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Abstract

This study is designed to investigate the effect of sequencing instruction on form and function on the learning of a problematic French grammatical feature by Grade 11 French immersion (FI) students. The impetus for the study derives from research indicating a need to improve FI students' grammatical skills, and from my personal experience as a French immersion teacher. The experimental materials consist of mechanical, meaningful and communicative drills and are designed to provide students with opportunities to focus first on the forms of the passé composé and imparfait and subsequently on their functions (aspectual meaning). Isolating forms from context initially, and then moving to teaching the function/use of the two aspects allows learners to focus on one thing at a time and takes into consideration learners' limited attentional capacity. Mechanical drills focus on linguistic forms isolated from context and provide students with opportunities to practise the target forms (verb conjugation, correct auxiliary, correct past participle and correct agreement) to the extent of memorization and eventually automatization. Meaningful and communicative drills focus on function (as it arises in meaningful contexts) and provide students with opportunities to learn the aspectual distinction between the passé composé and imparfait and to use the target verb forms in context.
The experimental materials were implemented in a Grade 11 FI classroom by the researcher over a period of 6 weeks. In a pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest design, the experimental group was compared with two other Grade 11 groups who did not receive the experimental treatment. Statistical analyses, with adjustment made for pretest scores, indicated that where there were differences in performance, they favoured the experimental group. This study is the first in a French as a second language context to use sequencing instruction on form and function in an attempt to improve FI students' linguistic accuracy in written production. Generalizability of findings is, however, limited due to small sample size and further research is required.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. The purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of sequencing instruction on form and function on the learning of the forms and functions of the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* by grade eleven French immersion students. Instruction on form conforms to the structural-analytic component in Allen's (1983) curriculum model, and refers to explicit teaching of the forms of the *passé composé* and *imparfait* (verb conjugation, choice of auxiliary, correct past participle, and agreement) isolated from context. Instruction on function conforms to a functional-analytic approach as advocated by Allen (1983), Stern (1990, 1992) and Harley (1989) (see chapter 2), and refers to teaching the use or function of the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* in appropriate and meaningful contexts with particular emphasis on differences in aspectual meaning (see chapter 4). (The terms function and use will appear interchangeably throughout the study).

The purpose of sequencing instruction on form and function in this study is to first direct students' attention to the targeted forms only, instead of attending to form and function at the same time. As VanPatten (1990) argued, learners have limited attentional capacity and, if they have to concentrate mostly on informational content and on learning that content, they do not have enough attention left to also concentrate on language forms. The type of instruction used in this study with the experimental group involves two consecutive steps with respect to the *passé composé* and *imparfait*: 1- a focus on form through systematic instruction of grammatical concepts, routine practice and drill
exercises, and dictation (see chapter 3). 2-a focus on function where the rules and conjugation patterns taught are applied in meaningful contexts.

My interest in this question is motivated by several years of teaching in French immersion both at the elementary and the secondary levels. Despite many years of classroom exposure to French and meaningful communication, many immersion students fail to master some linguistic features to native-like levels (Swain & Lapkin, 1986; Harley, 1989; Lyster, 1990). Many researchers seem to believe that the experiential/content-based approach generally used in the immersion class may not be sufficient, and that some degree of attention to form may be necessary to enhance the accuracy of immersion students' French output (Allen, Swain, Harley, & Cummins, 1990; Stern, 1990, 1992).

The first French immersion (FI) program, known as the St. Lambert project, was established in 1965, in Montréal, Québec (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). It was initiated by a group of anglophone parents who were concerned about the level of French attained by their children within the regular French Second Language (FSL) programs, and who wanted to ensure their children's ability to participate in the workforce in Québec. Immersion programs involve the use of French as the language of instruction to teach content material. Their aim is to develop English-French bilingual skills without impeding students' achievement in academic subjects and to emphasize the learning of content rather than the learning of linguistic forms (Genesee, 1987).

When immersion programs were initiated, their main goal was to provide students with opportunities for genuine communication, and the overall context for second language learning was experiential, communicative and content-based (Genesee, 1987).
Although students in these programs seemed to have practically no exposure to French outside the school context (Swain & Lapkin, 1982), they were provided in the classroom with meaning-focused input and with opportunities for output, but not necessarily accurate output. Later, when the communicative approach appeared on the scene in the 1970's, grammar instruction was minimized in the language curriculum. The focus was mostly on communication and students were provided with increased opportunities for output and were encouraged to be creative and to express their ideas regardless of grammatical accuracy. I believe that grammatical accuracy is an important feature in communication because inaccurate output may obscure the message and distort the meaning the speaker wishes to convey.

As Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) indicated, communicative competence refers to grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. Learners can develop competence in any of these areas relatively independently, but the researchers' framework also assumes that breakdowns in communication may result from insufficient competence in one or more of the four components. This framework suggests that a lack in grammatical competence may interfere with the comprehensibility of students' output.

Moreover, a lack of grammatical metalinguistic terminology in English may result in a lack of metalinguistic competence in French, as suggested by Cummins' interdependence principle (1987), which indicates that conceptual knowledge developed in one language will help students to make input comprehensible in the other language. In other words, the promotion of literacy development in English will help students experiencing difficulties reading French. This principle stipulates that there is an
underlying cognitive/academic proficiency that is common across languages and which allows the transfer of certain skills from one language to the other. However, based on my personal observation, FL students do not always seem to have an explicit knowledge of the English language's grammatical terminology and rules. This makes comparison of the two languages very difficult, if not sometimes impossible.

Since their establishment in 1965, Canadian French immersion programs have been the subject of many research projects designed to evaluate their success. Evidence shows that after several years in the program, immersion students do successfully acquire content materials taught in French (Allen, Cummins, Mougeon, & Swain, 1983; Swain, 1991) and develop high levels of communicative proficiency in the second language (e.g. Swain & Lapkin, 1982; Genesee, 1987; Day & Shapson, 1989). However, research also indicates that there are still important gaps in students' productive use of the second language with respect to the acquisition and control of many grammatical features, and most of these students still demonstrate persistent weaknesses in their grammatical skills and linguistic production when compared with their Francophone peers (e.g. Harley, Cummins, Swain, & Allen, 1990; Harley, 1992). For instance, in a conversational interview designed to study the use of verb forms in the passé composé, the imparfait, the future and the conditional by grade 6 immersion students, Allen, Cummins, Mougeon and Swain (1983) found that these students scored on average 57 per cent compared to almost 100 per cent for native speakers. Harley and Swain (1984) reported that even after six to ten years in the immersion program, the productive skills of immersion students were far from those of native speakers and were still influenced by their first language. They claimed that the input French immersion students were receiving may not be adequate to
promote native-like proficiency, and that teachers should provide them with more focused French input and with activities requiring the productive use of target language forms in meaningful contexts.

In their chapter on the nature of language proficiency, Harley, Cummins, Swain and Allen (1990) found that grade 6 early immersion students scored significantly lower than native speakers on most grammar variables and especially on verb forms in the oral grammar component of a set of French language tests. Harley (1992) examined aspects of second language proficiency of early immersion, late immersion and extended French students at grade 10 (three types of immersion programs with different starting age and different number of hours of exposure to French). She reported that the early immersion students did not necessarily have higher oral proficiency in all areas of the French verb system even though they had had more exposure to French input. Harley argued that the natural classroom input of French immersion classes may not lead to high enough levels of second language proficiency and that more focused input may be necessary to draw students’ attention to relevant French forms and form-meaning connections. Moreover, Warden (1997) noted that even by grade 11, FI students are still having problems with gender.

My personal observations in FI classes also attest to the need for improving these students’ grammatical competence. Students do not generally focus on form because they are more concerned about understanding and communicating meaning. Therefore, even students in the last year of high school have difficulties with verb tenses, agreement, gender, and only a few are able to use metalinguistic terms to identify grammatical features such as adverbs, adjectives, subjects, objects, in sentences; this eventually
interferes with the accuracy of their output. I have witnessed such problems first-hand in my years of teaching in French immersion programs and, as a result of these weaknesses, students' French output is sometimes far from "comprehensible" (Swain, 1985), especially in the written form.

In an attempt to find the most effective teaching orientation to promote second language proficiency, Allen, Swain, Harley and Cummins (1990) compared FI and core French programs with respect to their emphasis on "experiential" teaching versus "analytic" teaching (see discussion of these terms in chapter 2). They found that the FI program focused more on experiential strategies and not enough on analytic strategies, while core French programs focused more on analytic strategies and not enough on experiential strategies. The experiential strategy is characterized by students' involvement in purposeful activities that give priority to meaning and fluency over accuracy. The analytic strategy is characterized by a focus on aspects of language and the practice of language items: it gives priority to accuracy. In the core French observation study, Allen, Carroll, Burtis and Gaudino (1987) compared the effect of "analytic" versus "experiential" teaching in eight grade 11 core French classes from the Metropolitan Toronto area. All students completed a series of pretests consisting of a multiple-choice grammar test, two written production tasks including a formal letter and an informal note, both scored for discourse and sociolinguistic features, and a multiple-choice global listening comprehension test. An oral interview was administered to a subsample of students from each class and was scored for the use of grammatical.

---

1 Core French refers to the regular French second language program generally delivered in daily 40-minute periods from grade 4 on in Ontario.
sociolinguistic and discourse features. Each class was observed four times during the school year using the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme (Allen, Fröhlich, & Spada, 1984; Spada & Fröhlich, 1995). An observer coded Part A of the COLT scheme which has a list of indicators of communicative classroom activities. Part B of the COLT scheme, which includes indicators of communicative features of teacher-student interaction, involved coding from a timed sample of the transcripts and tape recordings of the classroom observations. The same tests were administered to all classes at the end of the year and the same students were interviewed again.

