that underline the importance of concept development and understanding as the goals of instruction rather than the development of behaviors (Fosnot, 1996). With the influence of several theoretical perspectives on language learning, and given the influence that the concepts of attention and noticing (Schmidt, 1995) have had in the fields of second and foreign language research, the inductive model of the audio-lingual method and its behaviorist theoretical underpinnings was rejected. Inductive strategies started to differ, putting more cognitive demand on the learner.

Empirical studies. Little experimental research has investigated and compared the effectiveness of both approaches in foreign language classrooms (Erlam, 2003; Norris & Ortega, 2000). As previously mentioned, researchers and classroom instructors approach the teaching of grammar with various strategies. Past studies that compared inductive and deductive approaches often failed to show the effectiveness of one approach over the other. Indeed, while there seems to have been a consensus on how to present a grammar rule deductively (explanation of the rule followed by practice) each study presented a different inductive model, contributing to conflicting results. As will be shown later, a more recent chain of research that has investigated a hybrid guided

inductive model at different levels of proficiency has, on the contrary, produced consistent results.

Fotos and Ellis (1991) compared the effectiveness of a metalinguistic explanation provided by the teacher to that of a consciousness-raising task performed in groups or pairs on the acquisition of dative alternation (the position of an indirect object in a sentence) among Japanese learners of English as a foreign language. The design featured a pretest, an immediate posttest, and a delayed posttest using a grammaticality judgment test with 20 sentences as a measure of language proficiency. In the teacher-fronted group, the instructor explained the correct and incorrect sentences and wrote the corresponding rules on the board. In the consciousness-raising task condition, students were given the sentences and asked to read them aloud to one another. Negotiations occurred, which consisted of clarification requests, confirmation or comprehension checks, restatements, or requests for repetitions as students tried to understand the sentences provided in the grammar task. A pretest and a posttest consisting of a grammaticality judgment task were used to assess grammar performance. The results of this study showed significant gains in understanding the targeted structure from pretest to posttest in both conditions; however, gains were more durable for the teacher-fronted lesson group. The consciousness-raising task group was provided opportunities to negotiate and co-construct meaning through interactions and discussions about grammar, but without the guidance or feedback of the teacher. The researchers argued that the lack of teacher feedback might have contributed to the lower gains in the consciousness-raising task condition.

Robinson (1996) addressed Krashen's theory that language structures, and particularly complex ones, are more effectively learned implicitly. Robinson explored the

effectiveness of four instructional conditions – implicit, incidental, rule-search (i.e., inductive) and instructed (i.e., deductive) – on the learning of easy and complex English (as a second language) grammar rules. Intermediate-level learners of English as a second language from Japan participated in this study. The implicit and incidental conditions required no focus on form. Students were respectively told that it was a memory test and an exercise for reading for meaning. The rule search condition consisted of an exercise to identify the rules illustrated by sentences, without anyone verbalizing the grammatical rules after the presentation. Finally, in the instructed condition, students read the rules focusing on the targeted structures. Each condition had two training sessions. A pre/posttest design was implemented to assess participants' grammar performances using a grammaticality judgment task. The study revealed that complex English rules were more effectively learned under both explicit conditions, inductive and deductive, but that the deductive condition generated more significant results on easy rules.

Rosa and O'Neill (1999) also investigated how five different presentations of input, with or without formal instruction and with or without directions to search for rules, influenced intake (the information that the learner notices and processes) of the Spanish conditional mood and how students' level of awareness about the target structure would vary. Fourth-semester learners of Spanish as a foreign language participated in this study. A multiple-choice recognition test was administered after the treatment. In the formal instruction group (i.e., deductive), students received a written rule explanation and completed a multiple-choice jigsaw puzzle (matching clauses). In the direction to search for rule condition (i.e., inductive), students were asked to complete the multiple-choice jigsaw puzzle and were instructed to search for rules while completing the activity. The

results indicated that formal instruction and directions to search for rules (explicit forms of instruction) resulted in significantly better gains in performance on the posttest than in the implicit treatment conditions, without formal instruction or directions to search for rules, thus showing the efficacy of explicit types of instruction. However, the researchers could not show any significant difference between the two types of explicit instruction – namely, the formal instruction (deductive) and the rule-search conditions (inductive) on the acquisition of the grammar structure. While the above two studies (Robinson, 1996; Rosa & O’Neill, 1999) investigated different approaches to focusing on grammar and showed the benefits of explicit types of instruction, they did not specifically isolate the deductive/inductive feature.

Speaking directly to the deductive/inductive controversy, Shaffer (1989) conducted a study among high school students learning French and Spanish as a foreign language at the beginning and intermediate levels. Intermediate-level students, of interest in the current study, were tested on the imperfect tense and the subjunctive mood. In the inductive condition, students read 10 written examples and were asked to formulate the rule for themselves and verbalize the rule after the presentation. The teacher did not provide any help or feedback in this process. In the deductive condition, a written rule was given to the students along with practice exercises. An immediate posttest consisting of a grammaticality judgment task was administered after the treatment phase. Analysis of scores drew no statistically significant conclusions in favor of one approach. Instead, a slight trend in favor of the inductive approach was found. It is important to note that Shaffer’s research design involved no teacher-student oral interactions, an essential component in the communicative language classroom. The study also diminished the

critical role of the teacher in the negotiation of meaning, as the teacher did not provide any guidance to learners in the inductive condition. Guidance is however believed to increase students' abilities to solve problems and reflect upon the language they are learning (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002a).

To further investigate this deductive/inductive controversy and build on the positive trend in favor of an inductive approach that Shaffer's study highlighted, Herron and Tomasello (1992) investigated the effect of guided induction on first semester French college students' learning of grammar over the course of a semester. In the deduction condition, the teacher began the lesson with a brief grammatical explanation of the targeted structure using a model sentence on the board that illustrated the rule. This rule explanation was followed by an oral question/answer exercise. In the guided induction condition, students first practiced using the targeted structure in the same oral question/answer exercise as in the deduction condition. After the oral practice activity, the students completed the same model sentence on the board as in the deduction condition but this time with blanks for the targeted structure. This completion activity provided them with immediate feedback on their understanding of the structure practiced in the oral exercise. The rule was never elicited by the teacher. Student's grammar performances were measured via a pretest, immediate posttests (the day after treatment), and a delayed posttest (a week after treatment). The results indicated that students performed significantly better in the guided induction condition at posttests. The investigators concluded that a guided induction presentation was favorable for the teaching of some elementary-level French grammatical structures. They suggested that using an oral format rather than a written format might have enhanced learners' active

hypothesis testing which could have resulted in better scores in the guided induction condition.

More recently, Erlam (2003) investigated the effect of a deductive approach versus an inductive approach on the acquisition of French direct object pronouns formation and placement among secondary school students learning French as a foreign language. Under the deductive instruction condition, the teacher explained the rule with an example and the students completed a written exercise with the help of a chart. In the inductive treatment condition, students began written practice exercises but never received any explanations. The control group received instruction on another structure. Data were collected through immediate and delayed posttests. Grammar performances were measured via a pretest, an immediate posttest (one week after the treatment phase), and a delayed posttest (16 weeks after the treatment phase) that consisted of a written part, an oral production task, and a listening and a reading comprehension tests. Erlam's analysis of the tests results concluded that the deductive treatment led to significantly better grammatical performances on the oral and written parts of the posttests, although the effect sizes decreased over time. It is important to highlight that Erlam's study was conducted in a school whose language department policy noticeably emphasized focus on forms. The natural tendency toward using a deductive approach among the instructors might have influenced the results of her study. Moreover, students in the inductive group did not receive any corrective feedback and their attention was not drawn to the rule governing direct object pronouns placement, even after the exercise was performed. Thus, little attention to form was given in this condition and the inductive approach resembled an implicit type of instruction.

Building upon Herron and Tomasello's (1992) study, Haight et al. (2007) investigated the effects of both deductive and guided inductive approaches on the learning of French grammatical structures in a second semester elementary college French course. Similar to the current study, the inductive condition was a hybrid model designed after the PACE model (Adair-Hauck, Donato, & Cumo-Johanssen, 2005) and Herron and Tomasello's (1992) guided induction techniques. The guided inductive condition featured an oral practice session followed by a co-construction of the grammatical rule, whereby the instructor asked students guiding questions as they were looking at blanked model sentences to help them reach an understanding of the underlying rule. Finally students were asked to chorally complete the blanks in the model sentences. The deductive condition featured a teacher-fronted explanation of the rule orally in French, followed by the same oral practice activity. Quantitative data were collected via immediate multiple-choice quizzes to assess students' short-term learning of the targeted eight grammatical structures and via a grammar pre/posttest to assess long-term learning of these structures. The results of this investigation revealed that grammar performances on the immediate quizzes were significantly better for students in the guided inductive condition. Analyses that tested the effectiveness of both methods on long-term learning revealed an improvement of grammar knowledge over time in both treatment conditions, with a trend ($p = .05$) for a greater increase in grammar performances for students in the guided inductive treatment condition. This study suggested that the collaborative guided inductive model was a suitable and effective approach to teaching certain linguistic patterns in the second semester college elementary

French course, consistent with Herron and Tomasello's (1992) results among first semester learners.

Haight (2008) conducted another study investigating the effects of a guided inductive and a deductive approach in a first semester college-level elementary French course, French 101, over the course of a semester. This study targeted 12 linguistic patterns, and the treatment conditions were identical to that of Haight et al.'s (2007) treatment conditions. Data were collected through immediate multiple-choice quizzes to assess short-term learning, and through a grammar pre/posttest to assess long-term learning of the linguistic structures. Similarly to the previous study, the results showed that the guided inductive model had a significant effect on French 101 students' short-term learning of the linguistic patterns. However, findings on long-term learning of the targeted structures revealed no statistical difference between the two conditions. Gains in grammar knowledge from pretest to posttest were significant in both treatment conditions.

Building upon the positive effect of the guided inductive teaching model over a deductive approach in elementary French courses, Vogel et al. (in press) sought to investigate the effects of these teaching strategies among college intermediate-level learners of French. Using the same research design and classroom procedures as Haight et al. (2007), 10 grammatical structures were taught over the course of a semester alternating between a deductive presentation and a guided inductive presentation. Quantitative data, collected through immediate posttests and a pre/posttest, revealed that students performed significantly better on the immediate tests when taught with the guided inductive approach. Analysis of the long-term effect revealed a significant

improvement of students' grammatical knowledge over time; yet, there were no significant results with regards to the effect of the instructional approaches over time. Quantitative data showed that although a large majority of students preferred to be taught grammar rules explicitly, these students performed significantly better in the guided inductive condition. The results of this study showed the positive effect of guided inductive teaching beyond the elementary level.

Finally, building upon the same chain of research, Dotson (2010) compared the effects of a guided inductive and a deductive approach among advanced learners of French. While using the same guided inductive model and classroom procedures to teach 10 grammatical structures, Dotson's findings contrasted with previous studies. The results showed no significant difference between the two approaches on students' short-term learning of grammar. The author argued that because the grammatical structures were generally a review for students in this advanced French course, the effect of the two presentational approaches was minimal on their immediate grammar performances. Nonetheless, long-term analyses revealed a significant improvement in grammar knowledge over time as well as an interaction effect. The guided inductive approach led to significantly greater gains in grammatical knowledge over time. The author suggested that a guided inductive approach might be suited for a variety of grammatical structures of varying complexity, whether new to students or review. While past studies had yielded conflicting results regarding the differentiated effectiveness of inductive and deductive approaches, recent research on guided inductive teaching based on elements of the PACE model has shown, in a consistent fashion, the benefit of this approach on college students' short-term retention of grammatical structures beyond the elementary level.

A large number of the empirical studies focusing on the inductive/deductive controversy often measured student learning of grammar via written production activities. Rivers (1975) conceived of two types of writing activities in the foreign language classroom. The first, skill-getting activities, include constructed response activities in which students practice a grammatical point in a controlled task to reinforce their knowledge. These activities can be multiple-choice, fill-in-the blank, or sentence combination exercises. The second, skill-using activities, include expressive writing tasks that may be guided or free but communicative in nature. Constructed response activities have been commonly used to assess the effect of form-focused instruction. The magnitude of the effect of different types of instructional approaches has in fact been greatest when measured with such types of assessment (Ellis, 2008b; Norris & Ortega, 2000). Nevertheless, communicative tasks, such as expressive writing, remain the “best measure of learners’ second language proficiency, as [they] correspond most closely to the kind of language found outside of the classroom. The ability to get a multiple-choice question right amounts to very little if the student is unable to use the target feature in actual communication” (Ellis, 2008a, p. 5). Few studies comparing guided inductive and deductive approaches have assessed students’ ability to use the targeted structures in communicative activities (Erlam, 2003). With this lack of data in mind, the current study was designed to compare the effects of a deductive and a guided inductive approach on students’ performances using researcher constructed response assessments, but also to evaluate students’ accurate use of the targeted grammatical structures in open-ended communicative written activities in intermediate-level French.

Grammar Instruction at the Intermediate-Level

In many institutions of higher education, the intermediate courses are those that will either attract students to a foreign language studies major or minor or will discourage them from pursuing the language further. Traditionally, the intermediate level has been seen as a bridge between language courses and advanced content courses, whether in literature or civilization. Suozzo (1981) argued that the intermediate level was often perceived as being the last stage before “serious study can begin, as the period during which students somehow attain sufficient linguistic competence to enable them to study literature” (p. 405), and was therefore devoted to the review and refinement of grammar. Grammar skills traditionally measured students’ ability to continue their study of civilization or literature (Ramsay, 1991); thus, the intermediate level relied heavily on formal instruction of grammatical concepts.

Along with a more meaning-oriented communicative approach to foreign language instruction came a fear that intermediate-level students would no longer be ready to move on to upper-level content courses. Ramsay (1991) wrote about the fear of a possible decline in the grammatical competency of intermediate-level students due to an emphasis on meaning over form, which she referred to as the “grammar question” (p. 255). With concerns for accuracy in proficiency-oriented instruction, the role of grammar and linguistic accuracy cannot be underestimated at the intermediate level. However, research at the intermediate level has shown that communicative and contextualized approaches to foreign language teaching could enhance students’ grammar performances (Herron, York, Corrie, & Cole, 2006; Ramsay, 1991).

In many college curricula, the intermediate-level remains a bridge toward content courses, whether literature or civilization/culture. Yet, students' views – and those of instructors – on the goals of intermediate-level instruction have shifted toward the development of speaking skills (Harlow & Muyskens, 1994; Martin & Laurie, 1993). Harlow and Muyskens (1994) reported that the most important goal identified by foreign language learners at the intermediate level was the ability to speak in the target language, while grammar instruction was given mid to low ranking. While these findings highlighted the important fact that grammar should not be the organizing principle of intermediate-level foreign language classrooms, they also suggested that teaching strategies at the intermediate level could be improved to teach grammar functionally and in context. In addition, the ability to know and appreciate the target culture was also given a low ranking by both students and instructors. The authors argued that this finding reflected the fact that students viewed culture as superficial, or as an add-on. These results suggested a dichotomy between language skills development and culture instruction. They also suggested that cultural material may not be used adequately as a resource to practice using the target language and may not be perceived as helping learners reach their linguistically oriented goals. Integrating cultural content with the presentation of specific grammatical structures remained to be further investigated.

Language Skills Development and Culture in Foreign Language Instruction

Content-based instruction, or the use of subject matter for second and foreign learning, views the target language as a means to learn the content and content as a resource to enhance and improve language skills (Pessoa, Hendry, Donato, Tucker, & Lee, 2007). Such a model of instruction is fully encountered in immersion settings such

as the Canadian immersion programs, where the content of the curriculum is taught in French to native English speakers. Such immersion programs fall on what Met (1999) described as the content driven side on the continuum of language and content integration, as content is the primary focus of instruction.

In traditional college foreign language classrooms, content is usually well defined in advanced language courses, where the study of literature and/or civilization prevails and serves as a vehicle for language learning. However, this is not to say that cultural content cannot be introduced in the earlier stages of foreign language instruction, i.e., in language courses. While traditional foreign language courses remain language driven (Met, 1999), cultural content can be integrated for language practice.

In an effort to integrate the teaching of language and culture in foreign language programs, communicative video-based curricula have, for example, been developed both at the elementary and the intermediate levels. Limited research exists that assessed the effect of these programs, rich in authentic dialogues with embedded linguistic forms and cultural elements, on students' grammar performances and various skills (Herron, Morris, Secules, & Curtis, 1995; Herron, York, Corrie, & Cole, 2006; Ramsay, 1991). As the area of primary interest in the current study is grammar instruction and grammar learning, only the findings pertaining to grammar performances are highlighted below.

Ramsay (1991) compared the effect of a video-based approach to that of a text-based approach on intermediate-level students' grammar and listening comprehension performances. The video-based curriculum, *French in Action*, takes the form of a continuous story, rich in cultural elements, where the grammatical structures to be learned are repeatedly embedded. The traditional text-based curriculum was thematically

organized and each grammatical structure was presented through reading passages and/or explicit rule explanation. The researchers used a pre/posttest designed to assess students' learning of grammar over time, which included a dictation, a listening comprehension and a grammar part. With respect to grammar performances, the results showed that the difference in grammar score gains from pretest to posttest was significantly better for students using the story-based approach than for students using the text-based approach. The results of this study suggested that students' grammar performances could increase when taught via a communicative approach that used a culturally relevant video-based curriculum.

In order to continue assessing the effects of video-based curriculum on foreign language learners, Herron, Morris, Secules, and Curtis (1995) compared the effect of a video-based program to that of a traditional textbook curriculum on all four skills (speaking, reading, writing, and listening) as well as on the grammar performances of elementary-level French students. The study was conducted over the course of two semesters of college-level French. With respect to the assessment of grammar, a teacher-designed pretest was administered at the onset of the study, and teacher-designed posttests were administered in French 101 and in French 102. The posttests were not identical to the pretest, but rather became progressively more difficult. The results indicated no significant difference between the video-based group and the text-based group on students' grammar performances at the end of French 101, at the mid-semester test in French 102, or at the end of French 102. Herron et al.'s findings (1995) did not support Ramsay's results (1991) that had found a significant difference in favor of the video-based curriculum for improved grammar performances. Herron et al.'s research

(1995) did, nonetheless, demonstrate that students using a video-based curriculum could learn grammar at least as well as students using a text-based program.

Continuing along this trend of research, Herron et al. (2006) compared the effectiveness of a story-based instructional curriculum to that of a traditional text-based curriculum on intermediate-level students' listening and grammar performances in college French. One group used a video-based curriculum organized around a movie, *Le Chemin du retour*, accompanied by a print textbook, while the other group used a traditional text-based package which also contained a video that was only used as a supplemental resource. A pretest-posttest design was used to assess long-term gains in listening and grammar performances for the two groups. With respect to grammar, the results indicated that students in both groups significantly improved their grammar performances over time. However, the increase in mean score for the video-based condition was significantly higher than the increase in mean score for the text-based condition. These findings suggested that a narrative video based on a culturally relevant story line could benefit the grammar performances of intermediate-level students. These findings appeared to reinforce the positive benefits of using a video-based curriculum with embedded language structures to teach grammar.

It is important to emphasize that the studies mentioned above (Herron et al., 1995; Herron et al., 2006; Ramsay, 1991) did not focus on how the specific grammatical structures were presented to students, either inductively or deductively. In addition, while these studies used curricula rich in authentic dialogues and cultural information, they did not assess whether students' knowledge of culture would increase as a result of exposure to the text-based approach or the video-based approach.

In this vein, another strand of research has investigated whether students' knowledge of culture would benefit from exposure to curricula offering authentic cultural material (Dubreil, Herron, & Cole, 2004; Herron, Cole, Corrie, & Dubreil, 1999; Herron, Dubreil, Cole, & Corrie, 2000; Herron, Dubreil, Corrie & Cole, 2002). Herron et al. (1999) and Herron et al. (2000) investigated whether beginning students would learn the cultural information embedded in their video-based language curriculum, *French in Action*. For both studies, the weekly videos were primarily viewed for comprehension of the story line. A pretest, administered prior to exposure to the videos, and a posttest, given at the end of the semester, assessed long-term gains in knowledge of little "c" culture (cultural products) and big "C" culture (cultural products). Immediate tests measured short-term retention of the cultural information embedded in the weekly video, and a short questionnaire administered at the end of the study analyzed student perceptions of how well they learned about the culture. The results of Herron et al. (1999) with French 102 students indicated significant gains in cultural knowledge from pretest to posttest. With respect to the effect of culture type, although the increase in little "c" scores over time was greater than the increase for big "C" scores, the difference was not statistically significant. Analysis of the short-term retention of both types of culture indicated that scores for the little "c" items were significantly higher than scores for the big "C" items. According to the results on the questionnaire, students in fact believed that more little "c" culture was presented than big "C" culture in the instructional videos. Similarly, Herron et al.'s (2000) findings with French 101 students also indicated significant gains in cultural knowledge from pretest to posttest. However, the increase for the little "c" scores was significantly greater than for the big "C" scores. With respect to

analyses of the immediate posttests, there was no significant difference between the types of culture retained. According to the results on the questionnaire, the French 101 students also believed that more little “c” culture was presented than big “C” culture in the instructional videos. Both studies showed that beginning-level students’ knowledge of culture improved when students were exposed to cultural material while focusing on the development of language skills, such as listening comprehension.

With respect to intermediate-level students, Herron et al. (2002) examined the effects of a curriculum with a supplemental video component on cultural knowledge, and specifically on students’ learning of cultural practices and cultural products from exposure to the video component. The videotape that accompanied the curriculum material consisted of a series of short segments in a journalistic format including primarily interviews with French speakers from the francophone world. The researchers used a pretest/posttest design to assess long-term gains in cultural knowledge and to determine whether the students retained more cultural practices or more products over the course of the semester. Immediate posttests, featuring short-answers and free recall items, measured the students’ ability to make cultural inferences and to recall the presented cultural information. In addition, two conditions were created, whereby students either received an advanced organizer (AO) prior to the viewing of the video, or did not receive an advanced organizer. A post study questionnaire also investigated students’ perceptions of cultural learning. The results of the pre/posttest analysis indicated a significant gain in cultural knowledge over time from exposure to the videos. With respect to the type of culture learned, the magnitude of the gains for cultural practices scores was not different from that of the products. Analysis of the short-answer and free-recall items of the

immediate posttests indicated that the students' ability to make cultural inferences or recall the cultural information embedded in the videos did not improve significantly either in the advance organizer or in the non-advance organizer condition. For free recall, scores were significantly higher for the mention of cultural practices than for cultural products. Students in fact believed that more cultural practices had been presented in the videos and that they had learned more about cultural practices than cultural products. The results of the study supported using a journalistic-style video component to enhance intermediate-level students' knowledge of culture.

Dubreil, Herron, and Cole (2004) continued to investigate whether culture could be learned and how different kinds of culture might be learned in a different instructional environment. The study assessed whether intermediate-level students could increase their knowledge and understanding of French and Francophone culture from exposure to a curriculum that included Internet activities. The study also assessed the effectiveness of an advance organizer (AO) prior to the Internet activity. Students visited a total of eight web sites, taken from references offered by the course curriculum, one each week for 30 minutes. A pretest/posttest design assessed long-term gains in culture as well as the learning of cultural practices and products from exposure to the websites. Immediate posttests, that included short-answer and free-recall items, measured students' ability to retain factual information and to make inferences from the material presented, and a questionnaire assessed students' perceptions of learning. The results of this study indicated again a significant gain in cultural knowledge over time. In addition, the long-term analyses suggested that students learned significantly more products than practices over the semester. Analyses of the immediate posttests indicated no significant difference

between the AO and the non-AO conditions on students' ability to make inferences or retain information. The students reported enjoying completing the Internet activities and believed that the websites featured more cultural products than practices. The results of the study showed that students' knowledge of culture could increase when using authentic websites and thus supported using the Internet to teach culture in a foreign language classroom.

The previous studies (Dubreil et al., 2004; Herron et al., 1999; Herron et al., 2000; Herron et al., 2002) suggested that using video-based instructional programs and authentic websites, abundant in linguistic features and cultural content, could be an effective strategy to increase students' cultural knowledge while also focusing on language skills such as listening comprehension or reading. By the same token, such approaches can integrate language and culture into the foreign language curriculum. However, none of these studies have integrated cultural information into the formal teaching and study of grammar, nor have they simultaneously assessed whether both grammar performances and cultural knowledge could benefit from these approaches to foreign language teaching. As such, the current study was primarily concerned with integrating cultural information into specific grammar lessons, taught either with a deductive or a guided inductive approach, and to assess whether students' knowledge of culture could increase when exposed to grammar lessons that are culturally enriched. Because the primary focus of the present study remained effective grammar teaching, the types of culture learned, products or practices, was not assessed.

While advances have been made towards the integration of language and culture into foreign language instruction, as illustrated by the use of video-based program or

authentic websites, grammatical concepts and culture have continued to be taught isolated from one another in many foreign language curricula and classroom practices (Ballman, 1997; Frantzen, 1998; Grim, 2008). In their examination of first year Spanish textbooks, both Frantzen (1998) and Ballman (1997) concluded that culture rarely existed in conjunction with the presentation of linguistic/grammatical features and that the opportunity to teach linguistic forms through culture was missing. Culture often remains presented in English, isolated from grammar, while the grammar is sometimes deprived of context (Katz & Blyth, 2007, 2008).

In an effort to try and combine the teaching of linguistic forms with culture early on in foreign language courses, Ballman (1997) advocated a model for “enhancing beginning language courses through content-enriched instruction ” (p. 173). He defined content-enriched instruction as an approach where the study of grammar and vocabulary is carried out in relation to a specific topic, where cultural information is presented in the target language, and where students use the target language to learn new information. In this model of instruction, culture and linguistic forms are intertwined.

Following Ballman’s model (1997), Grim (2008) investigated the effect of three types of focus on form instructional approaches (planned, incidental, and focus on meaning) integrated into culturally enriched lessons on students’ learning of grammar, vocabulary, and culture in second and third-semester French courses. A lesson on Belgium was presented to second-semester French students, and a lesson on Senegal was presented to third-semester French students. One grammatical structure and several lexical items were embedded in each lesson. All groups received the same content presented using transparencies containing images and written information. In the planned

focus on form group, the written lexical and grammatical forms were enhanced (italicized and bolded). The instructors were encouraged to cover the material enhanced during the verbal presentation, but no specific guidelines were provided on how to present the grammatical forms. In the incidental focus on form group, the same material was provided to students. The instructors were told to present the content material, but only to answer students' questions on forms if they arose unsolicited. In the focus on meaning group, the instructors were told to only present the material featured in the transparencies, and no input enhancement was provided. Two identical posttests were administered, one the day after the lesson and one 14 days later. Each test was comprised of items testing cultural knowledge, lexical acquisition, and items testing grammar through sentence fillers (constructed response), while the last part of the test required students to produce a small paragraph on a given topic using the targeted grammatical structure. For second-semester learners, the results indicated that the planned focus on form group performed significantly better than the incidental or focus on meaning groups on vocabulary, focused grammar, and writing at posttest I. However, no significant differences between the groups were found at posttest II. On the cultural part of the test, the planned focus on form group significantly outperformed the focus on meaning group, but there were no differences between the focus on meaning group and the incidental group or the planned focus and the incidental focus groups. At posttest II, no significant differences between groups were found. For third-semester French students, students in the planned focus on form group performed significantly better on the vocabulary items at posttest I, but not so at posttest II. Though all groups increased from pretest to posttests, there were no

significant differences among the three groups on the grammar or on the culture at either posttest.

It could be argued that the three treatment groups were in fact planned focus on form as defined by Ellis (2008b), as the focus on the grammatical structures and lexical items were intentional; therefore making all three conditions similar rather than different. The results may also have been confounded by teacher effect as no specific instructions regarding how to focus on the grammatical rules were provided. Nonetheless, students' knowledge of grammar and culture increased over time in all conditions.

Form-focused instruction plays a role in language learning; yet, the role of different approaches to implementing a focus on grammatical forms within a culturally enriched lesson remained to be further investigated. Research has shown that different approaches to presenting grammatical rules may have a different effect on beginning and intermediate-level students' learning of grammar, (Dotson, 2010; Haight, 2008; Haight, et al., 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Vogel et al., in press). As mentioned in the introductory section, the PACE model, a guided participatory approach to teaching grammar, also provides an excellent framework for enriching the teaching of grammar with culture. Yet, the literature focusing on the PACE model has mainly only described how to implement grammar instruction through the use of stories (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002b; Chrysostome, 2000) or literary pieces (Paesani, 2005). Empirical studies investigating different types of instructional approaches, including the PACE model, have only assessed the learning of linguistic forms, but not the understanding or retention of the message provided in the input. Studies on guided inductive strategies were contextualized around the curriculum videos used in the respective courses (Haight,

2008; Haight et al., 2007; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Vogel et al., in press), or around famous American characters (Dotson, 2010). However, with the integration of culture and communication at the heart of the *Standards* (ACTFL, 1996, 1999), the current investigation was concerned with the formal study of grammatical structures taught either deductively or with a guided inductive approach through culturally enriched lessons.

While it is essential to take into consideration theoretical and empirical arguments regarding the effectiveness of various instructional techniques and presentational formats, it is also important to consider students' opinions about them. Few of the studies previously mentioned on inductive/deductive teaching strategies and content-enriched instruction investigated students' preferences and perceptions, a gap this study was designed to fill.

Students' Opinions on Foreign Language Learning

The literature in the field of foreign language instruction focusing on students' perceptions and opinions has often targeted language learning as a whole (Horwitz, 1988). Several studies have given a general insight into what students believe the role of grammar and culture to be in foreign language learning, but less research has surveyed students' opinions regarding specific approaches to teaching grammatical rules and their perceived effectiveness. For example, Horwitz' (1988) beliefs about language learning inventory (BALLI) included some items specifically related to grammar. Studies that have used this questionnaire seemed to suggest that students believe that "learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules" (Horwitz, 1988, item 20). Brown (2009) compared students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching via a Likert-type questionnaire. The results highlighted some

differences among teachers and students' beliefs. For example, students agreed more than teachers on the use of "activities to practice grammar points rather than information exchange" (Brown, 2009, p. 51), whereas teachers agreed more than students on "[having] students complete specific tasks rather than grammar." In other words, teachers seemed to adhere to a more communicative approach to foreign language learning than did students. The items targeting the place of culture in foreign language instruction, such as "devote time to culture" or "be as knowledgeable about culture as language," also received more teacher than student agreement. The results of this recent study highlighted a discrepancy between teachers and students' perceived role of grammar and culture in foreign language instruction.

More specifically targeting grammar instruction, Schulz's (1996, 2001) investigations on teachers and students' views of the role of grammar in the classroom also revealed that students believed the formal study of grammar to be a necessary element of successful language learning, more so than the teachers believed. Loewen, Li, Fei, Thompson, Nakatsukasa, Ahn, and Chen (2009) also investigated second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction using quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques. Results indicated that students believed grammar to be central to language learning. When prompted to answer the item "I like to be taught grammar in the following ways...", a majority of students stated that they liked to receive examples and explanations of the grammar rules. Some students, on the other hand, held negative views about grammar instruction and expressed the desire to prioritize communication.

Pertaining directly to the inductive/deductive controversy, Mohamed (2004) compared learners' perceptions of inductive and deductive learning tasks, but did not find any significant difference in terms of students' preferences. This finding could be explained by the fact that the researcher failed to expose students to both conditions prior to inquiring about their preferences and opinions. Haight (2008), on the other hand, inquired about students' preference of instructional approach after all participants had been exposed alternatively to both a guided inductive and a deductive approach throughout a semester and discovered that a large majority of students preferred to be taught grammatical structures with a deductive approach, even though the quantitative results showed that students' short-term grammar performances were significantly better when taught with the guided inductive approach. Vogel et al. (in press) found similar results in intermediate-level French. Regardless of prior exposure to the language, students consistently preferred to be explained the grammatical rules prior to engaging in a practice activity. While the current study was concerned with assessing students' learning of grammar and culture via PACE, it also sought to continue assessing students' preference of instructional approach and inquiring about students' perceptions regarding the integration of cultural material into grammar lessons.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter begins with a description and rationale for the research design used to investigate effective grammar instruction within a cultural context in an intermediate-level French classroom. Study participants and the two featured instructional approaches are described as well as the instruments used to measure grammar and culture performance, and to evaluate students' preferences and opinions. This chapter also outlines the quantitative and qualitative research procedures implemented in the study, including data collection, and data analyses.

Mixed Methods Research Design

A mixed methods research design was adopted in this investigation on the effectiveness of two instructional approaches to teach grammar through lessons enriched with cultural information in a college intermediate-level French language classroom. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) presented mixed methods research as a “third research paradigm in education,” which is formally defined as “the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines techniques, methods, approaches, concepts, or languages into a single study” (p.14), a study in which quantitative and qualitative data are collected, analyzed and interpreted (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Both qualitative and quantitative research traditions are important, and the goal of mixed methods research, as Johnson and Onwuegbuzie argued, is not to replace either but to “draw from the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of both in single research studies and across studies ” (p. 15). Newman and Ben (1998) argued that quantitative and qualitative data could be integrated and viewed as an interactive continuum. They

emphasized that “design validity is more likely to be built into studies when the researcher is open to both paradigms rather than precluding one from the other” (p. 11). Although the combination of these two research perspectives has been debated, the integration of both quantitative and qualitative research methods can provide a more complete examination of a research problem as it “allows researchers to mix and match design components that offer the best chance of answering their specific research questions” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 15).

Rationale. The goal of the mixed methods design was to allow the researcher to assess in depth the effectiveness of two different instructional approaches on intermediate-level students’ short- and long-term learning of eight grammatical structures and of cultural information, and to answer questions about students’ personal preferences of teaching approach and opinions regarding the integration of culture into grammar lessons. A mixed methods design was appropriate to provide significant insights into students’ experiences with regards to grammar and culture instruction in order to inform and/or explain the quantitative results.

Implementation and priority. Creswell (2003) insisted that researchers must “convey the specific strategy for data collection they plan to use” (p. 210). The ordering of the qualitative and quantitative phase is an important dimension of the mixed methods design and can be sequential or concurrent (Creswell, 2003; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). This study adhered to a sequential implementation strategy where quantitative data were collected first throughout the course of a 14-week semester, and qualitative data were collected during the last week of the semester.

Priority was given to the quantitative data. The qualitative data were used in a supporting fashion to explain or elaborate on the quantitative results.

Participants and Setting

The participants in this study were 25 students enrolled in three sections of the intermediate-level French language course, French 201, at a medium-sized southern private liberal arts university during the Fall of 2009. The participants were assigned to one of the three course sections through the college registrar system. Fifty four students were originally enrolled in French 201. Three students withdrew from their course, two graduate students and one undergraduate student. Forty-seven students had pretests scores, posttests scores and answered both the background and the post study preference questionnaires. Twenty-five of these 47 participants were present and had immediate grammar and culture tests scores for all eight structures (four in each condition), while an additional 17 participants had immediate tests scores for three or more structures in each condition. Five of the 47 students had scores for two or more structures in each condition. A decision was made to include in the statistical analyses participants who were present for all four lessons in each treatment condition. In light of the unique nature of the lessons presented, which included a grammar and a cultural component, and since the researcher was assessing grammar and culture learning as well as writing performance, maximal exposure to the interventions was of interest. An advantage of this measurement protocol is that all students and structures had the same exposure to the treatments in both conditions.