On the basis of both Part A and B of the observation scheme, the classes were categorized on a bipolar composite scale from "most experiential" to "most analytic". Although none of the classes were ranked as completely "experiential" or "analytic", two classes were identified as "high" communicative and labeled Type-E (experiential) and the other four were identified as "low" communicative and labeled Type-A (analytic). The COLT findings were supplemented by teacher questionnaires asking for information about classroom activities during the school year. Results indicated no significant differences between Type-E and Type-A classes, but Type-A classes demonstrated a near-significant higher performance on the grammar multiple-choice test relative to type E. When the two Type-E classes were compared to the two most Type-A classes (labeled Type-A*), the latter scored significantly higher on the grammar multiple-choice test and in the use of the conditional in the letter-writing task and also provided a better rationale for the letter and a better closing statement. However, in the 1970's, core French programs in Canada were criticized for being too analytical and focusing too much on
forms. They were described as “taking too narrow a view of language and for operating with too limited a conception of the language learner and language learning process” (Allen, 1983, p. 38).

Researchers seem to advocate that an appropriate balance of analytic and experiential teaching may be necessary for second language learning and that both strategies may be integrated in the second language classroom (Allen, Swain, Harley, & Cummins, 1990; Stern, 1992). The present study uses both strategies in a sequential manner whereby instruction on form is followed by instruction on function. This approach is derived from the need to improve the accuracy of French immersion students’ written output while taking into consideration their limited attentional capacity, as suggested by theoretical evidence and by my personal experience and practical knowledge of these students.

Clandinin and Connelly (1988, 2000) pointed out that teachers’ experiential knowledge is often ignored and they are only considered as curriculum transmitters. However, in an attempt to understand and improve education, the two researchers worked with a number of experienced teachers and were impressed with the way those teachers were able to transform new ideas into effective curriculum materials. Subsequently, Clandinin and Connelly acknowledged the importance of teachers’ personal practical knowledge of their students as they experience together the curriculum in their respective classrooms. Therefore, based on my personal experience as a French immersion teacher, my philosophy for developing French accuracy in written production may be summarized as follows:
1. Instruction should focus on form and function in a sequential manner as defined on page one.

2. Grammar should have an important place in the curriculum and should be taught explicitly.

3. Target forms should be taught one by one and should be cumulative.

4. Students should learn conjugation patterns and grammatical rules.

5. Teachers should provide students with a variety of practice activities where the focus is on formal aspects of the language (mechanical drills, see chapter 3).

6. Dictation should be used to allow students to retrieve from memory grammatical rules taught and to apply them for the purpose of accuracy (see chapter 3).

7. When learners are able to use linguistic structures with increasing ease, teachers should provide them with activities designed to integrate form and function (meaningful and communicative drills, see chapter 3).

This philosophy draws from both the Audiolingual Method and cognitive theory (DeKeyser, 1998). It uses mechanical drills, takes into consideration the role of language as a means for communication and the limited attentional capacity of students. It is, however, based only on personal experience and needs to be tested in a more systematic way, the main reason for the present study.

Grade 11 has been selected to show that students who are near the end of their immersion program are still experiencing grammatical difficulties in their written output. OAC (Ontario Academic Courses) classes would have been ideal for that purpose but were rejected due to ethical considerations. Students in their last high school year need to
focus on their marks for university admission and a research project at this point may interfere with their studies. *Passé composé* and *imparfait* were chosen because the area related to distinctions in meaning between them is one of the most difficult points to teach and to learn, and it is known to be problematical for immersion students as well as for anglophone learners of French in general (Harley, Allen, Cummins, & Swain, 1987).

1.2. The nature of the study

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods were used in this study. The quantitative method involved administering pretests, treatment materials, immediate posttests and delayed posttests in one experimental class, and pretests, immediate posttests and delayed posttests in two comparison classes. The experimental class and one of the comparison classes were taught by the researcher. The second comparison class was taught by another teacher in another school. Students in the experimental class completed questionnaires designed to assess their reactions to the treatment materials using a five-point scale. Some items on the questionnaires were open-ended and invited students to comment on the treatment materials used. The qualitative method consisted of the researcher's examination of student questionnaire responses and of her journal notes recorded in the experimental class during the treatment period. In addition, appendix I presents a case study of the student in the experimental class who improved the most from the composition pretest to the delayed posttest and appendix J presents selected samples of other students' compositions.

1.3. Research questions

This study examines the effects of sequencing instruction on form and function on the learning of the forms and functions of *passé composé* and *imparfait*. The following
Specific questions are under investigation: 1- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on correct forms of the passé composé? 2- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on the use of the passé composé in contexts for the passé composé? 3- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on correct forms of the imparfait? 4- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on the use of the imparfait in contexts for the imparfait?

1.4. Dissertation outline

This dissertation is presented in eight chapters. The first presents the introduction to the research, the rationale for the study, the nature of the study and the specific research questions to be addressed. Chapter two provides the background for the study, explains and compares analytic and experiential approaches to second language teaching and summarizes research on focus on form instruction (Spada, 1997) that adopt a functional-analytic approach particularly in French immersion programs and research on focus on forms as characterized by Norris and Ortega (2000). Chapter three presents the rationale for drill and practice and for dictation. Chapter four presents research that has been conducted in certain areas pertinent to the thesis topic, such as the difference in meaning between passé composé and imparfait, the different approaches to teaching them and their acquisition by both native speakers and second language learners of French. Chapter five explains in detail the methodology used in the study. It describes the design, the participants, the testing instruments and scoring methods and the treatment materials used. Chapter six presents the results of all pretests and posttests. Chapter seven presents the results of the questionnaire data and reports the researcher's examination of
her journal notres recorded in the experimental class. Chapter eight presents the interpretation of the findings, the implications of the study for French immersion programs and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This chapter explains and compares analytic and experiential approaches to second language teaching. It presents some of the attempts to improve second language learners' linguistic accuracy and summarizes focus on form (Spada, 1997) studies that adopt a functional-analytic orientation to instruction particularly in French immersion programs and studies that Norris and Ortega (2000) characterized as focus on forms. Ortega (2000) characterized as focus on forms. In Allen's (1983) terms, studies that adopt a structural-analytic approach.

2.1. Analytic and experiential approaches to second language teaching

This study derives support from theoretical evidence advocating the inclusion of analytic components in communicative/experiential language teaching (Allen, 1983; Stern, 1990, 1992) and from research investigating the effect of focus on form (Spada, 1997) and focus on forms (Norris & Ortega, 2000; Long & Robinson, 1998) on second language learning.

Two basic orientations in language teaching are the experiential approach and the analytic approach (Allen, Swain, Harley, & Cummins, 1990; Stern, 1990; see discussion later in this chapter). The experiential approach focuses mainly on fluency and communication of message and content rather than on linguistic accuracy. Language learning is expected to take place incidentally, without formal instruction. Students are exposed to authentic language use and they are provided with opportunities to communicate in meaningful situations. The analytic approach focuses on accuracy and error correction. Language features are isolated and made salient for the learner.
Students learn rules and exceptions and they may practise language items through drills and exercises.

Allen (1983) proposed a three-level curriculum model combining structural-analytic, functional-analytic, and non-analytic (experiential) components. The structural-analytic component focuses on grammar and other formal features of language, and the functional-analytic component focuses on communicative functions, discourse and sociolinguistics. The non-analytic (experiential) component focuses on the spontaneous use of language in a natural context. Stern (1992) proposed a multidimensional curriculum model integrating four syllabi: language, communicative activities, culture, and general language education. The language syllabus is analytic with focus on both structure and function. The communicative activities syllabus provides students with opportunities to use the second language in order to establish personal contact with the community whose language is being studied. The cultural syllabus is based on the belief that language and culture interact. It stresses the observation and analysis of the target culture to sensitize students to this particular culture and to enhance their communicative competence in the target language. The general language syllabus is mainly analytic and focuses on increasing students' awareness of language in general. However, both Allen and Stern argued that, while concentration on a specific curriculum component is sometimes justified, all components should be integrated in the second language classroom.

Both the analytic and experiential approaches have been criticized. Critics of the analytic approach have claimed that by focusing only on grammar rules and drills, this approach decontextualizes and fragments language. Students are not provided with real
and meaningful situations to express themselves and their fluency may suffer (Stem. 1990). Consequently, the learners may become more reluctant to take risks with the language and to use it outside the classroom. In the experiential approach, students are exposed to authentic language use and are provided with opportunities to communicate in meaningful situations. This approach is consistent with Krashen's (1984) "comprehensible input" hypothesis which states that language acquisition in the classroom occurs when "comprehensible input" beyond the student's level of competence is available in a non-threatening environment. This hypothesis suggests that second language learners will have access to form through comprehension. For instance, in French immersion programs the focus is on communication of message (i.e. experiential) rather than on language structure: French is used as the language of instruction to teach content material such as geography and history. Students' reading materials are in French and assignments and tests are written in French. Oral activities also focus on the use of French as the only language of communication in student-teacher and student-student interactions (an ideal situation). The purpose is to foster in French immersion students an acquisition process similar to the one they use in their first language.

However, many researchers believe that the experiential approach may not be sufficient to enhance the accuracy of FL students' output and several explanations have been proposed to account for the grammatical weaknesses of these students. For instance, Swain (1985) suggested that comprehensible output, that is, language production, is needed in addition to comprehensible input because it is one way of testing hypotheses about comprehensibility or accuracy of linguistic features. She argued that it is by trying to produce the target language that students may be made aware of some of
their linguistic problems. Therefore, second language learners must be provided with opportunities to produce the target language. However, Swain pointed out that the conditions of natural language use cannot be completely reproduced in classroom settings and students may never be exposed to certain linguistic features.

Similarly, Harley (1993) argued that the environment of the immersion class does not include all contexts for language use and may therefore restrict the range of vocabulary and types of discourse to which students are exposed. She further claimed that these students may not even be aware of some of the linguistic features which are often present in teachers' input but are not salient enough to be detected by students. Harley also pointed out that, in the case of some linguistic features (for example ëtre and avoir, and gender distinctions), frequency in the input does not guarantee that learning will take place. Also, since accuracy and error correction are not stressed, students continue to make the same mistakes (Lightbown & Spada, 1993) and incorrect forms may appear to be fossilized. Moreover, Stern (1990) argued that activities in experiential classes are also sometimes linguistically too demanding for the proficiency level of the students, who may then feel frustrated and may eventually revert to their first language in order to express their ideas. Lightbown (1992) also questioned how native-like immersion students' input is, much of which is provided by their peers' output.