Demographic information was collected prior to the treatment phase through a background questionnaire (see Appendix A). Table 1 presents the sample ($N = 25$)

characteristics by course section. Seventeen of the 25 participants were female (68%) and eight were male (32%). Of the 25 participants, 10 were freshmen (40%), 11 were sophomores (44%), three were juniors (12%), and one was a senior (4%). Eighteen participants were native speakers of English (72 %), and seven were native speakers of other languages (28%). Fifteen participants had already received between 3 and 4 years of prior instruction in French (60%), seven participants had received less than 3 years of formal instruction in French (28%), and three participants had received more than 4 years of formal instruction in French (12%). The results of a one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant differences between the three sections with regards to previous formal instruction in French, $F(2, 22) = .675, p = .520$.

Consent procedures and confidentiality. The current classroom study was exempt from approval by the University's Institutional Review Board. Therefore, informed consent was not obtained from participants. Nevertheless, participants were notified of the nature of the research project conducted in their classes, and were provided with general information concerning the procedures, risks and benefits. Specifically, students were informed of the confidential nature of their performance on all tests and responses to all questionnaires. A code using a combination of the participants' birthdate and home zip code was implemented for this purpose. The structures taught and tested in this investigation were structures commonly taught in an intermediate-level French language course; therefore, all students were asked to fully collaborate with the investigator. Participants were also informed that the results on all grammar, culture and writing tests would not affect their course grade, and that their instructors would not have access to measures of their performances. This decision was made so that extraneous

variables such as student preparation or teacher effect would not confound the results. If the structures taught in this study were to count toward students' course grade, it is possible that the instructors would have taught them or that students would have studied them, thus cancelling the effect of the experimental conditions.

Classroom Procedures

The instructors for each section were graduate students in a French Ph.D. program. Two instructors were nonnative speakers of French with an advanced proficiency level, and one instructor was a Francophone speaker. The goal of this intermediate-level French language course is to review the basic structures of French and to introduce new grammatical concepts so that students are able to communicate with confidence. A story-based instructional curriculum, comprised of a textbook and a workbook *Bien Vu Bien Dit, Intermediate French* and a movie *Le Chemin du retour* (Williams, Grace & Roch, 2007), was used in all three sections. Each course section met four times a week. Everyday activities included presentations and reinforcement of vocabulary, grammar lessons, cultural readings, and listening activities. In this program, all the grammar structures are embedded in the context of the movie and emphasis is placed on oral communication with vocabulary and grammar taught in context. Explanations of the grammatical concepts appeared in the students' textbook in English and were followed and reinforced by a series of workbook exercises to be prepared by the students prior to the daily in-class lessons. During regular class time, instructors were generally free to introduce grammar points either deductively or inductively. Every day cultural aspects of life were presented through the movie and several sections of the books were exclusively devoted to cultural or literary readings.

Target Structures and Cultural Themes

In order to compare and test the effectiveness of the guided inductive and the deductive teaching approaches on the learning of French grammar and culture in the intermediate-level course, eight grammatical structures were taught through eight different cultural lessons over the course of a semester. Table 2 presents the grammatical structures and cultural topics chosen for this study. The grammatical structures selected for the current study are usually not the focus of instruction in the elementary-level college courses and were expected to be new to students entering French 201. The structures were taken from the course curriculum and introduced to the students in the chronological order in which they appeared in the textbook. The grammatical structures were chosen because they were embedded in the curriculum video *Le Chemin du retour* and represented major grammatical themes included in the plot of the film. Each of the eight patterns was also selected because it could be clearly illustrated through a culturally based oral activity allowing for the cultural information to be conveyed naturally. To avoid confounding, these structures were not included in the course syllabus and were not taught or tested during regular class time.

The cultural topics were selected for several reasons. They were not presented in the students' textbook, but were related thematically to general topics mentioned in the book or in the movie. For example, the chapter that includes relative pronouns is focused on the cultural and physical aspects of a country or region; therefore, the topic chosen for the lesson on relative pronouns "que" and "dont" was Belgium, a francophone country not presented in the textbook. In chapter one, students meet a character from the movie, Rachid, whose father is Algerian and mother is from Brittany. This character inspired the

first lesson around the theme of diversity in France. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, each of these topics allowed for the targeted grammatical structure to be as naturally embedded as possible.

Research Design

The participants were assigned to each course section through the college registrar system. Although this sample was not randomly selected, all sections were counterbalanced with a within-subjects design (Herron & Tomasello, 1992). The within-subjects design used is an equivalent time samples design with one group of participants. It enables the researcher to compare the performances of each individual student in the two different treatment conditions, therefore allowing for an equal representation of participants in each condition. It also allows for lower variability in the results, as each individual present in the two different treatment conditions serves as his or her own control. Additionally, each grammatical structure is present in both treatment conditions, thus controlling for potential differences in difficulty among the target structures. Table 3 presents the counterbalanced design. The three sections of French 201 were randomly sorted into two groups. The sorting occurred at the onset of the study prior to dropping participants from the statistical analyses. The first of the eight target structures was taught to the first group (sections A and B) with the guided inductive approach, while the second group (section C) received a deductive presentation of the structure. For each subsequent grammatical structure taught, the groups switched conditions, alternating between a guided inductive and a deductive presentation.

Treatment Procedures

All research procedures and testing related to this study occurred during the participants' regular class time. Only one lesson was taught per class period, and each lesson lasted no longer than 15 minutes. To minimize instructor bias, the investigator was in charge of teaching all lessons to all sections in both treatment conditions. In order to control for researcher bias, a few lessons were videotaped and peer reviewed to ensure that the investigator did not favor one approach over the other.

The guided inductive condition was based on Herron and Tomasello's (1992) guided induction techniques and elements of the PACE model (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002). In this treatment condition, the primary investigator first presented the targeted grammar structure through a question/answer oral activity (with 12 examples) also designed to present the cultural information. The cultural materials were illustrated in a *PowerPoint* presentation with images only. The purpose of this initial activity was to call students' attention to a specific grammar structure while providing them with relevant cultural information on the chosen topic. This activity required students' oral contribution; students were asked either/or questions and provided feedback on their answers. The first two slides of a presentation served as examples to the activity. The investigator asked an either/or question on the cultural information using the targeted structure, the illustration in the *PowerPoint* pointed at the correct answer, and students repeated the answer chorally. During the rest of the activity, participants answered each question chorally and received feedback from the investigator. Following this initial practice activity, the participants and the investigator collaborated on the co-construction of the grammatical rule. A few fill-in-the-blank model sentences appeared on the last

slide of the *PowerPoint* presentation to draw students' attention to the form under examination. While these sentences illustrated the use of the grammar structure, they did not contain cultural information relevant to the topic of the lesson. Rather, these sentences were contextualized around the same theme but in a different cultural context, such as American culture.

The collaboration to co-construct the rule took on the form of teacher-formulated questions. For each guiding question asked, students answered and received feedback from the investigator. Once all guiding questions were asked and answered, students completed the blanks in the model sentences. After the students orally and chorally responded, the correct answer appeared on the screen, providing final written feedback. One must note that the co-construction phase of this guided inductive model differed from the PACE model in which the guiding questions are not scripted in advance but rather emerge from the student's responses to the material (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002b). Due to the need for statistical rigor, the guiding questions in this study were designed prior to the lessons and were identical in all course sections.

In the deductive condition, the investigator first explained the grammatical rule orally in French. The rule's function was illustrated by several model sentences, identical to these found in the guided inductive presentation but without any blanks. These model sentences appeared this time at the beginning of the presentation. After the initial explanation, students participated in the same question/answer activity that presented the same cultural information and used the same illustrations. While the students discovered new cultural information, they manipulated the targeted structure previously explained (see Appendix B for lesson plans in both conditions). After each presentation, deductive

or guided inductive, an immediate grammar posttest and an immediate culture posttest were administered, while a written production task measuring students' grammar performance on the structure was administered the next day. After completion of the immediate posttests, each section resumed its regular classroom activities with its respective instructor.

Instruments

The analyses of this study were based on the following instruments, all of which were designed and scored by the investigator.

Background questionnaire. This questionnaire was designed to provide demographic information about the sample, as well as information regarding the participants' foreign language learning history that might be relevant to the findings of this investigation (see Appendix A).

Grammar pretest and posttest. The participants' baseline knowledge of the eight grammatical structures was assessed at the beginning of the semester with a grammar pretest. The pretest was also designed to determine comparability of participants' grammatical competence across the three sections of French 201 prior to the treatment phase. The grammar pretest consisted of 16 multiple-choice items with four answer choices. There were two items per structure targeted. Possible scores for the grammar pretest ranged from zero to 16. This grammar pretest was a modified version of the instrument used in Vogel et al. (in press). Eight items were deleted from the original test and two were added to include one structure that was not tested in Vogel et al.'s study. During the last week of the semester, a grammar posttest was administered to assess participants' long-term retention and overall learning of the eight grammatical

structures as well as to assess the effectiveness of each instructional approach over time. The grammar posttest was identical to the grammar pretest (see Appendix C).

Culture pretest and posttest. The participants' baseline knowledge of the cultural content that was emphasized during each presentation and tested immediately after the presentation was assessed at the beginning of the semester with a culture pretest. Similarly to the grammar pretest, the culture pretest was also designed to determine comparability of participants' cultural knowledge across the three sections of French 201 prior to the treatment phase. The culture pretest consisted of 40 multiple-choice items with four answer choices. There were 32 items under investigation, four items related to each cultural topic presented. Eight distracter items were added. Possible scores for the culture pretest ranged from 0 to 40 and a score ranging from 0 to 32 was assigned for the cultural information under investigation. During the last week of the semester, a culture posttest, identical to the pretest, was administered to the participants to assess long-term retention and overall learning of the cultural content as well as to determine whether different approaches to teach grammar affected long-term retention of the cultural information (see Appendix D).

Immediate grammar posttests. An immediate grammar posttest was administered following each presentation to assess participants' understanding of the targeted grammar structure and ability to use it in a different context. All immediate posttests mirrored typical classroom activities in an intermediate-level French language class. Each test was designed to exclude cultural information related to the chosen topic so as to not confound participants' performance on the immediate culture posttest. Instead, they were thematically related to the characters of the movie, *Le Chemin du*

retour. Each immediate grammar test contained four items and scores ranged from 0 to 8. For each item, students were asked to create full sentences using elements given in parenthesis (see Appendix E for all immediate quizzes). Partial or full credit was awarded and each item had a possible score of 0, 1 or 2.

Unlike the above-mentioned grammar pretest/posttest, immediate tests were not designed as multiple-choice items. Indeed, the grammar pretest and the immediate posttests were aimed at assessing different types of knowledge: recognition and recall knowledge. The multiple-choice pretest assessed possible recognition knowledge, as the students had not yet been taught the targeted structures. Recall knowledge, on the other hand, can only be assessed after students have been actively taught a particular structure. The immediate posttests, requiring written production, were aimed at assessing recall knowledge.

Immediate culture posttests. An immediate culture posttest was administered after each presentation, along with the immediate grammar test, to assess understanding and immediate retention of the cultural information provided during the presentation. The questions were asked in English and students were prompted to answer in English, so as not to confound students' knowledge and understanding with their writing proficiency in French. Each culture posttest contained four items: two items asked for factual information and two items asked students to make inferences based on the information given throughout the presentation. The factual items were dichotomous, with possible scores of 0 (incorrect) or 2 (correct), while partial credit was awarded to the inference items, with possible scores of 0, 1 or 2 for these items. The total score for each immediate culture posttest ranged from 0 to 8 (see Appendix F for all immediate culture posttests).

Delayed writing tasks. A writing activity was administered to students one day after each presentation to assess participants' ability to accurately use the targeted grammatical structure in an open-ended task. They were administered at the very beginning of class. Students were provided directions in English asking them to write five sentences in French on a given topic using the targeted grammar structure taught the previous day (see Appendix G for all written production tasks). A 10-point scale was used for each writing task and partial credit was awarded. The scoring of these tasks focused on the accurate use of the targeted structure only and mirrored the grading system used to score the items of the immediate grammar posttests.

Preference and perception questionnaire. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected through a post study questionnaire administered at the end of the treatment phase. This questionnaire was designed to assess students' preferences and opinions regarding the two instructional approaches used to teach grammar and to assess students' perceptions regarding the integration of culture into grammar lessons. This questionnaire consisted of nine Likert-type items and six open-ended items. For items 1 through 5, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with each statement, from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). For items 6 through 8, students were asked to indicate their preference, from *no preference* (1) to *very strong preference* (5). Finally, item 9 asked students to indicate their relative preference of instructional approach (See Appendix H).

Quantitative Data Analysis Phase

Analysis of research question 1 (short-term learning of grammar). In order to assess which instructional approach to teach grammar was more effective on students'

short-term learning of the eight grammatical structures, total percentage scores for the guided inductive and the deductive conditions were calculated at the end of the treatment phase. Each participant was taught four structures in each treatment condition and received a total percentage score for each condition. A paired samples *t* test was conducted to compare participants' scores in the two different conditions.

Analysis of research question 2 (accuracy in writing tasks). To assess the effects of the two instructional approaches on students' grammatical accuracy in writing production, total percentage scores were calculated for each condition. However, because the writing tasks were administered the day after the lesson, some participants had missing data. Fourteen of the 25 participants were present for all eight writing activities, and a total of 22 participants were present for three or more writing tasks in each condition. Three participants were present for two or more writing tasks in each treatment condition only. In order to explore the effects of each instructional approach on students' grammatical accuracy in writing production in depth two paired samples *t* tests were conducted to compare participants' percentage scores in each condition. A first *t* test was conducted using participants who were present for all eight writing tasks. A second *t* test was conducted using participants who were present for three or more writing tasks in each condition. For this analysis percentage scores were calculated based on the number of structures for which participants were present, and missing scores were not included. Pearson product moment correlations were also conducted between participants' scores on the writing tasks and on the immediate grammar tests.

Analysis of research question 3 (long-term learning of grammar). To assess long-term learning of the eight grammatical structures investigated and a possible effect

of instructional approach over time, a 2 (pre, post) \times 2 (guided inductive, deductive) repeated measures ANOVA was conducted using pretest and posttest raw scores. The investigator related individual items of the grammar pretest and posttest to each student according to the condition in which each structure was taught. Each student learned four structures with a guided inductive approach and four structures with a deductive approach. Hence, each student received a raw score ranging from 0 to 8 (two items per structure) on the pretest and on the posttest for the guided inductive condition, and a raw score ranging from 0 to 8 (two items per structure) on the pretest and on the posttest for the deductive condition.

Analysis of research question 4 (short-term retention of culture). Similar to the immediate grammar tests, total percentage correct scores were calculated for the immediate culture tests in each condition. A paired samples *t* test was conducted to compare participants' scores in the two different conditions.

Analysis of research question 5 (long-term retention of culture). Similar to the analysis assessing the long-term retention of the grammatical structures, a 2 (pre, post) \times 2 (guided inductive, deductive) repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to assess long-term retention of the cultural material and a possible effect of instructional approach over time.

Analysis of research questions 6 (preference of instructional approach) and 7 (perceptions about instruction). To address participants' preference of instructional approach and opinions about the integration of cultural information into the grammar lessons, descriptive statistics were used on the Likert-type items on the post study preference and perception questionnaire.

Analysis of research question 8 (relationships between preference and performances). Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to assess the relationship between the guided inductive and deductive total percentage scores on the grammar, culture, and delayed writing tasks and students' preference of instructional approach. In addition, Pearson product moment correlations were also computed to assess the relationship between students' inductive and deductive scores on the grammar and culture posttests and their preference of instructional approach.

Qualitative Data Analysis Phase

Data sources. Qualitative data for the current study were collected via the open-ended questions on the post study preference and perception questionnaire, as well as oral interviews conducted with eight participants after all quantitative data had been collected.

Open-ended questions. The preference and perception questionnaire included both quantitative and qualitative elements in order to further explore participants' preference of instructional approach and thoughts regarding the integration of cultural information into grammar lessons. First, students were asked to elaborate on their answers to the first six Likert-type items of the questionnaire in written detail. Second, participants were asked to answer the open-ended questions to elaborate on their preferences and opinions. Sample questions included "In your opinion, what is the best way to learn grammar in a foreign language classroom?" The open-ended questions section sought to illuminate the thoughts behind the majority of the participants, since in-depth interviews could not be conducted with each participant.

Oral interviews. Eight participants were randomly selected and participated in the interviews; four were females and four were males. Two participants were enrolled in

section A, three were enrolled in section B, and three were enrolled in Section C. The interviews took place in a semi-private environment and were conducted by the investigator. The interviews lasted no longer than 15 minutes and were designed to be “narrow in focus” (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) and were thus semi-structured interviews. A set of guiding questions was designed in relation to the research questions and purposes of this study (see Appendix I). Specifically, the interviews were aimed at evaluating the two instructional approaches featured in this investigation and the integration of culture into grammar lessons. However, opportunities were provided to explore emerging themes within the structure of the guiding questions. Technical terms such as guided inductive and deductive approach were explained to participants during the interview so as to prevent any misunderstanding. Each interview was recorded digitally and transcribed verbatim soon after completion by the primary investigator (see Appendix J). In order to ensure the reliability of the data, all interview transcripts were verified by an English native speaker to guarantee accuracy.

Data analysis. All the information collected via the two data sources was reviewed and coded independently. A grounded approach was used whereby the themes emerged from the participants’ responses. For both instruments, codes related to recurring and distinctive ideas were created, as suggested in Rubin and Rubin (2005), whereby data units pertaining to a particular concept were grouped together for further analysis and a detailed list of codes was then developed (see Appendix K). Beginning with the themes suggested by the questions and developing from the themes created by the responses, first-level codes were developed to group similar concepts among all participants’ responses. These codes were then grouped into second-level codes in order

to include these themes in broader categories. The coded data were reexamined to identify similarities, differences and/or contradictions existing across participants' experiences or within one participant's experience.

Reliability and validity. Many qualitative researchers have emphasized the need for reliability and validity (Creswell, 2003; Newman & Benz, 1998). These considerations are important when using a mixed methodology to increase the validity of the research study (Newman & Benz, 1998). Various strategies can be included to enhance internal validity of the study. During the qualitative data analysis phase of the current study, triangulation of the two data sources through which participants' responses were collected was performed. As Creswell (1998) explained, in triangulation, the researcher uses multiple data sources "to provide corroborating evidence" in order to "shed light on a particular theme or perspective" (p. 202). Triangulation is also referred to as one of the standards of quality and verification (or validity) of the data (Creswell, 1998). In the current study, both the open-ended questionnaire and the interviews were structured to respond to the research questions. The open-ended questions provided not only further understanding of participants' responses on the Likert-type items, but also allowed for checks both within a participant's responses and between participants. While the less structured interview data provided deeper insights into students' experience, it also provided related information on the more structured open-ended questions to which all participants responded.

Researcher bias. When interpreting qualitative data, it is important to consider the researcher's expectations of a research study (Newman & Benz, 1998). Controlling

for researcher bias is a vital component of mixed methodology designs. As such, I will briefly discuss my language learning history and pedagogical training.

My interest in foreign language grammar instruction has grown out of my own personal experience learning several foreign languages. As an English and Spanish language learner in France, I received predominantly explicit instruction focused on detailed grammatical rules. My study of English from the third grade on consisted of memorizing vocabulary, studying verb conjugations, practicing through mechanical written drills, and translating. Perhaps the way English was taught reflected the way the French language itself was taught to me as a child, with a strong emphasis on grammatical accuracy and metalinguistic knowledge. When I began to teach French and study foreign language teaching methodologies, I became interested in communicative teaching and various instructional approaches to teaching grammar that moved away from traditional teacher explanations. I believe that a solid knowledge of grammar is necessary to become proficient and achieve communicative competence; however I do not believe that jargon explanations, mechanical drills and translations are the most effective approach to achieving such goals. As the primary investigator, I entered into this study with a bias concerning grammar instruction. Nevertheless, the goal of the qualitative phase of the current study was to learn about intermediate-level French students' experiences with two different instructional approaches to teaching grammar in a communicative classroom. I have tried to identify and prevent these biases from threatening the interpretation or validity of the current study. The questions featured on the post-study questionnaire as well as in the interview guide were designed as

objectively as possible in order to understand and impartially report participants' experiences throughout the course of this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the analyses conducted to answer the research questions of the current study, including pretests, immediate tests, posttests, questionnaires and interviews. Results of the quantitative data analyses are presented first, followed by the qualitative data interpretation.

Quantitative Data Interpretation

Preliminary analyses: pretest differences. Table 4 presents the grammar and culture pretest scores means and standard deviations. In order to determine the comparability of students' grammatical and cultural knowledge across the various sections of French 201 prior to the beginning of the treatment phase, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare participants' mean grammar and culture pretest scores in each section. The results indicated no statistically significant difference between the three sections on the grammar pretest scores, $F(2, 22) = 1.87, p = .177$, and no significant difference on the culture pretest scores, $F(2, 22) = 1.11, p = .346$.

Preliminary analyses: instruments. Reliability and item difficulty analyses were computed for all culture and grammar tests in this study.

Grammar pretest and posttest. The value of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the grammar posttest, which assesses consistency in scores among items, was .78, indicating satisfactory reliability of this instrument. Table 5 presents the grammar pre- and posttest items means and standard deviations. For comparison purposes, the items' means and standard deviations based on the larger sample of students who took the tests ($N = 47$) are also provided in the table. Item difficulties for the grammar pretest items

ranged from .08 to .84. Item difficulties for the grammar posttest items ranged from .12 to .92. Eleven of the 16 posttest items had item difficulties ranging between .44 and .72; two items had a mean difficulty below .20; and three items had a mean difficulty above .80. Two items (1 and 6) increased in difficulty from pretest to posttest. Even though the differences were not statistically significant, this analysis suggested that this instrument could be improved.

Culture pretest and posttest. Table 6 presents the culture pretest and posttest items' means and standard deviations. For comparison purposes, the items' means and standard deviations based on the larger sample of students who took the tests ($N = 47$) are also provided in the table. The value of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the 32 items of culture posttest under investigation was .65, indicating acceptable reliability. Item difficulties for the culture pretest items ranged from 0 to .80. Item difficulties for the posttest items ranged from .20 to 1. Twenty-six of the 32 posttest items had a mean difficulty ranging between .20 to .80, and 6 items had a mean difficulty above .80.

Scoring of the immediate tests and writing tasks. Interrater reliability coefficients were calculated to ensure reliability of the scoring. A second rater was trained to grade the grammar, culture, and writing tests using rubrics established by the primary investigator. The interrater reliability coefficients were calculated based on the total of the eight tests' raw scores for each participant. The correlation coefficient was $r = .99$ for the scoring of the immediate grammar tests, $r = .94$ for the scoring of the immediate culture tests, and $r = .98$ for the scoring of the writing activities, indicating high reliability for the scoring of these instruments.

Immediate grammar tests. Table 7 presents the immediate grammar test items' means and standard deviations. For comparison purposes, the items' means and standard deviations based on the larger sample of students who took each of the immediate tests as well as the reliability coefficient for each larger sample are also provided in the table. Internal consistency estimates of reliability were conducted for each immediate grammar test. Values for the coefficient alpha ranged from .36 to .96, with five tests having a reliability coefficient alpha above .60, indicating satisfactory reliability of these instruments given the small number of items and the small sample size. The lower reliability coefficients are attributable to the small sample size ($N = 25$) used in the statistical analyses in this study. The lower coefficient for test 2 ($\alpha = .36$) and 4 ($\alpha = .49$) were further examined. In the immediate grammar test 2, items 2 and 3 were negatively correlated ($r = -.08$). If item 3 were deleted, the reliability coefficient would be higher ($\alpha = .48$). As for the immediate test 4, items 3 and 4 were also negatively correlated ($r = -.08$). If item 3 were deleted, the reliability coefficient would also be higher ($\alpha = .59$). These exploratory analyses suggested that these instruments could be improved. Item difficulties for the 32 grammar test items ranged between .20 (test 7 item 4) and .96 (test 4 item 1). Thirty of the 32 items had a mean difficulty ranging between .20 and .80, and two items had a mean difficulty above .80.

Immediate culture tests. Table 8 presents the immediate culture test items' means and standard deviations. For comparison purposes, the items' means and standard deviations based on the larger sample of students who took each of the immediate tests are also provided in the table. Item difficulties for the 32 immediate culture test items ranged between .08 (test 7 item 4) and .96 (test 1 item 1). Twenty-six of the 32 items had

item difficulties ranging between .20 and .80; two items had a mean difficulty below .20, and four items had a mean difficulty above .80. Unlike the immediate grammar tests, each item on the culture test measured a different aspect of the cultural topic presented; therefore, internal consistency estimates of reliability were not computed for these instruments.

Analysis of research questions. Based on the procedures described in the methodology section, the results are as follow.

Research Question 1: What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' short-term learning of eight grammatical structures? Mean percentage scores and standard deviations for each condition are presented in Table 9. The results of a paired samples t test conducted to compare participants' total guided inductive and deductive percentage scores indicated a statistically significant difference. Students performed significantly better on the immediate grammar tests when taught with the guided inductive approach ($M = 81.88$, $SD = 13.01$) than with the deductive approach ($M = 74.25$, $SD = 18.53$), $t(24) = 2.28$, $p = .032$, $d = .46$. The power for this analysis was .59, which reflects the low number of participants in this study ($N = 25$).

Research question 2: What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' accurate use of the target structures in a delayed writing task? Mean percentage scores and standard deviations in each condition for students present for all eight writing activities are presented in Table 10. The results of a paired samples t test indicated no statistically significant difference between conditions, $t(13) = -0.48$, $p = .634$, $d = .09$. Mean

percentage scores and standard deviations in each condition for students present for three or more writing activities in each condition are presented in Table 11. The results of a paired samples t test indicated no statistically significant difference between conditions, $t(21) = -0.09, p = .925, d = .01$. Power for these analyses was .06 and .05, reflecting small effect sizes and a low number of participants in the sample.

To explore the relationship between students' performance on the immediate grammar tests and their performance on the delayed writing activity, Pearson product moment correlations were computed between their immediate grammar tests and writing tasks raw scores. Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations of the immediate grammar tests, writing tasks, and the correlation coefficients. The results indicated that there was a positive correlation between performance on the immediate grammar tests and the writing activities for seven of the eight grammatical structures. Three were statistically significant. Although not statistically significant, a number of these correlations were substantial. Cohen (1988) indicated that the significance of a correlation coefficient is affected by sample size. In addition, he suggested definitions for small, medium, and large effect sizes as correlation coefficients of .10, .30, and .50, respectively. With the exception of the fourth structure that yielded a negative correlation, all other non-significant correlations can be considered of medium effect size. The descriptive statistics indicate that the means for the writing tasks were generally lower than the mean scores for the immediate grammar tests. Participants performed better in the controlled production grammar test than they did in the more spontaneous and communicative open-ended writing task. The negative correlation between the

immediate test and the writing performance for structure 4 illustrated the higher difficulty for participants to use the target structure accurately in the open-ended writing activity.

Research question 3: What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' long-term learning of eight grammatical structures (over the course of a semester)? Table 13 presents the grammar pretest and posttest means and standard deviations. The results of the 2 (pretest, posttest) \times 2 (deductive, guided inductive) repeated measures ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for time, $F(1, 24) = 18.00, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .43$, indicating an overall improvement in grammar knowledge over the course of the semester. However, the results indicated that there was no significant main effect for approach, $F(1, 24) = 3.407, p = .07$, and no interaction effect, $F(1, 24) = .141, p = .246$ (see Table 14). The pretest to posttest score increases were significant for both the guided inductive condition, $t(24) = 3.39, p = .001$, and the deductive condition $t(24) = 3.33, p = .033$.

Research question 4: What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' short-term retention of cultural information? Immediate culture tests' mean percentage scores and standard deviations for each condition are presented in Table 15. The results of the paired samples t test conducted to compare participants' total guided inductive and deductive culture scores indicated no statistically significant difference between conditions, $t(24) = 0.60, p = .551, d = .12$. The power was .08, which reflected the small effect size and low number of participants in the sample.

Each immediate test comprised of two factual items and two inference items. In order to determine differences in how students retained facts and made inferences from the material presented, subset scores were calculated for each category of items across all eight tests taken. The results of a paired samples t test showed a trend indicating that students were better able to make inferences from the material presented ($M = 64.00$, $SD = 11.34$) than they were at retaining facts ($M = 58.27$, $SD = 15.14$), $t(24) = 2.01$, $p = .056$. To assess the effect of each approach on students' retention of facts and ability to make inferences, subset scores were calculated for each condition. The results of a paired samples t test indicated no statistically significant difference between the guided inductive condition ($M = 57.5$, $SD = 18.39$) and the deductive condition ($M = 60.00$, $SD = 19.43$) on students' retention of facts, $t(24) = .52$, $p = .606$. Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference between the guided inductive condition ($M = 62.5$, $SD = 18.31$) and the deductive condition ($M = 65.5$, $SD = 14.78$) on students' ability to make inferences from the material presented throughout the presentations, $t(24) = .62$, $p = .544$.

Research question 5: What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' long-term retention of cultural information (over the course of a semester)? Table 16 presents the culture pretest and posttest means and standard deviations. The results of a 2 (pretest, posttest) \times 2 (deductive, guided inductive) repeated measures ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for time, $F(1, 24) = 118.00$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .83$, indicating an overall improvement in culture knowledge over the course of the semester. However, the results indicated that there was no significant main effect for approach, $F(1, 24) = .008$, $p = .929$, and no interaction effect, $F(1, 24) = .106$, $p = .748$ (see Table 17).

Research question 6: What are intermediate students' preferences and opinions regarding the two instructional approaches to teach grammar? Frequency distributions were calculated for the Likert-type items of the questionnaire. In response to the statement "I prefer to have the teacher explain the grammar first and then practice," 76% of the participants ($n = 19$) expressed a very strong or strong preference, 12% ($n = 3$) a moderate preference, and 12% ($n = 3$) a mild or no preference. Conversely, to the statement "I prefer to practice first and then discover the rule with the guidance of the teacher," 68% of the participants ($n = 17$) expressed a mild or no preference for this approach, while 24% ($n = 6$) expressed a moderate preference, and 8% ($n = 2$) indicated a strong preference. Participants were asked to indicate their relative preference of instructional approach. The item was ranked from 1 (strongly prefer deductive) to 5 (strongly prefer inductive). Sixty-four percent of the participants ($n = 16$) selected strongly prefer the deductive approach, 24% of participants ($n = 6$) selected mildly prefer the deductive approach, and 12% participants ($n = 3$) selected mildly prefer the guided inductive approach. None of the participants opted to select the no preference option. Taken as a whole, 88% of the participants expressed a preference for the deductive approach, while 12% favored the guided inductive approach.

Research question 7: What are students' perceptions of integrating grammar and culture instruction? Sixty-four percent of the participants ($n = 16$) selected agree or strongly agree in response to the statement "I enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context." Twenty-four percent of the participants ($n = 6$) selected disagree or strongly disagree, and 12% of the participants ($n = 3$) chose neutral. In a related manner, 72% of the participants ($n = 18$) selected strongly agree or agree in response to the statement

“The cultural presentations in the PowerPoint presentations were interesting.” Twenty-four percent ($n = 6$) selected neutral, and 4% ($n = 1$) disagree. Though a majority of participants found the cultural presentations interesting, 56% of participants ($n = 14$) selected agree or strongly agree to the statement “It was difficult to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the cultural information.” Sixteen percent of the participants ($n = 4$) were neutral, and 28% ($n = 7$) either selected disagree or strongly disagree. Similarly, 52% of the participants ($n = 13$) elected agree or strongly agree to the statement “It was difficult to focus on the cultural information while paying attention to the grammar,” 8% ($n = 2$) selected neutral, and 40% ($n = 10$) disagreed or strongly disagreed. Likewise, 48% of the participants ($n = 12$) expressed a strong preference or very strong preference in response to the statement “I prefer to have grammar taught in an activity that focuses on grammar only.” Thirty-two percent ($n = 8$) expressed a moderate preference, and 20% ($n = 5$) expressed a mild or no preference.

Correlation analyses between select items on the questionnaire were also conducted in an exploratory fashion to further understand participant perceptions. A significant positive correlation was found ($r(23) = .47, p = .017$) between item 4, “It was difficult to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the cultural information,” and item 5, “It was difficult to focus on the cultural information while paying attention to the grammar,” indicating a positive relationship in the perceived difficulty of learning both new grammatical and cultural material in one lesson. A significant positive correlation was found ($r(23) = .73, p < .001$) between item 4, “It was difficult to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the culture” and item 6, “I prefer to have grammar taught in an activity that focuses on grammar only,” indicating a positive relationship between

preference for having grammar taught on its own and perceived difficulty of paying attention to both culture and grammar in one lesson. A significant negative correlation was found ($r(23) = -.64, p = .001$) between item 3, “I enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context,” and item 4, “It was difficult to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the culture,” indicating that higher enjoyment for learning grammar in a cultural context was associated with not finding it difficult to focus on both aspects of the lesson. This result is consistent with the significant negative relationship found ($r(23) = -.72, p < .001$) between item 3, “I enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context,” and item 6, “I prefer to have grammar taught in an activity that focuses on grammar only,” indicating that higher enjoyment for learning grammar in a cultural context was associated with a weak preference for having grammar taught with a sole focus on grammar. Finally, item 1, “The cultural presentations were interesting,” and item 6, “I prefer to have grammar taught in an activity that focuses on grammar only,” yielded a negative correlation ($r(23) = -.37, p = .06$). Although not statistically significant, it can be considered of moderate effect size and indicated that higher interest in the cultural presentations was associated with a weaker preference for having grammar taught with a sole focus on grammar.

Research question 8: Is there a relationship between students’ instructional preference and their performance on grammar and culture tests? To explore possible relationships between the participants’ preference of instructional approach and their performance on the grammar and culture tests, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed using participants’ responses to item 9 of the preference and perception questionnaire. The results indicated that there was no significant relationship

between students' preference of instructional approach and their immediate guided inductive grammar score, $r(23) = .09, p = .669$, or their immediate deductive grammar score, $r(23) = -.08, p = .679$. No significant relationship was found between students' preference of instructional approach and their immediate guided inductive culture scores, $r(23) = .19, p = .362$, or their immediate deductive culture scores, $r(23) = .05, p = .792$. There was also no significant relationship between students' preference and their guided inductive writing scores, $r(23) = -.17, p = .411$, or their deductive writing scores, $r(23) = -.03, p = .872$. With regards to long-term performances, no significant relationship was found between students' preference of instructional approach and their posttest guided inductive grammar scores, $r(23) = .22, p = .289$, or their deductive posttest grammar scores, $r(23) = .05, p = .792$. Similarly, no significant relationship was found between students' preference and their posttest guided inductive culture scores, $r(23) = -.12, p = .573$, or their deductive posttest culture scores, $r(23) = -.20, p = .923$.

Qualitative Data Interpretation

Qualitative data for the present study was collected via the preference and perception questionnaire as well as through one-on-one interviews conducted with eight participants at the end of the quantitative data collection phase. The two data sources were analyzed and interpreted separately, but will be integrated in the discussion chapter to shed light or elaborate on the aforementioned quantitative findings.

Open-ended responses interpretation. Both the questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews were designed to further explore participants' preference of instructional approach to learn grammar, as well as their perceptions regarding the integration of culture into the grammar lessons.

Research question 6 (Students' preference of instructional approach). Four questions addressed participants' beliefs of effective grammar teaching, preference of instructional approach, and their opinions regarding the deductive and guided inductive approach featured in this study. Item 10 asked students to explain what they believed to be the most effective way to learn grammar in a foreign language classroom. In a related manner, item 13 asked participants which of the two approaches featured in the study they preferred. Items 11 and 12 asked participants to express their opinions about each approach featured in this study. Participants' responses were organized into three categories: (1) preference of instructional approach to learn grammar, (2) opinions of the deductive approach, and (3) opinions of the guided inductive approach.

Preference of instructional approach to learn grammar. Participants' responses were very consistent and highlighted a strong preference for the deductive approach. A majority of the participants (88%) favored being explicitly taught the rules prior to practice. For example, one student said, "I prefer to learn with the rules first. It just makes more sense to me and I feel like I understand the structure more rather than guessing some random rule," or, as another participant explained, "I prefer rule first then practice. I think in a logical way. I learn everything better and retain the information when presented visually with a step-by-step approach." Some participants preferred explicit teaching of the rules first as it helps them memorize the grammatical rules which they can later retrieve when completing various activities: "I find that rule first then practice works better for me because it helps me memorize the rule better," or, "Rules first then practice. It's like a mathematical formula you memorize and then you are able to apply it to whatever situation." Nonetheless, some participants also expressed a preference for a

contextualized practice activity following the teaching of the rules. One participant wrote, “I learn grammar best by being taught all the grammar rules first and then applying them to sentences using them in context,” while another said, “I prefer [that] the teacher explains the grammar, what and how it is used, then practice. Interesting ways such as learning interesting information helps.” For these participants, learning the rules first was a strong preference; however meaningful practice with relevant material and contextualization was also important. In addition to explicit teaching of the rules first, most participants highlighted the importance of repetition and extensive practice: “I think the best way to learn grammar is to learn the rule and then get a lot of spoken and written practice with it.” In addition to examples to illustrate the rules, some participants expressed the need for additional input enhancement in a written form to clarify the rules even more: “I like having *PowerPoint* with rules and part of a sentence highlighted to better understand/see the rule.”

While a great majority of participants preferred the deductive approach, a few participants expressed a preference for the guided inductive approach or no particular preference for either approach. One participant stated, “I like to discover because when you learn it on your own, or figure it out, it kind of sticks with you. Especially if you don’t get it right at first.” For this participant, learning through discovery-based activities and through trial and error appears to be more beneficial than being taught the rules explicitly. Finally, one participant nuanced his response in light of the various levels of difficulty that different grammatical concepts may represent: “I do not really have a preference for either one. For easier lessons, I would prefer practice first then the rule, but rule first then practice for harder grammar concepts.”

However, taken as a whole, participants' responses reflected a strong preference for a deductive approach to teaching and learning grammar and highlighted the importance of practice and written visualization of the rule. Interestingly, participants did not mention whether they generally prefer to be taught the rules in the target language or in their native language. The lack of comments on the use of the target language only or code switching may lead to believe that at the intermediate level, students may not be opposed to the use of the target language only when learning grammar.

Opinions on the deductive approach. When asked about the advantages and disadvantages of a deductive approach to teaching and learning grammar, participants expressed that learning the rules first was more beneficial because they felt it provided them with more "clarity," and allowed them to "know" or "understand" the grammatical structure better. One student stated, "it makes me less confused and lets me understand the material before I practice with it." Participants overall felt that the deductive approach made the targeted structure more noticeable during the introductory phase and in subsequent practice activities. One participant wrote, "You know what to focus on before you practice." Another participant commented, "Learning the grammar first gives you some knowledge or preparation before practicing the grammar structure." "Knowing" the grammatical rule ahead of time appears to provide more confidence in the likelihood of being successful at "doing" an exercise.

Another important and related theme that emerged from participants' responses was the notion of accuracy and of forming sound grammatical habits. Participants felt that with a deductive approach, they were more likely to use a structure correctly: "It is more precise, less chances to make mistakes." A deductive approach is believed to be

more beneficial as “knowing the rules” allows participants to “know how” to use a grammatical structure correctly: “If a student learns a grammatical rule first, they will know how to apply the rule in any situation, know all the exceptions, which will help them remember the grammar more easily.” Participants overall expressed the desire to be able to use the language correctly and felt that this goal would be best achieved if taught explicitly before practice.

Nonetheless, as participants discussed each approach, they also pointed out negative aspects of learning grammatical rules explicitly first. Some participants noticed that while this method generally provides more clarity and accuracy, it could also turn into a mechanical rather than a meaningful way of learning. One participant explained, “I think it provides the most clarity when learning a new grammatical rule in French. However, it can lead to an over mechanized learning of the material.” Another participant stated, “It helps you compute the rule and then it gets embedded in your memory,” thus comparing language learning to a formula that one applies to different situations, potentially regardless of meaning. The deductive approach, as noticed in some responses, does not necessarily put students in a situation where they have to think and reflect about the language they are learning: “Although you understand the rule, you might just be regurgitating it without truly understanding or thinking about it.” However, participants overwhelmingly preferred the deductive approach, which appeared “easier” to them.

Opinions on the guided inductive approach. Despite their clear preference for the deductive approach, participants also discussed advantages and disadvantages of the guided inductive approach. An important difference between the two that emerged from participants’ responses was based in “knowing how” to use a grammatical structure

versus “knowing when” to use it. One participant commented that with the guided inductive approach, “You learn the types of phrases to use the grammar first so you know when you can use it.” Some participants felt that they could get a better understanding of usage and not only forms. Practicing first was also perceived to be a more active form of learning that could be “more engaging for students,” as it forces them to think about the language. One participant stated, “It allows me to think about the sentences structurally and find patterns, it makes me think more.” A benefit of the guided inductive approach seems to come from the fact that participants are able to reach a different level of understanding. One participant wrote, “Practicing the grammatical structure first makes you think and truly understand the information on your own versus just memorizing it.” Other participants stressed the benefits of being forced to look for patterns: “You train your mind to recognize patterns and learn more through osmosis,” thus making the learning process a more intuitive one.

However, for a majority of participants, learning through examples first and discovering the rule afterwards with the guidance of the teacher caused confusion and frustration. As one participant and several others commented, “I feel as though it causes confusion because in essence you don’t know what you are doing.” Participants felt that with this approach, the targeted grammatical structure is less noticeable, and they are therefore unsure of where to focus their attention: “You don’t know what part of the sentence to focus on so you may not know what you are learning.” Feelings of frustration often led to strong negative reactions, as illustrated by one participant’s comment: “I don’t find any advantages. You don’t know how to use it. It’s like telling someone to shoot a gun and then afterwards telling them how to work it. It was very frustrating.”

Associated with the confusion and frustration is the fear of forming bad habits and making mistakes: “It lets people think more but it’s harder for me to learn. It can make people believe the way they came up with is right when it’s actually wrong.” Another participant commented on her feelings of frustration as they related to being able to use a structure correctly: “I would get frustrated because I don’t like to be wrong.” While participants felt that the deductive approach provided them with a more extensive knowledge and a greater likelihood of being accurate, they expressed frustrations and overwhelming concerns for making errors with the guided inductive approach.

Research question 7 (students’ perceptions instruction). The open-ended questions on the preference and perception questionnaire were designed to address in more detail topics covered by the Likert-type items. In the first part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to explain in written detail their selected rating on the Likert-type items related to the integration of a cultural component into the grammar lessons. An additional two questions in the second part of the questionnaire also addressed related topics. The process of reviewing and coding the data revealed three broad categories associated with this research question, including preference, grammar learning effects, and culture learning effects.

Preference. Several items of the questionnaire tackled the issue of preference regarding the integration of cultural information into grammar presentations. Item 3 of the questionnaire asked participants whether they enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context. In a related manner, items 10 and 14 respectively asked students to describe what they believed to be the best way to learn grammar and culture in a foreign language classroom. While participants’ preference of instructional approach was clearly

determined, their perceptions regarding the integration of cultural information were more complex. Participants' comments addressed several preferences such as enjoying the integration of both components, disliking it, as well as suggestions for effective integration.

Participants' responses to the quantitative part of item 3 showed that a majority (72%) of students found the lessons interesting and that 64% of them enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context. Several participants described it as an interesting approach to teaching grammar: "I love culture and I think it made the grammar more interesting," or, "I felt like the culture made the grammar more engaging." Another participant felt that it could be beneficial to use a cultural context to teach grammar, but that more classroom time might be needed to make it a fully effective method: "For the most part, integrating culture into grammar presentations is very beneficial. It makes students focus more on the concept. Some more time may be needed to understand the information however."

Some participants, on the other hand, mentioned that culture would be best taught separate from grammar, and addressed the issue of cognitive overload. One participant described the inclusion of a cultural component as "cramming in the most basic form." This participant added, "You forget what you learn and how can you learn when your attention is divided into two areas. I was floored when I had to answer culture questions with the first lesson because I wasn't paying attention to it." Similarly, another participant expressed that integrating culture and grammar was "a lot of information to take in." It seems from similar responses that focusing on culture while being introduced to a new grammatical concept created a feeling of cognitive overload among some participants, as described by Just and Carpenter (1992). Participants' short-term memory

was overworked in trying to focus on both aspects of the lesson at once. Several participants preferred to have both aspects of language learning taught separately, even though the cultural topics appeared interesting to them.

Several other participants nuanced their responses and expressed the notion that while it may be harder to focus on both aspects concurrently, the practice of grammar concepts could nonetheless benefit from integrating a cultural component to it; however, not in the introductory stage of a new grammatical concept: “After learning the grammar, you can use that to describe culture but you can’t do both at the same time.” Thus, several participants suggested that it would be most beneficial for them to learn the grammar first and subsequently practice manipulating the targeted structure in a cultural activity: “I think the best way to learn grammar is to introduce the grammar first. Cultural aspects of France can be incorporated further after the basics are learned because the cultural information can provide a great way to practice language after learning it.” When reviewing participants’ responses as a whole, it is important to keep in mind that a majority of students expressed that they enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context. Many others suggested other options focused on using cultural topics to practice grammar as opposed to not integrating both aspects at all.

Grammar learning effects. In responding to questions regarding the integration of culture and grammar, and in discussing in more detail advantages and disadvantages of such an approach, participants discussed the effects that these lessons had on their perceived learning of the grammatical structures and cultural information. In this section focusing on the effects of the lessons on students’ perceived learning of grammar, several

subthemes emerged from the participants' responses such as interest, connections, difficulty, and no effect.

Although several participants found it somewhat difficult to focus on both aspects of the lessons, a majority of the participants felt that those presentations were interesting. Many participants indeed included statements regarding the interest-building factor behind having grammar taught in a cultural context. For many students, the lessons covering French and Francophone cultural aspects increased their interest in the grammar itself. One participant commented, "It was more interesting than learning plain grammar." From this comment and several similar ones, the nature of these lessons seemed to differ from what participants considered traditional grammar instruction. The increased interest in grammar due to the cultural context in turn helped some participants pay closer attention to the targeted grammatical structures. According to one participant, the cultural context "helped [me] focus even more on the grammar content. Usually grammar lessons are boring." Another participant stated, "It made [focusing on the grammar] easier since it was more interesting." Because these participants were interested, they also felt more engaged in the learning process: "I felt like the culture made the grammar more engaging." For these participants, the increased interest due to the cultural context of the lessons seemed to have positively reinforced their focusing on the grammar.

Tied to the theme of interest was the theme of connections. Because the grammar was taught in a cultural context, some participants explained that they were able to connect those two aspects of language learning. For example, one participant commented, "It makes more sense to relate grammar to real-life, so grammar isn't just rules." Another

participant expressed that “It allows you to tie more things together, so if you forget a rule, it is easier to go back and remember it in the cultural context it was taught, at least since I do personally.” For these participants, the cultural context allowed them to make connections and to see how grammar can be used to discuss various aspects of the targeted culture.

Other participants commented on the benefit of a cultural context to better remember the grammar, but nuanced their responses by pointing to the fact that one aspect can be overpowered by the other: “I think integrating them helps me remember the grammar and the culture better, but sometimes some details can be looked over when focusing on grammar or culture more than the other.” Some participants felt that they had to choose whether to focus their attention on grammar or culture, whether because one aspect interested them more than the other or because focusing on both grammar and culture concurrently proved to be too difficult. On the one hand, some participants felt that their interest in the culture overpowered the grammar. For example, one participant stated: “The cultural information is more interesting than grammar, so I would end up focusing on that,” perhaps showing that for some participants, the culture turned out to be an enjoyable yet distracting factor to their focusing on the targeted grammar. As another participant commented, “It makes classes more interesting, but a disadvantage is that it may overpower the actual grammar,” explaining why some participants found it “difficult to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the cultural information.”

Because of the cultural context, some participants did not perceive the grammar to be the main focus of the lesson, which in turn may have affected the way they learned the targeted structures. One participant stated, “The grammar was not the focus of some of

the lessons.” The issue of cognitive overload was recurrent in some participants’ responses as they expressed struggling to focus their attention on the grammar. One participant wrote, “I really enjoyed learning about culture but struggled retaining the grammatical aspects.” Another participant expressed that the culture “makes the lessons more engaging, but it makes it hard to retain the grammatical information.”

An issue related to the theme of difficulty focused on the oral aspect of the lessons. One participant commented, “I need to see the grammar. I entered French 201 knowing all of the grammar that would be taught and still struggled answering the sentences.” The oral format of the practice activity involving cultural content might have added to students’ feeling of cognitive overload. Also related to theme of difficulty was the pace of the lessons. A few participants felt that the lessons were too quick, which they believe affected learning: “The grammar lessons were quick and I don’t feel like I really learned them.” This suggests that more time might be required for this integration to be effective.

Participants’ responses regarding the difficulty to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the culture were divided. Some participants saw the culture as a motivational factor to focus on the grammar, while others found it distracting or difficult to focus on both concurrently.

Culture retention effects. Related to the effects of the lessons on students’ perceived learning of grammar was students’ retention of culture. Although several participants found the lessons interesting and felt it was easier to engage in the learning of grammar, participants’ responses seemed to suggest that the learning of the cultural content was more challenging.

One of the issues that arose from participants' comments was that of vocabulary and the difficulty of retaining the cultural information due to vocabulary. One participant stated, "It's hard to concentrate on both at the same time and with new words. I would forget the cultural information as a result." Specifically, the lack of written vocabulary words in the presentations appeared to be an issue for some participants despite their interest in the material. For example, one participant stated, "[The presentations] were interesting, but without seeing the words being said, none of the information stayed with me." Again, the oral format of the activity made it more difficult for participants to retain the new cultural information. However, the visuals provided in the *PowerPoint* seemed to balance the lack of written words for some participants: "I was able to much better comprehend because of the picture. Seeing made me remember more than just hearing." Also related to the difficulty of retaining the cultural material was the issue of time. One participant stated, "I didn't understand many of them because they were very fast." This suggested that more time might have been needed in order for participants to not only focus on the grammar, but also on the new vocabulary related to the cultural information.

Similar to the effects mentioned above on participants' perceived learning of grammar, many students expressed that they felt the need to choose between focusing on grammar or culture. It seems that some struggling participants made a conscious choice to focus on the grammar. For example, one participant stated, "I focused on the grammar instead of the cultural information." Another participant made a similar comment: "I just ignored the culture. I feel like there may be a trade off between the two." Some participants saw the grammar as distracting from focusing on the culture: "We were

learning grammar and pronunciation simultaneously, which distracted me from learning the cultural information.” While focused on understanding the targeted grammatical structures presented, participants’ learning of culture seemed to have been negatively affected: “It is hard to understand the culture when focused on learning the grammar.” These responses suggest that for many participants, culture was peripheral, and priority was given to the grammar.

Overall, participants’ responses to the preference and perception questionnaire reflected different preferences and opinions regarding the inclusion of a cultural component in the teaching of grammatical structures, as well as its perceived effect on learning. Participants were divided as to their preference and as to the perceived difficulty of focusing on both aspects of the lessons simultaneously. It is thus important to examine participants’ responses to the questionnaire with other data sources to fully understand them.

Interviews. As previously mentioned, eight interviewees were randomly selected to discuss their preference of instructional approach and perceptions of the lessons taught in this study. The interviewees were selected from each course section, representing diverse backgrounds and experiences. Each informant was interviewed for approximately 10 to 15 minutes. While the same topics were discussed with each informant, following a general plan, there was no specific order of questions. Both participants’ impressions of instruction featured in this study and their opinions about the two approaches to teaching grammar were discussed concurrently.

As a foreign language instructor, grammar and culture are of great interest to the researcher. Therefore, it was necessary to refrain from expressing personal viewpoints

and to maintain a proper distance in order to explore objectively and analyze participants' responses. After the process of transcribing, coding and analyzing the interview data, participants' responses were broken down into the following categories: (1) impressions of instruction featured in this study – specifically of its dual aspect, and (2) preferred instructional approach to learn grammar. The data analysis revealed a mixture of similarities and differences among the informants' experiences, preferences, and opinions concerning the instruction received during the treatment phase. For reasons of confidentiality, direct quotes from participants are attributed to participants A, B... H.

Perceptions of instruction in this study. The participants interviewed expressed various opinions concerning the overall instruction featured in this study, particularly regarding the incorporation of a cultural element into the teaching of the grammatical structures. As several participants discussed their prior experiences in a foreign language classroom, it appeared that the way the grammar was presented in this study contrasted with their previous experiences in learning grammar and culture. Several participants mentioned that both aspects of language learning were often taught separately. Participant F's statement summarized what several other participants highlighted:

In middle school we didn't learn that much about culture, we learned vocab and grammar, and in high school we focused more on culture, so it was nice to do both of those together [...] we wouldn't be learning how to use the grammar in a cultural context like you taught us. It was like here is the subjunctive, and here is something about Versailles.

Similarly, participant C explained, "I hadn't really done grammar since sophomore year of high school because junior and senior year, we mostly did more like cultural stuff."

Parallel to the trend noted in the post-study questionnaire, six of the eight participants enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context and mentioned that the lessons presented in the *PowerPoint* presentations were an interesting and innovative way to present grammar that they felt was more “engaging.” Participant F explained why she enjoyed the cultural context:

For me it made it more interesting. Because usually when people teach grammar it’s more in like a math setting, like you kind of go ok, you take this stem, you add this ending and it is used here. But when it’s in a cultural setting, it makes it more engaging and interesting, at least for me [...] it’s not just memorizing facts, it’s putting them in a context that I will remember.

Participants perceived that the cultural context allowed for more connections than the more traditional grammar instruction they had received previously and could help students focus on and remember the grammar. Participant E explained:

I enjoyed it because you can kind of see how it fits into like real-world situation, instead of like the usual grammar where it’s like oh your sister whatever. But when you see it in a real context it kind of draws more connections. I did enjoy that.

Participant A enjoyed the cultural aspect as it provided him with a clear context for the discussion that would later allow him to remember the grammatical concept:

I definitely liked the culture part [...] I actually preferred the cultural context because it [...] helped me indicate what we were talking about at times where I didn’t know what we were talking about grammatically [...] It’s more fun when

you have the cultural aspect, and you know, you remember...oh we were talking about this and then you remember the grammar.

Participant G believed the cultural context was helpful as it provided a “theme” to the grammatical topics to which he could connect:

Usually grammar exercises, it’s kind of like these random sentences put together whereas... if there’s like a central theme to whatever you’re learning [...] I guess it’s easier to remember the concept, like ok, this week we did a presentation on Martinique and I remember we had a sentence like this one. I don’t know, you just connect it more easily.

Despite their enjoying the cultural context, and despite the fact that the presentations were interesting and allowed for more connections and associations, several participants felt that the lessons were sometimes difficult to follow and, as a result, the material difficult to grasp. Focusing on two different aspects simultaneously created a feeling of cognitive overload among several participants. Participant B felt “indifferent” to the cultural context used to teach grammar, as it created a feeling of confusion and perhaps frustration for her: She explained:

One thing that I definitely thought was confusing was that it was hard to pay attention to both at the same time, both the culture and the grammar. I had trouble concentrating, because I think I would try harder... I would get the grammar down, so I would almost like lose the cultural information, so that for me, was hard [...] I don’t like to learn grammar in a very straightforward way, like here is this, you always use this with this kind of thing. It’s much more interesting to

have it incorporated into something else. But when asked to remember both of these, it was hard.

For Participant E, although having a cultural context was “more interesting,” it was also difficult to focus on both aspects simultaneously: “If you’re trying to learn the grammar, you want to focus on learning the grammar [...] It might be hard to remember what the culture part was if you’re trying to focus on the structure.” For these participants as well as others, grammar seems to have remained the priority on which to focus attention. The cultural aspect appears to have made it harder for them to do so and thus affected their retention of the cultural material. While participant H found the lessons “interesting” from a grammatical point of view, he was also indifferent to the integration of cultural information into the grammar lessons and chose to exclusively focus his attention on the grammatical aspects:

I felt like I couldn’t focus on both at once so... I guess I didn’t really realize you were trying to teach us both until further into the semester. I was just focused on the grammar [...] I guess the culture was like subliminally stuck in there so for some reason I just didn’t pay any attention to it. And I guess what it came down to was well I have to choose one so I’ll choose the grammar.

Associated with the theme of perceived difficulty was indeed the issue of the pacing of the lessons. For Participant F the short period of time devoted to these lessons was insufficient for the material to “stick.” She stated, “We only learned it for a day or a few minutes so it didn’t really stick in my brain as much as going over things [in class] but that’s because it was just quickly taught.” Some participants suggested that grammar

instruction might benefit from adding a cultural component if the course were structured differently and more time could be devoted to such activities. Participant G expressed:

I really liked [the lessons]. I just thought they were really fast paced. Of course you have a short period of time but I thought that if it was in a normal class structure, it would be really interesting, like keep you engaged while learning grammar.

Similar to a trend noted in the post-study questionnaire, informants specifically expressed that they would enjoy practicing grammar in a cultural context, after the teaching of grammatical structures had occurred. While not dismissing the potential benefit of combining both aspects, these participants felt it might have lessened the level of difficulty and thus potentially been more valuable to include a cultural component once knowledge of the grammar had been acquired. Participant C's comment reflected other informants' feelings:

I thought it was an interesting idea because it makes grammar less boring, but I thought that if we had learned the grammar in a boring way first that might have been helpful. I didn't really get to fully understand the culture or fully understand the grammar. I was just getting little bits and pieces of each. So I think if we had learned the grammar first and then put it in the context of culture that would have been better.

Prior knowledge of the grammar might have been an additional element factoring into students' experiences of difficulty with the lessons. Participant D explained:

In the beginning I thought [the lessons] were pretty good, but then towards the end because there were some of the stuff I hadn't learned before, I didn't really

know what was going on. I could sort of see the rules but together with the culture...

Participants highlighted the additional difficulties they faced in understanding what was going on due to the oral component and limited written information that was provided on the *PowerPoint* presentations. Participant C explained how not seeing the grammar made it more difficult:

It was kind of hard to just hear the grammar instead of actually seeing it written and... it was written on the *PowerPoint* but it was a lot of listening and learning culture all at once, so it was just a lot for the brain to process.

Participants generally perceived that the lack of written vocabulary words related to the culture information contributed to their feeling of cognitive overload and confusion.

Participant D stated, "I didn't see any words and I am not really that good with the hearing, so I was a little confused." For Participant B, "seeing the pictures of what you were talking about for the culture was helpful, but trying to remember the words you said for me was hard." Students believed that more written information such as vocabulary words related to the culture and input enhancement techniques to make the grammatical structures more salient would have increased clarity. As participant B explained, "One thing I would have liked was like when we did do the examples, having things like highlighted in different colors to kind of make it very clear." Other participants nonetheless commented on the usefulness of doing the oral exercises. As participant G stated, "I am better at reading and writing French than actually speaking or listening to it [...] It was a little difficult at first but I think it's a good thing because you have to develop those skills sometimes."

Preference of instructional approach. The participants interviewed clearly expressed their preference regarding the most effective instructional approach to teach and learn grammar, which echoed participants' responses in the post-study questionnaire. Six of the eight informants stated that they preferred the deductive approach. These students felt as though they understood the material better and “knew” what to focus their attention on when given a rule prior to an activity. Participant A explained how learning the rules provided a comfort-zone and eliminated confusion:

I am more of a rule first then practice sort of guy. Because for me it was a bit confusing when I had speak out the phrases first before knowing the rules, I had no idea what I was talking about in a sense [...] I need that comfort level. I need to know what I am talking about.

Participant D explained how a passive learning situation better suited her learning style: “I think for me it helps me if I hear the explanations first and then go through examples just because I think I'm not an aggressive learner, I'm sort of passive so I learn what other people tell me.” Participant F compared French and mathematics learning, stating, “It's the same for me in math. I like the teacher to explain it and then once I understand the concept, to do problems so it like instills in my brain.”

Only participant H expressed a preference for the guided inductive approach. He felt that looking for patterns on his own and perhaps making a mistake but being corrected could be beneficial and make the grammar “stick” better:

When you start off with sentences, you kind of figure this out, you see like a pattern, then I guess it's like self discovery, ok I am noticing this pattern and now let's go back and oh now this makes a lot more sense [...] I mean they're both

effective but I just feel like because you have to think about it and let's say you get it wrong and you say oh... now I understand so I guess it kind of helps that way.

Participant G nuanced his response regarding his preference of instructional approach and explained that he felt that both could be effective depending on the complexity of the grammatical concept presented:

It depends. I feel like for more difficult grammar concepts, I would probably want the rules first and then do examples. But if it's like something simple such as... what was something we learned that was simple? ... I guess like *lequel*... I felt like that was something you can catch onto quickly, then that worked as far as doing examples first and then getting explained to you afterwards.

It must be noted that several participants were unable to distinguish between the approaches used to teach the various grammatical structures over the course of the study. Only participant F was able to recall the main characteristics of both approaches, while participants C, G, and H were only able to describe the features of the guided inductive approach.

Advantages and disadvantages. Despite their preference for one type of instructional approach, participants discussed what they considered advantages and disadvantages of both teaching techniques. As outlined above, participants preferred the deductive approach and commented on the “confusion,” or possible confusion, that learning with the guided inductive approach could cause. They believed that learning the rules first was a more “straightforward” approach and commented on the necessity of “knowing” right from the beginning of a lesson what to focus on, or “what to look for.”

For Participant B, the teaching of the rules first generally provided “a basic understanding that helps me better understand [...] I personally look at something and am able to point out what I understand about it.” Similarly, the deductive approach made it “easier” for Participant C to understand the grammar, to notice the structure in the activity that followed and thus to feel more confident. She explained:

I knew what to look for. When you were asking us questions, I wasn't really understanding, it was harder to figure out what I was supposed to be focusing on, what the rules were. And like deductive, then we went into the examples I knew what to focus on in a sentence and like what was important about the grammar beforehand so I could look for that.

Participant E felt that the deductive approach allowed for more clarity and accuracy, as it was easier to know “how to respond.” Participant E felt that with the guided inductive approach, the risk of not being able to figure out a particular pattern “correctly” might lead to more errors. Participant G discussed the same idea and stated, “When you're trying to learn something by yourself, you don't necessarily learn it correctly, so when you get the rules first, you already know *how* things are supposed to work and you can apply them.”

Critics of the deductive approach mirrored advantages of the guided inductive approach. Participants felt that perhaps through the process of “figuring out” a grammatical concept, students might be more likely to remember it better. They perceived guided induction as an approach that challenges students to “think” more. Participant D pointed to the deductive approach as a more “passive” way of learning contrary to the guided inductive approach that according to participant A forces students

to “participate.” For participant H learning through a discovery approach and actively thinking might help to remember the grammar better than a more passive learning situation:

I guess the second approach where you like jump in there I guess that’s helpful in like it helps you think. The student has to do more thinking about it and then just making connections. I think it may be more helpful in the long term just because you know through trial and error you remember things more than if it’s just given to you.

Likewise, Participant F felt that a potential disadvantage of the deductive approach was that memorization of rules may not lead to a full understanding of the grammatical concept: “I am sure for some kids, they memorize it but they don’t fully understand it and then later they forget it or like on a test they become more confused because they weren’t the ones first figuring it out themselves.”

Several participants referred to the potential mechanical aspect of language learning when taught the rules first. Participant D stated, “When you learn the rule... you just like... sometimes I do this, if it’s a verb form, I just fill in the verb, I don’t even really read the sentence, so I guess that’s not really good.” Participant G also commented on the mechanical aspect of learning, where one focuses only on the specific grammatical aspect but does not try to understand the context in which that particular form is presented:

I feel like if you’re trying to learn while trying to fill in something, you’re going to be focused on trying to fill in whatever grammar concept you’re doing, not also trying to figure out, try to learn oh what’s the cultural thing going on there.

Some participants indeed pointed to the fact that practicing first may have helped some students focus on the cultural information, or the message being conveyed. Participant A expressed, “Because when you practice first, you’re forced to focus on that particular phrase a bit more than maybe you would if you learned the rules first.”

Conversely, some participants thought that the deductive approach might have made it easier to focus on the cultural information. Participant E’s comments reflected others’:

When you told us what it was, it kind of gave us an idea of what we were doing so I already had an idea of the grammar, then when we went through the culture it wasn’t so much like trying to figure out the grammar.

For Participant F, the instructional approach did not make a difference on her capacity to focus on the cultural information: “I feel like once I kind of grasped the grammar that was going on, it was easy for me to focus on the culture. So I guess it didn’t really make a difference to me.”

Finally, some informants pointed out the difficulty of completing the writing activity the day after the lesson was taught regardless of the approach used in the lesson. For example, participant E explained why the time that had elapsed made it all the more difficult:

I couldn’t remember what we had gone over since it was at the beginning of the class and we would do other stuff and then come back the next day and like have to write five sentences, trying to remember what was the rule and how do we use the sentences.

These activities were deemed difficult not only because they were administered the following day, but also because of their communicative nature. Participant H stated:

The most difficult thing was when we had to come back on Tuesdays and it would be like write five sentences, it was just like wow, wow, wow! [...] It was like when do I use it because it was like the day after [...] conjugating is definitely easier than forming your own sentences.

In conclusion, the interview data reflected the preference and perception questionnaire data. Participants' perceptions of the instruction received over the course of this study varied as far as the inclusion of a cultural context for the teaching of grammatical structures. While many participants found the lessons interesting and engaging, several also experienced difficulties in learning and focusing on various aspects at once, which they felt hindered their learning of either grammar or culture. Vocabulary and lack of written information accounted for this perceived difficulty. Nonetheless, participants suggested other avenues for including these two aspects of language learning.

Overall participants' preference of instructional approach was unambiguous. They preferred learning the rules first and perceived that the guided inductive made it "harder" to understand the material and to see "what was going on." While students agreed that the guided inductive approach made students "think" more, they believed that it also created more confusion and perhaps more errors. The deductive approach allowed participants to "know" ahead of time what to "look for" and made it "easier" for them to notice the structures in the subsequent oral practice activity and to be more confident in their ability to complete such tasks.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The current study was designed to teach grammatical forms through culturally enriched lessons in an intermediate-level college French course. Its primary aim was to investigate the effectiveness of two instructional approaches to teaching grammar on the learning of grammatical forms and grammatical accuracy in writing tasks. The approaches investigated were the guided inductive and deductive presentational models. Additionally, this study sought to examine whether these two types of form-focused instruction would also affect the retention of culture. A secondary goal of this study was to investigate quantitatively and qualitatively students' perceptions regarding the integration of culture into the presentation of grammatical structures as well as their opinions and preference for each instructional approach. This chapter will provide further review of the results described in the previous chapter and discuss the significance of these findings.

Limitations

There are limitations intrinsic to any study involving classroom research that must be discussed prior to drawing conclusions. First, generalizability cannot be extended to all contexts and populations outside of the academic setting in which this investigation took place. This limitation is recurrent in classroom research and inevitable in the present study. The sample of students participating in this quasi-experimental study was not randomly assigned to each course section due to the fact that the University's registrar system assigns students to course sections. While this may have led to group differences

among the three sections of French 201, the within-subjects design implemented in this study controlled for possible group differences. In addition, as shown through the analyses of pretest scores and previous years of exposure to French, all three groups were comparable prior to the treatment phase.

It must be noted that this investigation only focused on one particular type of inductive approach, which may also limit the generalizability of the results. The deductive approach featured in this study mirrored the traditional deductive approach commonly used in foreign language classrooms –teacher-fronted rule explanation followed by a practice activity that illustrates the rule. The inductive condition was a hybrid of two approaches, the guided induction approach (Herron & Tomasello, 1992) and the PACE model (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002; Adair-Hauck et al., 2005). All instruction, whether inductive or deductive, including explanations of the grammatical rules, was done orally with limited written information provided. This oral emphasis might have limited the results of this study as suggested by a few participants' comments on the post-study questionnaire and in the interviews.

In addition, this investigation only targeted a set of eight grammatical structures taught through eight particular cultural topics. Although these grammatical structures represented a range of structures taught in intermediate level French courses, they were by no means representative of the whole of French grammar. Similarly, the cultural topics targeted several specific aspects of French and Francophone culture but were by no means comprehensive. This study focused on the effects of both instructional approaches on the learning of grammatical forms in controlled and open-ended tasks in a written format only. Future research should focus on investigating the effects of guided inductive

and deductive instructional approaches on the development of other skills, such as speaking, reading, or listening, with various test formats to measure short or long term learning. Finally this study involved one particular level of French students – namely, intermediate-level college French students – using a particular curriculum. Future research should continue to investigate whether different types of inductive presentations produce varying results on students’ learning of grammar and continue to explore the effects of approaches combining culture and grammar on learners at different proficiency levels.

Several threats to the internal validity of the present study also exist. Due to the counterbalanced within-subjects design, practice effects were minimized, as all 25 participants were present an equal number of times in each treatment condition. Although the research design also controlled for individual variability, carryover effects, or changes in participants’ performance that might occur due to their participation in an earlier treatment condition, could have affected the results. To minimize the differential carryover effect, adequate time intervals were designed and a minimum of a one-week interval was provided in between the teaching of two lessons.

Participant attrition may also affect the internal validity of this study. The attendance policy of the department in which this study took place allows students to miss six classes without penalty. Missing data is a recurrent and inevitable issue in classroom research, as the researchers cannot control for students’ presence or absence in the classroom. In this study, 25 of the 47 participants eligible for treatment were present for the teaching of all structures, the pretests and the posttests, as well as for the post study questionnaire. As explained earlier, the decision to keep those 25 participants in the

statistical analyses was made so that all participants had a maximal and similar exposure to the interventions. Future research should try and replicate the current study on a larger scale.

Since all lessons and testing procedures occurred during participants' regular class time, it is also necessary to consider time constraints as a limitation in this study. The length of time that could be devoted to the treatment was limited, as it occurred within the bounds of classroom activities and covered materials that were not assigned in the course syllabus. Each lesson took place at the beginning of class and lasted no longer than 15 minutes followed by the immediate tests, which could have been too little time to effectively focus on the grammatical and cultural aspects of the lessons at once. This potential limitation was highlighted in participants' responses to the post study questionnaire and in the interviews.

Even though the principal investigator was in charge of teaching all lessons related to this study to all course sections, teacher effect needs to be taken into consideration as a potential limitation in this study. Although bi-weekly meetings were conducted with the French 201 instructors to ensure that the material tested in this study would not be covered during regular class time, the different teaching styles of these instructors might have had an effect on how students learned grammar and culture over time. Since the primary investigator was responsible for teaching all lessons to all sections, researcher bias also needs to be acknowledged. As described earlier, efforts were made to identify these biases and ensure objective reporting of the qualitative data. The investigator also videotaped a few of her lessons in both conditions to guarantee that no particular preference was given to either approach. In addition, discussions with each

of the instructors were conducted on a weekly basis to make sure that the lessons were taught in the most unbiased way.

Analysis of Results

Research questions 1, 2, and 3:

- (1) What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college students' short-term learning of eight grammatical structures?
- (2) What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college students' accurate use of the target structures in a delayed writing task?
- (3) What is the effect of a guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college students' long-term learning of eight grammatical structures (over the course of a semester)?