It seems then that more attention to grammatical accuracy is required to help immersion students attain more native-like proficiency. Garrett (1996) stated that "to teach grammar without understanding how it functions in communication is a waste of everyone's time, but not to teach it may jeopardize the whole endeavor. This dilemma is the problem in foreign language teaching today" (p. 134). To deal with this problem,
several attempts have been made by researchers to improve immersion students’ oral and written grammar. They have presented a number of suggestions, some emphasizing the need for exposing students to more contexts in which they can use French (Swain & Lapkin. 1995), some proposing drawing learners’ attention to linguistic forms through “consciousness-raising” (Ellis. 1991; Casey. 1997) or “input enhancement” (Ellis. 1991; Sharwood-smith. 1993), others, more recently, emphasizing a focus on form (Long & Robinson. 1998) and a focus on forms (DeKeyser. 1997. 1998). Each of these notions is dealt with in its own section below.

2.2. Consciousness-raising and input enhancement

Consciousness-raising is designed to allow students to develop an explicit knowledge of grammar without necessarily articulating grammatical rules. It aims to help learners understand target forms but does not require a repeated production of these forms (Ellis. 1991). Consciousness-raising activities enable students to distinguish between the different component parts of a particular grammatical construction. Casey (1997) suggested that a first step into the grammar would be, for instance, to allow learners to differentiate between fixed expressions (e.g. ça va) and non-fixed ones (e.g. nous arrivons). The next step would then be to attract their attention to the distinction between the nature of a pronoun and the nature of a verb. Similarly, students’ attention could be drawn to the different constituents of the past tense formulae (Macrory & Stone. 2000). Although these noticing activities may enable students to detect the target forms, they may not necessarily retain them in short-term memory and subsequently in long-term memory (Long & Robinson. 1998). Moreover, teachers’ attempts to raise their
students' consciousness may not necessarily result in consciousness-raising, that is, what teachers think they do is not always what students perceive it to be.

Sharwood-smith (1991, 1993) proposed the term input enhancement to replace consciousness-raising because it does not assume that teaching necessarily leads to consciousness on the part of learners and it allows a better verification of input salience. Written input enhancement involves attention-drawing devices such as color-coding, highlighting, etc. to make aspects of the structure visually salient to learners while they are focusing on meaning (Ellis, 1991; Sharwood-smith, 1991, 1993). Enhancement techniques involve positive and negative input enhancement. The first type increases salience of correct forms in the input. the second type draws attention to given incorrect forms when they are produced. In oral production, input enhancement may be a gesture or a special intonation. or even explanation of linguistic features using metalinguistic terms. This procedure, however, requires learners' knowledge of appropriate terminology (Sharwood-smith, 1993). In input enhancement, students are not required to produce the structures right away and are not required to produce them correctly from the start.

The present study does not use input enhancement techniques to make the target forms visually salient to learners. The treatment provides students with explicit rules (and associated terminology) and requires them to practise conjugation patterns from the beginning to instill automaticity of the target forms. Students may then direct their attention to function. This structural-analytic (Allen, 1983) stage is followed by functional-analytic teaching that characterizes the studies discussed in the next section.
2.3. Focus on form studies

Harley (1989) carried out an experimental study with grade 6 French immersion students to examine the effect of a functional-analytic teaching approach on the learning of the *passe composé* and the *imparfait*. An experimental and comparison group were compared on a cloze test, an oral interview and a written composition. During an eight-week period, students in the experimental group were provided with a unit focusing on the functions/uses of the two past tenses in meaningful contexts. The purpose of these activities was to establish the distinctions in meaning between the two tenses and to integrate grammar teaching with content teaching and with students' personal experience. Results indicated that the experimental group outperformed the comparison group on the immediate oral interview and cloze posttests, but there were no significant differences between the groups on the written composition posttest. On the delayed posttest, three months later, the experimental group did not do significantly better than the comparison group on any of the measures. However, this does not necessarily mean that functional-analytic instruction is ineffective since both groups improved between immediate and delayed posttests. It appears that the comparison teachers had also devoted some time to teaching the *passe composé* and *imparfait*. Harley argued that the amount of time spent on the topic in the experimental group may also have been insufficient.

Day and Shapson (1991) carried out an experiment with grade 7 immersion students to determine the effect of a functional-analytic approach on the learning of the conditional in expressing hypothetical situations and as a politeness marker. There were six classes in the experimental group and six in the comparison group. Results indicated that the experimental group scored significantly higher than the comparison group on two
immediate posttests (written composition and cloze test), but not on an oral interview. These scores were maintained eleven weeks later and progress was also made on the oral interview. However, there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the comparison group on the oral component. The researchers attribute this in part to the fact that the teacher of one comparison class had spent time teaching the conditional using an approach similar to the one used in the experimental materials.

Lyster (1994) investigated the effect of functional-analytic teaching on the sociolinguistic competence of French immersion students in grade 8. Three experimental classes and two comparison classes participated in the study. The focus was to examine the ability of students to use vous (the formal form of "you" in French, in contrast to the informal "tu") appropriately and accurately in formal situations, to use polite closings in formal letters, to choose the appropriate utterance for a specific context and to choose the appropriate context for a particular utterance (in hypothetical social interactions such as between school friends or in a note from one spouse to the other). Results indicated a substantial improvement in the sociolinguistic competence of students in the experimental group on all three target features but not in the comparison group where performance on tests was significantly lower.

Warden (1997) investigated the effect of focus on form instruction on the acquisition of gender by French immersion students. Sixty-two grade 11 students took part in the study. The experimental group consisted of 28 students and there were two comparison groups with 17 students each. The treatment period lasted approximately eight weeks and during this period, students in the experimental group were exposed to focus on form tasks designed to draw their attention to word ending regularities as a clue
to the gender of French nouns. Students were also provided with opportunities to practice gender agreements. Results indicated that the experimental group outperformed the comparison group on listening, written endings, and agreement tests; but there were no significant differences between the groups on either the writing assignment or oral interview. However, Warden noted improvement on those endings that had been taught.

Harley (1998) investigated the effect of focus on form activities on the second language acquisition of children in grade 2 of an FI program. These activities were designed to draw students' attention to gender distinctions. Harley pointed out that FI students have difficulty with gender due to its lack of salience for the English-speaking learner. Since grammatical gender is not part of the grammatical system (excluded in pronouns, except in 3rd person singular) in English, FI students are not generally aware of its importance in French and may not notice the distinction between *le, la* and *un, une* which are the most common indicators of gender for French nouns. Harley also argued that incorrect input from peers as well as absence of corrective feedback from teachers may contribute to gender's lack of salience for Anglophone learners of French. Six experimental classes and six comparison classes participated in the study. Focus on form activities included songs, rhymes, games and the use of picture cards. The treatment period lasted for five weeks and the treatment materials were designed for a daily use of twenty minutes. In the first two weeks, the focus of instruction was on the definite and indefinite articles in order to make students aware that gender is an integral part of all French nouns. In the other three weeks, the focus of instruction was on word-ending clues to gender such as */o/, */Ø/ for masculine, and */øz/, */as/ for feminine. Four tests were developed. Test one was designed to determine whether students were able to recognize
the difference between masculine and feminine forms of articles in French. Test two was
designed to determine whether students were able to associate nouns with appropriate
articles. Test three and four were individual production tasks and were administered to a
random subsample of eight students in each class. Test three was designed to elicit
definite and indefinite articles associated with unfamiliar nouns and where the focus was
mainly on noun endings. Test four was designed to elicit mainly indefinite articles
associated with illustrated items many of which assumed to be familiar nouns. Results
showed that the mean scores of experimental groups were significantly higher than those
of the comparison groups between pretest and immediate posttest on tests one two and
four. However, there was no significant progress on test three and no indications that
focus on form instruction helped students to generalize what they had learned about noun
endings to unfamiliar nouns.

The studies described above seem to indicate that focus on form instruction may
improve language acquisition by FL students. However, when comparing some of these
studies. Spada (1997) noted that: 1) Harley (1989) studied the effects of drawing FL
students' attention to aspectual distinction in French verbs but no corrective feedback was
provided. Moreover, results showed benefits for instruction but the comparison groups
caught up at the delayed posttest: 2) Day and Shapson (1991) investigated the effects of
explicitly drawing FL students' attention to the use of conditional in a variety of co-
operative learning tasks. Their results showed immediate and delayed benefits for
written performance only: 3) Lyster (1994) studied the effect of controlled practice
activities and corrective feedback from both peers and teachers on the use of
sociolinguistic variations among FL students. He measured their ability to identify
appropriate French in context. to use vous appropriately and accurately in formal situations, and to use polite closings in formal letters. His results showed immediate and delayed effects for the experimental group on all three measures. Spada concluded that focus on form instruction is beneficial to second language acquisition, but she suggested that a combination of explicit instruction and corrective feedback within a communicative context may be superior to either just explicit instruction or implicit learning alone.

The type of instruction proposed by Spada (which encompasses Allen's structural-analytic and functional-analytic curriculum components in communicative context) implies that learners need to focus on individual language forms, form, meaning and function. But VanPatten (1990) stressed learners' limited attentional capacity for performing simultaneously two or more tasks when one of them is an attention-demanding task. He showed that instruction requesting students to attend simultaneously to form and meaning led to a decrease in recall. In his experiment, four groups of learners (at three different stages of second language learning) listened to a Spanish language text in four conditions. One group was instructed to pay attention only to content (the control condition); a second group attended to meaning and a key lexical item; the third group attended to meaning and a function word; and the fourth group paid attention simultaneously to meaning and a verb morpheme. Even the most proficient learners (in a 3rd year university Spanish conversation course) had difficulty attending to content and verb forms simultaneously. VanPatten claimed that if learners have to use most of their resources to understand meaning and to learn, then they do not have enough attention left to focus on a new form. For this reason, in the present study, the treatment.
that is, the sequencing of instruction on form and function aims to allow students to focus first on form to instill automaticity in conjugation patterns so that they are free to apply the relevant forms in context later on.