As emphasized in the review of the literature, grammar instruction in a communicative foreign language classroom can be carried out in various ways. The body of empirical research focusing on deductive and inductive teaching approaches is not only rather limited but also yielded conflicting results, sometimes favoring an inductive approach (Herron & Tomasello, 1992), other times favoring a deductive approach (Erlam, 2003; Robinson, 1996). However, recent studies investigating a hybrid approach based on elements of the PACE model have shown the effectiveness of a collaborative guided inductive approach over a more traditional rule explanation approach on students' short-term learning of various linguistic patterns at different levels of proficiency (Haight et al., 2007; Haight, 2008; Vogel et al., in press).

The results of this study present statistically significant evidence of the positive effect of the guided inductive approach on college French intermediate-level students' short-term learning of the eight structures that were taught using culture as a context. The results of the analyses testing the short-term differentiated effect of both approaches indicated that the guided inductive approach had a significantly greater effect on French 201 students' immediate grammar performances. The effect size ($d = .46$), as measured by Cohen's d (Cohen, 1988), indicated a medium effect of the instructional approaches on the immediate grammar performances of the participants. By Cohen's definition, this suggests that the magnitude of the treatment effect was substantial, and therefore, the results carry practical significance.

The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of previous research conducted in beginning, intermediate and advanced level French college courses that investigated the same guided inductive approach (Dotson, 2010; Haight et al., 2007; Haight, 2008; Vogel et al., in press). This study confirmed a consistent trend across several levels of instruction in French pointing to the positive effects of the guided inductive approach on the learning of certain grammatical structures. The current study at the intermediate level supported Vogel et al.'s (in press) previous findings also at the intermediate level. The incorporation of the cultural context to practice the grammatical structures, before or after a focus on the rule, did not seem to hinder intermediate-level French students' performances on the immediate grammar tests. As many students commented in the post study questionnaire and in the interviews, the cultural context often sparked their interest and made the grammar lessons more "interesting." While some participants perceived the lessons to be difficult due to the added cultural material,

students performed rather well on the immediate grammar tests, whether taught inductively or deductively. Over the duration of the study, students answered correctly 81.8% of the test items in the inductive condition and 74.25% of the test items in the deductive condition. These mean percentages of correct answers are consistent with the findings of the researcher's previous study (Vogel et al., in press) where the presentation of grammar was not enriched with cultural information – students had answered correctly 82% of the test items in the inductive condition and 76% of the test items in the deductive condition. In the Vogel et al. study (in press), the grammar was presented in oral practice activities based on characters or themes from the curriculum movie.

The immediate tests were administered directly after a lesson was taught, which might account for the rather high percent correct scores in both conditions. As previously mentioned, the grammatical structures, taken from the intermediate-level curriculum, are not typically the focus of instruction in elementary level college French courses and were expected to be new to most participants. While it is difficult to know whether students coming from high school French programs had previously encountered these structures, the pretest results showed that students had not yet mastered the concepts evaluated in this study. Although the difficulty of each structure or lesson taught could not be assessed in comparison with the rest of the structures investigated in this study, the counterbalanced design controlled for potential differences in the difficulty of the structures, as each structure was taught in both treatment conditions.

The results on the positive effect of the guided inductive approach are consistent with cognitive theoretical perspectives on second and foreign language learning that view learning as an active process, requiring the engagement of the student, rather than as a

passive learning of facts and strategies (Ausubel, 1968; McLaughlin, 1987). In the guided inductive model presented in this study, students were required to think about the linguistic structure as they received oral input before being asked to formulate the rule with the guidance and feedback of the instructor. Learners were encouraged to actively participate in the oral activity, practice manipulating the input, form hypotheses about the structure, and test these hypotheses during the co-construction and fill-in-the-blanks phases. This active participation in the processing of linguistic data and the construction of knowledge supported the guided inductive techniques in the PACE model (Adair-Hauck et al., 2005) and in Herron and Tomasello's (1992) guided induction model.

From a sociocultural perspective, and particularly from a Vygotskian standpoint (1978), the development of cognitive skills is due to social interactions and mediation. The co-construction phase of the guided inductive model, where the instructor guides the learners with targeted questions to help them formulate their own understanding of a grammatical rule, parallels the expert-novice interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). The co-construction featured in this study slightly differed from that of the PACE model where the interactions between students and teacher are dictated by students' questions. In the guided inductive model featured in this study, the guiding questions were designed prior to the lessons to ensure the rigorousness of the research design. Nonetheless, these teacher-led pedagogical interactions or mediation might have enabled learners to perform structures that were new and not yet internalized. Fotos and Ellis (1991) in fact argued that the lack of teacher feedback and mediation might have accounted for the lower retention gains in the inductive condition (consciousness-raising) of their study, as might have been the case in other studies (Erlam, 2003; Shaffer, 1989). As illustrated by the

current findings, the role of the teacher as a mediator appears critical to the learning process, as the teacher engages students in discussions and reflections about grammar. While students tended to prefer being passive actors in the learning of a foreign language grammar and believed that teacher explanations of the grammar rule prior to a practice activity was the easiest way to learn effectively, the data have shown that a more active form of learning through discovery, hypothesis testing, and collaboration could enhance students' short-term learning of some grammatical structures in college intermediate-level French classes.

Contrary to the analyses conducted to assess the effectiveness of both methods on students' performance on the immediate grammar tests, the findings on students' accurate use of the targeted structures in a writing task indicated no significant effect of either approach. While participants performed well on the immediate grammar tests, their performances on the delayed writing tasks were lower. The mean percentage of accurate use of the targeted structures for students who were present for three or more writings in the guided inductive condition was 44.9% and 45.4% in the deductive condition. The effect sizes for the delayed writing tasks suggested that the magnitude of the treatment effect on participants' performances was almost non-existent. The low number of participants may partially account for the lack of results; therefore additional research must be conducted on a larger scale.

In addition to the small sample size, several factors could account for the lack of results and low mean scores on these tasks. First, the nature of the activities could have affected the results. The immediate grammar tests were controlled written production exercises, where students were asked to manipulate the targeted grammatical structure

and recreate a sentence based on elements given in parentheses. The writing activities were open-ended responses involving meaningful communication, where the learners were asked to create five sentences to provide a personal answer on a given topic using the grammatical structure taught the previous day. No examples were provided so as not to confound the results. While participants' performances on the writing tasks were positively associated with their performances on the immediate grammar tests – the grading system used to score the writings followed the rubric established to score the immediate grammar tests –, mean scores were constantly lower and the variability was greater on the writing tasks than it was on the immediate grammar tasks. The negative correlation between the grammar test and the writing task for lesson # 4 indicated a greater difficulty to complete the open-ended task for this target structure. Students were often unable to produce the targeted structures accurately or to produce them at all in a creative, communicative sentence. Several participants in fact commented on the perceived difficulty of these tasks, such as Participant H, who mentioned, “Conjugating is definitely different than creating your own sentences.”

Secondly, these findings might indicate that students had not internalized and automated the use of the structures. For a language learner to become proficient, McLaughlin (1987) argued that skills must be practiced, automated, and then integrated into the existing rule system that is constantly restructured as language proficiency develops. He referred to “automatic processing” (p. 134) as the process of making a skill a routine. When “controlled processes” are activated, the response has not yet been acquired or automated, but can be retrieved if distractions are minimal. The constructed response assessment (immediate tests) in this study required manipulation of a structure,

but did not require students to create their own meaning. A communication task, on the other hand, requires the integration of multiple skills such as retrieving lexical items, using appropriate grammatical rules and conversational conventions. McLaughlin (1987) argued that controlled processes are “capacity-limited” (p.135), as only one sequence can be controlled at a time, without interference. The results of the analyses on the writing activities suggested that participants had not automated the use of the target structures after only one lesson but were still within the “controlled processes” phase. The open-ended communicative writing activity might have placed too high a processing demand on the learners, requiring them to retrieve vocabulary in addition to using the grammatical structure, resulting in low performances. More controlled practice prior to such a communicative activity would be needed to yield higher scores.

Thirdly, motivational factors might also account for the lower performances and lack of results. The lessons and grammar structures presented were supplementary material to the participants’ regular classroom material and activities, and their performances on all tests did not affect their course grade. It is also important to note that the writing activities were administered the day after the lesson was taught, at the beginning of each course, but did not cover the concepts covered in class with their instructor. Combined with the processing demand of these writing activities, students might have felt less motivated to fully engage in these activities.

Finally, the findings that assessed long-term learning of the eight grammatical structures taught over the course of a semester did not yield a statistically significant difference with regards to the effect of the two presentational approaches over time, contrary to the analyses conducted to assess short-term learning. Even though the

difference in teaching methods over time was not significant, students' grammar knowledge of the targeted structures significantly improved over the course of the semester. The percentage of correct answers on the pretest of 41.5% increased to 57% on the posttest, similar to the findings from the researcher's previous study (Vogel et al., in press) – students' scores increased from 39.6% correct answers to 52.4% – where the grammar was not taught using culture as a context. Once more, these findings highlight the important fact that teaching grammar through culture did not seem to have negatively affected students' retention of grammar over time. Nonetheless, the posttest remained a rather difficult test compared to the immediate tests. The low percentage of correct answers on the posttest suggested that these structures were perhaps difficult to retain over time. Two items increased in difficulty from pretest to posttest, suggesting that improvement could be made to this instrument. In addition, due to the need to control for extraneous variables, no additional exposure to or practice of the eight grammatical structures was provided after the initial lesson. In a normal classroom setting, additional practice might lead to greater gains.

The findings on long-term learning are consistent with the previous studies conducted in elementary and intermediate-level French courses (Haight et al., 2007; Haight, 2008; Vogel et al., in press), as these studies also reported improved grammar knowledge but no interaction effect over time. With the exception of Dotson's (2010) study in an advanced level French course, investigations of the differentiated effect of the guided inductive and the deductive approach on students' long-term learning have not shown that one is more effective than the other in the long term. Teacher effect needs to be considered as a potential limitation to obtaining an interaction effect between time and

instructional approach on students' long-term learning. While treatments were administered by the primary investigator to minimize teacher effect, this type of confounding could be present given the intrinsic differences between instructors' teaching styles and the way they conduct their classroom on a daily basis. Contrary to the grammar immediate tests, which were administered immediately after a structure was taught, the grammar posttest was administered at the end of the semester, therefore leaving more time for possible teacher effect and other extraneous variables to confound the effect of the treatment conditions. Indeed, although the grammatical structures investigated in this study were not assigned to students for preparation and did not appear on the course syllabus, they were present in the course curriculum. Any contact with the targeted structures outside of this investigation could have confounded the treatment effect.

Even though the effect of either teaching approach could not be detected in the long-term analyses, the significant grammar gains throughout the semester are an important finding. It reminds us, as scholars have already emphasized, that form-focused instruction can promote foreign language learning (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2008b). The lessons in this study represented an attempt to enhance students' learning of grammar while exposing them to relevant cultural material. Activities aimed at drawing students' attention to a specific form of a language in a communicative and cultural context, whether through an inductive or a deductive presentation, fostered learning. As many intermediate-level foreign language learners continue on to literature and/or civilization courses, the findings are relevant as they documented improved grammar performance.

Research questions 4 and 5:

- (4) What is the effect of guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' short-term retention of cultural information?
- (5) What is the effect of guided inductive and a deductive presentational approach on intermediate-level college French students' long-term retention of cultural information (over the course of a semester)?

As previously mentioned, the PACE model of instruction provides a rich framework for teaching grammar through relevant cultural material. While the learning of grammar via this collaborative approach has begun to be investigated, students' learning of culture via PACE is still lacking. This study sought to introduce grammatical structures in a cultural context. It investigated whether students were able to retain the cultural information presented, and whether the instructional approach used to introduce the grammatical rule made a difference on how much cultural information students would retain in the short and long term.

The results of this study indicated no statistically significant difference of the effect of the instructional approaches on students' immediate recall of the cultural material presented. The effect size ($d = .12$) indicated a small effect of the instructional approaches on the participants' performance on the immediate culture tests. Over the course of the semester, the percentage of correct answer on the immediate culture tests was 60.1% in the guided inductive condition and 62.5% in the deductive condition. Students were asked to remember specific facts from the presentation and to make

inferences from the information presented. The data have shown that students tended to be more accurate when inferring from the material than they were at remembering specific facts. The format of the assessment and the arbitrary choice of factual information tested might have contributed to the lack of significant results. Indeed, only two items tested factual information, and two items asked students to gather the information presented and make inferences. A free-recall format as in Herron et al. (2002) and Dubreil et al.'s (2004) studies, instead of two factual items, may have increased performances. Nonetheless, the quantity of cultural information presented in the grammar lessons was less than the amount of information students had the opportunity to grasp while watching videos or browsing websites. It is however likely that more factual items on the immediate tests would have increased performances and provided more conclusive results. In addition, the oral format of the presentations combined with the format of the assessment might have affected the retention of the cultural material and, perhaps, specifically that of the factual information. Indeed, unlike the grammar co-construction/rule slide that provided students with written examples of the targeted grammatical structures in both treatment conditions, the cultural information was conveyed orally only with associated pictures. Several participants mentioned that although the illustrations were somewhat helpful in understanding the cultural information, the lack of written vocabulary made it difficult to retain. Perhaps, lexical input enhancement would have lessened participants' perceived difficulty of processing the cultural information and led to greater performances on the immediate tests. In addition, the assessment was designed for students to answer the items in English so as not to confound their understanding of the material with their proficiency in writing

French. However, factual items may have been difficult to answer due to issues of vocabulary. Perhaps a multiple-choice assessment in English could have reduced the difficulty of processing the lexical information. Future research will need to continue to investigate whether different presentation formats may enhance the retention of culture using various assessment formats.

Nonetheless, the long-term analyses indicated a statistically significant increase in knowledge of culture over time. Even though no differentiated effect of either instructional approach on the retention of culture over time was detected, students' knowledge of the targeted French and Francophone topics significantly increased from 32.5% of correct answers on the pretest to 54% on the posttest. This 21.5% increase resulted from students' exposure to the cultural information integrated into the grammar lessons designed for the current study. These findings suggested that exposure to cultural material during a focus on grammar could enhance students' knowledge of French and Francophone culture. This finding is consistent with studies that have examined students' learning of culture through meaningful exposure during a focus on language. These former studies indicated that being exposed to cultural material during language instruction could lead to increased cultural knowledge (Dubreil et al., 2004; Herron et al., 1999; Herron et al., 2000; Herron et al., 2002). Grim (2008) also showed that a focus on grammar and vocabulary through cultural lessons led to increased knowledge of culture. The findings from the current study indicated that students' knowledge of the targeted grammatical structures and cultural topics increased over time, suggesting that regardless of the presentational approach used to present grammar, inductive or deductive, cultural materials could be integrated into the teaching of grammatical structures effectively.

With respect to future research, it should be remembered that the presentational topics in this study were designed and created by the researchers. Other researchers should continue to investigate various approaches to teach grammar through culture by using already existing materials, such as literary excerpts, song lyrics, or historical accounts. In addition, unlike previous studies that assessed the various types of culture learned over time from exposure to culturally relevant curriculum material, practices or products (Dubreil et al., 2004; Herron et al., 1999; Herron et al., 2000; Herron et al., 2002), the current study did not address whether students would retain one type of culture more than the other. In light of the encouraging results provided by this study, future research should assess whether students might retain more practices or products when exposed to cultural information during a grammar activity.

Research question 6, 7, and 8:

- (6) What are intermediate students' preferences and opinions regarding the two instructional approaches to teach grammar?
- (7) What are students' perceptions of integrating grammar and culture instruction?
- (8) Is there a relationship between students' instructional preference and their performances on grammar and culture tests?

A secondary goal of this study was to determine which instructional approach intermediate-level students preferred to learn grammar, as well as their perceptions regarding the integration of culture into the formal study of grammar.

Eighty-eight percent of the participants expressed a preference, either strong (64%) or mild (12%), for explicit rule explanation by the teacher prior to engaging in

practice activities. The results of this investigation provided additional evidence that students consistently preferred to be explained the grammatical rules first (Dotson, 2010; Haight, 2008; Vogel et al., in press). Students expressed the need to and importance of studying grammar to achieve their linguistic goals, a finding consistent with many other studies assessing students' beliefs of effective foreign language teaching (Brown, 2009; Horwitz, 1988; Loewen et al., 2009; Schulz, 1996, 2001). The results of the current study did not support Mohamed's (2004) findings that there was no significant difference in students' preference between a deductive and an inductive approach. However, participants in Mohamed's study were only exposed to one approach on one occasion, which might have accounted for the lack of significant difference.

The qualitative data analysis provided a deeper insight into students' preference of instructional approach. Participants perceived that a deductive teaching of the grammatical rules provided them with a more extensive knowledge of the language, preparing them to accurately complete various activities, and reducing the chance of error. Conversely, participants perceived that the guided inductive approach could foster more confusion and frustration and could lead them to make more errors.

Participants viewed the deductive approach as one that provided the most understanding and clarity and allowed them to "know how" to use the target structures. Knowledge of the rule prior to engaging in a practice activity seemed to provide students with more clarity and thus more confidence in completing a task successfully. The rule explanation provided by the teacher was seen as an important advanced organizer: Students felt prepared and knew "what to look for." The deductive approach was

perceived to make the targeted structures subsequently more salient and noticeable, comforting students in their ability to succeed at completing an activity.

Conversely, students who expressed a preference for the guided inductive approach stressed the importance of being able to know “when” to use a particular structure, as opposed to knowing only “how” the form works. Practice first allowed these students to see how language was used naturally first, which they perceived could provide them with the confidence to use the language appropriately.

As in several studies, participants’ comments highlighted the important role of grammar in foreign language learning (Horwitz, 1988; Loewen et al., 2009; Schulz, 1996, 2001). The theme of confidence that emerged from participants’ statements related to Harlow and Muysken’s (1994) study on the goals of foreign language instruction at the intermediate-level. In the top third goals for intermediate-level instruction as ranked by students, the third most important goal was the affective goal of increased self-confidence in overall use of the language. While in their study students did not view grammar as the most effective in-class or out-of-class activity for achieving their preferred goals, participants in the present study linked grammar instruction to the development of confidence in language production and to successful language learning.

As the qualitative analysis also indicated, grammatical accuracy appeared to be an important concern for intermediate-level students. Accuracy does have an important place in the proficiency-oriented communicative foreign language classroom and, as Omaggio Hadley (2001) stated, “various forms of instruction and evaluative feedback can be useful in facilitating the progression of their [the students’] skills towards more precise and coherent language use” (p. 99). Intermediate-level students in the current study

perceived that a deductive approach to teaching grammar could lead to a more accurate use of the target language. Conversely, for students who expressed a preference for the guided inductive approach, learning through trial and error was believed to lead to more accuracy. Students felt that by discovering a pattern, testing hypotheses, and receiving feedback, they were more likely to remember the correct form of a structure.

However, for many participants the guided inductive approach was perceived as confusing. Students felt that they were not fully aware of where to focus their attention, which created second-guessing and frustration. Participants' concern for accuracy and fear of error, in this study as in previous studies (Haight, 2008; Vogel et al., in press), might suggest that a guided inductive approach could potentially raise their affective filter. Krashen (1982) argued that the affective filter must be low in order for learners to notice and process input. The affective filter may go up when learners are unmotivated, lacking confidence, or concerned with failure (Mc Laughlin, 1987). Receiving rule explanations seemed to create a learning environment where students were "comfortable" and where their affective filter remained low. However, although the majority of participants expressed a preference for the deductive approach, the results of the quantitative analyses showed that the guided inductive approach had a greater effect on students' short-term learning of the eight grammatical structures. The results of the analyses conducted to assess the relationship between students' preference of instructional approach and students' performances on all grammar and culture tests indicated that students' preference was not associated with their performances on the tests. The lack of relationship between preference and immediate grammar test scores was consistent with the findings regarding short-term learning of grammar. Without the

influence of preference on performance, those findings can be attributed to the treatment effect. The non-association of preference and tests scores also provided an indication that preference was not related to the finding that the long-term learning of the grammatical structures did not differ as a function of teaching approach.

The results of this study thus highlighted a discrepancy between students' performance and preference. While students tended to prefer passive learning, active forms of learning requiring students' participation and co-construction of the rule was more effective on the short-term learning of grammar. With identical cultural materials and oral techniques used in both treatment conditions, it possible that students followed along each lesson without experiencing negative reactions to the presentational approach. It appeared from the quantitative results that this lack of negative reaction could have allowed learning to occur. Furthermore, it is important to note that several participants interviewed acknowledged that they did not notice a major difference between the two presentational approaches.

The discrepancy found between preference and performance in this study as well as in previous studies (Haight, 2008; Vogel et al., in press) should continue to be investigated and should lead the way for future research. A discussion with the interviewees about the discrepancy between their preference and performance under both conditions might have yielded valuable information. However, due to time constraints, such a discussion was not feasible for the purpose of the current study. In addition, participants were not given an explanation at the onset of the study regarding the two approaches that were used alternatively throughout the lessons. Perhaps the findings on students' preference of instructional approach would differ if participants were made

aware of the pedagogical tenants of each approach and given the opportunity to reflect upon them immediately after each lesson. Brown (2009) argued that teachers and students might have similar or different beliefs about effective foreign language instruction, which may have implications for student learning. He recommended not only surveying students' perceptions of effective language learning but also previewing students with the different pedagogical activities they will use in the classroom and the rationale behind them. Finally, it is possible that assessing students' preferences and beliefs about grammar instruction prior to the experiment and examining how these may evolve over time could also provide a more precise picture of students' preferences and beliefs about foreign language grammar instruction and learning.

With respect to the integration of cultural material into grammar lessons, analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data reflected different opinions. Seventy-two percent of the participants reported finding the presentations interesting, and 64% enjoyed learning grammar through cultural presentations. The culturally enriched grammar lessons seemed to differ from the traditional instruction participants had received in the past. Several interviewees indicated that in their experience, culture and grammar were often taught separately. They thought that throughout the current study, the grammar was not presented in a "dry" or "boring way," but rather in an "interesting" and "engaging" manner that allowed them to make connections. Several participants talked about their increased interest in the grammar due to what they considered an "engaging" context. Foreign language instruction is now geared towards providing students with contextualized and meaningful input through which learners engage in meaningful use of the target language. An approach to language learning that stimulates interest for learners

responds to the practical needs of language learners in the real world, creating a classroom environment where the learner is actively engaged. With Culture present at the heart of the National Foreign Language *Standards* (ACTFL, 1999) it is important to try and determine how to use cultural material to increase students' interest and motivation in discovering and processing information about the target language and culture.

In doing so, the issue of cognitive overload must be further investigated. Although a majority of students found the lessons interesting and enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context, several participants pointed to the difficulty of focusing on both aspects of the lesson simultaneously. Participants' perceived difficulty of focusing on both the grammatical and the cultural aspects of the lessons needs to be taken into consideration when designing lessons and assessments. Just and Carpenter (1992) stressed that, according to the capacity theory of comprehension, human beings are limited in their attention and processing capacities. If certain activities are too demanding for the learners' working memory, the capacity theory of comprehension predicts that the processing of the information will slow down and some information will be forgotten. For several participants, the dual nature of the lessons tended to constrain them to focus their attention on one aspect rather than the other. The nature of the activity, along with learners' information processing capacity, might have limited how much information learners were able to process. Indeed, some students found the culture interesting, but perhaps it distracted them from the grammar. Some participants pointed to the fact the cultural material may have hindered their focusing on the targeted grammatical structures. Others, on the other hand, preferred to consciously focus their attention on the grammar and only peripherally, if at all, on the culture. It appears from participants'

comments, that when struggling, priority was given to the grammar part of the lesson, which the mean grammar scores seemed to corroborate.

It also appears as though the oral presentation of the material might have contributed to increased feelings of cognitive overload. The cultural practice activity, whether before or after a focus on the grammatical rule, was conducted orally with visual support. Unlike the grammar pattern that was repeated throughout each lesson, each slide of a lesson contained a different piece of information about the cultural topic. As previously discussed in relation to research question 4 (short-term learning of culture), the lack of cultural input enhancement, combined with the format of the assessment chosen to measure short-term learning of culture, could have contributed to feelings of cognitive overload. Several participants indeed commented on the difficulty of having to remember both aspects for the purpose of the immediate tests. Finally, several participants mentioned that a practice activity that uses culture to focus on grammar would be most beneficial if conducted once the grammar has been taught. Consistent with their preference of instructional approach, it appears as though trying to figure out the grammatical patterns as well as focusing on the cultural content in the guided inductive condition might have led to increased feelings of cognitive overload. Perhaps if more time could be spent in a regular classroom setting going over the information provided, feelings of cognitive overload might be lessened.

It should be remembered, as mentioned in the discussion of research question 5, that although several participants might have attended to the cultural information only peripherally, the results of the culture posttest showed that exposure to culture during a focus on grammar could lead to increased cultural knowledge over time. This finding,

along with positive student responses, should encourage researchers and pedagogues to develop or simply use culturally rich materials aimed at teaching or practicing linguistic aspects of the target language in foreign language classroom settings. Future research should continue to investigate how to most effectively incorporate culture into the study of linguistic forms, lexical or grammatical, at various levels of language proficiency. In addition, it seems important to continue to investigate students' perceptions of the role of culture in the foreign language curriculum, as well as that of teachers, and how these perceptions may evolve as language proficiency develops.

Conclusion

With a renewed emphasis on accuracy in proficiency-oriented instruction and a stress on culture as part of the *Standards* for foreign language education, the unanswered issue of how best to present grammar while integrating meaningful cultural content warranted investigation. This research study contributed new knowledge to a limited body of research analyzing the effects of deductive and guided inductive presentational approaches on the learning of grammar in the context of a cultural lesson. The current study made a significant contribution as it sought to integrate the formal study of specific grammatical forms with cultural content.

The results of this study presented empirical evidence of the benefit of guided induction on intermediate-level students' short-term learning of grammar, replicating previous findings in intermediate-level French where the grammar was taught via presentations thematically related to the curriculum movie rather than through culturally enriched presentations. These favorable findings have implications for teaching practices, as they addressed the type of form-focused instructional approach that could benefit

French students at the intermediate level when learning grammar. Even though student preference might appear to favor a deductive approach, the guided inductive model has performed significantly better on the short-term learning of grammar than the deductive model at the elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels in college French. With this knowledge, perhaps instructors, as well as creators of pedagogical materials, will move away from the traditional approach, where the rules are explained first by the teacher, to a model of learning that stresses a collaborative co-construction of grammatical explanations with the students. Finally, this study has shown that including culture in the teaching of grammar could lead to increased cultural knowledge and awareness over time for college French students at the intermediate level. In light of the *Standards* that stressed the importance of cross-cultural understanding in foreign language education, it is hoped that the results of the present study will inspire teachers to create or use culturally relevant material to practice and teach linguistic forms in foreign language classrooms.

REFERENCES

- ACTFL*. (1986, revised 1999). *Proficiency guidelines*. Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Inc.
- ACTFL*. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Inc.
- Adair-Hauck, B., & Donato, R. (2002a). The PACE model: A story based approach to meaning and form for standards-based language learning. *The French Review*, 76, 265-276.
- Adair-Hauck, B., & Donato, R. (2002b). The PACE model: Actualizing the Standards through storytelling: “Le Bras, la jambe et le ventre.” *The French Review*, 76, 278-296.
- Adair-Hauck, B., Donato, R., & Cumo-Johanssen, P. (2005). Using a story-based approach to teach grammar. In J. L. Shrum & E. W. Glisan (Eds.), *Teacher’s handbook: Contextualizing language instruction*, 3rd ed. (pp. 189-213). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Aski, J. M. (2005). Alternatives to mechanical drills for the early stages of language practice in foreign language textbooks. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 333-343.
- Ausubel, J. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehartm and Winston.
- Ballman, T. L. (1997). Enhancing beginning language courses through content-enriched instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 173-186.
- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students’ and teachers’ perception of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46-60.

- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 459-480.
- Chastain, K. D., & Woerdehoff, F. J. (1968). A methodological study comparing the audio-lingual habit theory and the cognitive code-learning theory. *The Modern Language Journal, 52*, 268-279.
- Chrysostome, L. I. (2000). Introducing and implementing the PACE model in Benin: Culture and grammar through stories. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Pittsburgh, PA.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, N.J. : L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27-50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dotson, E. (2010). The effects of deductive and guided inductive approaches on the learning of grammar in an advanced college French course. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Emory University, GA.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dubreil, S., Herron, C., & Cole, S. P. (2004). An empirical investigation of whether authentic web sites facilitate intermediate-level French language students' ability to learn culture. *CALICO Journal*, 22, p. 41-61.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Oxford: Basil.
- Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N.C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 79-115). London: Academic Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51, p. 1-46.
- Ellis, R. (2002). The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 17-34). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Ellis, R. (2008a). Principles of instructed second language acquisition. CAL Digest. Retrieved from www.cal.org, on February 1st, 2008.
- Ellis, R. (2008b). *The study of second language acquisition, second edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Fosnot, C. (1996). *Constructivism: Theory, perspective and practice*. New York: teacher College Press.
- Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness raising and noticing through focus on form: Grammar task performance versus formal instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 385-407.
- Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicative about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 605-628.
- Frantzen, D. (1998). Focusing on form while conveying a cultural message. *Hispania*, 81, 134-145.
- Grim, F. (2008). Integrating focus on form in L2 content-enriched instruction lessons. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 321-346.
- 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, GA.

- Haight, C., Herron, C., & Cole, S. P. (2007). The effects of inductive and deductive instructional approaches on the learning of grammar in the elementary foreign language classroom. *The Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 288-311.
- Hammerly, H. (1975). The deduction/induction controversy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59, 15-18.
- Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 331-359.
- Harlow, L., & Muyskens, J. A. (1994). Priorities for intermediate-level language instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 141-154.
- Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammar structures by guided induction. *The French Review*, 65, 708-718.
- Herron, C., Morris, M., Secules, T., & Curtis, L. (1995). A comparison study of the effect of a video-based versus text-based instruction in the foreign language classroom. *The French Review*, 68, 775-795.
- Herron, C., Corrie, C., Cole, S. P., & Dubreil, S. (1999). Effectiveness of a video-based curriculum in teaching culture. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 518-533.
- Herron, C., Cole, S. P., & Corrie, C. (2000). Using instructional video to teach culture to beginning foreign language students. *CALICO Journal*, 17, 395-429.
- Herron, C., Dubreil, S., Corrie, C., & Cole, S. P. (2002). A classroom investigation: Can video improve intermediate-level French language students' ability to learn about a foreign language culture? *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 36-53.
- Herron, C., York, H., Corrie, C., & Cole, S. P. (2006). A comparison study of the effects of a story-based video instructional package versus a text-based instructional

package in the intermediate-level foreign language classroom. *CALICO*, 23, 281-308.

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283-294.

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

Just, M. A. & Carpenter, P. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences in working memory. *Psychological Review*, 99, 122-149.

Katz, S. & Blyth, C. S. (2007). *Teaching French grammar in context*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

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* (pp. 2-14). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1994). The input hypothesis and its rivals. In N. C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 45-78). London: Academic Press.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

- Lafayette, R. (1978). Integrating the teaching of culture into the foreign language classroom. *Language in Education: Theory and Practice series, n° 11*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lafayette, R. (2000). Culture in second language learning and teaching: Anthropology revisited. In D. L. Lange & M. R. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning*, (pp. 53-71). Greenwich, CT: Age Publishing.
- Lange, D. L. (2000). Implications of theory and research for the development of principles for teaching and learning culture in second language classrooms. In D. L. Lange & M. R. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning*, (pp. 271-337). Greenwich, CT: Age Publishing.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). L2 learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 91- 104.
- Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 359-382.

- Martin, A. L., & Laurie, I. (1993). Students' views about the contribution of literary and cultural content to language learning at the intermediate level. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 187-203.
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Met, M. (1999). Making connections. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Standards for foreign language standards: linking research, theory, and practices*, (pp. 137-164). New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Mohamed, N. (2004). Consciousness-raising task: A learner perspective. *ELT Journal*, 58, 228-237.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language Learning*, 51, 157-213.
- Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context*, 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Paesani, K. (2005). Literary texts and grammar instruction: Revisiting the inductive presentation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 15-23.
- Pessoa, S., Hendry, H., Donato, R., Tucker, G. R., & Lee, H. (2007). Content-based instruction in foreign language classrooms: A discourse perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 102-121.
- Ramsay, R. (1991). French in Action and the grammar question. *The French Review*, 65, 255-266.
- Rivers, W. M. (1975). *A practical guide to teaching French*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 27-77.
- Rosa, E., & O'Neil, M. D. (1999). Explicitness, intake, and the issue of awareness. Another piece to the puzzle. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 511-556.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing the data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.). *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. Manoa, HI: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: student and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 343-364.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*, 244-258.
- Scott, V. (1989). An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*, 14-22.
- Scott, V. (1990). Explicit and implicit grammar teaching strategies: New empirical data. *The French Review, 63*, 779-789.

- Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 395-403.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (Eds.). (2005). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualizing language instruction*, 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Siskin, H. J., Williams-Gascon, A., & Field, T. (2003). *Débuts: An introduction to French*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Suzzo, A. G. Jr. (1981). Once more with content: Shifting emphasis in intermediate French. *The French Review*, 54, 405-411.
- Swain, M. (1984). A review of immersion education in Canada: Research and evaluation studies, *Studies on Immersion Education: A Collection of U.S. Educators* (pp. 87-112). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.). *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swiderski, R. M. (1993). *Teaching language and culture*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

- Tashakkoori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social science and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Van Patten, B. (1993). Grammar teaching for the acquisition-rich classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 435-450.
- VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2007). Early theories in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten and J. Williams (Eds.). *Theories in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vogel, S., Herron, C., Cole, S. P., & York, H. Effectiveness of a guided inductive versus a deductive approach on the learning of grammar in the intermediate-level college French classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* (in press).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, A., Grace, C., & Roche, C. (2007). *Bien vu bien dit, intermediate French*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Wong, W., & VanPatten, B. (2003). The evidence is in: Drills are out. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32, 403-420.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Background Questionnaire

Background and language learning history questionnaire

1. French 201 Instructor: _____
 2. Age: _____
 3. Nationality: _____
 4. Gender (please circle): Female Male
 5. Year in college (please circle): Freshman Sophomore Junior
 Senior Graduate student
 6. Major field(s) of study: _____
 7. Minor field of study: _____
 8. What is your native language? _____
 9. Is this French course an elective or a university requirement?
 _____ Elective _____ Requirement

10. Indicate below what year and at what level you have studied French before this class.

Level studied	Year studied	Please circle
_____	_____	Middle school / high school / college / French or Francophone country
_____	_____	Middle school / high school / college / French or Francophone country

Level studied	Year studied	Please circle
_____	_____	Middle school / high school / college / French or Francophone country
_____	_____	Middle school / high school / college / French or Francophone country

11. Have you ever spent time or lived in a French speaking country? ____ Yes ____ No
 If yes, indicate countries/cities and length of stays:

Country(ies): _____	Length of stay: _____
_____	Length of stay: _____
_____	Length of stay: _____
_____	Length of stay: _____

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

Language: _____	Number of years studied: _____
Language: _____	Number of years studied: _____
Language: _____	Number of years studied: _____

Appendix B: Guided Inductive and Deductive Lesson Plans

Lesson Plan 1

C'est vs. Il est Diversité/ immigration en France

GI

Intro : Comme vous le savez, Rachid est français, son père est algérien et sa mère est bretonne. C'est une famille diverse. Aujourd'hui, nous allons parler de la diversité en France, d'où viennent les personnes qui ont immigré et vivent en France, célèbres ou non. Nous allons décrire ces personnes. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Title Slide :

Slide 1 : Voici Thierry Henry... un grand membre de l'équipe de France.

T : C'est un footballeur ou un journaliste ?

T : **Répétez :** C'est un footballeur.