Recently, Norris and Ortega (2000) undertook a meta-analysis of studies which fell into two categories that they characterized as “focus on forms” and “focus on form” (Long & Robinson, 1998). “Focus on forms” entails the isolation of linguistic features from context and the explicit teaching of linguistic elements (Doughty & Williams, 1998), such as agreement features and verb endings, where explicit teaching refers to presentation and explanation of grammatical rules (DeKeyser, 1998), and is the same as what I describe as instruction on form. Norris and Ortega’s definition of “focus on form”, however, does not correspond to the definition that Spada (1997) was using when she reviewed studies that I have also reviewed in section 2.2 above. Norris and Ortega chose to adopt Long and Robinson’s (1998, p. 23) definition: “during an otherwise meaning-focused classroom lesson, focus on form often consists of an occasional shift of attention to linguistic code features - by the teacher and/or one or more students - triggered by perceived problems with comprehension or production”. The main orientation in Long and Robinson’s focus on form is on meaning but there are certain occasions where attention to the language itself may be necessary.

The studies discussed in the next section compared performance on learning tasks when attention was directed mainly to forms versus when attention was mainly directed to meaning.
2.4. Focus on forms studies

Doughty (1988, 1991) investigated the rate of acquisition of relative clauses by adult second language learners of English. In her study, 20 university students from different backgrounds were divided randomly into one comparison/control group and two experimental groups, one meaning-oriented and one rule-oriented. Both experimental groups were exposed to relative clauses, but one received a meaning-oriented instructional treatment where relative clauses were visually enhanced by highlighting and capitalization, and the other group was exposed to a rule-oriented instructional treatment. The comparison group was also exposed to relative clauses but had no instructional treatment. All groups were required to skim and scan a given text and to answer comprehension questions. Both experimental groups outperformed the comparison group on their acquisition of relativization and the meaning-oriented group did significantly better than the other two on comprehension tests.

Green and Hecht (1992) investigated whether the learning of grammar rules in an explicit manner could lead to an implicit knowledge of these rules. They discovered that, having learned the rules, students proceeded largely by “feel” when confronted with a grammar test. That is, they corrected based on implicit rules whose application may have been enhanced by the explicit ones provided through instruction. These rules resurfaced when specifically called for but were incorrectly remembered in some cases. The researchers concluded that a balance needs to be found between time devoted to the learning of explicit rules and time devoted to the communicative use of the language, both of which may contribute to the development of the implicit rule system.
Alanen (1992, 1995) demonstrated that learning was better for learners who attended simultaneously to forms and meaning when attention to formal features was facilitated by "input enhancement techniques", such as highlighting, bolding, underlining, etc., that make some aspects of the target forms more visually salient. He investigated the acquisition of two aspects of a semi artificial language, based on Finnish, by different groups of second language learners of English. All groups were required to read texts for meaning and to perform comprehension and word-translation tasks. They were randomly assigned to four different conditions: one group read unmodified texts (control group). one group read texts where target forms were visually enhanced through italicization, one group received non-enhanced texts and rule instruction, and one group was given enhanced texts and rule instruction. Results indicated that groups with rule instruction outperformed the control group and the group receiving enhancement alone, though the latter did produce more target forms than the control group. Though the forms were incorrect, results suggested that input enhancement leads to greater student's awareness of linguistic forms.

Similar results were obtained by Hulstijn (1989), who investigated the effects of focus on forms, focus on meaning and focus on forms and meaning on recall and retention of a grammatical structure by adult second language learners of Dutch. Participants were divided into one forms group, two meaning groups, and one forms and meaning group. During pretest, learners were briefly exposed to sentences that they were then required to copy. The forms group was provided with a series of sentence fragment-ordering activities and was asked to order eight sentence fragments to match a sentence on a computer screen. The meaning group were required to read sentences on a computer
screen and to indicate if they agreed (yes, somewhat, not at all) with the idea provided by these sentences. The forms and meaning group was instructed to pay attention to both grammar and meaning, but was not asked to perform a task.

The posttest consisted of two tasks. The first task was a cued recall activity where learners were required to remember all the target sentences shown during treatment. This activity was scored for both structure accuracy and content. The second task was a retention activity similar to the sentence-copying activity used for the pretest. Since exposure to the sentences was brief, accuracy of results reflected students' prior knowledge of the target forms. Hulstijn reported that the recall measure resulted in a better score for the forms and the forms plus meaning groups as compared with the meaning groups. with the forms and meaning group performing the best of all. There was, however, no difference between groups on the retention measure.

DeKeyser (1997) explored the effect of explicit teaching of rules in an artificial language followed by computer controlled comprehension and production practice for the purpose of automatization of those rules by a group of paid volunteer learners. They were first taught rules and were then allowed to practice them in comprehension and production activities for a period of eight weeks. Comprehension activities required learners to choose between pictures on the computer screen to match them with sentences. Production activities required learners to type the correct sentences matching a picture. Results indicated that learning second language grammar rules follows skill acquisition theory whereby declarative knowledge is proceduralized during the initial stage of practice and is subsequently gradually automatized. DeKeyser's hypothesis of gradual automatization as a function of practice was confirmed. He concluded "that there
is a role for systematic practice of specific rules for specific skills in the second language curriculum. ... and that the sequence of explicit rule learning, followed by a short period of activities focused on using explicit knowledge during performance of the target skills, and finally by a long period of repeated opportunities to use that knowledge in meaningful contexts, is likely to yield knowledge that is highly automatized” (p. 215).

DeKeyser (1998) recommended sequencing of learning activities in such a way as to allow declarative knowledge to be developed first, then carefully proceduralize this knowledge before automatization can begin. He defined declarative knowledge as “factual knowledge, for example, knowing that Napoleon was defeated in 1815 or knowing that most English verbs take an-s in the third person of the present tense when the subject is singular” (p. 48), and procedural knowledge as “condition-action pairs that state what is to be done under certain circumstances or with certain data” (p. 48. 49), and automatized knowledge as “using a third person-s for singular verbs without having to think about it.” (p. 49). He added that grammar teaching, if any, should be explicit to ensure understanding. Learners should then be provided with some activities because they need time to establish procedural knowledge. DeKeyser pointed out that it is only when learners have had the opportunity to let this knowledge sink in that using a text containing the grammatical structure taught may lead to automatization.

2.5. Summary

So, even though researchers agree that second language learners need to focus on both grammatical and communicative components to improve their overall language proficiency, there seem to be competing points of view regarding the method or methods that will allow students to eventually attain native-like levels of accuracy and fluency in
the second language. In the last two decades, research on second language acquisition has suggested a wide variety of instructional treatments to improve linguistic accuracy, some of which were presented in this chapter. Norris and Ortega (2000) summarized findings from studies that investigated the effectiveness of second language instruction between 1980 and 1998. They examined the instructional effectiveness of focus on forms, focus on meaning, and focus on form (integration of both forms and meaning), and reported the following: 1- focused second language instruction is effective and durable; 2- explicit instruction is more effective than implicit instruction. The term explicit was used when “rule explanation comprised part of the instruction or learners were directly asked to attend to particular forms and to try to arrive at metalinguistic generalizations on their own” (p. 437). The term implicit was used when “neither rule presentation nor directions to attend to particular forms were part of a treatment” (p. 437). 3- instruction where the focus is on forms is as effective as instruction where the focus is on form. The researchers, however, cautioned that interpretation of those results should take into consideration the different methodologies used in the 49 studies they reviewed for their meta-analysis. For instance, with respect to explicit versus implicit instruction, Norris and Ortega cautioned that explicit treatments are usually favored when learners are asked to perform explicit memory tasks. Moreover, effects tend to be greater in studies where test formats consist of selected responses than in studies where test formats consist of free response. Norris and Ortega also reported that 18% of the changes detected may be the result of other factors, namely test practice and maturational effects.

The present study uses a type of instruction that sequences form and function in that order, as suggested by DeKeyser (1997, 1998). As described in chapter I, instruction
on form conforms to Allen's (1983) structural-analytic curriculum component and refers to the explicit teaching of the forms of the *passé composé* and *imparfait* isolated from context. Instruction on function conforms to functional-analytic teaching (Allen, 1983; Stern, 1990, 1992; Harley 1989), and refers to the correct use of the *passé composé* and *imparfait* in context.
CHAPTER 3

RATIONALE FOR FORMAL PRACTICE AND DICTATION

This chapter provides an overview of the use of drill and practice in second language teaching and a rationale for dictation. It presents arguments for the use of practice and explains its importance for automatization and retention. It also presents an overview of the importance of dictation in language teaching and assessment and summarizes some of the new attempts to bring this teaching/testing tool back into the language classroom.

3.1. Drill and practice

In the late 60's and early 70's there was an increasing emphasis on the importance of communication in second language learning. This communicative approach pulled teachers and students away from the structural grammatical syllabus and the notion of practice in production was eventually rejected. However, while some researchers continue to oppose the idea of emphasizing practice in the language classroom (Krashen, 1984) due to its interference with communication, others seem to advocate the use of drill and practice in second language teaching. Pica (1994) stated that "drill and practice, two very traditional procedures in the second language classroom, are still worthy of both teachers' and researchers' consideration." (p. 60). In the present study, drill and practice are built into the treatment, especially at the initial stages.

Although she does not advocate drill and practice as such, Swain (1995) argued that in order to improve their linguistic skills, second language learners should be given more opportunities to perform activities that will allow them to reflect on their linguistic weaknesses because it may eventually improve the accuracy of their output. She
explained that when students engage frequently in the target behavior, they may notice the difference between their interlanguage and the target language or they may realize that they are unable to say what they want to say. Students are then in a situation where they may have to find a solution allowing them to move from semantic to syntactic processing. For instance, in the case of the use of the passé composé and imparfait by FI students, Swain (1995) suggested that an explicit presentation of relevant rules for formation and use (see chapter 4) followed by activities requiring students to use their output may allow them to apply their knowledge of these rules to correct their inadequacies.