Slide 2 :

T : Il est antillais ou marocain?

T : **Répétez :** Il est antillais.

Slide 3 : Voici Fabien Barthez... un autre membre de l'équipe de France.

T : Il est footballeur ou journaliste ?

S : ---

T : Il est footballeur.

Slide 4 :

T : C'est un Toulousain ou un Parisien ?

S : ---

T : C'est un Toulousain.

Slide 5 : Voici Marie José Pécé.

T : C'est une athlète ou une fonctionnaire ?

S : ---

T : C'est une athlète.

Slide 6 :

T : Elle est guadeloupéenne ou sénégalaise ?

S : ---

T : Elle est guadeloupéenne.

Slide 7 : Voici la mère de Zidane... un grand footballeur de l'équipe de France.

T : C'est une Algérienne ou une Antillaise ?

S : ---

T : C'est une Algérienne.

Slide 8 :

T : Elle est musulmane ou catholique ?

S : ---

T : Elle est musulmane.

Slide 9 : Voici des gens qui vivent à Paris.

T : Ils sont européens ou marocains ?

S : ---

T : Ils sont européens.

Slide 10 :

T : Ce sont des Catholiques ou des Musulmans ?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des Catholiques.

Slide 11: Voici des femmes qui vivent à Marseille.

T : Ce sont des Marocaines ou des Européennes ?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des Marocaines.

Slide 12 :

T : Elles sont musulmanes ou catholiques ?

S : ---

T : Elles sont musulmanes.

Slide 13 : Et voici des gens qui habitent à Nantes.

T : Ils sont marocains ou sénégalais ?

S : ---

T : Ils sont sénégalais.

Slide 14 :

T : Ce sont des Musulmans ou des Protestants ?

S : --

T : Ce sont des Musulmans.

Slide 15 : Co-construction :

(G. Bush) C'est un Américain.

Il est américain.

(Maria) C'est une Protestante.

Elle est protestante.

(Mike et Ben) Ce sont des Newyorkais.

Ils sont Newyorkais.

(Jen et Kate) Ce sont des journalistes.

Elles sont journalistes.

Guiding questions :

Regardons ces phrases ensemble, dans un contexte Américain.

1. Qu'est-ce que ces phrases décrivent ? (Américain, protestante, journaliste, qu'est-ce que ça décrit ?)
2. Dans les phrases « A » est-ce que vous voyez un article après le verbe être ?
3. Alors « un Américain » et « une Protestante », « des Newyorkais » et « des journalistes » ce sont des adjectifs ou des noms ?
4. Dans les phrases « B » est-ce qu'il y a un article ?
5. Alors « américain, » « protestant, » « newyorkais » et « journalistes » ce sont des noms ou des adjectifs ?
6. « G. Bush, » c'est un sujet féminin ou masculin ? c'est singulier ou pluriel ?
7. Et « Marie » c'est masculin ou féminin ? Et c'est singulier ou pluriel ?
8. Et « Mike et Ben » c'est un sujet masculin ou féminin ? Et c'est singulier ou pluriel ?
9. Et « Jen et Kate » c'est féminin ou masculin ? Et c'est singulier ou pluriel ?
10. Pour décrire une personne, quelle expression avec le verbe « être » utilise-t-on quand il y a un article indéfini avec un nom féminin singulier ? Et avec un nom masculin singulier ? Et au pluriel ?
11. Pour décrire une personne, quelle expression avec le verbe « être » utilise-t-on quand il y a un adjectif au féminin singulier ? Et au masculin singulier ? Et au masculins pluriel ? Et au féminin pluriel ?

Lesson Plan 1

C'est vs. Il est
Diversité en France

DED

Slide 1 : Rule explanation

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

En français, les professions, religions et nationalités peuvent être des noms ou des adjectifs. Pour identifier/décrire une personne, et spécialement pour parler de profession, de religion, ou de nationalité, on utilise les expressions « c'est » au singulier, féminin ou masculin, et « ce sont » au pluriel, masculin ou féminin, devant un nom déterminé, c'est-à-dire quand il y a un article devant le nom. On utilise les expressions « il est » au

singulier masculin ou « elle est » au singulier féminin et « ils sont » ou « elles sont » au pluriel devant un adjectif, quand il n'y a pas d'article. ¹

(G. Bush)	<u>C'</u> est un Américain.	<u>Il</u> est américain.
(Maria)	<u>C'</u> est une Protestante.	<u>Elle</u> est protestante.
(Mike et Ben)	<u>Ce</u> sont des Newyorkais.	<u>Ils</u> sont Newyorkais.
(Jen et Kate)	<u>Ce</u> sont des journalistes.	<u>Elles</u> sont journalistes.

Intro : Comme vous le savez, Rachid est français, son père est algérien et sa mère est bretonne. C'est une famille diverse. Aujourd'hui, nous allons parler de la diversité en France, d'où viennent les personnes qui ont immigré et vivent en France, célèbres ou non. Nous allons décrire ces personnes en utilisant « c'est » ou « il est ». Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Title Slide :

Slide 1 : Voici Thierry Henry... un grand membre de l'équipe de France.

T : C'est un footballeur ou un journaliste ?

T : **Répétez :** C'est un footballeur.

Slide 2 :

T : Il est antillais ou marocain ?

T : **Répétez :** Il est antillais.

Slide 3 : Voici Fabien Barthez... un autre membre de l'équipe de France.

T : Il est footballeur ou journaliste ?

S : ---

T : Il est footballeur.

Slide 4 :

T : C'est un Toulousain ou un Parisien ?

S : ---

T : C'est un Toulousain.

Slide 5 : Voici Marie José Pécé.

T : C'est une athlète ou une fonctionnaire ?

S : ---

T : C'est une athlète.

Slide 6 :

T : Elle est guadeloupéenne ou sénégalaise ?

¹ Adapted from Gregoire, M., & Thiévenaz, O. (1995). *Grammaire progressive du Français niveau intermédiaire*. Paris : CLE international, p. 30-32.

S : ---

T : Elle est guadeloupéenne.

Slide 7 : Voici la mère de Zidane... un grand footballeur de l'équipe de France.

T : C'est une Algérienne ou une Antillaise ?

S : ---

T : C'est une Algérienne.

Slide 8 :

T : Elle est musulmane ou catholique ?

S : ---

T : Elle est musulmane.

Slide 9 : Voici des gens qui vivent à Paris.

T : Ils sont européens ou marocains ?

S : ---

T : Ils sont européens.

Slide 10 :

T : Ce sont des Catholiques ou des Musulmans ?

S : --

T : -- Ce sont des Catholiques.

Slide 11 : Voici des femmes qui vivent à Marseille.

T : Ce sont des Marocaines ou des Européennes ?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des Marocaines.

Slide 12 :

T : Elles sont musulmanes ou catholiques ?

S : ---

T : Elles sont musulmanes.

Slide 13 : Et voici des gens qui habitent à Nantes.

T : Ils sont marocains ou sénégalais ?

S : ---

T : Ils sont sénégalais.

Slide 14 :

T : Ce sont des Musulmans ou des Protestants ?

S : --

T : Ce sont des Musulmans.

Lesson Plan 2

Passé composé
Trois monuments parisiens

GI

Title slide : **Intro**

Comme vous le savez, les personnages de *Chemin du retour* habitent à Paris. Imaginons que nous sommes allés à Paris l'été dernier. Qu'est-ce que nous avons fait à Paris ? Nous allons parler de quelques monuments parisiens que nous avons visités et de leurs symboles. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Slide 1 : **Répétez** : Les Invalides.

Slide 2 : (Musée de l'armée)

T : Aux Invalides, nous sommes passés à travers le musée de l'armée ou le musée d'art contemporain ?

T : **Répétez**: Nous sommes passés à travers le musée de l'armée.

Slide 3 : (Tombeau de Napoléon)

T : Nous sommes passés devant le tombeau de Napoléon ou de Victor Hugo ?

T : **Répétez**: Nous sommes passés devant le tombeau de Napoléon.

Slide 4: (Espace De Gaulle)

T : Puis, nous sommes descendus dans l'amphithéâtre dédié au Général De Gaulle ou aux philosophes français?

S : ---

T : Nous sommes descendus dans l'amphithéâtre dédié au Général De Gaulle.

Slide 5 : (Invalides cathédrale)

T : Enfin, nous sommes sortis par la cathédrale militaire ou par un monastère ?

S : --

T : Nous sommes sortis par la cathédrale militaire.

Slide 6 : **Répétez** : Les Champs Elysées.

Slide 7 : (Metro FDR)

T : Nous sommes descendus à la station Franklin D. Roosevelt ou Saint-Michel ?

S : ---

T : Nous sommes descendus à la station FDR (un homme important pendant la seconde guerre mondiale).

Slide 8 : (Place de l'Etoile)

T : À pied, nous sommes montés jusqu'à la Place de L'Etoile ou de La Concorde ?

S : ---

T : Nous sommes montés jusqu'à la Place de l'Etoile (où se trouve l'Arc de Triomphe, signe de victoire militaire).

---- **Attention, écoutez bien... on change un peu**

Slide 9: (Escalier de l'arc et sculpture de guerre)

T : Voici l'arc de Triomphe. Alors, ici, nous avons monté l'escalier pour observer des sculptures ou des peintures de guerre ?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Nous avons monté l'escalier pour observer des sculptures de guerre. Oui, il y a beaucoup de sculptures de guerre.

Slide 10 : (Les Champs Elysées en 1940)

T : En 1940, les Allemands ou Français ont descendu l'avenue des Champs Elysées?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Les Allemands ont descendu l'avenue. Oui, en signe de victoire.

Slide 11 : **Répétez** Le Panthéon.

Slide 12 : (La crypte et les escaliers)

T : Nous avons descendu les escaliers de la crypte ou de la Place du Panthéon ?

S : ---

T : Nous avons descendu les escaliers de la crypte.

Slide 13 : (Le tombeau de Rousseau)

T : Et dans la crypte, nous avons passé du temps devant le tombeau de Rousseau (le philosophe) ou de Napoléon?

S : ---

T : Nous avons passé du temps devant la tombeau de Rousseau (un grand philosophe français).

Slide 14 : (Tombe de Victor Hugo)

T : Devant la tombe de Victor Hugo, nous avons sorti Les Misérables ou Madame Bovary de notre sac ?

S : ---

T : Nous avons sorti Les Misérables.

Slide 15 : (Statue de Voltaire)

T : En sortant, nous avons passé une minute avec Voltaire (le philosophe) ou avec Chirac (l'ancien président) ?

S : ---

T : En sortant, nous avons passé une minute avec Voltaire.

Slide 16: **Co-construction slide**

Une Visite à Paris...

Hier,

A. Nous sommes descendus du métro.

Nous sommes passés devant le Panthéon.
 Nous sommes sortis par la porte principale.
 Nous sommes montés sur l'Arc.

- B. Nous avons descendu les valises dans le lobby.
 Nous avons passé une heure au musée.
 Nous avons sorti nos brochures sur Paris.
 Nous avons monté nos achats dans notre chambre.

Guiding questions

Regardons ces phrases ensemble.

1. Ces phrases sont au passé composé ou au présent ? Quels verbes sont conjugués au passé composé ? Est-ce que ce sont des verbes de mouvement ?
2. Dans les phrases A voyez-vous une préposition après le verbe au passé composé ? Lesquelles ?
3. Alors « le métro » « le panthéon » « la porte » et « l'arc » ce sont des objets directs ou indirects ?
4. Dans ces phrases, quel verbe auxiliaire utilise-t-on avec « descendre/passer/sortir et monter » pour former le passé composé ? (être ou avoir ?)
5. Et est-ce que le participe passé s'accorde avec le sujet ?
6. Dans les phrases B, voyez-vous une préposition après le verbe au passé composé ?
7. Alors « les valises » « une heure » « nos brochures » et « nos achats » ce sont des objets directs ou indirects ?
8. Quand il y a un objet direct après les verbes « descendre/passer/sortir et monter » quel verbe auxiliaire utilise-t-on pour former le passé composé ?
9. Est-ce que les phrases B ont un sens différent ?
10. Lorsqu'on utilise le verbe « avoir, » est-ce que le participe passé s'accorde avec le sujet ?

Slide 1 : Rule explanation

En français certains verbes de déplacement ou de mouvement au passé composé qui sont habituellement utilisés avec « être, » se forment avec l'auxiliaire « avoir » quand ils sont suivis d'un complément d'objet direct (pas de préposition entre le verbe et le complément). Ces verbes sont les verbes descendre, monter, passer, rentrer, sortir (et aussi le verbe retourner). Le sens du verbe est différent quand on utilise l'auxiliaire « avoir » et le participe passé ne s'accorde pas avec le sujet. ²

Lisons ces phrases

Hier,

- A. Nous sommes descendus sur les Champs Elysées.
 Nous sommes passés devant le Panthéon.
 Nous sommes sortis par la porte principale.
 Nous sommes montés sur l'Arc de Triomphe.
- B. Nous avons descendu les valises dans le lobby.
 Nous avons passé une heure au musée.
 Nous avons sorti nos brochures sur Paris.
 Nous avons monté nos achats dans notre chambre.

Title Slide : **Intro**

Comme vous le savez, les personnages de *Chemin du retour* habitent à Paris. Imaginons que nous sommes allés à Paris l'été dernier ? Qu'est-ce que nous avons fait ? Nous allons parler de quelques monuments parisiens que nous avons visités et de leurs symboles en utilisant le passé composé des verbes descendre/monter/passer et sortir avec « être » ou « avoir ». Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Slide 1 : **Répétez** : Invalides.

Slide 2 : (Musée de l'armée)

- T : Aux Invalides, nous sommes passés à travers le musée de l'armée ou le musée d'art contemporain ?
- T : **Répétez** : Nous sommes passés à travers le musée de l'armée.

Slide 3 : (Tombeau de Napoléon).

² Adapted from Gregoire, M., & Thiévenaz, O. (1995). *Grammaire progressive du Français niveau intermédiaire*. Paris : CLE international, p. 176.

T : Nous sommes passés devant le tombeau de Napoléon ou de Victor Hugo ?
 T : **Répétez** : Nous sommes passés devant le tombeau de Napoléon.

Slide 4: (Espace De Gaulle)

T : Puis, nous sommes descendus dans l'amphithéâtre dédié au Général De Gaulle ou aux philosophes français?

S : ---

T : Nous sommes descendus dans l'amphithéâtre dédié au Général De Gaulle.

Slide 5 : (Invalides cathédrale)

T : Enfin, nous sommes sortis par la cathédrale militaire ou par un monastère ?

S : --

T : Nous sommes sortis par la cathédrale militaire.

Slide 6 : **Répétez** : Les Champs Elysées.

Slide 7 : (Metro FDR)

T : Nous sommes descendus à la station Franklin D. Roosevelt ou Saint-Michel ?

S : ---

T : Nous sommes descendus à la station FDR (un homme important pendant la seconde guerre mondiale).

Slide 8 : (Place de l'Etoile)

T : À pied, nous sommes montés jusqu'à la Place de L'Etoile ou de La Concorde ?

S : ---

T : Nous sommes montés jusqu'à la Place de l'Etoile (où se trouve l'Arc de Triomphe, signe de victoire militaire).

---- **Attention, écoutez bien... on change un peu**

Slide 9: (Escalier de l'arc et sculpture de guerre)

T : A l'arc de Triomphe, nous avons monté l'escalier pour observer des sculptures ou des peintures de guerre ?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Nous avons monté l'escalier pour observer des sculptures de guerre. Oui, il y a beaucoup de sculptures de guerre.

Slide 10 : (Les Champs Elysées en 1940)

T : En 1940, les Allemands ou Français ont descendu l'avenue des Champs Elysées ?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Les Allemands ont descendu l'avenue (en signe de victoire).

Slide 11: **Répétez** : Le Panthéon.

Slide 12 : (La crypte et les escaliers)

T : Nous avons descendu les escaliers de la crypte ou de la Place du Panthéon ?

S : ---

T : Nous avons descendu les escaliers de la crypte.

Slide 13 : (Le tombeau de Rousseau)

T : Et dans la crypte, nous avons passé du temps devant le tombeau Rousseau (le philosophe) ou de Napoléon?

S : ---

T : Nous avons passé du temps devant le tombeau de Rousseau (un grand philosophe français).

Slide 14: (Tombe de Victor Hugo)

T : Devant la tombe de Victor Hugo nous avons sorti *Les Misérables* ou *Madame Bovary* de notre sac ?

S : ---

T : Nous avons sorti *Les Misérables*.

Slide 15 : (Statue de Voltaire)

T : En sortant, nous avons passé une minute avec Voltaire (le philosophe) ou avec Chirac (l'ancien président) ?

S : ---

T : En sortant, nous avons passé une minute avec Voltaire.

Lesson plan 3

Le superlatif Parlons de gastronomie !

GI

Title Slide : **Intro** Camille va déguster un bon couscous chez Rachid. Le couscous est un plat gastronomique typique de l'Afrique du Nord. Ce matin, nous allons parler de gastronomie en France et de différentes institutions gastronomiques. Nous allons décrire les choses les plus spéciales de la gastronomie française. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Slide 1 :

T : En France, quelle est la ville la plus peuplée, Lyon ou Paris?

T : **Répétez** : Paris est la ville la plus peuplée.

Slide 2 :

T : En France, quelle est la ville la plus gastronomique, Paris ou Lyon ?

T : **Répétez** : Lyon est la ville la plus gastronomique.

Slide 3 :

T : A Lyon, quelle est la viande la plus typique, l'andouillette ou le bœuf?

S : ---

T : L'andouillette est la viande la plus typique de Lyon.

Slide 4 :

T : A Lyon, quelle est la spécialité la plus traditionnelle, le coq au vin ou le steak frites?

S : ---

T : Le coq au vin est la spécialité la plus traditionnelle.

Attention on change un peu

Slide 5 :

T : A Lyon, quel est le fromage le plus consommé, le Saint-Marcellin ou le Brie?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Le Saint-Marcellin est le fromage le plus consommé.

Slide 6 :

T : En France, quel est le guide gastronomique le plus célèbre, Michelin ou Gault et Millau?

S : ---

T : Michelin est le guide le plus célèbre.

Slide 7 :

T : Dans le guide Michelin, quel est le symbole le plus important, l'étoile ou la fourchette?

S : --

T : L'étoile est le symbole le plus important.

Slide 8:

T : Quel est le symbole le plus économique, l'étoile ou la fourchette?

S : --

T : La fourchette est le symbole le plus économique.

Attention on change un peu

Slide 9 :

T : Dans quelle ville travaillent les chefs les plus célèbres, à Lyon ou à Paris?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Les chefs les plus célèbres travaillent à Lyon.

Slide 10 :

T : À Lyon, quels sont les vins les plus consommés, les rouges ou les rosés?

S : ---

T : Les vins rouges sont les vins les plus consommés (Le Beaujolais et le Cote du Rhône).

Slide 11 :

T : A Lyon, quelles sont les cantines les plus raisonnables, les bouchons ou les 3 étoiles?

S : ---

T : Les bouchons sont les cantines les plus raisonnables. (Ce sont des restaurants authentiques et populaires.)

Slide 12 :

T : A Lyon, quelles sont les institutions les plus élégantes, les étoilées ou les bouchons?

S : ---

T : Les étoilés sont les institutions les plus élégantes.

Slide 13 : **Co-Construction**

Aux Etats-Unis...

Coca est la boisson la plus consommée.

Le Hamburger est le plat le plus rapide.

Budweiser et Miller sont les bières les plus connues.

Les restaurants italiens sont les restaurants les plus appréciés.

Guiding questions

Regardons ces phrases ensemble dans le contexte de la gastronomie américaine.

1. Quel mot utilise-t-on pour exprimer le superlatif de supériorité (++)?
2. « Boisson », c'est masculin ou féminin? Singulier ou pluriel? Et « plat, » c'est masculin ou féminin? Singulier ou pluriel? Et « bières, » c'est masculin ou féminin? Singulier ou pluriel? Et « restaurants, » c'est masculin ou féminin? Singulier ou pluriel?
3. Qu'est-ce qu'il y a avant chaque nom?
4. Dans ces phrases, les adjectifs « consommée », « rapide, » « connues » et « appréciés », sont avant ou après les noms?
5. Alors le superlatif « plus » se trouve avant ou après le nom? Avant ou après l'adjectif?
6. Y a-t-il un article défini avant le mot « plus » ?
7. Alors dans une phrase au superlatif, combien de fois y a-t-il l'article défini quand les adjectifs sont après le nom ?

Slide 1 : Rule explanation

Le superlatif sert à comparer plus de deux personnes, choses ou groupes. Pour former le superlatif de supériorité, on utilise l'adverbe « plus » avant l'adjectif. Le superlatif est différent du comparatif à cause de l'article défini LE LA ou LES qui s'accorde avec le nom et qui se trouve avant « plus. » La place du superlatif est déterminée par la place de l'adjectif, avant ou après le nom. Quand l'adjectif est après le nom, le superlatif est après le nom et il y a toujours 2 articles définis, un avant le nom, et un avant « plus ». ³

Aux Etats-Unis...

Coca est la boisson la plus consommée.

Le Hamburger/frites est le plat le plus rapide.

Budweiser et Miller sont les bières les plus connues.

Les restaurants italiens sont les restaurants les plus appréciés.

Title Slide : Intro

Camille va déguster un bon couscous chez Rachid. Le couscous est un plat gastronomique typique de l'Afrique du Nord. Ce matin, nous allons parler de gastronomie en France et de différentes institutions gastronomiques. Nous allons décrire les choses les plus spéciales de la gastronomie française. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Slide 1 :

T : En France, quelle est la ville la plus peuplée, Lyon ou Paris?

T : **Répétez** : Paris est la ville la plus peuplée.

Slide 2 :

T : En France, quelle est la ville la plus gastronomique, Paris ou Lyon ?

T : **Répétez** : Lyon est la ville la plus gastronomique.

Slide 3 :

T : A Lyon, quelle est la viande la plus typique, l'andouillette ou le bœuf?

S : ---

T : L'andouillette est la viande la plus typique de Lyon.

Slide 4 :

³ Adapted from Ollivier, J. (1993). *Grammaire française, 2e édition*. Fort Worth: Holt Rinehart and Winston, p. 216-217.

T : A Lyon, quelle est la spécialité la plus traditionnelle, le coq au vin ou le steak-frites?

S : ---

T : Le coq au vin est la spécialité la plus traditionnelle.

Attention on change un peu

Slide 5 :

T : A Lyon, quel est le fromage le plus consommé, le Saint-Marcellin ou le Brie?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Le Saint-Marcellin est le fromage le plus consommé.

Slide 6 :

T : En France, quel est le guide gastronomique le plus célèbre, Michelin ou Gault et Millau?

S : ---

T : Michelin est le guide le plus célèbre.

Slide 7 :

T : Dans le guide Michelin, quel est le symbole le plus important, l'étoile ou la fourchette?

S : --

T : L'étoile est le symbole le plus important.

Slide 8:

T : Quel est le symbole le plus économique, l'étoile ou la fourchette?

S : --

T : La fourchette est le symbole le plus économique.

Attention on change un peu

Slide 9 :

T : Dans quelle ville travaillent les chefs les plus célèbres, à Lyon ou à Paris?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Les chefs les plus célèbres travaillent à Lyon.

Slide 10 :

T : À Lyon, quels sont les vins les plus consommés, les rouges ou les rosés?

S : ---

T : Les vins rouges sont les vins les plus consommés (Le Beaujolais et le Cote du Rhône).

Slide 11 :

T : A Lyon, quelles sont les cantines les plus raisonnables, les bouchons ou les 3 étoiles?

S : ---

T : Les bouchons sont les cantines les plus raisonnables. (Ce sont des restaurants authentiques et populaires.)

Slide 12 :

T : A Lyon, quelles sont les institutions les plus élégantes, les étoilées ou les bouchons?

S : ---

T : Les étoilés sont les institutions les plus élégantes.

Lesson Plan 5

Pronom relatif Lequel Quelques caractéristiques de la France

GI

Title Slide : **Intro**

Camille va dans les Cévennes, c'est une région française avec des caractéristiques spécifiques. Nous allons parler des spécificités culturelles et physiques de la France et de ses différentes régions. Nous allons parler du général et de choses plus spécifiques. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

La France,

Slide 1 :

T : La France, c'est un pays dans lequel il y a 10 ou 22 régions administratives?

T : **Répétez** : C'est un pays dans lequel il y a 22 régions.

Slide 2 :

T : C'est un pays dans lequel il y a 22 ou 100 départements?

T : **Répétez** : C'est un pays dans lequel il y a 100 départements.

Slide 3 :

T : La préfecture, c'est un bâtiment dans lequel le préfet ou le président gouverne?

S : ---

T : La préfecture est un bâtiment dans lequel le préfet gouverne. (Le préfet gouverne; il est responsable de la région.)

L'île de France (la région dans laquelle se trouve Paris).

Slide 4 :

T : C'est une région dans laquelle il y a 2 ou 8 départements?

S : ---

T : C'est une région dans laquelle il y a 8 départements.

Slide 5 :

T : C'est une région à travers laquelle l'urbanisme est peu ou très développé?

S : ---

T : C'est une région à travers laquelle l'urbanisme est très développé.

Slide 6 :

T : C'est une région vers laquelle les jeunes ou les vieux émigrent?

S : ---

T : C'est une région vers laquelle les jeunes émigrent.

La Corse et La Bretagne.

Slide 7 :

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles on parle les langues régionales ou l'anglais ?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles on parle les langues régionales. (On parle encore le breton et le Corse.)

Slide 8 :

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles il y a un sentiment d'indépendance ou d'appartenance?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles il y a un sentiment d'indépendance.

Slide 9 :

T : Ce sont des régions parmi lesquelles on trouve beaucoup de villes ou de villages?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des régions parmi lesquelles on trouve beaucoup de villages.

Les villages français.

Slide 10 :

T : Ce sont des endroits dans lesquels il y a une population jeune ou âgée?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des endroits dans lesquels il y a une population âgée.

Slide 11 :

T : Les places de villages, ce sont des endroits sur lesquels il y a toujours une église ou une poste ?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des endroits sur lesquels il y a toujours une église.

Slide 12 :

T : Sur la place du village, il y a des commerces parmi lesquels on trouve toujours un bar ou une boutique ?

S : ---

T : Il y a des commerces parmi lesquels on trouve toujours un bar.

Slide 13 : **Co-construction**

Regardons ces exemples dans un contexte américain.

1. Le désert est un bel endroit. Il y a des cactus dans cet endroit.

Le désert est un bel endroit dans lequel il y a des cactus.

2. Manhattan est une île. Il y a des gratte-ciels sur cette île.

- Mahattan est une île sur laquelle il y a des gratte-ciels.
3. La Louisiane et le Mississippi sont des états. Le Mississippi passe à travers ces états.
La Louisiane et le Mississippi sont des états à travers lesquels le Mississippi passe.
4. À NYC il y a des boutiques. On trouve Gucci parmi ces boutiques.
À NYC il y a des boutiques parmi lesquelles on trouve Gucci.

Guiding questions

1. Dans chaque exemple, il y a combien de phrases, d'idée ?
2. Dans l'exemple # 1, quelle répétition trouve-t-on dans la deuxième phrase ? Et dans le 2^e, le 3^e et le 4^e exemple ?
3. « Endroit, » « île, » « états » et « villes » ce sont des choses ou des personnes ?
4. Voyez vous une préposition avant ces noms dans la deuxième phrase?
Lesquelles ?
5. « Endroit » c'est masculin ou féminin ? Et « île » ? « états » ? « villes » ?
6. « Endroit » c'est singulier ou pluriel ? Et « île » ? « états » ? « villes » ?
7. Pour lier deux idées, quel pronom relatif utilise-t-on avec une préposition simple comme « dans » pour remplacer une chose au masculin singulier ?
8. Pour lier deux idées, quel pronom relatif utilise-t-on avec une préposition simple comme « sur » pour remplacer une chose au féminin singulier ?
9. Pour lier deux idées, quel pronom relatif utilise-t-on avec une préposition simple comme « à travers » pour remplacer une chose au masculin pluriel ?
10. Pour lier deux idées, quel pronom relatif utilise-t-on après une préposition simple comme « parmi » pour remplacer une chose au féminin pluriel ?
11. Où se trouve la préposition dans la phrase complexe, avant ou après le nom ? Et où se trouve le pronom relatif (et la phrase subordonnée) ?
12. Est-ce que la répétition existe toujours ?

Slide 1 : **Rule explanation**

Le pronom relatif « lequel » est un pronom relatif qui permet de combiner deux idées en évitant une répétition. Il remplace une chose, pas une personne, et s'utilise toujours après une préposition, comme « dans, » « sur, » « à travers, » etc... (sauf après la préposition « de »). Ce pronom relatif porte le genre et le nombre de la chose qu'il remplace. « Lequel » est masculin singulier, « laquelle » est féminin singulier, « lesquels » est masculin pluriel et « lesquelles » est féminin pluriel.⁴ Le pronom relatif, et la phrase subornée, se placent toujours après la préposition qui l'introduit, après le nom auquel il fait référence.

1. Le désert est un bel endroit. Il y a beaucoup de cactus dans cet endroit.
Le désert est un bel endroit dans lequel il y a beaucoup de cactus.
2. Manhattan est une île. Il y a des gratte-ciels sur cette île.
Manhattan est une île sur laquelle il y a des gratte-ciels.
3. La Louisiane et le Mississippi sont des états. Le Mississippi passe à travers ces états.
La Louisiane et le Mississippi sont des états à travers lesquels le Mississippi passe.
4. À NYC il y a des boutiques. On trouve Gucci parmi ces boutiques.
À NYC il y a des boutiques parmi lesquelles on trouve Gucci.

Intro :

Camille va dans les Cévennes, c'est une région française avec des caractéristiques spécifiques. Ce matin nous allons parler de quelques caractéristiques physiques et culturelles de la France. Nous allons utiliser le pronom relatif « lequel » pour parler de la France et de ses caractéristiques (générales et spécifiques). Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

La France.

Slide 1 :

T : La France, c'est un pays dans lequel il y a 10 ou 22 régions administratives?

T : **Répétez :** C'est un pays dans lequel il y a 22 régions.

Slide 2 :

T : C'est un pays dans lequel il y a 22 ou 100 départements?

⁴ Adapted from Gregoire, M., & Thiévenaz, O. (1995). *Grammaire progressive du Français niveau intermédiaire*. Paris : CLE international, p. 136.

T : **Répétez** : C'est un pays dans lequel il y a 100 départements.

Slide 3 :

T : La préfecture, c'est un bâtiment dans lequel le préfet ou le président gouverne?

S : ---

T : La préfecture est un bâtiment dans lequel le préfet gouverne. (Le préfet gouverne; il est responsable de la région.)

L'île de France (la région dans laquelle se trouve Paris).

Slide 4 :

T : C'est une région dans laquelle il y a 2 ou 8 départements?

S : ---

T : C'est une région dans laquelle il y a 8 départements.

Slide 5 :

T : C'est une région à travers laquelle l'urbanisme est peu ou très développé?

S : ---

T : C'est une région à travers laquelle l'urbanisme est très développé.

Slide 6 :

T : C'est une région vers laquelle les jeunes ou les vieux émigrent?

S : ---

T : C'est une région vers laquelle les jeunes émigrent.

La Corse et La Bretagne.

Slide 7 :

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles on parle les langues régionales ou l'anglais ?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles on parle les langues régionales. (On parle encore le breton et le Corse.)

Slide 8 :

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles il y a un sentiment d'indépendance ou d'appartenance?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des régions dans lesquelles il y a un sentiment d'indépendance.

Slide 9 :

T : Ce sont des régions parmi lesquelles on trouve beaucoup de villes ou de villages?

S : ---

T : Ce sont des régions parmi lesquelles on trouve beaucoup de villages.

Les villages français.

Slide 10 :

T : Ce sont des endroits dans lesquels il y a une population jeune ou âgée?
 S : ---
 T : Ce sont des endroits dans lesquels il y a une population âgée.

Slide 11 :

T : Les places de villages, ce sont des endroits sur lesquels il y a toujours une église ou une poste ?
 S : ---
 T : Ce sont des endroits sur lesquels il y a toujours une église.

Slide 12 :

T : Sur la place du village, il y a des commerces parmi lesquels on trouve toujours un bar ou une boutique ?
 S : ---
 T : Il y a des commerces parmi lesquels on trouve toujours un bar.

Lesson Plan 6

Gérondif

GI

Le sud de la France (Provence et Côte d'azur)

Title Slide : **Intro**

Camille est allée dans les Cévennes, maintenant elle va à Marseille. Imaginons que nous irons nous aussi dans le Sud de la France cet été... que ferons-nous en visitant le sud ? Nous allons parler du sud de la France, et des caractéristiques culturelles de cette région. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Au restaurant...

Slide 1 :

T : Pour l'apéritif. Nous grignoterons en buvant un pastis ou une bière?
 T : Répétez : nous grignoterons en buvant un pastis.

Slide 2 :

T : Notre plat principal. Nous l'attendrons en dégustant un vin rosé ou un vin blanc?
 T : Répétez : Nous l'attendrons en dégustant un vin rosé.

Slide 3 :

T : Nous discuterons en mangeant des crêpes ou de la Bouillabaisse?
 S : ---
 T : Nous discuterons en mangeant de la Bouillabaisse.

A voir...

Slide 4 :

T : Nous découvrirons Rousseau ou Cézanne en visitant Aix?
 S : --
 T : Nous découvrirons Cézanne en visitant Aix.

Slide 5 :

T : La prison du masque de fer. Nous la verrons en allant sur une île ou sur une montagne?

S : ---

T : Nous la verrons en allant sur une île.

Slide 6 :

T : L'influence italienne. Nous la comprendrons en regardant Garibaldi ou Roosevelt?

S : ---

T : Nous la comprendrons en regardant Garibaldi.

A célébrer...

Slide 7 :

T : La vie locale. Nous y participerons en célébrant la lavande ou la fête du cinéma?

S : ---

T : Nous y participerons en célébrant la lavande. (Tous les étés il y a la fête de la lavande en Provence.)

Slide 8 :

T : A Aix, nous nous amuserons en écoutant de la musique classique ou du rap?

S : ---

T : Nous nous amuserons en écoutant de la musique classique.

Slide 9 :

T : A Nice, nous danserons en écoutant du jazz ou du rock?

S : ---

T : Nous danserons en écoutant du jazz

A faire...

Slide 10 :

T : Nous rencontrerons des gens en jouant à la pétanque ou au foot?

S : ---

T : Nous rencontrerons des gens en jouant à la pétanque.

Slide 11 :

T : À Nîmes, nous mangerons une glace en regardant la corrida ou le rugby?

S : ---

T : Nous mangerons une glace en regardant la corrida. (C'est une marque de l'influence espagnole dans cette région.)

Slide 12 :

T : Nous communiquerons en parlant le breton ou le provençal?

S : ---

T : Nous communiquerons en parlant le provençal. (C'est une langue régionale parlée dans le sud de la France.)

Slide 13 : **Co-construction**

Regardons ces exemples ensemble, dans un contexte américain.

En Louisiane,

Nous boirons un cocktail en marchant dans la Rue Bourbon.

Nous chanterons en dansant sur la musique cajun.

Guiding Questions

1. Dans chaque phrase, combien de verbes voyez-vous? Combien de sujets voyez-vous?
2. Ces actions se passent-elle en même temps, ou à des moments différents?
3. Le premier verbe est-il conjugué ?
4. Comment se termine le deuxième verbe dans les phrases que vous voyez?
5. C'est le gérondif ou l'infinitif ? Quel est l'infinitif de « marchant », et « dansant »?
6. Quel petit mot utilise-t-on mot pour former le gérondif et qui se trouve entre les deux verbes, avant le gérondif?