McLaughlin (1987) also acknowledged the role of practice in bringing about automaticity and integration of second language skills. He argued that, within the framework of cognitive theory, learning a second language is considered as learning a skill because learners need to practise and automatize several aspects of a task in order to communicate an intended message fluently and clearly. He differentiated between controlled language processing and automatic language processing. He reported that controlled processing requires a great deal of attention and energy since second language learners need to restructure declarative knowledge to make it easier to proceduralize, and only one sequence can be controlled at a time. Automatic processing however, requires little attention and little energy and relies on a "relatively permanent set of associative connections in long-term storage" (p. 134). However, in order for second language learners to automatize and maintain an automatic process, they need an appreciable amount of practice. However, once acquired, the automatic process is not easily changed and learners can then direct their attention to other components of the task.
Paulston (1971, 1972) argued that formal practice is essential to induce learning. She classified drills into mechanical, meaningful, and communicative. Paulston acknowledged that all three types of drills are necessary to move learners from formal grammar practice to independent language use, and suggested a systematic shift from mechanical drills to communicative drills. Paulston defined mechanical drills as sets of items (language structures) having only one correct answer and, because of this complete control, the students do not necessarily need to analyze (consciously) what they are doing. The expected behavior in this type of drill is "automatic use of manipulative patterns-formation of habits" (p. 204). Paulston pointed out that this kind of drill provides practice in linguistic forms requiring mechanical association such as verb endings (conjugation patterns) and noun-adjective agreements, and that this practice is a very important step in language learning even if students are still unable to communicate their ideas fluently. In meaningful drills there is also one correct answer but students may express it in different ways. However, because they have a choice of answers, students need to understand the structure and the semantics of what they are saying, even if the criteria and the information used in selecting those answers are provided (e.g. reading comprehension questions). The expected behavior in this type of drill is "automatic use of manipulative patterns-formation of habits still working on habit formation" (p. 204). In communicative drills teachers have no control of the answer. Students are free to choose their answers based on their own opinion of the real world. The expected behavior in this type of drill is "normal speech for communication-free transfer of patterns to appropriate situations" (p.204). This study uses Paulston's
terminology and the gradation from mechanical to communicative drills for the activities in the treatment.

DeKeyser (1998) also acknowledged the importance of practice in allowing second language learners to achieve automatization and maintain automatic processing. However, contradicting Paulston's view of a gradation process involving the three types of drills, he reported that one should not focus exclusively on form or exclusively on meaning. DeKeyser stated that "we need to think carefully about what the goal of each teaching/learning activity is: instilling knowledge about rules, turning this knowledge into something qualitatively different through practice, or automatizing such knowledge further in the sense that it can be done even faster with fewer errors and less mental effort" (p. 62). He suggested that communicative drills would be the most appropriate to use since they allow students to convey meaning while the focus of the drill is kept in mind. He stated that "in the case of communicative drills, the higher-level plan for the sentence calls on the lower-level plans being automatized, for example, procedure for past tense marking or subject-verb agreement" (p. 52). However, in the case of FL students, declarative knowledge is not necessarily available and students have not necessarily automatized conjugation patterns or rules of agreement. Therefore, they need to learn these lower-level plans before they can engage in communicative drills. Even though DeKeyser criticized mechanical drills because they focus mainly on forms, such drills provide students with practice in linking forms according to a certain pattern kept in working memory. Although mechanical drills do not provide learners with opportunities to convey meaning through language use, DeKeyser acknowledged the usefulness of these drills in some situations. "Some behaviors to be learned, of course, do not involve
meaning: Some phonological and morphological rules pertain to mere forms-forms relationships, such as consonant assimilation rules or variation in verb endings as a function of verb classes: in such cases mechanical drills can be useful." (p. 54).

In the present study, instruction is sequenced so that the conjugation patterns are internalized before these forms are applied in context

3.2. Summary

This section presented theoretical evidence for the importance of practice in improving language communication, for the possibility of using learning activities in a sequential manner, and for the usefulness of mechanical drills in practice of verb endings and verb-noun agreements. Based on the above research (e.g. DeKeyser, 1997, 1998), the present study uses mechanical drills as a means to the achievement of accuracy and not as an end. The purpose is to "anchor" (DeKeyser, 1998) the passé composé and imparfait forms in students' working memory instead of using input enhancement techniques, and to develop declarative knowledge. Students' attention may then be directed to the functions of passé composé and imparfait.

3.3. Dictation

In the present study, dictation is used because it provides a correct model of written language and requires students to recall the rules and conjugation patterns in order to produce the target aspects correctly. Historically, in first language classrooms, dictation was used to transmit content from master to pupil (Stansfield, 1985). It was then passed into the second language classroom and is being accepted as a valid and useful language testing procedure in the present day (Tonnes-Schnier & Scheibner-
Serzig, 1988; Oller, 1972; Oller & Streiff, 1975; Fouly & Cziko, 1985; Jafarpur, A. & Yamini, M., 1993) and as a possible indication of the presence of an internalized grammar of the language (Oller & Streiff, 1975). Dictation is also widely accepted as a test of integrative skills. Jafarpur and Yamini (1993) argued that dictation that “integrates the stream of speech and its written representation in its entirety is accordingly the most perfect amalgamation of functions and abilities” (p. 361). Moreover, dictation also appears to be gaining ground as a teaching tool: to reinforce vocabulary and grammatical structures (Morris, 1983), to review and teach punctuation, spelling, and sentence variety (Lawrence & Levinson, 1987), and to enhance listening comprehension and the ability to write in the language (Rivers, 1988). Davis and Rinvolucri (1988) suggested that dictation should be “back on the language-teaching map” (p. 1) because it allows students to be active during and after the exercise. When they are writing the dictation, students are actively engaged in producing the language. Then, when they proceed into the correction phase it allows them to reflect on accuracy and provides them “with opportunities to ‘over-learn’ the language” (p. 4) because dictation relies on memory ability, recognized to be an important factor for language aptitude (Harley & Hart, 1997).

Recent approaches to dictation have attempted to change the old-fashioned image of dictation and make it more attractive to teachers and students. For example, the “rehearsed dictée” (Thompson, 1983) presents students with a short text of approximately 100 words and provides them with copies on tape. Students work in groups on the taped texts and the formal dictation is given one week later. In the “written-oral dictation” (Stephen, 1989), students see the text first, then hear it and write it as it is being dictated.
Other variation exercises include "picture dictation", where students draw a picture of what is said (Davis & Rinvuluci, 1988) and dictation where students write sentences they like from television, music, etc. and dictate material to each other (Parrot, 1993).

3.4. Summary

This section provided theoretical and empirical evidence for the role of dictation as a valid teaching and testing tool. The present study uses dictation for both instruction and evaluation. As an instructional technique, it provides students with second language input that serves as a good writing model with respect to the distinction in meaning between the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* and allows students to recall the grammatical rule taught and to apply it for the purpose of accuracy (in *passé composé* with être, the past participle agrees in gender and number with the subject of the verb; in *passé composé* with avoir, the past participle agrees in gender and number with the direct object of the verb only if this direct object precedes the verb in the sentence: in *imparfait*, verb endings vary according to both person and number). As an evaluation technique, dictation tests students' ability to use contextual clues to help identify, through listening, *passé composé* and *imparfait* functions, to retain the grammatical rules related to *passé composé* and *imparfait* forms, and to apply these rules for correct agreement.
CHAPTER 4

PEDAGOGICAL GRAMMAR OF THE PASSE COMPOSE AND THE IMPARFAIT

This chapter provides an explanation of the pedagogical grammar of the passé composé and the imparfait and the rules governing their formation and presents research on their acquisition by both native speakers and second language learners of French.

4.1. Definition of passé composé and imparfait

The area of French grammar related to the distinctions in meaning between the passé composé and the imparfait is one of the most difficult to teach (Dansereau, 1987: Haley, 1989) and, according to Dansereau, native speakers of English are confused because there is no clear equivalence in the English language.

The English simple past is used in a variety of situations where French makes a distinction between the passé composé and the imparfait (e.g. when he was young, he played tennis: quand il était jeune, il jouait / a joué au tennis). In this example, both aspects are correct because the event of playing tennis may be viewed as completed (a joué) or as habitual and continuous (jouait). Bardovi-Harlig (2000) argued that the acquisition of verb morphology for expressing past time in French is not simply a question of the acquisition of tense, but also one of aspect (the term “aspect” is used in the remainder of this study to refer to the distinction in meaning between the passé composé and imparfait). She differentiated between tense and grammatical aspect where tense situates an event with respect to the time of speaking, and grammatical aspect “also known as viewpoint aspect, provides different ways of viewing situations” (p. 205). The
term aspect implies that one event in the past can be viewed from different perspectives and, in French, any verb can be used in either the passé composé or the imparfait depending on the speaker's perception of that particular event. Bardovi-Harlig (2000) pointed out that passé composé views a situation as complete with both beginning and end, whereas imparfait views a situation from within and includes both habituality and continuousness, but not necessarily together.

Another important point about the passé composé and the imparfait in French involves the rules governing their formation. The passé composé is formed by combining the present indicative tense of the auxiliary verb with the past participle (participe passé) of the lexical verb, which is more or less similar to the formation of the present perfect in English. However, whereas in the present perfect active, English uses only the auxiliary "have", French uses either "have" or "be" (avoir ou être), and this choice is determined by the verb semantics (with some exceptions, e.g. pronominal verbs). Furthermore, when the auxiliary être is used, the past participle agrees in gender and in number with the subject, and when the auxiliary avoir is used, the past participle agrees in gender and in number with the direct object of the verb only if this direct object (in the form of a noun or a pronoun) precedes the verb in the sentence. However, the majority of verbs use the auxiliary avoir in the passé composé (with the exception of reflexive verbs and a limited number of frequent verbs that use être). Immersion students need then to remember the past participle of irregular verbs, the correct auxiliary, and the rules for agreement of the past participle. In the case of the imparfait, verb endings in French vary according to both person and number and several verbs have a root different from the infinitive (e.g. finir – finissait, résoudre - résolvait). In contrast, the English past progressive uses the
same ending (-ing) for all the persons with a minor change marking singular or plural in
the auxiliary (was – were).