Lesson Plan 6

**Gérondif
Un été en Provence**

DED

Slide 1 : **Rule explanation**

On utilise le gérondif pour exprimer deux actions simultanées réalisées par un même sujet. Le premier verbe est conjugué à un temps de l'indicatif (ici le futur simple) et le deuxième verbe est au gérondif. Le gérondif est introduit par la préposition « en ». Pour les verbes en ER *réguliers*, l'infinitif « er » est remplacé par « ant ».⁵

En Louisiane,

Nous boirons un cocktail en marchant dans la Rue Bourbon.

⁵ Adapted from Gregoire, M., & Thiévenaz, O. (1995). *Grammaire progressive du Français niveau intermédiaire*. Paris : CLE international, p. 148.

Nous chanterons en dansant sur la musique cajun.

Title Slide : **Intro**

Camille est allée dans les Cévennes, maintenant elle va à Marseille. Imaginons que nous irons nous aussi dans le Sud de la France cet été... que ferons-nous en visitant le sud ? Nous allons parler du sud de la France, et des caractéristiques culturelles de cette région. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Au restaurant...

Slide 1 :

T : Pour l'apéritif, nous grignoterons en buvant un pastis ou une bière?

T : **Répétez** : nous grignoterons en buvant un pastis.

Slide 2 :

T : Notre plat principal, nous l'attendrons en dégustant un vin rosé ou un vin blanc?

T : **Répétez** : Nous l'attendrons en dégustant un vin rosé.

Slide 3 :

T : Nous discuterons en mangeant des crêpes ou de la Bouillabaisse?

S : ---

T : Nous discuterons en mangeant de la Bouillabaisse (un plat à base de poisson).

A voir...

Slide 4 :

T : Nous découvrirons Rousseau ou Cézanne en visitant Aix?

S : --

T : Nous découvrirons Cézanne en visitant Aix.

Slide 5 :

T : La prison du masque de fer. Nous la verrons en allant sur une île ou sur une montagne?

S : ---

T : Nous la verrons en allant sur une île.

Slide 6 :

T : L'influence italienne. Nous la comprendrons en regardant Garibaldi ou Roosevelt?

S : ---

T : Nous la comprendrons en regardant Garibaldi.

A célébrer...

Slide 7 :

T : La vie locale. Nous y participerons en célébrant la lavande ou la fête du cinéma?

S : ---

T : Nous y participerons en célébrant la lavande. (Tous les étés il y a la fête de la lavande en Provence.)

Slide 8 :

T : A Aix, nous nous amuserons en écoutant de la musique classique ou du rap?

S : ---

T : Nous nous amuserons en écoutant de la musique classique.

Slide 9 :

T : A Nice, nous danserons en écoutant du jazz ou du rock?

S : ---

T : Nous danserons en écoutant du jazz.

A faire...

Slide 10 :

T : Nous rencontrerons des gens en jouant à la pétanque ou au foot?

S : ---

T : Nous rencontrerons des gens en jouant à la pétanque.

Slide 11 :

T : À Nîmes, nous mangerons une glace en regardant la corrida ou le rugby?

S : ---

T : Nous mangerons une glace en regardant la corrida. (C'est une marque de l'influence espagnole dans cette région.)

Slide 12 :

T : Nous communiquerons en parlant le breton ou le provençal?

S : ---

T : Nous communiquerons en parlant le provençal. (C'est une langue régionale parlée dans le sud de la France.)

Lesson plan 7

La voix passive

GI

La Martinique

Title Slide : **Intro**

Camille voyage au Maroc, un pays francophone. Ce matin nous allons parler d'une autre région du monde francophone, La Martinique. C'est une île qui se trouve dans les Antilles. Nous allons parler du passé et du présent de La Martinique. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Un peu d'histoire...

Slide 1 :

T : La Martinique a été découverte par C. Colomb ou par les Français ?

T : **Répétez** : Elle a été découverte par Christophe Colomb (en 1502).

Slide 2 :

T : Elle a été surnommée l'île aux fleurs ou l'île aux poissons par C.C?

T : Répétez : Elle a été surnommée l'île au fleurs par CC.

Slide 3 :

T : Puis, l'île a été colonisée par les Français ou par les Allemands ?

S : --

T : Elle a été colonisée par les Français.

Slide 4 :

T : En 1902, L'ancienne capitale, Saint-Pierre, a été détruite par un volcan ou une guerre ?

S : ----

T : Elle a été détruite par un volcan (La Montagne pelée).

Slide 5 :

T : Après la deuxième guerre mondiale, la colonie a été transformée en région (administrative) française ou en pays indépendant par la France ?

S : ---

T : La colonie a été transformée en région française par la France.

Slide 6 : (Pendant et après la colonisation...)

T : La littérature (et la politique) martiniquaise a été influencée par Aimé Césaire ou Victor Hugo ?

S : ---

T : La littérature martiniquaise a été influencée par Aime Césaire.

Attention.... Aujourd'hui...

Slide 7 :

T : Aujourd'hui, ce territoire est dirigé par le gouvernement martiniquais ou français ?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : il est dirigé par le gouvernement français.

Slide 8 :

T : Entre amis, le français ou le créole est parlé par les Martiniquais?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Le créole est parlé entre amis par les Martiniquais.

Slide 9 :

T : L'euro ou le franc martiniquais est utilisé par les Martiniquais?

S : ---

T : L'euro est utilisé par les Martiniquais.

Slide 10 :

T : La Capitale (Fort de France) est bordée par la mer ou la montagne?

S : ---

T : Elle est bordée par la mer.

Slide 11 :

T : La plage est occupée par les touristes ou les locaux ?

S : ---

T : Elle est occupée par les touristes.

Slide 12 :

T : Dans les terres, le paysage est marqué par l'agriculture ou l'industrie ?

S : --

T : Il est marqué par l'agriculture.

Slide 13 :

T : La banane ou la mangue est le fruit exporté par la Martinique?

S : --

T : La banane est le fruit exporté par les Martiniquais.

Slide 14 : **Co-construction**

La Nouvelle-Orléans a été colonisée par les Français au 18^{ème} siècle.

Aujourd'hui, la Nouvelle-Orléans est envahie par les touristes.

Guiding questions

1. Dans la première phrase, quel est le verbe principal ? Et dans la deuxième phrase ?
2. Qui « colonise » les Français ou la Nouvelle-Orléans ? Et qui « envahit » les touristes ou la Nouvelle-Orléans ?
3. La Nouvelle-Orléans subit ou fait l'action ?
4. C'est la voix passive ou active ?
5. Pour former la voix passive quel verbe auxiliaire utilise-t-on ?
6. Quelle est la forme du verbe principal, le participe passé ?
7. Dans la première phrase, « au 18^{ème} siècle » le verbe « être » va être au présent ou au passé composé ?
8. Dans la deuxième phrase « aujourd'hui » le verbe « être » va être au présent ou au passé composé ?

9. Le participe passé « colonisée » et « envahie » se terminent par « e ». Pourquoi ?
 10. Quel petit mot introduit la personne ou la chose qui fait l'action ?

Lesson plan 7**La voix passive
La Martinique****DED****Slide 1 : Rule explanation**

En français, on utilise la voix passive quand on met l'accent sur l'objet du verbe (celui qui subit une action) au lieu du sujet (celui qui fait l'action). On forme la voix passive avec le verbe « être » conjugué au temps nécessaire (ici au présent ou au passé composé par exemple) et suivi du participe passé du verbe. Le participe passé s'accorde toujours avec le sujet (colonisé avec un « e » parce que la Nouvelle-Orléans c'est féminin). La préposition « par » introduit le complément d'agent (celui qui fait l'action). Par exemple :

La Nouvelle-Orléans a été colonisée par les Français au 18^{ème} siècle.
 Aujourd'hui, la Nouvelle-Orléans est envahie par les touristes.

Title Slide : Intro

Camille voyage au Maroc, un pays francophone. Ce matin nous allons parler d'une autre région du monde francophone, La Martinique. C'est une île qui se trouve dans les Antilles. Nous allons parler du passé et du présent de La Martinique, et pour décrire l'histoire présente et passée de ce pays nous allons utiliser la voix passive. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Un peu d'histoire...

Slide 1 :

T : La Martinique a été découverte par C. Colomb ou par les Français ?

T : **Répondez** : Elle a été découverte par Christophe Colomb (en 1502).

Slide 2 :

T : Elle a été surnommée l'île aux fleurs ou l'île aux poissons par C. C. ?

T : **Répondez** : Elle a été surnommée l'île aux fleurs par C. C.

Slide 3 :

T : Puis, l'île a été colonisée par les Français ou par les Allemands ?

S : --

T : Elle a été colonisée par les Français.

Slide 4 :

T : En 1902, L'ancienne capitale, Saint-Pierre, a été détruite par un volcan ou une guerre ?

S : ----

T : Elle a été détruite par un volcan (La Montagne pelée).

Slide 5 :

T : Après la deuxième guerre mondiale, la colonie a été transformée en région (administrative) française ou en pays indépendant par la France ?

S : ---

T : La colonie a été transformée en région française par la France.

Slide 6 : (Pendant et après la colonisation...)

T : La littérature (et la politique) martiniquaise a été influencée par Aimé Césaire ou Victor Hugo ?

S : ---

T : La littérature martiniquaise a été influencée par Aime Césaire.

Attention.... Aujourd'hui...

Slide 7 :

T : Aujourd'hui, ce territoire est dirigé par le gouvernement martiniquais ou français ?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : il est dirigé par le gouvernement français.

Slide 8 :

T : Entre amis, le français ou le créole est parlé par les Martiniquais?

S : ---

T : **Répétez** : Le créole est parlé entre amis par les Martiniquais.

Slide 9 :

T : L'euro ou le franc martiniquais est utilisé par les Martiniquais?

S : ---

T : L'euro est utilisé par les Martiniquais.

Slide 10 :

T : La Capitale (Fort de France) est bordée par la mer ou la montagne?

S : ---

T : Elle est bordée par la mer.

Slide 11 :

T : La plage est occupée par les touristes ou les locaux ?

S : ---

T : Elle est occupée par les touristes.

Slide 12 :

T : Dans les terres, le paysage est marqué par l'agriculture ou l'industrie ?

S : --

T : Il est marqué par l'agriculture.

Slide 13 :

T : La banane ou la mangue est le fruit exporté par la Martinique?

S : --

T : La banane est le fruit exporté par la Martinique.

Lesson Plan 8

Subjonctif / Infinitif Quelques fêtes françaises...

GI

Title Slide : **Intro**

Vous avez vu que la famille est une chose très importante pour Camille dans notre film. Une des choses qui est importante dans la vie d'une famille ce sont les traditions, les fêtes. Ce matin nous allons parler de quelques fêtes qui sont célébrées en France. Nous allons voir ce que les Français aiment faire et ce qu'ils aiment que les autres fassent pendant ces célébrations. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Mardi Gras...

Slide 1 :

T : Les enfants adorent se déguiser ou étudier ?

T : **Répétez** : Les enfants adorent se déguiser.

Slide 2 :

T : Les instituteurs adorent que les enfants se déguisent ou étudient ?

T : **Répétez** : Ils adorent que les enfants se déguisent.

Slide 3 :

T : Les mamans aiment préparer des crêpes ou des gâteaux ?

S : ---

T : Elles aiment préparer des crêpes.

Slide 4 :

T : Les enfants aiment que les mamans préparent des crêpes ou des gâteaux ?

S : ---

T : Ils aiment que les mamans préparent des gâteaux.

Le 1^{er} mai...

Slide 5 :

T : Les Français veulent se reposer ou travailler ?

S : ---

T : Ils veulent se reposer.

Slide 6 :

T : Le gouvernement veut que les Français se reposent ou travaillent ?

S : ---

T : Le gouvernement veut que les Français se reposent. (C'est la fête du travail en France !)

Slide 7 :

T : Les Français préfèrent donner du muguet ou des roses ?

S : ---

T : Ils préfèrent donner du muguet.

Slide 8 :

T : Les Français préfèrent qu'on leur donne du muguet ou des roses ?

S : ---

T : Ils préfèrent qu'on leur donne du muguet.

Pâques...

Slide 9 :

T : Les enfants aiment chercher des chocolats ou des jouets dans le jardin?

S : ---

T : Ils aiment chercher des chocolats (dans le jardin).

Slide 10 :

T : Les parents aiment que les enfants cherchent des chocolats ou des jouets dans le jardin?

S : ---

T : Ils aiment que les enfants cherchent des chocolats dans le jardin.

Slide 11 :

T : Les cloches ou les lapins adorent apporter les chocolats aux enfants ?

S : ---

T : Les cloches adorent apporter les chocolats aux enfants.

Slide 12 :

T : Les enfants adorent que les cloches ou le lapin leur apportent des chocolats ?

S : --

T : Les enfants adorent que les cloches leur apportent des chocolats.

Slide 13 : Co-construction

Regardons ces phrases ensemble... dans un contexte américain.

Les Américains veulent passer les jours de fêtes en famille.

Les enfants aiment célébrer Halloween.

Les parents veulent que leurs enfants passent les fêtes en famille.

Les parents aiment que leurs enfants célèbrent Halloween.

Guiding questions

1. Voyez-vous une différence entre les phrases A et B ?
2. Dans ces phrases, les verbes « vouloir » et « aimer » ce sont des verbes qui expriment une volonté ou une préférence n'est-ce pas ?
3. Est-ce que c'est une attitude subjective ou objective ?
4. Dans les phrases A, combien de sujets voyez-vous dans chaque phrase ?
Quel est le sujet dans chaque phrase ?
5. Quelle est la forme du deuxième verbe qui vient après le verbe de préférence/volonté quand il y a un seul sujet ?
6. Dans les phrases B, combien de sujets y a-t-il ? Lesquels ?
7. Alors quand il y a un deuxième sujet, après le verbe de préférence, est-ce que le deuxième verbe est à l'infinitif ou au subjonctif ?
8. Quand on utilise le subjonctif, quel petit mot se trouve entre le premier verbe et le deuxième sujet ?

Lesson Plan 8

Subjonctif / Infinitif
Quelques fêtes françaises...

DED**Slide 1 : Rule explanation**

Avec les verbes qui expriment un désir, une préférence, une volonté... l'attitude est subjective. Le subjonctif est employé après les expressions de volonté, de désir, de préférence (entre autres) quand il y a un deuxième sujet qui est différent de celui qui exprime la volonté ou la préférence.

Le subjonctif est introduit par la conjonction « que » et le sujet du deuxième verbe est

toujours différent.

Quand le sujet des deux verbes est le même, on utilise un infinitif après ces même verbes de volonté ou de préférence. Le sens de la phrase est alors différent.

Les Américains veulent passer les jours de fêtes en famille.

Les parents veulent que leurs enfants passent les fêtes en famille.

Les enfants aiment célébrer Halloween

Les parents aiment que leurs enfants célèbrent Halloween

Title Slide : **Intro**

Vous avez vu que la famille est une chose très importante pour Camille dans notre film. Une des choses qui est importante dans la vie d'une famille ce sont les traditions, les fêtes. Ce matin nous allons parler de quelques fêtes qui sont célébrées en France. Nous allons voir ce que les Français aiment faire et ce qu'ils aiment que les autres fassent pendant ces célébrations. Je vais vous poser des questions et vous allez me répondre. Nous allons faire deux exemples ensemble.

Mardi Gras...

Slide 1 :

T : Les enfants adorent se déguiser ou étudier ?

T : **Répétez** : Les enfants adorent se déguiser.

Slide 2 :

T : Les instituteurs adorent que les enfants se déguisent ou étudient ?

T : **Répétez** Ils adorent que les enfants se déguisent.

Slide 3 :

T : Les mamans aiment préparer des crêpes ou des gâteaux ?

S : ---

T : Elles aiment préparer des crêpes.

Slide 4 :

T : Les enfants aiment que les mamans préparent des crêpes ou des gâteaux ?

S : ---

T : Ils aiment que les mamans préparent des gâteaux.

Le 1^{er} mai...

Slide 5 :

T : Les Français veulent se reposer ou travailler ?

S : ---

T : Ils veulent se reposer.

Slide 6 :

T : Le gouvernement veut que les Français se reposent ou travaillent ?

S : ---

T : Le gouvernement veut que les Français se reposent. (C'est la fête du travail en France !)

Slide 7 :

T : Les Français préfèrent donner du muguet ou des roses ?

S : ---

T : Ils préfèrent donner du muguet.

Slide 8 :

T : Les Français préfèrent qu'on leur donne du muguet ou des roses ?

S : ---

T : Ils préfèrent qu'on leur donne du muguet.

Pâques...

Slide 9 :

T : Les enfants aiment chercher des chocolats ou des jouets dans le jardin?

S : ---

T : Ils aiment chercher des chocolats (dans le jardin).

Slide 10 :

T : Les parents aiment que les enfants cherchent des chocolats ou des jouets dans le jardin?

S : ---

T : Ils aiment que les enfants cherchent des chocolats dans le jardin.

Slide 11 :

T : Les cloches ou les lapins adorent apporter les chocolats aux enfants ?

S : ---

T : Les cloches adorent apporter les chocolats aux enfants.

Slide 12 :

T : Les enfants adorent que les cloches ou le lapin leur apportent des chocolats ?

S : --

T : Les enfants adorent que les cloches leur apportent des chocolats.

Appendix C : Grammar Pre/Posttest**French 201 Pre/Post Grammar Test**

Imagine that you have been doing an internship as a journalist working for a French T.V channel. You are writing a letter to your best friend to tell him/her about your experiences. The following are several sentences discussing your experience as a journalist in France. Please read each sentence and circle the answer below that correctly completes the sentence. **You will not be penalized for guessing and your performance on this test will by no means affect your course grade.**

1. Je travaille avec des gens formidables! _____ des journalistes très professionnels.
 - a. Ils sont
 - b. C'est
 - c. Il est
 - d. Ce sont

2. Je travaille au centre de Paris! C'est vraiment _____ du monde !
 - a. la plus intéressante ville
 - b. la ville plus intéressante
 - c. la ville la plus intéressante
 - d. la plus intéressante la ville

3. Le travail ne finit jamais, alors je m'endors souvent _____ les vidéos prises pendant la journée.
 - a. en visionnant
 - b. visionnant
 - c. visionne
 - d. en visionner

4. Les histoires sur _____ nous enquêtons sont souvent des histoires criminelles.
 - a. ce que
 - b. lesquelles
 - c. dont
 - d. que

5. Les témoins du drame sont les personnes _____ nous questionnons immédiatement.
 - a. que
 - b. dont
 - c. lesquelles
 - d. qui

6. Hier, par exemple, mes collègues et moi, _____ l'après midi à interroger des jeunes de la banlieue à propos d'un vol.
- nous sommes passés
 - nous avons passés
 - nous avons passé
 - nous sommes passé
7. Le vandalisme, _____ ces jeunes sont responsables, est un gros problème.
- qui
 - que
 - dont
 - lequel
8. Par exemple, le mois dernier, des jeunes _____ sur le toit d'un musée pour y faire des graffitis.
- ont monté
 - sont montés
 - sont monté
 - ont montés
9. Parfois nous voyageons. Je suis allée à Lille, une ville dans _____ il y a beaucoup de sites historiques.
- laquelle
 - lequel
 - que
 - dont
10. Quand je suis allé à la Rochelle, j'ai vu _____ !
- le plus impressionnant port
 - le port le plus impressionnant
 - le plus impressionnant le port
 - le port plus impressionnant
11. J'aimerais _____ un résumé de ces histoires à tous nos amis !
- que tu fasses
 - que tu fais
 - que raconter
 - tu racontes
12. J'ai un collègue qui s'appelle Philippe. _____ un suisse !
- Ce sont
 - Ils sont
 - Il est
 - C'est

13. Il me dit que son pays est magnifique. Mais la Suisse _____ par les touristes!
- envahie
 - est envahie
 - a envahi
 - envahissent
14. Plus tard je voudrais _____ pour une chaîne de télévision francophone.
- Marie travaille
 - que travailler
 - travailler
 - Marie travailler
15. Je rentre aux Etats-Unis la semaine prochaine. Dans l'avion, je dormirai sûrement _____ à toutes mes aventures de journaliste!
- penser
 - pensant
 - en pensant
 - en penser
16. Mon billet d'avion _____ par la chaîne de télévision! C'est super!
- offre
 - a été offert
 - offrait
 - a offert

Appendix D: Culture Pre/Posttest**Fr 201 Pre/Post Culture Test**

The following are several questions regarding cultural specificities of France and francophone countries that you will learn about this semester. Please read each sentence and circle the appropriate answer below. **You will not be penalized for guessing and your performance on this test will by no means affect your course grade.**

1. How does the gastronomic guide “Michelin” rate restaurants?
 - a. With numerical grades
 - b. With chef hats and forks
 - c. With forks and stars
 - d. With letter grades

2. Mussels and fries are a specialty of which country?
 - a. Belgium
 - b. France
 - c. Luxembourg
 - d. Switzerland

3. Why was Eiffel Tower built?
 - a. In celebration of a king
 - b. For the 1889 universal exhibition
 - c. At the demand of the city of Paris
 - d. To commemorate the 1789 revolution

4. In France, which are the two biggest administrative entities?
 - a. Regions and cities
 - b. Regions and departments
 - c. Departments and cities
 - d. Cities and counties

5. On May 1st, what do French people like to give and receive?
 - a. Lily of the valley
 - b. Roses
 - c. Chrysanthemums
 - d. Tulips

6. What kind of wine is someone from Provence more likely to drink?
 - a. Red wine
 - b. White wine
 - c. Rosé wine
 - d. Pastis

7. What is the second most important religion in France?
 - a. Catholicism
 - b. Protestantism
 - c. Judaism
 - d. Islam

8. What kind of museum is “Les Invalides”?
 - a. A museum of modern art
 - b. A museum of impressionist art
 - c. A museum of military artifacts
 - d. A wax museum

9. What is Martinique also known as?
 - a. The plant island
 - b. The flower island
 - c. The volcano island
 - d. The Creole island

10. How much paid vacation do French people officially enjoy?
 - a. Two weeks
 - b. Three weeks
 - c. Five weeks
 - d. Seven weeks

11. “L’andouillette,” a type of French sausage, and “coq au vin” are specialties of which area?
 - a. Paris
 - b. Lyon
 - c. Provence
 - d. Corsica

12. Which city is at the center of the European Union?
 - a. Paris
 - b. Brussels
 - c. Berlin
 - d. Amsterdam

13. Who brings chocolate to young children in France for Easter?
 - a. A horse
 - b. A bell
 - c. A bunny
 - d. A hen

14. What characterizes La Sorbonne?
 - a. It is the most expensive university in France
 - b. It is the oldest university in France

- c. It is the largest university in France
 - d. It is the university from which French government leaders graduate
15. Whose tomb can be found at the “Panthéon” in Paris?
- a. Napoleon
 - b. Charles de Gaulle
 - c. Voltaire
 - d. Molière
16. Martinique is ...
- a. An independent francophone country
 - b. A territory in the South Pacific
 - c. A territory governed by France
 - d. An island in the Mediterranean sea
17. What was the 1998 world Cup French team unofficially called in relation to its members?
- a. Les champions
 - b. Black blancs beurres
 - c. Les coqs français
 - d. Les rouges
18. What is the center of activity in a French village?
- a. The church
 - b. The park
 - c. The supermarket
 - d. The town square
19. What is/are the official language(s) in Martinique ?
- a. French
 - b. Creole
 - c. French and Creole
 - d. There is no official language
20. Who was “le Maréchal Pétain”?
- a. A German soldier
 - b. A resistance fighter
 - c. A collaborationist
 - d. De Gaulle’s right arm
21. The city of Lyon is ...
- a. The gastronomic capital of France
 - b. The third largest city in France
 - c. The capital of the Provence region
 - d. A city on the Rhine river

22. In Belgium, who is the head of the state according to the Constitution?
- A president
 - A prime minister
 - A king
 - A senator
23. Which famous painter was from Provence?
- Cezanne
 - Degas
 - Monet
 - Dali
24. What is the favored local sport in the South of France?
- Tennis
 - Soccer
 - Bocce ball
 - Rugby
25. In which French region are there independent activists today?
- Ile de France
 - Provence
 - Alsace
 - Corsica
26. How does a one star restaurant compare to a three-forks restaurant?
- It is cheaper and less elegant
 - It is as expensive but less elegant
 - It is more expensive and as elegant
 - It is more expensive and more elegant
27. What is the dominant religion in Belgium?
- Protestantism
 - Islam
 - Judaism
 - Catholicism
28. Whose tomb is found in “Les Invalides”?
- Rousseau
 - Hugo
 - Napoleon
 - Charles de Gaulle
29. Who has the status to officially validate a marriage in France?
- a government official
 - a religiously affiliated person
 - both

- d. the bride's father
30. Which French region has seen a growth in population recently as a result of internal migrations?
- a. Ile de France
 - b. Bretagne
 - c. Provence
 - d. None of the above
31. What is historically associated with the Champs Elysées?
- a. Fireworks
 - b. Military parades
 - c. Concerts
 - d. Literary gatherings
32. How many witnesses are required at a French wedding ceremony?
- a. 1
 - b. 2
 - c. 3
 - d. 4
33. From where do most immigrants in France come from?
- a. Europe and South Africa
 - b. Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle east
 - c. North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa
 - d. North Africa and The Middle East
34. What do people formally celebrate during the summer in Provence Cote d'Azur?
- a. Jazz music and lavender
 - b. Pastis and olive oil
 - c. Car racing and yachting
 - d. The weather and lavender
35. What sectors mainly support Martinique's economy?
- a. Industrialism and tourism
 - b. Agriculture and tourism
 - c. Fishing and mining
 - d. Fishing and textiles
36. For which holiday are French children likely to dress up in costumes?
- a. Easter
 - b. Halloween
 - c. Mardi Gras
 - d. Bastille day

37. What is the predominant religion of Europeans living in France?
- a. Catholics
 - b. Protestants
 - c. Muslim
 - d. Jewish
38. During the Second World War, when did the battles finish in France?
- a. 1939
 - b. 1940
 - c. 1943
 - d. 1945
39. In France, what is celebrated on the first of May?
- a. Armistice day
 - b. Labor day
 - c. Memorial day
 - d. Bastille Day
40. Most French people take a vacation in...
- a. August
 - b. May
 - c. September
 - d. June

Appendix E : Immediate Grammar Tests

Activité 1 C'est vs. Il est

Dans les situations suivantes, créez une phrase pour décrire chaque personne. Pour chaque phrase, utilisez les éléments entre parenthèses et choisissez la structure appropriée *c'est/ce sont vs. Il/elle est, ils/elles sont*. Accordez les noms et adjectifs si nécessaire.

1. (une / étudiant) :

Yasmine : _____

2. (professionnel) :

Camille et Hélène : _____

3. (des / retraité) :

Louise et son ami Jean : _____

4. (algérien) :

Sonia : _____

Activité 2 Le passé composé avec les verbes descendre, monter, passer, et sortir.

Parlons d'une histoire que Bruno a racontée à Camille, une histoire que son grand-père (Charles) et sa grand-mère (Marie) ont vécue avant la guerre. Pour chaque phrase, utilisez les éléments donnés et conjuguez les verbes au *passé composé*.

En 1938 ...

1. (Charles et Marie / passer / une semaine de vacances à Nice.)

2. (Charles et Marie / descendre / dans un bel hôtel.)

3. (Charles/ monter /leurs affaires dans la chambre.)

4. (Un soir, Marie / sortir/ sur la promenade des Anglais... seule.)

Activité 3 Le superlatif.

Mado discute des gens de Canal 7 avec un ami. En utilisant les éléments entre parenthèses, recréez ce que Mado dit à propos des gens de Canal 7. Utilisez le *superlatif de supériorité* et accordez l'adjectif si nécessaire.

1. (Hélène / est / journaliste / professionnel)

2. (Martine et Camille /sont / femmes / ravissant)

3. (Rachid / est / reporter / amusant)

4. (Camille et Bruno / sont / employés / fiable)

Activité 4 Les pronoms relatifs « que » et « dont »

Camille et Bruno parlent du 5^{ème} arrondissement, leur quartier parisien favori. Combinez les éléments entre parenthèses pour créer une phrase complexe. Utilisez *que* ou *dont* où nécessaire.

1. (Le 5^{ème} est un beau quartier. Les touristes adorent ce quartier.)

2. (Le 5^{ème} est un quartier. Les habitants sont fiers de ce quartier.)

3. (On se promène dans la rue Mouffetard. Les boutiques de cette rue sont uniques.)

4. (Il y a plusieurs parcs. Les enfants du quartier aiment ces parcs.)

Activité 5 Le pronom relatif « lequel »

Imaginons que Rachid décrit à un ami son lieu de travail. Dans les situations suivantes, combinez les éléments entre parenthèses pour créer une phrase complexe en utilisant la forme correcte du pronom relatif *lequel* où nécessaire.

1. (Le studio a un grand plateau. On trouve des télévisions sur ce plateau.)
-

2. (Martine travaille dans une petite pièce. Il y a des moniteurs dans cette pièce.)
-

3. (Dans l'immeuble, il y a plusieurs grandes entreprises. On trouve une banque parmi ces entreprises.)
-

4. (L'immeuble est près de bons restaurants. Beaucoup de monde déjeune dans ces restaurants.)
-

Activité 6 Le gérondif

Parlons maintenant de ce que Bruno fait le matin avant d'aller rejoindre Camille sur le plateau de Canal 7, lui aussi fait plusieurs choses en même temps! Complétez les phrases suivantes avec la forme correcte des verbes entre parenthèses et utilisez le *gérondif*.

Le matin...

1. (Bruno / se brosser les dents / se doucher)
-

2. (Ensuite, il / grignoter / promener le chien)
-

3. (Il / arriver à Canal 7 / crier « où est Camille ???? »)
-

4. (Le soir, il / se coucher / penser à Camille)
-

Activité 7 La voix passive

Parlons maintenant de ce que les personnages de Canal 7 subissent ou ont subi!
Complétez les phrases suivantes en utilisant *la voix passive* au temps qui convient (présent ou passé). Soyez logiques !

Le matin...

1. (Tous les matins / Bruno / réveiller / son alarme / à 8 heures)

2. (En 2001/ Camille / arrêter / la police)

3. (Hier/ Martine / convoquer / le directeur du studio)

4. (Tous les vendredis / Rachid et Sonia / entendre / un conseiller matrimonial)

Activité 8 Le subjonctif et l'infinitif

Parlons maintenant des préférences et volontés des personnages du *Chemin du retour*. En utilisant les éléments entre parenthèses (ces éléments ne sont pas nécessairement dans l'ordre), créez une phrase en utilisant soit une construction avec *l'infinitif* ou avec le *subjonctif*.

1. (Bruno et Rachid / Camille/ trouver la trace de son grand-père /désirer)

2. (Rachid / habiter avec Sonia/ aimer)

3. (Martine et Bruno / Camille / souhaiter / rester à Canal 7)

4. (Louise/ Alex/ jouer de l'accordéon / préférer)

Appendix F : Immediate Culture Tests

Activité 1 Culture

From what you have heard and seen in this presentation, answer the following questions in English.

1. What are two countries from which people immigrate to France?
2. In what way do sports support diversity in France?
3. What is the predominant religion of European immigrants in France?
4. What has been an effect of immigration on religion in France?

Activité 2 Culture

Based on what you have heard and seen in the presentation, answer the following questions in English.

1. What famous World War II figure is celebrated in « Les Invalides » museum?
2. Name one famous figure buried at « Le Panthéon » ?
3. What type of famous figures are found in « Le Panthéon » ?
4. What do « Les Invalides » and « Les Champs Elysées » have in common?

Activité 3 Culture

Based on what you have heard and seen in the presentation, answer the following questions in English

1. Which symbols are used to classify restaurants in the Michelin Guide?
2. What is a typical dish served in Lyon?
3. Why might tourists decide to go to Lyon rather than Paris?
4. Who might decide to go to a « Bouchon » versus a restaurant rated with a star?

Activité 4 Culture

Based on what you have seen and heard in the presentation, answer the following questions in English.

1. What is the dominant religion in Belgium?
2. What is a typical dish in Belgium eaten with fries ?
3. Why is Brussels important in European politics?
4. What does Belgium have in common with the U.K but not with France ?

Activité 5 Culture

Based on what you have heard and seen in the presentation, answer the following questions in English

1. How is France administratively divided?
2. Name one characteristic of Corse and Bretagne ?
3. Why has the population of l'« Ile de France région » increased ?
4. What does « La place du village » represent for the life of the village?

Activité 6 Culture

Based on what you have heard and seen in the presentation, answer the following questions in English.

1. Name the local sport in Provence.
2. What is the typical wine one drinks in Provence?
3. How are several cultural influences visible in Provence?
4. Why does the South of France attract many visitors

Activité 7 Culture

Based on what you have heard and seen in the presentation, answer the following questions in English.

1. What is the popular name of La Martinique?

2. What is one economic sector that supports La Martinique?
3. What is the relationship between French and Creole (languages) in Martinique?
4. Why is it possible for a young Martiniquais to enroll in a school in France?

Activité 8 Culture

Based on what you have heard and seen in the presentation, answer the following questions in English.

1. What flower do people traditionally give in France on the first of May?
2. What brings chocolate to children for Easter?
3. In France, what do Easter and Mardi Gras have in common?
4. How is the celebration of the first of May different from Mardi Gras?

Appendix G: Delayed Writing Tasks

Activité 1 **Ecriture**

Describe members of your family, their profession, nationality etc... Write 5 sentences using *il est, elle est, ils sont, elles sont, c'est or ce sont*.

Activité 2 **Ecriture**

Describe briefly a museum visit you and your friends or family did in the past. Please, just write 5 sentences using the *passé composé* of the verbs *descendre, monter, passer, et sortir* (use each verb at least once). Start using « *nous.* »

Activité 3 **Ecriture**

Describe a city that you think is most famous for its food. Write 5 sentences using the *superlatif*.

Activité 4 **Ecriture**

Describe the region/country where you are from. Write 5 complex sentences using the *pronoms relatifs que and dont*.

Activité 5 **Ecriture**

Describe the place of your dreams (country, region, city or island). Write 5 sentences using the *pronom relatif "lequel"* after a preposition.

Activité 6 **Ecriture**

Talk about what you are able to do when you are on vacation. Write five sentences using the *gérondif* of –er verbs.

Activité 7 **Ecriture**

Describe a country (or state) where you have traveled/lived. Talk about its history and current features. Write five sentences using *la voix passive* both in the past and in the present tense.

Activité 8 **Ecriture**

Describe what you like, want, or prefer to do during the holidays and what you like, want, or prefer others to do on these same holidays. Write five sentences using *subjonctif* and *infinitif*.

Appendix H : Preference and Perception Questionnaire

French 201 Post Study Questionnaire

Please, circle the number that best describes to what degree you agree with the following statements

1= strongly disagree

2= disagree

3= neutral

4= agree

5= strongly agree

1. The cultural lessons in the PowerPoint presentations were interesting

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

Please explain:

2. The visuals helped me focus on the cultural information

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

Please explain:

3. I enjoyed learning grammar in a cultural context

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

Please explain:

4. It was difficult to focus on the grammar while paying attention to the cultural information

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

Please explain:

5. It was difficult to focus on the cultural information while paying attention to the grammar structure

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

Please explain:

For items 6-8, please circle what best describes your personal preference

1= no preference

2= mild preference

3= moderate preference

4= strong preference

5= very strong preference

6. I prefer to have grammar taught in an activity that focuses on grammar only

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

7. I prefer to have the teacher explain the grammar rules entirely first and then practice

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

8. I prefer to practice a structure first and then discover the grammar rule with the guidance of the teacher

-----1 ----- 2 -----3 ----- 4 ----- 5 -----

9. When learning grammar, please indicate your relative preference for the teaching approaches listed below:

A. The teacher first explains the grammar rules entirely first and then student practice follows.

B. Students practice first and then discover the grammar rule with the guidance of the teacher.

1. Strongly prefer A
2. Mildly prefer A
3. No preference
4. Mildly prefer B
5. Strongly prefer B

Please answer the following questions in as much detail as you can.