4.2. Studies on the acquisition of perfect vs. imperfect

Research indicates that with respect to the distinction in meaning between perfect
(passé composé) and imperfect (imparfait) aspects, students seem to generally acquire the
perfect before the imperfect (Kaplan, 1987; Bardovi-Harlig, 2000). This is also evident
among French immersion students where the imparfait seems to develop more slowly
than the passé composé (Harley, 1992). One possible explanation for this discrepancy is
that teachers probably focus more on the passé composé than on the imparfait (Macrory
& Stone, 2000), or that teachers consider the passé composé as more reliable to trigger
discussions about the past (Kaplan, 1987), or that in immersion they naturally use it more
(Harley, 1987). Harley also noted that even if teachers did use the imparfait, they tended
to do so with stative verbs (see Bardovi-Harlig below for definition) and, even by grade
6, immersion students appeared to get very little exposure to the distinction in meaning
between the passé composé and the imparfait in referring to actions. Bardovi-Harlig
(2000) explained that, in Romance languages, the acquisition of tense-aspect morphology
by second language learners tends to follow a certain pattern whereby the passé composé
emerges first followed by the imparfait. She differentiated between grammatical and
inherent aspects. She considered the first as typically morphological and the second as
lexical. Bardovi-Harlig defined lexical aspect as “the inherent temporal make up of verbs
and predicates” (p. 193). These predicates have different aspeccual qualities such as
inherent duration (e.g. talk and run); punctuality (e.g. arrive and notice); both duration
and achievement (e.g. climb a mountain) and state (e.g. be and seem). She reported that
there is a relation between lexical aspect and discourse structure in the acquisition of both first and second language and with both tutored and untutored learners. Her findings are summarized as follows: 1- Second language learners use perfect aspect first for achievements then for accomplishments then for activities and finally for states; 2- In languages where there is a distinction between perfect and imperfect, the perfect past emerges first; 3- Second language learners use imperfect aspect first for states, then for activities, then for accomplishments and finally for achievements.

Bardovi-Harlig and Bergström (1996) examined the developing tense / aspect systems of English as a second language (ESL) and French as a foreign language (FFL) learners to determine whether instructed students follow the same acquisitional patterns as uninstructed learners. Bardovi and Bergström analyzed written narratives from 23 ESL and 23 FFL learners on the basis of their rate of use of a past tense in past-time contexts. Findings were analyzed according to Vendler's (1967) classification of lexical aspect of verbs into four categories: states (STA), activities (ACT), accomplishments (ACC) and achievements (ACH). States do not change over time: activities have inherent duration and no specific end point: accomplishments have inherent duration and a specific goal: and achievements capture the beginning or the end of an action. This classification was first used for second language by Andersen (1989, 1991) who distinguished between stative and non-stative or dynamic verbs, where dynamic verbs comprise activities, accomplishments and achievements.

Bardovi-Harlig and Bergström reported that learners do not use past tense equally well with all verbs and the rate of use of the passé composé in obligatory contexts decreased from achievements, to accomplishments, to activities and then to states
whereas the use of the *imparfait* in obligatory contexts was most frequent for states, then activities, accomplishments and achievements. They suggested that in some contexts additional classroom work is not indicated, like for example, in the case of activity verbs which show a very high rate of appropriate use of *passé composé* even by low proficiency students. However, presentation of positive evidence of state verbs in the *imparfait* may encourage learners to use it and may also expand their range of lexical state verbs.

Harley and Swain (1978) made similar observations regarding French immersion students. They noted that by grade five and six, these students generally overuse the *passé composé* in oral expression even if they are describing actions in habitual and progressive contexts, while the *imparfait* is reserved only for state verbs. Harley and Swain also reported that grade six French immersion students tend to mix the *imparfait* and *passé composé* indiscriminately in their written tasks. They argued that this confusion may persist in higher grades and that some early immersion students do not master the distinction between the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* even by grade ten.

However, even if the *passé composé* may be acquired before the *imparfait*, it takes time for students to fully master the complexities of *passé composé* with respect to forms for both French as a first language (Heinen & Kadow, 1990) and French as a second language (Harley, 1992). Harley argued that immersion students tend initially to omit the auxiliary and/or later to overgeneralize the use of *avoir* (e.g. *j'ai venu(e)*). They take time later to master the difference between the use of *être* and *avoir*. This was also evident among adult immigrants who were part of the European Science Foundation project. The purpose of this project was to investigate their acquisition of different
European languages. It suggested that the marking of past time in French is first expressed through context, then through lexis, and it is only much later that it is expressed morphologically. The results reported by Klein and Perdue (1992) indicated a late mastery of correct passé composé forms for both avoir and être as auxiliaries.

Harris (1988) reported some similarities of sequence and of error in the acquisition of the perfect aspect between first and second language learners of French in U.K. classrooms in grades 10, 11 and 12. Both groups had a tendency to omit the auxiliary verb and to use avoir as the auxiliary instead of être which is consistent with Harley’s (1992) findings. In their study about students’ progress in the acquisition of the passé composé. Macrory and Stone (2000), compared the performance of a small group of grade ten second language learners over a two year period. The project took place in a secondary school in the United Kingdom within the context of modern foreign language teaching. They reported that, in both grades, most of the students were able to demonstrate some knowledge of the form and function of the passé composé using a gap-filling test. They knew that an auxiliary was required and which verbs were used as auxiliaries and were also able to produce the correct forms. However, results were quite different in spontaneous production. In both grade 10 and 11, students had problems using an auxiliary especially in the third person, and when they were able to produce one, it was not necessarily correct. Swain (1995) reported that F1 students were inaccurate in their use of passé composé and imparfait even though they might have noticed them at some point. She suggested that these students should be taught the rules explicitly and should perform activities that will require them to produce output in order to reflect on their own linguistic weaknesses.
4.3. Summary of the rationale of the study

The rationale for the present study is based on theory, previous research and the researcher's personal philosophy. It can be summarized as follows:

1) Research indicates that some degree of attention to form may be necessary to improve the linguistic production of FI students (Harley. 1989: Day & Shapson. 1991).

2) Students have limited attentional capacity and may experience difficulty focusing simultaneously on form and function when they compete for attention (VanPatten. 1990).

3) Practice activities allow learners to proceduralize their declarative knowledge and may help develop automaticity in second language performance (McLaughlin. 1987: DeKeyser. 1998).

4) DeKeyser. (1998) proposed a sequencing of learning activities where students are given enough time to develop declarative knowledge and are provided with opportunities to practise and automatize this declarative knowledge.

5) As suggested by Paulston (1971. 1972) a gradual shift from mechanical. to meaningful. to communicative drills allows learners to move from formal practice to independent language use.

6) Based on my personal teaching experience and the above research. I believe that FI students need to (i) learn conjugation patterns and rules of agreement to develop declarative knowledge: (ii) practise this declarative knowledge in meaningful
contexts; (iii) apply the automatized declarative knowledge in communicative activities.

The present study sequences instruction on form and function in an attempt to help grade 11 French immersion students learn the forms and functions of the passé composé and the imparfait, and apply them accurately in written production. The term form refers to the conjugation patterns of the passé composé and the imparfait and their rules of agreement. The term function refers to the distinction in meaning between the two aspects as defined by Bardovi-Harlig. The study provides students with mechanical and meaningful drills, dictation and a final communicative drill (Paulston, 1971, 1972).
CHAPTER 5

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is to investigate the effect of sequencing instruction on form and function on the learning of the forms and functions of passé composé and imparfait by grade eleven French Immersion (FI) students. This chapter describes the participants, the testing instruments and the scoring system, the procedures and the treatment materials and questionnaire used.

Pre-tests, immediate post-tests and delayed post-tests were administered in one experimental class and two comparison classes. Immediately following pre-tests, treatment materials designed specifically for the study were implemented in the experimental class over a period of six weeks for approximately one hour per week. Students in the experimental class completed questionnaires designed to assess their reactions to the treatment materials used. The researcher’s observations of the experimental class during the treatment were recorded. The three groups were compared statistically on test results in order to determine their growth over time.

5.1. Participants

5.1.1. Students

The participants in the study were 61 grade eleven French Immersion (FI) students in three classes from two schools in the same board in the Greater Metropolitan Toronto area. The experimental class with 21 students and one comparison class with 24 students were in the same school and were taught by the researcher. The second comparison class with 16 students was in another school with a similar French Immersion
program, where students had comparable socioeconomic backgrounds. Unfortunately, due to timetabling problems, it was impossible to schedule the experimental class and the two comparison classes in the same school in the same semester. However, teaching in the experimental class and in the second comparison class took place simultaneously in the same semester, though in different schools.

Before the classes were selected, permission to conduct the study was requested and received from the school board and the schools’ principals. Letters of permission were also sent home requesting parental approval for students to engage in the research. A brief description of the study was given to parents, but the specific language focus was not mentioned to avoid any interference with the results. One student from the experimental class, two students from the first comparison class and three students from the second comparison class were not granted parental permission (Appendix K).

The students were then asked to complete a questionnaire to provide information regarding languages used at home as well as a brief history of their French studies (Appendix G). One student in the second comparison class was a native francophone and spoke mainly French at home. Two students in the first comparison class were grade 12 students repeating their grade 11 French credit. These three students participated in the treatment and the testing, but their results were omitted from the data analysis. The experimental group consisted then of 20 students, while the two comparison groups consisted of 20 and 12 students respectively. The majority of students began French in grade five in a 50/50 middle immersion program (half day French, half day English), and a group of eleven students began French in Kindergarten in a 50/50 early immersion program (half day French, half day English). There were four early immersion students
in the experimental class, six in the first comparison class (but two were not included in the study because they were repeating grade 11), and one in the second comparison group. Both programs continued to the end of grade 8. However, by the end of grade eight, students enrolled in early immersion have more hours of instruction in French than students in middle immersion (approximately 2040 hours for middle immersion and 5400 hours for early immersion). In high school, both groups are mixed together with students from French schools because the number of immersion and francophone students is not large enough to have separate classes. This situation is typical of some schools in the participating school board. The program background of students in the three classes involved in the study was similar.

In grade 9, all students took five subjects (French, Art, Geography, Physical Education and Keyboarding) were conducted in French. In grade 10, the early immersion students were required to take three subjects in French (French, History and Dramatic Arts) but the middle immersion students were required to take only two subjects in French (French and History). In grade 11, the early immersion students were required to take three subjects in French (French, Consumer Studies and Religion) but the middle immersion students were required to take only two subjects in French (French and Consumer Studies). However, some of the middle immersion students also took Dramatic Arts in grade 10 and/or Religion in grade 11.

The two participating schools were semestered, so each credit was taken during half the school year, either from September to January, or from February to June. Classes were 70 minutes long. Several students came from a different ethnic background than the majority of students and spoke other languages than English at home. In the
experimental group, two spoke only Spanish all the time at home and four spoke only Polish. Five other students spoke half English and half Italian. In the first comparison group, one student spoke mostly Spanish and another one spoke mostly Tamil. In the second comparison group, three students spoke Polish most of the time and one spoke Korean. One student spoke half English and half Polish and one spoke half English and half Spanish. So, overall, the third language factor was similar in all groups.

The first comparison class taught by the researcher participated in their regular classroom instruction. There was a focus on form and function since both passé composé and imparfait were reviewed in the grade eleven curriculum. Students spent the same amount of time (approximately one hour per week for six weeks) as the experimental group reviewing both form and function of the two aspects. They were provided by the researcher with the same functional description of the two aspects and with the same rules governing their formation. With respect to form, it was explained, in French, that the past participle agrees in gender and in number with the subject of the verb when the auxiliary used is être: and it agrees in gender and in number with the direct object of the verb if it precedes it. With respect to function, it was explained that both passé composé and imparfait refer to past time but each expresses a different perspective on the past. Students were also given two mechanical drills to practise the different forms of passé composé and imparfait, and two paragraphs (from a grammar book) where they had to choose between the two aspects and write the correct forms using their notes and/or Bescherelle (a conjugation textbook) (see samples in appendix F). The four activities were corrected in class and problematic points were explained on the board. Students, however, were not asked to memorize past participles, rules of agreement and verb
endings, and there was no systematic practice for each rule as with the experimental group. Students did not have dictation where they were required to identify the functions of *passé composé* and *imparfait* through listening, write their correct forms from memory, and provide an explanation for their choice. Focus on *passé composé* and *imparfait* also occurred incidentally, as it came up in reading texts as a response to students’ questions or as corrective feedback in their writing. Moreover, there was no sequencing of learning activities with this group, whereby students had to learn conjugation patterns and rules of agreement before applying them in meaningful contexts and later in communicative activity (without using their notes).

The second comparison class, on the other hand, had received very detailed grammar instruction in grade 10 with rule formulation, explanation and application, as reported by their grade 11 teacher. Moreover, this second comparison group was very strong. Unfortunately, the researcher was unable to contact the grade 10 teacher to get a better description of what this group had been taught the previous year and which teaching procedures and learning activities were used. In grade 11, the distinction in meaning between *passé composé* and *imparfait* as well as the rules of agreement were reviewed as reported by their teacher. Students engaged in some practice and drill exercises. The activities used were a combination of mechanical, meaningful and communicative drills. The rest of the time, students’ compositions were used to provide corrective feedback and rule formulation with respect to these two aspects as well as other grammatical features. I could not obtain any information provided regarding sequencing of learning activities. It is also unknown how much time exactly, if any, was
spent on the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* between pretest and immediate posttest and between immediate and delayed posttests.

### 5.1.2. Teachers

The researcher is from a middle eastern background with two first languages, French and Arabic. She had been teaching for 11 years at the time of the study. nine in French Immersion and two in Science in French in a francophone school. The teacher in the other school was from an Italian background, fluent in both French and English, with 15 years of teaching experience in French Immersion. This particular school was chosen because it was semestered and drew students from similar socio-economic backgrounds. The grade eleven French Immersion class was running the same semester as the experimental class, and the students were from early and middle immersion programs. As noted earlier, the composition of students in all three classes was similar.

### 5.2. Research questions

The questions under investigation were the following:

1- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on correct forms of the *passé composé*?

2- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on the use of the *passé composé* in contexts for the *passé composé*?

3- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on correct forms of the *imparfait*?

4- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on the use of the *imparfait* in contexts for the *imparfait*?
5.3. Testing instruments and scoring procedures

This section provides a description of each of the three testing instruments used as well as an explanation of the scoring procedures. All tests except the dictation test were adapted from materials developed by researchers at the Modern Language Centre at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE/UT). However, because these instruments were originally developed for a grade 6 French Immersion group, testing materials were piloted with a small group of grade 11 French Immersion students to ensure that the pre-test would not produce "a ceiling effect" which might happen if a large number of students scored at or near the top of the measurement scales on the pre-test, leaving little or no room for improvement on the post-test. The participants in the pilot study were three female students enrolled in a middle immersion program (half day French, half day English) in grades 5 to 8, who had continued with French immersion in high school. In grades 9 and 10, four of their subjects (Geography, History, Keyboarding and French Language Arts) were taught in French. In grade 11, they were taking only Language Arts in French. The mean score for the pilot group on the modified cloze pretest was 72.1% for passé composé and 70.9% for imperfect for form A and 71.9% for passé composé and 70.2% for imperfect for from B.

The written modified cloze test and the composition came in two forms, A and B. The dictation task came in one form only. These activities were designed to assess students' ability to use the passé composé and imperfect and were used in this research to assess both student's ability to use the two aspects in obligatory contexts as well as their ability to write correct forms of these aspects. In both schools, form A was used for both pre-tests and delayed post-tests, and form B was used for post-tests only. Counter-
balancing (Johnson, 1992) was not used, but should have been. Brown (1988) stated that to achieve counterbalancing “two different but equivalent tests (say, forms A and B) might be given to random halves of each group at the beginning of the study. Then the opposite forms would be given to these halves at the end of the study. The result would be that no subject had taken the same test twice.” (p. 38). The absence of counterbalancing may interfere with the reliability of the tests since equivalence of forms A and B, as adapted for this study was not determined. However, this equivalence was established for grade 6 immersion students who, for each blank on the cloze test, were given a choice of two responses whereas in the present study, the students were not provided with any possible answers. I did not establish equivalence, except through my pilot testing where three grade 11 immersion students did both tests and performed similarly on each test (see p. 50).

5.3.1. Modified cloze tests

The modified cloze tests consisted of two narrative texts in French (form A= le vol and form B= le monstre) (see Appendix C). Students had 20 minutes to fill in the blanks using either the passé composé or the imparfait according to the context and were also required to write the correct forms of verbs. Beneath each blank, the needed verb was in the infinitive. In the original study with grade six immersion students (Harley et al., 1987), the needed verb was written in both the passé composé and the imparfait and students were required to choose the correct answer. There were 38 items in form A (22 passé composé and 16 imparfait) and 37 items in form B (20 passé composé and 17 imparfait). However, when the validity of these items was assessed in the original study, the scorers (two adult native speakers of French and three adult near-native speakers of
French) agreed on all the correct choices of aspects with the exception of one aspect (imparfait) in form A which was eventually deleted from the study. The final count in the Harley et al. study was then 22 passé composé and 15 imparfait in form A and 20 passé composé and 17 imparfait in form B. In my study, however, two passé composé were later deleted from form A and two imparfait from form B because the majority of the students wrote them correctly on the pretests. The final count was then 20 passé composé and 15 imparfait in both form A and B.

Items were scored for both function and form. Each verb was given four points: two for function and two for form. If function was incorrect, the score was zero. In the case of form, there was a tough score and a lenient score. The tough score was to evaluate students’ ability to write the passé composé and imparfait forms accurately. The lenient score was to evaluate students’ ability to write passé composé and imparfait forms accurately taking into account the correct sound. In the tough score for passé composé, one point was given for correct auxiliary and correct agreement, and one point for correct past participle including correct agreement. In the lenient score, one point was given for correct auxiliary and one point for correct sound of past participle regardless of incorrect agreement (e.g. nous avons manger instead of nous avons mangé - tough = 1 point, lenient = 2 points). In the tough score for imparfait, one point was given for correct root and one point for correct agreement. In the lenient score, one point was given for correct root and one point for correct sound regardless of incorrect agreement (e.g. ils mangeait instead of ils mangeaient - tough = 1 point, lenient = 2 points). However, due to a high correlation coefficient (.90) between the two results (tough and lenient scoring), the
lenient score was deleted because the focus of the study is on written accuracy (correct auxiliary, correct root and correct agreement) and not on merely "sounding correct".

5.3.2. Compositions

The topics for the compositions selected drew on students’ personal experience (form A= Des vacances du tonnerre! and form B= Ouf! Je l’ai échappé belle!) (see Appendix C). In form A, students were required to write about their best vacation; and in form B, they were required to write about an event in their life that could have been tragic. Students were given 20 minutes to write on the assigned narrative topic which was provided with a short opening that established a past time context. The students were specifically instructed in French to write their stories in past tense and were required to write the correct forms of verbs. The suggested length for the composition was about one page. Students were allowed to consult their bilingual dictionaries but not their grammar notes. However, most of them did not use dictionaries, probably due to time constraints. Each composition was assigned a maximum raw score of 60. 30 for function and 30 for forms using the first fifteen verbs. For the compositions with less than 15 verbs, they were also assigned a maximum raw score of 60 and were scored using the number of verbs available, starting from "0" and counting what students did correctly. The scoring procedure was similar to that of the modified cloze test.

5.3.3. Obligatory contexts

Scoring in the written composition focused on the appropriate selection of the passé composé or the imparfait according to context and on the correct forms of both aspects.
The following were considered “function” errors:

i. The use of a verb form other than the passé composé in a context requiring the passé composé or the passé simple. (see xii below).

ii. The use of a verb form other than the imparfait in a context requiring the imparfait.

iii. The use of a mixed form (auxiliary together with the imparfait, passé simple, or infinitive).

iv. The use of the second person plural present tense ending (ez) or the infinitive ending (er) instead of the passé composé or the imparfait.

v. The use of the past participle without the auxiliary in passé composé.