10. In your experience, what is the best way to learn grammar in a foreign language classroom?

11. In your opinion, what, if any, are the advantages of learning a grammatical rule first before practicing the structure in an activity? Disadvantages?

12. In your opinion, what, if any, are the advantages of practicing the grammatical structure in an activity before discovering the rule with the guidance of a teacher? Disadvantages?

13. Does one of the two instructional approaches mentioned (rule first then practice or practice first then rule) fit the way you prefer to learn better than the other? Please explain.

14. In your experience, what is the best way to learn culture in a foreign language classroom?

15. What, if any, are the advantages of integrating culture into grammar presentations? Disadvantages?

Appendix I : Interview Guide

French 201 Post-study Interview Guide

- During interview the primary investigator will provide the participants being interviewed with a brief, unbiased explanation of the instructional approaches and techniques used in this study.
1. What were your general impressions of the grammar instruction you received in this course throughout the semester?
 2. What were your impressions of the grammar lessons I taught this semester?
 3. What were your general impressions about culture in this course throughout the semester?
 4. What were your impressions about the cultural lessons I taught this semester?
 5. Did you enjoy learning grammar through cultural presentation? Explain. What might be some advantages/disadvantages?
 6. You were taught French grammatical structures using two different instructional approaches (a guided inductive and a deductive). Were you able to distinguish between the two methods? Were there any distinguishing characteristics of the two approaches that you noticed or remembered?
 7. In which condition did you prefer learning grammatical structures? Why?
 8. In your opinion are there any advantages or disadvantages to learning grammar deductively, or rather with an explicit explanation of the grammatical pattern and the exception?
 9. What about learning grammar using the guided inductive approach where the instructors use questions to help you figure out the rule yourself?
 10. Did either approach help you focus more on the cultural content of the lesson? Explain.
 11. Did the cultural context help you learn and retain the grammatical forms?

Appendix J : Interview transcripts

PI= Primary Investigator

P= Participant

Participant A

Code: 07/14/88/30329

Section B

December 8, 2009 1:30pm

P: My first question is a general question. Tell me what your impressions were of grammar instruction in general in French 201 throughout the semester.

P: Well...because I... for me ... I took 101 and then I skipped right to 201, so there was a lot of information, like, there was a lot of grammar. Obviously all the other students in the class... they had learned this grammar before. I was, like, new to everything, so there was obviously a lot of information and a lot to swallow.

PI: A rather challenging class you would say?

P: Yeah... it was pretty challenging.

PI: How come you skipped from 101 to 201?

P: It's a complicated situation but I was actually... I had previous experience with French... way back, like, when I was, like, eight or nine and I had had five or six years of French. I was pretty fluent back then, but then I had a seven year gap where I spoke no French at all, totally forgot everything, and then I talked to L. about it... L. was my 101 teacher as well and she said, you know, you just go into 201 and afterwards figure it out ... yeah and it will come back.

PI: Now more specifically, what were your impressions about the grammar lessons that I taught in your class?

P: Personally for me... I wrote this on the survey too... I sort of said I am more of the rule first then practice later sort of guy. Because for me it was a bit confusing that, you know, like, when I had to, you know, speak out the phrases first before knowing the rules. I had no idea what I was talking about in a sense. But then, when, like, later when I got used to the rules, you know, I was like oh yeah this is what they were talking about. So yeah, but... I am personally more for the rules first practice later.

PI: Does it make you more comfortable?

P: Yeah. I need that comfort level of like, you know, I need to know what I'm talking about. It is sort of difficult for me, especially because, you know, I, you know, skipping from 101 to 201, I absorbed a lot of knowledge. So yeah, I needed that comfort zone.

PI: Now what about the structures, were they new? I guess they were.

P: Yeah... Personally... yeah. I mean it's not like I actually... If I had had some prior knowledge, it wouldn't have really mattered I guess that structure where I speak and practice first. Because people tend to, like, there's a tendency where if you teach the rules first, and then you sort of read it off the book and read off your notes, then it never really sticks to your mind so... I guess there is that to this particular approach... Just for me personally though... I had, you know, no prior exposure to these structures so it was just ... you know...

PI: Actually throughout this semester I taught you with two different approaches...

P: Right, right, right...

PI: Did you notice any differences from one week to the next?

P: Yeah... I mean... yeah... I guess there were some times where the information was easier to grasp than other days. Because there were, like, honestly, there were sometimes, some days where I just didn't know what we were talking about.

PI: One week I would come and we would go through examples first and then at the end I would show you model sentences with blanks and ask you questions.

P: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

PI: That is called a guided inductive approach. You teach through examples, and then you ask students questions so they can figure out for themselves what the rule is. And other weeks, I would just show you model sentences and tell you...

P: Right, right...

PI: This is what it is and we would do examples. Was the difference noticeable to you?

P: Yeah... I couldn't... like... but I could definitely sense that something... like, I wasn't paying attention too much to how you taught it. It was like, for me, like, there were some times where the information was easier to grasp and sometimes it wasn't.

PI: But you would say that you prefer learning with the rules first?

P: Yeah, definitely.

PI: Now was it difficult to grasp because it was taught in a cultural context?

P: Actually no. I actually preferred the cultural context because it actually... it was the only thing that actually indicated what... like it helped me indicate what we were talking about at times where I didn't know what we were talking about grammatically, but you know, I have a culture inference right on the screen that I sort of know what we're talking about. So it actually helped.

PI: So did you find those presentations interesting?

P: Yeah I did. I actually thought I knew a lot about French culture because, like, I used to live in Poland and I went to France like seven, eight times... I thought I knew a lot about French culture, but I actually ... I realized that I didn't know that much, plus like all the francophone stuff...

PI: How did the cultural lessons compare to how you learned culture in general in 201? How did you learn culture throughout the semester? What was your general impression?

P: You mean the 201 course?

PI: Yes, and how does that compare to the way that we did grammar and culture together?

P: The 201 course, like we... like it was like one day per chapter. There was a specific section where you only talked about a certain aspect of culture. And I thought... your lessons... it was sort of talking broadly about areas and other things. Yeah, I just thought... comparing to the 201 course, I liked it better because I learned a lot more about culture. The 201 course went a bit deeper into the cultural aspect. So there are those things...

PI: Did you enjoy learning grammar and culture together when I taught your class?

P: Yeah I definitely like the cultural part.

PI: Is there in your opinion any advantages to integrating culture into grammar, doing both at the same time? Or disadvantages?

P: Well... I already, yeah, talked about the advantages; like it helps you understand the context of what you're talking about. If I had to point out a disadvantage... maybe there... I mean, for me, it wasn't the case, but I might, perhaps assume that for some people there was just too much information, both with cultural and grammatical information. But for me personally, I really didn't have that. I guess... I can assume that it might pose a problem.

PI: Now let's go back to the grammar part. In your opinion what would be advantages or disadvantages of learning through examples first and then discovering the rules, with the teacher asking you questions?

P: Advantages in the sense that the student is more involved, definitely, ... like when you throw out the examples, you're basically... making the students participate. But like, if you give the rules, there's a high chance that, like you know, they've just learned the rules so it's fresh in their minds and then when you asked them to, you know, it's basically asking them to repeat what it really says. I guess, you know, when you pay attention at that, you, you get a sense of the grammar in that short attention span but then afterwards it sort of goes away. Maybe if you... ask them to, you know, have to like practice first... it's sort of like, you know, when you... when you learn more by being wrong, you know. When you're corrected, it sticks in your mind much better than, you know, after doing it right the first time, it sort of goes away. I guess there's that.

PI: So learning the rules first... do you see advantages, disadvantages?

P: Yeah definitely the advantage is... for guys like me... it's easier to, easier to grasp, yeah, but at the same time as I said, you know, a disadvantage might be that you, you know, learn the rule at that particular time but then it might just go away because, you know, you're basically repeating what you just learned and it doesn't stick in you mind.

PI: And do you think that there's an approach that helped you focus on the cultural information better than the other? Or was it the same?

P: I guess the practice first rule later definitely... focuses on the cultural aspect a bit more. Because when you practice first you know you're forced to focus on that particular phrase a bit more than maybe you would if you learned the rule first so, so you maybe grasp that sentence.

PI: So you mean when you learned with the examples first you focused more on the meaning?

P: Yeah, yeah.

PI: Did you find that the cultural context helped you retain the grammar or not?

P: The examples definitely helped. I am not sure if, like, the cultural aspect...

PI: The cultural context.

P: Oh the context? Yeah, definitely!

PI: Like if I had taught the same grammar structures but with no context, you know...

P: Yeah, yeah, it definitely sticks better in your mind if you have... because like it's more fun if you have the cultural aspect, and like, you know, you remember... oh we were talking about, you know, this, this, and then you remember the grammar. It's easier for you to remember.

PI: Good. Is there anything else you want to add?

P: I don't know, like... I just... I just, you know, personally I enjoyed the cultural aspect.

P: Thank you so much for answering my questions!

Participant # B

Code: 11/23/89/19810

Section C

December 8, 2009, 2:30pm

PI: Thank you so much for coming, I really appreciate it.

P: No problem!

PI: My first question is a very general question. What was your overall impression of grammar instruction in French 201? In general, generally speaking.

P: My general impression, it's much different than what I was used to in high school. In my high school, we did much more of a reading-based approach I would say. We did a lot of, I guess, similar in terms of the way, like, you would try to figure things out, but we would have, I think, at least a little more prior instruction before we would like start something. Either, like, something would be on... like the different structures would be on the board and then... while we were trying to figure it out, so could try and piece them together.

PI: And what about culture instruction in general in French 201? The cultural aspect?

P: The cultural aspect was probably similar to what I was used to in high school, but when I was in high school we did have, our French teacher was from France so like it was very easy for him, obviously, to sort of kind of just tell us about it. And we did... a lot of our activities were, you know, based in culture and all of our readings... we did... we would read, like, some books or plays or newspaper articles, you know. We would watch like the news, like Le Monde... and then what's that one news program, they have it here in the U.S, it's on like...

PI: TV5?

P: Yeah, I think something like that... so like we would watch the news sometimes in class, so like similar to, I guess, to what like what Emory does with the *Chemin du retour*, but we would watch things that were, like, actually French, versus, you know, like, made for the book.

PI: Now what were your impressions about the grammar lessons that I taught in your class this semester?

P: One thing that I definitely thought was confusing was it was hard to pay attention to both at the same time, both the culture and the grammar. I had trouble concentrating because I think I would try harder... I would try to get the grammar down, so I would almost like lose the cultural information. So that, for me, was hard. And then, I am a very visual learner, so seeing the pictures of what you were talking about for culture was definitely helpful, but trying to remember the words that you said was hard for me.

PI: So the fact that we did all these lessons orally was challenging?

P: It was difficult yeah.

PI: Were those grammatical structures new to you, was it also challenging in that way?

P: No but they were ones that you don't use so often, like the passé. So, you know, I had heard them before and maybe used them once or twice in class, but like not really... I'm not really fluent in them, you know, conversant.

PI: So despite the fact that it was challenging and maybe confusing to do both at the same time, did you like to have grammar taught through culture? Did you enjoy that? Or was it just too confusing and you didn't like it, you'd rather have had them taught separately?

P: I might say I'm indifferent. Just because ... I mean I think both are valuable. I don't want... I don't like learning grammar in a very straightforward, like okay, here is this, you always use this with this kind of thing. It's much more interesting to have it incorporated into something else. But when asked to remember both of those, it was just hard. So like maybe... What I think would be cool is if you, you know, kind of went through and taught it maybe the same way but then when we practice it ourselves afterwards, you know, there's like little cultural points like either pictures or something up so that, like, if we create sentences ourselves using the structure and using the cultural information, then I know I'd be much more likely to remember them... rather than just like repeating.

PI: This semester... Let's talk about the grammar. Every lesson I taught, every week we alternated between two different approaches. Did you notice anything different from one week to the next? I will explain to you in a minute, but did you notice anything different from one week to the next, from one approach to the other that I used?

P: I don't know... my life is so... probably not, just because it's hard for me to remember things and pay attention exactly. So in terms of like, a different approach...

PI: You just went along?

P: Yeah.

PI: Some weeks I used a guided inductive approach which means that you start with examples, you have students go through a bunch of examples, and then they have model

sentences with blanks and you ask them questions so they can try and figure out on their own how it works, what the rule is and how it works. And other weeks, I showed you sentences first and I told you this is what it is. I told you the rule and then we went on and did some examples.

P: Hu hu, because I remember both, yeah... I remember both I can't remember in terms of like from week to week.

PI: Practice and then rules or rules first and then practice, and we alternated every week. Now is there ... Can you say that you prefer to learn with one rather than with the other?

P: I would probably prefer just like a brief overview of the rules maybe quickly, just to sort of know when we do the practice what I'm supposed to be looking for, you know. And then, to kind of like reinforce it, and then afterwards like practice with it, practice, practice.

PI: So you prefer the rules first?

P: I think so.

PI: So for you what are the advantages or disadvantages, if any, of that particular approach, learning the rules first and then practicing?

P: I don't like to be in the dark, just my personality, very type A. So I think just like sort of knowing them and then trying, as you're figuring out how it's used in a sentence, sort of having a basic understanding helps me better understand and like reinforces those concepts. I think.

PI: And do you see any disadvantages to learning this way?

P: I mean, I definitely think... because there's other subjects where I prefer to try and figure things out, like math class, I'm one of those people... I think it's much better if you try and figure it out yourself because you are much more likely to remember it if you figure it out. And then that also teaches you to be able to figure something out, you know, in the future if you forget a rule. So I mean, think there's definitely advantages to both and I wonder, you know...

PI: But it makes you feel like you're in the dark. What makes you feel that you're in the dark when you learn through examples first?

P: Oh... no it's just that... I mean I'm not really in the dark. I guess it's like... I think maybe I personally like to immediately look at something and, you know, be able to point to what I understand about it.

PI: I understand. So did you... did you feel that there is any... that one of those approaches, so rules first then examples or examples first... Did either one of them help

you focus more on the cultural information that was being conveyed at the same or did it not make a difference?

P: To be honest, I am not sure. I don't think I really remember how well I remembered the cultural information afterwards depending on the approach. I mean just off the top of my head I would probably say learning the rules first probably made a difference and that I remembered it better, but I...

PI: because you knew what to do with the grammar?

P: Yeah and so I could, you know, more easily kind of deal with both of them in my own head.

PI: And did you find the cultural context helpful in retaining the grammar information or not?

P: I think sometimes, you know, with like the little pictures, the phrases will kind of stick in your head and if you have an example phrase that you can kind of point to in your mind, this is how it's supposed to be used, then, you know, in the future you can kind of remember like oh, you know...

PI: So you can connect it to a particular topic.

P: Yeah...

PI: Good. Any comments you may have on the lessons I taught?

P: I don't know. I know it's... One thing that I'd like, I think I wrote this on my evaluation sheet, was like when you did do the examples having things like highlighted in different colors to kind of make it very clear and then...

PI: You mean writing more on the presentations?

P: Yes. Sometimes seeing the actual words up there, I like that. And then, I would recommend again though, having us trying to come up with sentences on our own, based on like the pictures and what we see, versus just the repetition too.

PI: Thank you so very much for coming and answering my questions.

Participant # C
ID: 11/14/90/48176
Section B
December, 9, 2009, 11am

PI: My first question is more of a general question. What was your overall impression of grammar instruction in your course, in French 201, this semester?

P: Like not your stuff, just in general?

PI: Yes, in general.

P: I thought it was good. We... I liked how we had homework and the grammar it was, like, kind of if you needed to go over it on your own you could because a lot of people already knew it, but there were certain, like, tenses and stuff like that that I didn't really remember from earlier French and, like, the book was really helpful. It just kind of laid out when to use it and, like, the exceptions. It was very clear-cut. I liked how there were a lot of exercises you could do if you needed to do them. We went over a little bit in class but not to the point where it was too repetitive.

PI: Was it your first college French class?

P: Yeah.

PI: How different was it from high school?

P: Well I hadn't really done grammar for French since sophomore year of high school, because, like, junior and senior year we mostly did, like, more like cultural stuff.

PI: What kind of cultural stuff?

P: We, like, just did projects on French speaking countries or, like, learned about the history, or, like, looked at French movies, stuff like that. So it was a lot more structured than my high school classes. My high school classes were more just kind of like... like, we would have more projects I would say and, like, more, just like, kind of like discussions...and like, once in while, like, throw grammar in ...

PI: And so what did you think about culture in 201 in general?

P: I don't think we did that much culture, besides the little blurbs we would read, like, articles in the book, which were all, like, pretty interesting but I wouldn't say that I learned a lot about French culture.

PI: Now what did you think about the grammar lessons I taught in your class?

P: I thought... It was kind of hard to just, like, hear the grammar instead of, like, actually seeing it written and, like... Like, it was written on the PowerPoints but it was a lot of listening and learning culture all at once, so it was just a lot for, like, the brain to process all at once. When it was grammar that I already knew it was easy, but when it was like a new concept, I just didn't really know what I was doing.

PI: So were they [the structures] mostly review for you or were they new structures?

P: It was a pretty good mix. Some was new and some was old.

PI: So what did you think about using a cultural context to teach the grammar?

P: I thought it was, like, an interesting idea because it makes grammar less boring but I thought that if, like, we had learned the grammar in like a boring way first that might have been helpful because I was like trying... Because I didn't really get to fully understand the culture or fully understand the grammar, I was just kind of getting, like little bits and pieces of each. So I think, like if we had learned the grammar first and then put it in the context of culture, that would have been better.

PI: Now, so this semester when I taught grammar, I used... we alternated between two different approaches every week, we switched. Before I explain to you, did you notice anything that was different, any distinguishing features of each?

P: I remember mostly, like, when... you would, like ask a question and we would have to answer in the grammar form.

PI: Yeah...that was one approach...

P: And then... I can't think of what the other one would be....

PI: What you were just talking about is called a guided inductive approach. You have students practice first, go through a series of examples, and then you show them model sentences and ask them questions so they can discover, figure out, how the rule works, how the structure works. And then, on other weeks, what I did is I gave you examples first with no blanks and I told you this is what it is, I told you the rule and then we went on to practice. It's a deductive approach, rules first and then you practice. Now do you feel that there's an approach you feel you learn better with?

P: I think for me the deductive approach works better but, like, I also understand, like, the other approach because, like, people figuring it out for themselves might, like, help them better. But for the me the deductive, I understood it better.

PI: So why do you think it helped you better?

P: I think it's because I, like, knew what to look for. Like, when you were asking us questions, I wasn't really understanding. It was harder to like figure out what I was

supposed to be, like, focusing on and, what, like, the rules were. And like, deductive, like, then when we went into the examples, I knew, like, what to focus on, like, in a sentence, and, like, what was important about the grammar like, beforehand so I could look for that.

PI: Do you see any advantages, disadvantages to that, to doing the rules first and then practice?

P: I think doing the rules first, it makes it easier for the student, which like could be a bad thing because they don't really have to challenge their thinking as much.

PI: What do you mean easy?

P: Like you're just kind of telling them how to do it rather than let them figure it out on their own. Easier may not necessarily be a good thing in, like, the long run.

PI: What would be advantages or disadvantages of doing examples first?

P: For me I just didn't know what to look for and like, I never like... It was hard to like to see what I was doing.

PI: Do you feel like maybe one approach made it easier to focus on the cultural information, on the meaning?

P: Probably the deductive approach just because I already knew the grammar so I could like, focus on the culture.

PI: And do you think that using a cultural context can help retain grammar a bit better than if it's just taught without a context?

P: I think it could because you have, like, some examples in your head that you could kind of relate to and, like you might remember them more. If you remember the culture you could be like oh here is that sentence that had the grammar.

PI: So did you enjoy that aspect of the lessons, that it was both?

P: I liked it but I didn't really like, retain it that much because it was just so quick.

PI: Good. Do you have any other comments about this project?

P: Not really I think it was just like hard, because, like, you would hear one sentence about the culture and like you're not really going to remember that much about it if you just hear a sentence once.

PI: Were the pictures helping?

P: Yeah because then you could actually see it. Because if there weren't pictures at all, I would have no idea!

PI: Do you prefer... I think you might have said that already, but do you prefer learning with oral techniques or you need to see it? Do you like to see it written?

P: I like to have both. I need to... I'm a very, very visual person and so I, like, need to see it. But like also hearing it helps. So, like, I definitely need to like see it and hear it.

PI: Good. Anything else?

P: No, that's all.

PI: Thank you so much for coming.

Participant # D
ID: 08/13/90/20874
December 9 2010 11:30am

PI: My first question is more of a general question. What was your impression of grammar instruction in general, in French 201, this semester?

P: I like learning grammar!

PI: Why is that?

P: I don't know because I... I guess because, like, when you speak, like, the basic structure, like, you really need to understand it. So, I guess that's why I like it... Because grammar is really important and everything...

PI: Was it you first French college class?

P: Yeah.

PI: Was it any different from high school?

P: I took four years of French in high school and then... So this year was mostly, like, review. So I sort of knew most of the grammar stuff that went through, but it just, like, reinforced it and, like, more practice.

PI: Was it taught differently than what you were used to in high school?

P: No, about the same.

PI: Meaning?

P: Like, we just learned from the book. The teacher would explain it.

PI: So explanations, is that important for you?

P: Yeah...

PI: And what did you think about culture in that course, in general?

P: I thought it was interesting. Because, like, we didn't really learn about that much culture with like S., but I thought, like, when you came, you taught us a lot of culture. I thought that was interesting.

PI: So what did you think about those grammar lessons I taught you when I came to your class?

P: I thought, like... In the beginning, I thought they were, like, pretty good, but then, towards the end, like... because there were some of the stuff I... Some of the stuff I hadn't learned before. So then, like, I didn't really know what was going on. I could, like, sort of see the rules but, like, together with the culture... plus I didn't see any words, and I'm not really that good with just like hearing. So I was a little confused sometimes. I'd try really hard to, like, find the rules. I think I could sort of get it, but, like, when you were still doing the presentation I could understand it, but when we had to do the written thing, I didn't know what to do!

PI: So because it was oral, it was different for you?

P: Yeah... because I'm not good at orals.

PI: Now did you enjoy the fact that grammar and culture were taught together?

P: Yeah.

PI: Why is that?

P: Because, like, sometimes when... I think when you just have sentences, like of grammar, I don't think it really makes sense, but, like, if you put in culture to it, it sort of makes you remember, like, you know, oh this is more something than this... And then it helps you remember the grammar.

PI: And did you find them interesting? The cultural topics, what did you like about them?

P: I liked how you introduced, like, sort of different regions and stuff. I thought that was interesting.

PI: Great! So every week, as far as the grammar was concerned, we alternated between two different approaches to teach grammar. So before I explain to you, did you notice anything different between the two, any differences between the two approaches, from one week to the next?

P: Two approaches?

PI: We did it slightly two different ways from one week to the next. So I am wondering if you noticed or just went along with it.

P: When just you came? No! (laugh)

PI: I will explain what we did. One week I used a guided inductive approach. That means that you practice first through examples. You have students go through a series of examples and then you show them model sentences and you ask them questions so they can try and discover for themselves how it functions, what the rule is. Other weeks, I would come in and show you the model examples and I would tell you this is what it is and then we would do the practice examples. Does that sound familiar? That's called a deductive approach, rules first and then practice. Is there an approach that you think you learn better with in general? Rules first or examples first?

P: I think for me it helps me if I, like, hear the explanation first and then go through the examples, just because, like, I think I'm not really an aggressive learner, I'm sort of passive. So like, I learn what other people tell me and so, like, I can't really figure something out for myself, I'm not that smart! So... I think it helps me more if it's explained, like, just a little bit before we go through and then, practicing with examples to sort of reinforce it, sort of like in the book. Although the book is boring.

PI: What do you find boring?

P: I don't know like ... I like it when it's, like, explained with, like, words, like, spoken words better.

PI: Not in like some grammatical language?

P: Yeah.

PI: And so what are the advantages or disadvantages of learning rules first and then practicing?

P: I guess, like, I know it's happened to me in high school because the teacher would always go through the rule and then we would do the practice, is like, when you learn the rule, you just like... Like sometimes I do this, if it's like a verb form, I just fill in the verb. I don't even really read the sentence. So I guess that's not really that good. But then the advantage is, you know, like, I guess you know what you're doing.

PI: So now what about learning with examples first. What would be advantages or disadvantages of that approach?

P: The advantage would be, like, you use your thinking to try to figure out what it is so you're always, like, actively thinking. But then, the disadvantage is like sometimes I don't know what I'm doing, so...

PI: It could be confusing?

P: Yeah.

PI: Do you feel that there is one approach that might help focusing on the cultural content, on meaning, more than the other?

P: The cultural content?

PI: Yes.

P: Oh I would probably say examples first because then, like, you understand the examples. So then, like... Because I feel that even if you didn't know the culture before, like, when the culture was taught to you, you would sort of understand it and you would sort of relate that to how the grammar is structured. So I think that would help you learn.

PI: So the cultural context you're saying is kind of helping remember the....

P: Yeah... Easier because I think, especially because, like, you put pictures and stuff and, like, I'm sort of a visual person so I remember the pictures so that helped me, like, remember the cultural aspect.

PI: And the grammar too?

P: More the culture.

PI: So the cultural context does not really help remembering grammatical forms?

P: I feel like, for me, I have to see the grammar in words. Yeah.

PI: More written? Can you elaborate?

P: I think ... it's just, like, for me I think, like sometimes... I don't really like... I'm not really that good at understanding French, I don't think, like, when people just speak it. Because, like, sometimes I can't tell when a word ends and when another word starts. So, like, when you're speaking... When like... When like I hear speaking, I don't really know like specific whole grammar rules, like "en" or like "dans." I might think that "en" is like "dans" like "in"... I don't know.

PI: But if it's written then it's easier?

P: Yeah! It makes it more clear what it is.

PI: Do you have any other comments about those lessons, grammar wise, culture wise?

P: I liked it!

PI: Thank you so much for coming, I really appreciate it.

Participant E

ID: 02/11/89/66209

Section B

December 8, 2010 2pm

PI: First I have a couple of general questions and then, we will talk more about what I did. What was your general impression of French 201, with regards to grammar instruction?

P: It more like a review for me. It was good because I hadn't taken French for a while, so it was kind of good to see all these things, and relearn.

PI: This was your first college French course?

P: Yeah, my first college French class.

PI: How many years in high school did you take?

P: All four years.

PI: Good. Was it different than what you were used to in high school?

P: I mean, it was like the same grammatical things we studied, but kind of in a different way.

PI: How did you study in high school?

P: In high school, I think they did it... It went slower. I guess we spent more time on each one, but I guess... I mean that's kind of how it works in high school.

PI: So was the material rather a review?

P: It was about the same.

PI: And what about culture instruction this semester? Did you learn anything about culture this semester? Was it different than before?

P: Oh yeah. We did, like... A lot of stuff we learned this semester, I hadn't learned about before, like, all the different restaurants and food, and all the islands... basically almost everything we learned was new to me.

PI: I am not saying necessarily with me but in general.

P: Oh... but yeah, we had never done... Like the last thing we did was Morocco. We had never gone over that before, like, all that stuff was new to me.

PI: And when you were in high school, and even this semester, were grammar and culture taught together ever, or...?

P: A little bit but not too much.

PI: Now what did you think about the grammar lessons I taught you this semester in your class this semester?

P: They didn't... It was kind of hard to follow because you just kind of went pretty quickly and didn't really explain what was going on. It was more just kind of like saying this is the sentence but not really saying this is how it's formed, this is why it's formed.

PI: What did you think about the fact that I tried to teach you grammar in the cultural context?

P: Oh I enjoyed it because you can kind of see, like, how it fits into, like, a real world-situation instead of like the usual grammar where it's like oh your sister... Whatever... But when you see it in a really world context, it kind of draws more connections. I did enjoy that.

PI: Did it make it more complicated to focus?

P: A little bit more complicated because it was hard. I mean you were trying to focus on more things at once, but it was also more interesting. But it might have been harder to follow everything all at the same time.

PI: What did you like about them?

P: The pictures, the visuals to go with it were very, very helpful to see.

PI: Do you see any disadvantages or advantages to trying to teach grammar and culture together like that?

P: I guess it's just kind of hard to try and focus on both at the same time. Because if you're trying to learn the grammar, like, you want to focus on learning the grammar, as opposed to, like, trying to get the grammar down but then also learn the culture at the same time. It might be hard to remember, like, what the culture part is if you're trying to focus on the structure.

PI: Now I don't know if you noticed, and I'll explain afterwards, but each week when I came in to teach you the grammar lessons, we alternated between two different approaches with regards to rule explanation. Did you notice anything different from one week to the next?

P: Sometimes I did notice... I couldn't tell how often it switched or when it would switch... but I could tell there were two different...

PI: We alternated every week. So what was different? What did you notice that was different?

P: I mean... I remember being like this is different than last week but...

PI: So one week I would use an approach that's called guided inductive. That means that you start with examples. You have students go through a series of examples and then, you show them model sentences with blanks and you asked them questions to... so you can try to discover how the structure works, more on your own, with me asking questions. And other weeks, I would come and I would give you model examples and I would tell you this what it is and this is how it works and then, we would practice with examples. Sounds familiar?

P: Yeah, it does.

PI: And this is called a deductive approach: rule explanation by the teacher and then practice. Now do you feel like you learned better with one or the other?

P: Maybe the one where you told us what it was and then we did the examples. I think it was easier for everyone, at least for me, to follow.

PI: Why do think it made it easier for you?

P: Because I kind of knew what you were looking for in the answers, and what we were... How we were supposed to respond. It made it easier.

PI: Could you tell me if you think that there could be disadvantages to that approach, or other advantages?

P: Maybe... If people didn't understand the rule... Maybe... I can't...

PI: Do you see advantages to the other approach, to learning through examples first, or disadvantages?

P: Disadvantages to doing the examples first might be like if you didn't know how to do it, you're just kind of stuck because you're trying to figure out an example but you don't know how to, you know, do it correctly.

PI: Might be confusing?

P: Yeah.

PI: Do you think that there was one approach that was more helpful for you to focus on the cultural information, did that help you?

P: I think when you go over the rule, like, when you told us what it was first, it kind of gave us an idea of what we were doing. So I already had an idea of the grammar. Then, when we went through the culture, it wasn't so much like, trying to figure out what the grammar we were trying to learn was.

PI: It felt less like two things at the same time?

P: Yeah.

PI: Do you think that having the grammar taught in a cultural context... Do you think that it helped you remember the grammar at all?

P: Well, I remember that, like, on the test the next day I always had problems remembering so...

PI: On the writing?

P: Yeah... It could be helpful, but I think it was a little more difficult to try and do both at the same time. Maybe if I could spend one day doing grammar and then the next day doing culture and then the third day combining them, it would have been easier.

PI: Do you have any other comments about the lessons?

P: Not really. I mean the second day was always harder trying to remember the sentences.

PI: What was harder?

P: It was like... There was just, I mean, I could always, like... I couldn't remember what we had gone over since it was at the beginning of the class and we would go do other stuff with L. and then come back the next day and, like, have to write five sentences. And trying to remember, like, what was the rule and how do we use the sentences, like, the right way.

PI: So you feel that regardless of the approach it was hard the next day?

P: Yeah.

PI: Was the fact that all the lessons, all the work that we did, was mostly oral work, oral practice...

P: I think that was also... Like... When you see it written up or take time to write it up on the board, it might make it easier, like, to interact with the students. It might have been easier, instead of just going through it and just reading it out loud and repetition. Like, saying it back after you might not have been the easiest way to learn it.

PI: For you writing helps more?

P: Yeah I am more of a visual person.

PI: Well thank you very much for coming.

Participant # F

ID: 06/21/91/01982

Section A

December 9, 2009, 1:30pm.

PI: The first couple of questions are going to be more general and then we will talk about...

P: They are not in French, are they?

PI: No, no, in English!

P: I was like, oh God! (laugh)

PI: What was your general impression of grammar instruction in 201, in general?

P: Including you and MK?

PI: Excluding me for now. In general, what you did this semester. Was it new, was it challenging, was it different than what you were used to doing in high school? What did you think about it?

P: I had actually learned all of the structures, or most of the structures before. This year was kind of a review for me, which was nice. I wasn't expecting that though because

there's not a placement test for French so they were like, just place yourself! And I was like ok... And I chose the one that seemed like it would work. But it was good because now, I feel like I fully understand everything that I learned in the past. So it's nice to have a year where it, like, instills in my brain more.

PI: How many years of French did you have?

P: I've been taking it since seventh grade and my parents are fluent.

PI: Was the teaching here different than it was in high school?

P: My teacher was younger! (laugh) But besides that, it was kind of the same method. Like she would go over the structure and the grammar and then we would do exercises and we would all speak aloud. So it was good. For me it's the best way that works.

PI: Good! Do you like grammar?

P: Yeah! (laugh)

PI: Why?

P: Well I mean... I think it's useful for writing. It's something that doesn't come all that naturally to me, in speaking at least, like, I can do it on tests and exams just because I've memorized it, but in speaking, if someone asks me to like speak in the subjunctive, I really couldn't do it. But yeah, I mean, it's like anything else, any other subject, it's part of learning a language.

PI: And what did you think about culture in general in French 201?

P: I love French culture! I want to major in anthropology, like, I'm big into different cultures and people. So learning about French culture was good.

PI: Do you feel like you learned a lot of culture?

P: Yeah I have. I was born in France, so I go back a lot. My parents go back every year.

PI: Are you a French citizen?

P: No, because you're only French if you live there for more than a year and we moved out when I was nine months. But we go back every year. And I love Marie Antoinette, it's a weird obsession of mine... So yeah, I love French culture, so that was fun!

PI: What did you think about the grammar lessons that I taught in your class?

P: I thought they were good.

PI: Was it new material, was it...

P: I mean... We only learned it for a day, or a few minutes, so it didn't really stick in my brain as much as going over things with MK. But that's because it was just like quickly taught. But I thought they were good.

PI: What did you think about the fact that the grammar was presented in a cultural context?

P: I liked that. For me, it made it more interesting. Because, like, usually when people teach grammar, it's more in like a math setting. You kind of go okay, you take this stem and you add this ending and it is used here. But when it's in a cultural setting, it makes it more engaging and interesting, for me at least.

PI: What did you like in the presentations?

P: I liked the food! And I liked the things about Easter.

PI: Was it the pictures?

P: The pictures and it's like the information was interesting too!

PI: Good! So you said it was more engaging. What would be other advantages, or disadvantages of trying to include both grammar and culture together?

P: Well... For me, it's an advantage to have culture because, for me, it keeps it in my mind better, like, what I've learned because it's also... It's not just memorizing facts. It's like putting it into a context that I will remember. But for a lot of people, I'm sure it can be distracting when they're trying to focus on grammar, they're also trying to learn the culture. And so I'm sure for some people it's confusing... Too much information. But for me, it works.

PI: Now maybe you have noticed but when I taught you grammar this semester, we alternated every week between two different approaches, with regards to like rule explanations. Did you notice anything different?

P: I think I did... Well maybe I'm wrong but I kind of remember some days you would teach it first and then we would do exercises and other times, you would kind of have us pick out what the changes were in the grammar.

PI: Yes, absolutely. When you start with examples first and then you show students model sentences and ask them questions to help them figure out how it works, it's called a guided inductive approach, to help them try to understand after you've showed them how it's used.

P: Yeah.

PI: And then the other approach is when you teach rules first and then you practice, it's called a deductive approach, teacher explanation and then practice. Now do you think that there's one or the other that... which one works best for you?

P: For me I learn better when the teacher explains something first and then I review the material and I do my own problems after.

PI: Why do you think that is?

P: I don't know, it's only in French and math that it's that way for me.

PI: But they are very similar.

P: Yeah and so it's the same for me in math. I like the teacher to explain it and then once I understand the concept, to do problems so it like instills in my brain. But like, when I'm reading a book or something about like English or History or anything, I don't need the teacher explaining that to me because that comes more naturally to me. So I can quickly understand that. But so I guess it's more of the left brain or right brain approach... One of the two... Just the way that I'm built.

PI: Could you tell me a little more about what you think would be advantages or disadvantages of learning rules first and then practicing?

P: I think learning rules first... It doesn't have... It's just like the kids just memorize the facts rather than... Well I mean, for me, I memorize it and then I fully understand it, but then I'm sure for some kids, they memorize it but they don't fully understand it and then later they forget it or, like, on a test or something they become more confused because they weren't the ones first figuring it out themselves and then applying it. But I think it's just for different brain types, for different people.

PI: Any advantages or disadvantages to learning through examples first and then discovering the rule?

P: Yeah. I mean, I'm sure there are. Just for me it doesn't work as well. So like, I guess it's an advantage to other brain people but I'm not that type of person. For me, it doesn't work.

PI: When we did the lessons, do you feel that you could focus more on the cultural information when we did the examples first or was it easier for you to focus on the information after I explained you the grammar rule? Did that make a difference?

P: I don't really feel like it made a difference because I feel like once I kind of got the... kind of grasped the grammar that was going on, it was easy for me to focus on the culture. So I guess, yeah, it didn't really make a difference to me.

PI: Do you think that having the grammar presented in a cultural context, regardless of the approach, do you think it helped you remember it?

P: Yeah, I think I did. I forget now which tense it was but it's like the "en passant..."

PI: Gerundive...

P: Yeah. I remember... I don't remember the exact picture now but I remember when we were doing the test after, I was like I honestly have no idea what's going on but I remember so and so picture, so like I could kind of remember how to do it. But I remember images better than I do, like, words.

PI: So was the fact that the work we did was mostly oral work, with a few written examples, was that challenging? Versus giving you a written activity and telling you let's look at these examples together. Was that challenging for you?

P: I probably would have done better if I had been given a hand out and I could have read it myself and gone over it, or, like, read it with the class. But I mean they both still work. I just think I would have understood it better if I had gotten a hand out.

PI: Do you have any other comments about those particular lessons, the different approaches?

P: No. It was fun! Well it's always nice switching up the teacher, like, I love MK but sometimes it's nice just having a different approach to things. And yeah, it was nice learning about culture. Well in middle school we didn't learn that much about culture, we learned a lot of vocab and grammar and in high school we focused more on culture, so it was nice to do both of those together.

PI: Was it taught separately before?

P: It was taught, like... They both would be in the same unit but we wouldn't be learning how to use the grammar in a cultural context like you taught us. It was like here is the subjunctive and here is something about Versailles. It's just a different approach. I like both! I just like culture! For me, anything that includes culture I get happy!

PI: Well thank you very much for answering my questions!

Participant G
ID: 02/O4/91/70115
Section A
December 9, 2009, 3pm

PI: The first couple of questions are going to be more general and then we will talk more about the project I did. But first, just tell me what your general impression of grammar instruction in French 201, in general?

P: In class or with the project?

PI: In general, in class.

P: In general, I thought it was kind of different from what I was used to usually. When I had done grammar in the past, it's... You'd get a workbook and you probably had to do exercises before. I think, like, what we did is we would do the exercises before and learn them on our own, and like, try to learn them on our own, and then we'd go to class the next day and the teacher would teach us. Whereas in 201, I feel like it was more, like, you have a *PowerPoint* and it has something to do, like, with a movie or a cultural aspect, and then you learn grammar while learning about another culture or something. It was a different style.

PI: Was it your first French college class?

P: Yeah, I've taken it since kinder garden.

PI: How were you taught before in high school?

P: High school was pretty much the standard, write on the board or, you know, you are doing workbook exercises.

PI: What about culture this semester in 201, learning culture, not just with me but in general?

P: I don't think we... Well actually... Yeah... We had readings. So the readings from the textbook, there was a lot of cultural things, as far as, you know, learning about Morocco, how they don't use as much technology or, you know, learning about Cajuns, which I already kind of knew because I'm from New Orleans. But I mean, you get some cultural aspects. I didn't start learning about cultural things, as far as high school goes, until last year. That's... Like my French class was all about culture. I don't know if you... I guess it's a book called *La France Contemporaine*, and it's all about how France is broken into regions and departments and so, I mean, I kind of learned some cultural things but...

PI: Now what did you think about the grammar lessons that I taught in your class?

P: I actually really liked them, I just thought they were really fast paced. Of course you only have a short period of time but I thought, like, if it was in a normal class structure, it would be, like, really interesting, like, keep you engaged while learning the grammar topics.

PI: What did you like about them?

P: I'm a visual person so like... I really don't... I just I don't necessarily like to see somebody stand up there and talk. So if they're going to talk, I need to see some kind of visual. Because it's interactive at the same time, so ok, you learn about some country but you're also learning this new grammar kind of stuff that you didn't know before.

PI: Did you enjoy learning grammar and culture at the same time or was it difficult to focus on both? How did you feel about that?

P: At first I would just focus on the grammar, just like on the set of grammar. And then once I learned that, I could focus on the culture. I couldn't really do it at the same time because then... I went like, ok well I remember this about the culture but what was the grammar concept that was being taught? I would forget.

PI: But you liked having both of them together?

P: Yeah I did. It was more engaging definitely.

PI: Now each week when I came in and taught you grammar, we alternated between two different approaches, with regards to rule explanation. Before I explain to you, did you notice anything different from one week to the next?

P: Huh....

PI: We flip-flopped every week...

P: I think... We did one thing slightly different? The only thing I noticed that was different was like the different... I noticed the worksheets changed like the exercises... Because at first you said just do the sheet where they would, I guess, you were given a sentence and you had to, like, put the grammar together and on the back it was like you trying to answer questions. And then all of sudden, I remember me starting doing those sheets where we were creating the sentences.

PI: Oh yes, that was the second day (the day after). But I will explain. I used two different approaches. One is called guided inductive and so on those days, I came to the class, we went through a series of examples, we started with the examples in the cultural context and at the end, I showed you model sentences with blanks and I asked you questions to help you try to figure out how that was working. And the other approach is called deductive and when I did that, I came in and I showed you model examples on the

PowerPoint, no blanks, and I told you this is what it is and this how it works and then, we went on and went over the examples. Sounds familiar?

P: Wait so what was the first one?

PI: The first one was examples first and on the last slide of the PowerPoint you had blanked model sentences...

P: I thought we had that on everyone. I guess I just...

PI: It just seemed almost the same to you?

P: Yeah...

PI: So if I ask you how you like to learn, with rules first and then practice or examples first and then sort of figuring it out on your own?

P: It depends. I feel like for more difficult grammar concepts, I would probably want the rules first and then do examples, but if it's like something simple such as... What was something we learned that was really simple? I think that we did... I guess like "lequel" and those types... I felt like that was something you can catch onto quickly. Then that worked as far as doing examples first and then getting explained to you afterwards.

PI: And why do you think it might be easier with more complicated structures? What would be the advantages of learning the rules first... or disadvantages?

P: Well... Learn the rules first, to me, it's like you're already... It means you won't have... Sometimes when you're trying to learn, like, something by yourself, you don't necessarily learn it correctly. So when you get the rules first, you already know how things are supposed to work and you can apply them. And so, like, for things that are more difficult, that have like more structure, that have more rules to them, like, you might want to have the rules first. But for things that are less structured, where you can really just catch onto them quickly, of course just go over examples because that's going to help you remember them more easily.

PI: Good. Do you think that either one approach was more helpful, or can be more helpful, to focus on the content, on the information? Was one or the other easier for you to catch on, to understand the cultural information that was given?

P: Probably the approach... The one where you kind of learn on your own, and then... Where you get examples... I think that one worked best as far as trying to learn the cultural aspects.

PI: Why might that be?

P: Because it's... I guess because you're already... You're going through examples, the examples are already there. I don't think you're creating. I guess the other approach you're filling in, right? As far as filling in what's missing. It's already there. I feel like if you're trying to learn while trying to fill in something, you're going to be focusing on trying to fill in whatever grammar concept you're doing, not only trying to figure out, like, also try to learn, like, oh what's the cultural thing going on.

PI: Were these grammar structures new to you, were they review?

P: They were pretty much review.

PI: But so do you think that having them taught in a cultural context helped you remember them better than a traditional grammar exercise let's say?

P: I think for the most part because they had a theme to them. So... Usually grammar exercises... It's kind of like these random sentences put together. Whereas if there's like a central theme to whatever you're learning, I can like, ok... I can remember when we had this sentence we were learning about Luxembourg, or something. I remember this sentence from...

PI: Belgium.

P: Oh Belgium right! (Laugh)... We learned about Belgium. We did learn about Martinique too, right? Was that the same presentation?

PI: We did two, two different presentations.

P: But yeah like I guess it's easier to remember the concept, like, ok, this week we did a presentation on Martinique and I remember when we had a sentence like this one. I don't know you just connect it more easily.

PI: Good! Do you have any other comments about grammar or culture in these lessons? Was it more of a challenge or not for you that most of the work we did was mostly oral? That the presentations of the grammar and culture were done orally, with the PowerPoint, but still in an oral activity?

P: A little bit because for me, like, French... Even if I have been taking it for a while, I'm still more of a read-write... I don't know I'm just better at reading and writing French than like actually speaking or listening to it. So I can understand... Like the first time, when you first introduced the presentation, I was like what is going on, but after a couple of examples, I finally understood. It's a little difficult at first, but I think it's a good thing because you have to develop those skills sometime.

PI: Any other comments?

P: No.

PI: Thank you very much for coming!

Participant H
 ID: 04/18/90/30904
 Section C
 December 10, 2010 11am

PI: I am just going to ask you some general questions and then more questions about what I did in your class.

P: Ok!

PI: So just from a general perspective, what was your impression of grammar instruction in French 201?

P: I thought there was a pretty significant amount of grammar. I've never been, like, good at it, you know, I've always been good at like the tenses and stuff like that, like that's my thing. But the grammar... It was... I mean, like, I thought the way it was taught was very structured, you know, being introduced. And, you know, most of the, you know, pronouns, the masculine singular, the feminine singular... I felt like it was very structured the way you learned it and stuff like that. And I felt like we worked it into the stories that we read in the book and stuff like that, and, you know, if we wrote, you know, a composition, like, trying to use this or try to use that. I felt like...

PI: Was it new material for you? You took French 101 and 102 right?

P: I took 102, I didn't take 101.

PI: Did you take French in high school?

P: Yeah I took three years of French in high school. But the third year wasn't...

PI: So was it new material for the most part for you in 201 or more revision?

P: A lot of the grammar stuff I had seen before but I had not necessarily been taught, you know, like, specifically. But a lot of it we did do in 102, like "celui" all that stuff... And then the "ce," "cette," you know, all those things. I guess those are the things I just have the most trouble with because you have to remember when to use them and things like that. But most of the other stuff was familiar and I think the only thing that we didn't really cover in 102 as far as material-wise was maybe the subjunctive. But other than that...

PI: What about culture in French 201? What was your impression about culture instruction?

P: I felt like we learned culture through like the stories that we read, especially... I know one of the things that I really remember is... We read a story about this Muslim guy, just like, culture over there. And then one of the big things was War World II and that was just like, really, you know, reading letters from, like, loved ones or people's perspectives and reading stories about it. I think that was about the two biggest things that I remember. And so through the stories I think we learned more about the culture. And I think it helped, you know, reading the stories and having something to pull and then just discussing it, ok what happened and, you know, what effect would this have today and, you know, stuff like that. I think that's how the cultural aspect... I liked the way that was integrated versus just like lectures, like, this happened this day and this happened this day.

PI: Now what did you think about the grammar lessons I taught in your class?

P: I thought some of them... Ok, I thought some of them were, like, you know, went along with some of the stuff we were doing in class, but other times, I was kind of like ok... I was kind of lost. But a lot of the stuff that you taught us, like, it was interesting so I was like ok, maybe I want to ask a question about it, but that's kind of irrelevant to what we were doing and so... I don't know, like, what other lines were you thinking?

PI: Were those grammar points new to you? Also revisions?

P: Oh no no! The stuff that you taught was totally new. I didn't know a lot of that stuff. Especially, like, the thing with "dont" and the passive form, I hadn't seen that before. So a lot was new.

PI: Did you enjoy the fact that I tried to teach you those lessons through a cultural theme?

P: I don't know. Like the culture... Like I feel like I couldn't focus on both at once and so, like, I didn't know... I guess I didn't really realize that you were trying to teach us both at once until like further into the semester. I was just focused on the grammar, the tenses part, like, that's the only thing I focused on. I don't even know why! Like, every time, especially, you do a couple sentences, do some examples and then we talk about the culture but like the sentences we used, like, with the culture, like, I never paid attention to any specifics of the sentence except the part that I thought... I guess because I thought they we were being taught that specific part, like it was underlined or something like that...

PI: They were!

P: I guess the culture was like subliminally, you know, like, stuck in there. So for some reason, I just didn't pay any attention to it. And then, I guess, what it came down to was well I have to choose one so I'll chose the grammar and stuff like that.

PI: You felt like you had to choose what to focus your attention on?

P: Yeah! I felt like I couldn't focus on both of them... Or maybe... I don't know... If I probably tried I could. And then I'm really good with like visuals, and like, if I see it... Like if you say the sentences and we see the sentence and repeat it, and then... Ok that works. But if you just say it and like, you say a sentence, you have us repeat it or answer it, and so, you know, we'd be like yeah... We had the first half of it and like mumbled in the middle and then, like, we'd get the verb or whatever it is we're supposed to get.

PI: Were the visuals helping you in any way grasping the information?

P: Oh yeah the visuals definitely helped. Especially when we were answering the questions. You know you had like "vin blanc" and you have the country or something like that, and you ask us the question it's like ok... This you associate it with the answer. But I definitely paid more attention to the grammar stuff than the...

PI: Is that what interests you most in learning a language in general or was it just because...?

P: I don't know I guess because when I think about, like, the language in general, I don't know if it's... I don't know... I guess, I don't know if it's, like, as important to learn the cultural aspect in order to be, like, good at speaking the language and understanding the language and stuff like that. I mean... I understand that there are like phrases and, you know, idiomatic expressions and things like that and through, you know, cultural awareness you understand those better. But just as far as the basics of the language and being able to speak it efficiently, I don't know if that's as important.

PI: So for you, you don't necessarily want to have grammar and culture integrated?

P: Oh yeah, it's fine if it's separate! I mean if it's integrated, like, it doesn't bother me or anything, but I just feel like if the purpose is to teach culture, then the stories, they just worked a whole lot better with that. And then, as far as like the grammar and the sentences and stuff like that, those kinds of examples, PowerPoint and all that stuff, that worked a lot better with that. For me, it's just, you know, I guess how I learn or whatever.

PI: Now did you notice that every week, we alternated between two different approaches to teach grammar, to learn grammar, with regards to rule elaboration or explanations. Did you notice anything?

P: I don't think I did. I can't remember... Oh no! The only thing that I recall was like the PowerPoint, and like you'd introduce it, we'd have a PowerPoint and then you know we answered the questions using the new sentence structure or whatever it was that we learned. But I don't know that I saw differences in like the ways that you did it.

PI: Ok I will explain. Some weeks, every other week, we used what's called a guided inductive approach, meaning that we started with the examples, the activity and then

P: Oh ok...

PI: And then at the end, I showed you model sentences with the blanks and I asked you questions to try and help you understand how it functions, how it works.

P: Oh versus just like introducing and then just... Ok.

PI: And then yes, other weeks, showing you model examples, explaining to you what it was and then doing the activity.

P: Ok, ok. It does sound familiar.

PI: Do you feel that there's an approach that fits you better, that helps you learn better?

P: I don't know I guess it's like they're both... I think they're both effective because when you introduce... I'll take the subjunctive... In introducing it, you know, you introduce the rule and when you use it like "*il est certain que*," you know, the phrases that you use subjunctive with versus the ones you use indicative with and then, you know, the differences among the two and then you see the sentences and oh ok I'm looking for this, and so, you know what to look for and so that works as well. But when you start off with the sentences, and you kind of figure this out, you see like a pattern, then I guess it's like self discovery: ok, I'm noticing this pattern and now let's go back ... And oh now this makes a lot more sense and so... I guess the second approach where you just like jump in there, I guess that's helpful in like it helps you, like, think. The student has to do more thinking about it and then just making the connections. I think that may be a little more helpful in the long term just because, you know, through trial and error you remember things more than if it's just given to you, this sort of thing. So I guess that would be... I mean, I think they're both effective but I just feel like because you have to think about it and let's just say you get it wrong and you say oh, now I understand, so I guess it kind of helps that way.

PI: Do you see any disadvantages to either one of the approaches?

P: I don't know that I see any disadvantages. I mean the first one is, you know, just very straightforward. It just gives you an idea of what to look for in a sentence like, you know, the mot clé, keys words, and things like that. And with the second one... No I don't think there really are disadvantages... I guess it just depends on the person, different people learn different ways so...

PI: And do you think that, I don't know because you said you weren't really paying attention to the culture, but do you think that with one approach it was easier to focus on the meaning, the cultural information?

P: I felt like... I feel like if we were to do this like now, for like the next six weeks, then I would be more aware of it. Because I guess I would just like, you know, ok I'm supposed to be learning this too. And I think that a lot of the times I just didn't focus on it because I didn't know that we were supposed to be like... That that was one of the focuses, I guess. So I don't know which would be better... with the culture.

PI: You know the point was to see if you could remember not everything, but some of the information that was presented, just by being exposed to it, even if it was briefly.

P: I guess because it was like subliminal, then maybe I kind of I like subconsciously got it, a little bit... But I don't know!

PI: So but do you think that having a cultural context to grammar can help you remember better?

P: I guess it can, just because you have like an association of things, you know so you can associate like when we talked about the *voix passive* with this country or when we did this with this group of people. So I guess that could be helpful in that respect.

PI: Did you enjoy the lessons?

P: Yeah I did enjoy the lessons. And so S. was just telling us that a lot of stuff you were covering were things we just didn't have time to cover... Because I realize, and I thought about it, we were moving through this book pretty fast, like after the first two weeks we're on page 200 already but I knew we didn't cover 100 pages worth of information. There was like so much stuff and so... I like the French language.

PI: Do you have any other comments?

P: One of the things... I guess the most difficult thing was when we had to come back on Tuesdays and like S. would give us your worksheet and it would be like write five sentences and it was just like waw waw... This was yesterday! And I don't know... Maybe if I had taken some notes so I could like review... Because a lot of time it was just like... What was the... I know we had to use like the "que" versus the "dont..." I was like damn what was the sentence structure with it? I couldn't remember the specific things that we learned but I could remember, you know, like when to use it or...

PI: Did it force you to think about it?

P: Yeah it definitely did. Because I remembered the *voix passive*. I remembered that and the "ant" like "en marchant" or something like that. I was like ok, when do I use it cause, you know, it was like the day after and you know...

PI: Do you think it would have been easier if it had been the day of the lesson?

P: Oh yeah! It would have been easier because, you know, it was right there. We had just learned it and so it would have been just like a reinforcing kind of deal. And a lot of times, you know, when we'd do the French exercises, we were used to like having an example at the top of the page and so we had that example. And then, like, most the sentences were like different forms of that one example. So we would get the sheet and there was like five blanks and it was like ok... And there was nothing visual to help us see ...

PI: Because it was research... If you give an example you give too much information and you don't see how much students can do it on their own.

P: Yeah, yeah... And usually... Exercises... It's like reform those sentences and the verb is already there, so it's not your own thought. Conjugating is definitely different than forming your own sentences.

PI: Do you have any more comments? Well thank you very much!

Appendix K: First and Second Level Codes for post Study Questionnaire and Interview Data

1. Preference for Grammar Instruction

ACT = class activity
 CONJ = conjugation
 DED= deductive
 DISC= discovering
 EXPL = explanation
 EX = exercise
 IND= inductive
 MEM = memorization
 PPT= power point

REP = repetition
 RUL = rules
 T EX = teacher explanations
 SPEAK = speaking
 UND= understanding
 WKST = worksheet
 WRIT= writing

2. Opinions of Guided Inductive and Deductive Approaches.

ACC= accuracy
 AO= advanced organizer
 APP = application
 BAD = form bad habits
 CONF = confusing
 CONF= confidence
 CONT = context
 CORR = correct
 DIFF = difficult
 DISC = discovery
 EASE= easy
 FIG = figure out
 FORM = formula
 FRUST = frustration
 HAB = habit
 HARD= hard
 HW= how
 INT = intuition
 KNHW= knowing how
 KNWH= knowing when
 LOOK= look for
 MIST = mistake
 NOT= notice
 PATT= patterns
 PRAC = practice
 PREFD= preference for deductive approach
 PREFI= preference for inductive approach
 PREFN=no preference

PPT= Power Point
 RECOG = recognize
 REM = remembering
 STICK = sticks better
 T & E= trial and error
 T EX = teacher explanations
 TIME = time/pace
 THINK = forces you to think
 UNDER = Understand
 WH= when
 WRIT= writing/written activities

3. Perceptions of integration of culture into grammar lessons
- | | |
|--|---|
| ATT=attention/paying attention | INDIF=indifferent |
| CO= cognitive overload | INNOV= innovative lessons |
| CONF=confusion | INT= interesting, build interest |
| CONT= context | PACE= pacing/too fast |
| CONN= connections | PRAC= practice (with culture) |
| DIFF= difficulty | REAL=real-life |
| DIST= distracting | SEP= separate instruction |
| ENG = engaging | SUGG= suggestions |
| FOCUS= focus on lesson/aspect
of lesson | TIME= more time needed/not
enough time |
| FORG= forget | TRAD= traditional |
| GFIRST= teach grammar first | |
4. Learning effects
- ATT=paying attention/focusing
BOR= boring
CHOICE= force to choose
CONF=confusion
CONN= connections
CONT=context
DIFF= difficulty to retain
information/focus
DIST= distracting
EAS= easy
ENG= engaging
ENJ= enjoy
FRUST= frustration
INT= interest
IGN= ignore
LOSS= loss of information
MOT= motivation
NOTICE= noticeability of
grammar structure
ORAL= difficulty with oral
format
PERIPH= peripheral
PRIO= priority
UND= understanding
VIS= visual/seeing
VOCAB= vocabulary
WRITT= written information
(lack of)

TABLES

Table 1

Sample Student Characteristics by Course Section (N = 25)

Characteristics	Section A	Section B	Section C
Gender			
Number of Females	8	4	5
Number of Males	3	2	3
University classification			
Freshmen	8	2	0
Sophomore	3	2	6
Junior	0	1	2
Senior	0	1	0
Years of Experience			
Mean	3.3	4.0	3.0
Standard Deviation	.78	2.34	1.83

Table 2

Grammatical Structures and Associated Cultural Topics

Lessons	Grammatical Structures	Cultural topics
L1	C'est vs. Il est	Immigration et diversité
L2	Passé composé	Trois monuments parisiens
L3	Superlatif	La Gastronomie
L4	Pronoms relatifs QUE et DONT	La Belgique
L5	Pronom relatif LEQUEL	La France et ses régions
L6	Gérondif	La Provence
L7	Voix passive	La Martinique
L8	Subjonctif vs. Infinitif	Quelques fêtes françaises

Table 3

Equivalent Times Sample Design

Structures	Group 1 (sections A and B)	Group 2 (Section c)
1	Guided Inductive	Deductive
2	Deductive	Guided Inductive
3	Guided Inductive	Deductive
4	Deductive	Guided Inductive
5	Guided Inductive	Deductive
6	Deductive	Guided Inductive
7	Guided Inductive	Deductive
8	Deductive	Guided Inductive

Table 4

Grammar and Culture Pretests Means and Standard Deviations (N = 25)

	Section 1 (<i>n</i> = 11)		Section 2 (<i>n</i> = 6)		Section 3 (<i>n</i> = 8)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Grammar	6.64	2.69	8.33	3.44	5.38	2.50
Culture	9.55	3.01	10.33	2.50	11.62	3.29

Table 5

Grammar Pretest and Posttest Items Means and Standard Deviations (N = 25)

Structures	Items	Pretest				Posttest			
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>N</i> =47)*	<i>SD</i> *	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>N</i> =47)*	<i>SD</i> *
S1	1	.16	.37	.17	.38	.12	.33	.19	.40
	12	.08	.27	.09	.28	.16	.37	.17	.38
S2	6	.52	.51	.38	.49	.44	.51	.34	.48
	8	.68	.47	.68	.47	.84	.37	.81	.40
S3	2	.24	.44	.17	.38	.52	.51	.45	.50
	10	.40	.50	.32	.47	.60	.50	.53	.50
S4	5	.36	.49	.30	.46	.56	.51	.62	.49
	7	.40	.50	.43	.50	.60	.50	.51	.51
S5	4	.44	.51	.47	.50	.52	.51	.64	.49
	9	.72	.46	.74	.44	.92	.28	.89	.31
S6	3	.28	.46	.19	.40	.48	.51	.43	.50
	15	.48	.51	.36	.49	.72	.46	.62	.49
S7	13	.40	.50	.34	.48	.48	.51	.45	.50
	16	.28	.46	.26	.44	.50	.51	.49	.51
S8	11	.36	.49	.30	.46	.72	.46	.68	.47
	14	.84	.37	.85	.36	.88	.33	.81	.40

* Item means and standard deviations for all students present for the test (*N* = 47) are provided for comparison purposes.

Table 6

Culture Pretest and Posttest Items Means and Standard Deviations (N = 25)

Lessons	Items	Pretest				Posttest			
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>N</i> =47)*	<i>SD</i> *	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>N</i> =47)*	<i>SD</i> *
1	7	.48	.51	.45	.50	.64	.49	.60	.50
	17	.08	.28	.11	.31	.28	.46	.30	.46
	33	.08	.28	.15	.36	.20	.41	.17	.38
	37	.80	.41	.72	.45	.84	.37	.74	.44
2	8	.40	.50	.38	.49	.60	.50	.57	.50
	15	.12	.33	.13	.33	.40	.50	.40	.50
	28	.32	.48	.36	.49	.32	.48	.26	.44
	31	.72	.46	.64	.49	1	0	.89	.31
3	1	.44	.51	.51	.51	.84	.37	.83	.38
	11	.52	.51	.55	.50	.84	.37	.77	.43
	21	.12	.33	.11	.31	.76	.44	.68	.47
	26	0	0	.06	.25	.32	.48	.26	.44
4	2	.56	.51	.62	.49	.84	.37	.81	.40
	12	.44	.51	.51	.51	.80	.41	.77	.43
	22	.12	.33	.17	.38	.32	.48	.32	.47
	27	.64	.49	.57	.50	.76	.44	.70	.46
5	4	.36	.49	.38	.49	.52	.51	.51	.51
	18	.52	.51	.55	.50	.60	.50	.60	.50
	25	.28	.46	.19	.40	.32	.48	.21	.41
	30	.08	.28	.09	.28	.40	.50	.28	.45
6	6	.08	.28	.13	.34	.20	.41	.21	.41
	23	.28	.46	.21	.41	.24	.44	.26	.44
	24	.32	.48	.28	.45	.60	.50	.53	.50
	34	.36	.49	.36	.49	.56	.51	.57	.50
7	9	.20	.41	.21	.41	.40	.50	.45	.50
	16	.44	.51	.40	.50	.52	.51	.43	.50
	19	.32	.48	.23	.43	.20	.40	.21	.41
	35	.48	.51	.53	.50	.84	.37	.79	.41
8	5	.16	.37	.21	.41	.48	.51	.55	.50
	13	.20	.41	.11	.31	.60	.50	.53	.50
	36	.40	.50	.43	.50	.72	.46	.62	.49
	39	.08	.28	.06	.25	.32	.48	.30	.46

* Item means and standard deviations for all students present for the test (*N* = 47) are provided for comparison purposes.

Table 7

Immediate Grammar Tests Reliability and Item Difficulty (N = 25)

Grammar Tests	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> *	<i>SD</i> *	Full credit	Partial Credit	Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha*
Test 1	1	1.48	.65	1.32	.75	.56	.36	.75	.84 (<i>N</i> = 47)
	2	1.68	.63	1.43	.77	.76	.16		
	3	1.60	.58	1.49	.68	.64	.32		
	4	1.60	.58	1.40	.71	.64	.32		
Test 2	1	1.24	.88	1.17	.92	.52	.20	.36	.52 (<i>N</i> = 41)
	2	1.52	.71	1.34	.79	.64	.24		
	3	1.40	.86	1.29	.93	.64	.12		
	4	1.60	.64	1.44	.77	.68	.24		
Test 3	1	1.68	.56	1.51	.69	.72	.24	.84	.90 (<i>N</i> = 44)
	2	1.68	.56	1.56	.66	.72	.24		
	3	1.88	.33	1.84	.37	.88	.12		
	4	1.64	.57	1.59	.58	.68	.28		
Test 4	1	1.96	.20	1.90	.37	.96	.04	.49	.68 (<i>N</i> = 42)
	2	1.64	.64	1.62	.76	.80	.04		
	3	1.72	.58	1.74	.54	.80	.16		
	4	1.52	.65	1.57	.83	.76	.00		
Test 5	1	1.76	.44	1.68	.56	.76	.24	.62	.86 (<i>N</i> = 47)
	2	1.60	.64	1.45	.77	.68	.24		
	3	1.56	.58	1.43	.74	.60	.36		
	4	1.56	.65	1.36	.73	.64	.28		
Test 6	1	1.64	.64	1.39	.83	.72	.20	.96	.96 (<i>N</i> = 40)
	2	1.68	.56	1.55	.71	.72	.24		
	3	1.71	.54	1.55	.71	.76	.20		
	4	1.64	.64	1.48	.78	.72	.20		
Test 7	1	1.32	.85	1.25	.81	.56	.20	.87	.86 (<i>N</i> = 44)
	2	1.36	.76	1.34	.80	.52	.32		
	3	1.20	.82	1.16	.86	.44	.32		
	4	.84	.75	.84	.78	.20	.44		
Test 8	1	1.60	.64	1.39	.77	.68	.24	.80	.80 (<i>N</i> = 41)
	2	1.48	.82	1.59	.78	.68	.12		
	3	1.48	.65	1.34	.76	.56	.36		
	4	1.56	.65	1.51	.71	.64	.28		

* Immediate grammar tests item means and standard deviations, and tests reliability coefficients for the number of participants present that day are provided for comparison purposes.

Table 8

Immediate Culture Tests Item Difficulty (N = 25)

Culture Tests	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> *	<i>SD</i> *	Full credit	Partial Credit
Test 1	1	1.92	.40	1.83	.56	.96	n/a
	2	1.68	.56	1.43	.72	.72	.24
	3	.48	.87	.51	.88	.24	n/a
	4	1.76	.60	1.62	.71	.84	.08
Test 2	1	.96	1.02	.95	1.01	.48	n/a
	2	1.44	.92	1.60	.81	.72	n/a
	3	1.52	.77	1.62	.71	.68	.16
	4	.76	.88	.75	.84	.28	.20
Test 3	1	1.08	1.02	1.18	.99	.54	n/a
	2	1.25	.99	1.14	1.02	.62	n/a
	3	1.54	.59	1.41	.58	.58	.37
	4	1.33	.82	1.30	.82	.54	.25
Test 4	1	1.84	.55	1.81	.59	.92	n/a
	2	.88	1.01	.81	.99	.44	n/a
	3	1.44	.82	1.40	.83	.64	.16
	4	1.20	.91	1.33	.85	.52	.16
Test 5	1	.96	1.02	.89	1.00	.48	n/a
	2	1.52	.87	1.49	.88	.76	n/a
	3	1.24	.78	1.28	.74	.44	.36
	4	1.16	.85	1.17	.84	.44	.28
Test 6	1	1.20	1.00	1.05	1.01	.60	n/a
	2	.40	.82	.45	.85	.20	n/a
	3	1.16	.80	1.22	.83	.40	.36
	4	.76	.72	.87	.76	.16	.44
Test 7	1	.88	1.01	.98	1.01	.44	n/a
	2	1.68	.75	1.58	.82	.84	n/a
	3	1.00	.41	1.05	.93	.08	.84
	4	1.68	.69	1.58	.76	.80	.08
Test 8	1	1.44	.92	1.22	.99	.72	n/a
	2	.96	1.02	.93	1.01	.48	n/a
	3	1.12	.73	1.17	.74	.32	.48
	4	1.12	.67	1.15	.69	.28	.56

* Immediate culture tests items means and standard deviations for the number of participants present that day are provided for comparison purposes (The *N*s are identical to the immediate grammar tests).

Table 9

Paired t Test Results for the Immediate Grammar Tests (N = 25)

Approach	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	Power
Guided Inductive	81.88	13.01	2.28	.46	.59
Deductive	74.25	18.54			

* p = .032

Table 10

Paired t Test Results for the Writing Tasks (N = 14)

Approach	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Power</i>
Guided Inductive	46.07	19.68	-.48	.09	.06
Deductive	49.11	25.73			

Table 11

Paired t Test Results for the Writing Tasks (N = 22)

Approach	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Power</i>
Guided Inductive	44.92	17.37	-.09	.01	.05
Deductive	45.42	24.18			

Table 12

Correlations between Performance on the Immediate Grammar Tests and Writing Tasks

Structures	Grammar (Maximum score =8)			Writing (Maximum score =10)			<i>r</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	
1	6.38	1.85	25	5.08	3.09	24	.37
2	5.76	1.83	25	4.05	2.28	22	.71**
3	6.88	1.69	25	4.67	3.09	24	.17
4	6.88	1.62	25	2.50	2.62	24	-.30
5	6.48	1.61	25	4.54	3.68	24	.33
6	6.68	2.25	25	5.60	3.85	25	.47*
7	4.80	2.75	25	3.38	2.44	24	.70**
8	6.12	2.20	25	6.53	2.55	17	.43

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 13

Grammar Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations (N = 25)

Approach	Pretest		Posttest	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Guided Inductive	2.92	.32	4.32	.32
Deductive	3.80	.39	4.80	.22

Table 14

ANOVA results Grammar (N=25)

Source	df	SS	MS	F	η^2
Time	1	36.00	36.00	18.00*	.42
Error	24	48.00	2.00		
Approach	1	11.56	11.56	3.41	.42
Error	24	81.44	3.39		
Time x Approach	1	1	1	.25	.20
Error	24	17	.71		

* $p < .001$

Table 15

Paired t-Test Results for the Immediate Culture Tests (N =25)

Approach	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>Power</i>
Guided Inductive	60.12	16.02	.60	.12	.08
Deductive	62.50	14.09			

Table 16

Culture Pretest and Posttest Means Scores and Standard Deviations (N =25)

Approach	Pretest		Posttest	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Guided Inductive	5.28	2.13	8.60	2.47
Deductive	5.12	2.22	8.68	2.44

Table 17

ANOVA Results Culture (N =25)

Source	df	SS	MS	F	η^2
Time	1	295.84	295.84	118.02*	.83
Error	24	60.16	2.51		
Approach	1	.04	.04	.008	.00
Error	24	119.96	4.99		
Time x Approach	1	.36	.36	.106	.004
Error	1	81.64	3.40		

* p < .001