The following were considered “form” errors:

vi. The use of the incorrect auxiliary in the passé composé.

vii. Errors in the forms of the past participle for regular and irregular verbs.

viii. Spelling errors in the root of the verb.

ix. Errors in gender or number agreement within the passé composé.

x. Spelling errors in the past participle.

The following were not considered as errors:

xi. The use of the passé simple instead of the passé composé (did not appear in any of the compositions).

xii. Any other tense that was acceptable in an obligatory context (e.g. present, future).
xiii. Form errors if the passé composé was used erroneously in a context for the imparfait, students got a score of "0" in these cases.

xiv. Form errors if the imparfait was used erroneously in a context for the passé composé.

5.3.4. Dictation

The dictation as a testing tool consisted of one form only because it was difficult to find another comparable text. The materials came from a newspaper article on an interview with Steven Spielberg regarding the film Saving Private Ryan (see Appendix C). The article was translated into French by the researcher and then recorded on tape. Students were required to listen to the tape three times for each test, once before dictation to help them make sense of what was being said, once during dictation, and once after dictation to allow for review and self-correction. The tape was stopped after each sentence during dictation to allow for writing.

Originally, there were twelve verbs in the imparfait and eight in the passé composé. However, four verbs in the imparfait were eliminated because the majority of students wrote them correctly on the pretests. Therefore, the final verb count was eight for the imparfait and eight for the passé composé. With respect to scoring, researchers have proposed different scoring procedures for dictation. Some very complicated (Valette, 1977), others less time-consuming. Davis and Rinvulucr (1988) pointed out that the most important factor in scoring a dictation is what is considered "right" or "wrong" according to the scorer. Bacheller (1980) proposed scoring the segments on a five-point scale: zero is assigned when none of the segment's meaning is understood by the scorer and five when the full meaning is understood. Savignon (1982) proposed an evaluation
of segments based on exact words, similar sound and conveyance of meaning. Morris 
(1983) used comprehension, meaning, structure, and spelling in his scoring procedure. 
Cohen (1980) scored word for word correspondence but ignored spelling if meaning was 
not affected. Hughes (1989) argued that spelling errors should be scored only if they are 
also made by native speakers because they serve as an indication of a test of meaning. 

In my study, verbs in the passé composé and the imparfait were scored as follows: 
verbs in the imparfait were given a score of two with one point for correct root and one 
point for correct agreement (e.g. ils traitaient= 2 points: je cherchait instead of je 
cherchais = 1 point). Verbs in the passé composé were given a score of two with one 
point for correct auxiliary including correct agreement, and one point for correct past 
participle including agreement (e.g. avez-vous entendue instead of avez-vous entendu = 
1+ 0= 1 point). The purpose of the researcher was to evaluate students' knowledge and 
application of conjugation patterns and rules of agreement for the purpose of accuracy. 

5.3.5. Inter-rater reliability for the tests in the study 

All tests were scored by the researcher and 20 percent by another scorer, both 
native speakers of French. Inter-rater reliability was calculated using a random sample of 
tests from comparison and experimental groups from each of the pretests, immediate 
posttests and delayed posttests. The criteria used were the same as the ones described in 
section 5.3.3. on obligatory contexts. Inter-rater reliabilities varied from .83 to .98 (see 
Appendix H for further details).
5.4. Procedures

5.4.1 Pre-tests

Pre-testing in the first comparison class was supposed to take place the fourth week in September 1998. Unfortunately, it had to be postponed till the third week in November 1998 due to conflicts in teachers' contract negotiations. This delay meant that the initially proposed treatment period in the experimental group was reduced from eight weeks to six weeks, as well as the period between pretest and immediate posttest for the two comparison groups. Pre-testing in the second comparison class and the experimental class took place the second week in March 1999. Participants in each class were identified by a number according to alphabetical order. All students received form A of the modified cloze test and the composition on the pre-tests. The modified cloze and composition tasks were administered in that order to the three groups the first day of the testing. The dictation was administered the second day.

5.4.2. Treatment period

The treatment period began in the experimental class the second week after the pre-testing (due to March break) and lasted six weeks. The activities were given to students in the same order as described in section 5.5 below. The purpose was to focus only on form using mechanical drills and later have students apply these forms in context using meaningful and communicative drills. At the end of each activity, students were asked to complete the questionnaire described in section 5.6.
5.4.3. Post-tests

Immediate post-tests were administered the second week in January 1999 for the first comparison class and the first week in May 1999 for both the experimental class and the second comparison class. For the experimental class this was the week following the end of the treatment period. All students received form B on the immediate post-tests for both modified cloze and composition tasks. However, immediate post-test results for the composition were not reported because comparability of the two forms A and B was not determined and counterbalancing was not used (see p. 51). The dictation was the same as in the pre-test. Delayed post-tests took place one month later, the second week of February, 1999, for the first comparison class and the first week of June, 1999, for both the experimental class and the second comparison class. All students received form A on the delayed post-tests and the same dictation passage.

5.5. Description of treatment materials and activities

The purpose of the treatment materials was to allow students to focus on form before having them focus on function. This sequencing of form and function occurred through the use of mechanical drills followed by meaningful and communicative drills. In this section, twelve main activities in which the experimental group was involved during the six-week treatment period are described (see Appendix B). The first seven activities involved mechanical drills with focus on form in isolation from context. Before each drill, students were instructed in writing on the board about the rule of agreement and were provided with examples of the application of that rule (see appendix E). They were then required to perform these drills to practise the conjugation patterns and the rules of agreement of the passé composé and the imparfait. The remaining five activities
were meaningful and communicative drills and involved a focus on form and function. that is form in context. Students were required to perform these activities to focus on the distinction in meaning between the two aspects while keeping in mind their correct forms.

**Activity 1: Mechanical drill - Bescherelle activity focusing on imparfait (focus on form)**

Students were given a list of verbs from each of the four verb groups: -er verbs such as donner. -ir verbs such as finir. -re verbs such as vendre. and -oir verbs such as recevoir. They were reminded the conjugation patterns for imparfait and were asked to use their Bescherelle to write the correct forms of imparfait (see Appendix B). The class was then divided in two groups (A and B). Group A was assigned half the verbs from the list and Group B was assigned the other half. Each group tested the other orally. Students were not allowed to look in their books and had to provide answers spontaneously and from memory. The group with the most correct answers won the contest.

**Activity 2: Mechanical drill – imparfait (focus on form)**

Students were given drilling exercises. The sentences were isolated from context and students were required to write from memory the verbs in brackets in the imparfait (e.g. mes amis (venir) ______ chez moi tous les vendredis soir).

**Activity 3: Mechanical drill - Bescherelle activity focusing on passé composé (focus on form)**
Students were given the same list (as in activity one) of verbs from each of the four verb groups: -er verbs such as donner, -ir verbs such as finir, -re verbs such as vendre, and -oir verbs such as recevoir, and were asked to use their Bescherelle to write the correct participe passé. The class was then divided in two groups (A and B). Group A was assigned one half the verbs from the list and Group B the other half. Each group tested the other orally. Students were not allowed to look in their books and had to provide answers spontaneously and from memory. The group with the most correct answers won the contest.

Activity 4: Mechanical drill - passé composé with être (Mrs. Van Der Tramp) (focus on form)

Students were given a handout with Mrs. Van Der Tramp’s verbs (e.g. naître, mourir, monter, descendre, arriver, partir, etc.). These verbs are generally conjugated with être and the name Mrs. Van Der Tramp is formed by combining the first letter of the verbs. For example M is for mourir, R for rester, S for sortir. The purpose is to help students memorize the verbs and their participe passé. They were also instructed on the board about the rule of agreement of the participe passé with être (it agrees in gender and number with the subject) and were given examples (see Appendix E). Students were then assigned mechanical drills (practice in isolated sentences) where they were required to write from memory the verbs in passé composé with correct agreement (for both auxiliary and participe passé. e.g. elles sont venues).

Activity 5: Mechanical drill- passé composé with être (reflexive verbs) (focus on form)

Students were given a list of reflexive verbs and were instructed on the board the rule of agreement of the participe passé (it agrees in gender and number with the subject
in the absence of a verb direct object; otherwise, it agrees in gender and number with the
direct object if placed before the verb: if the direct object is placed after the verb, it
remains unchanged) and they were given examples on the board (see Appendix E).
Students were then assigned mechanical drills (practice in isolated sentences) where they
were required to write from memory the verbs in passé composé with correct agreement
(for both auxiliary and participe passé, e.g. elle s’est lavée and elle s’est lavé les
cheveux).

Activity 6: Mechanical drill - passé composé with avoir (focus on form)

Students were taught on the board the rule of agreement for passé composé with
avoir (it agrees in gender and number with the direct object if placed before the verb) (see
Appendix E). The rule was explained and discussed with the group and examples were
provided on the board. Students were given a series of sentences and were required to
write from memory the verbs in passé composé with correct agreement for both auxiliary
and participe passé (e.g: Regardez ces belles fleurs; je les (acheter) ______ au marché).

Activity 7: Mechanical drill - combination of passé composé (Mrs. Van Der Tramp,
reflexive and verbs with avoir) (focus on form)

Students were given a series of sentences and were asked to write from memory
the verbs in passé composé with correct agreement for both auxiliary and participe passé.

Activity 8: Meaningful drill - paires de phrases à illustrer (focus on function)

This meaningful activity was adopted from materials developed for grade 6 by
researchers at the Modern Language Centre at OISE/UT. Students were instructed on the
board about the distinction in meaning between the passé composé and the imparfait and
how either aspect could be used depending on the perspective of a speaker or writer (see Appendix E). They were shown pairs of pictures representing past events. Beneath each picture, the description of what was happening was either in passé composé or in imparfait (e.g., il dégringolait l’escalier and il a dégringolé l’escalier). The purpose was to focus students’ attention on the distinction in meaning between the passé composé and imparfait. Students were then given a list of paired sentences and were asked to draw pictures to illustrate the aspectual difference between each pair.

**Activity 9: Meaningful drill - identification of function and form (focus on form and function)**

Students were given a text from one of the required readings (Rue Deschambault, by Gabrielle Roy) and were asked to underline verbs in passé composé and imparfait (see appendix B). Then, in a general group discussion, students were required to explain why each aspect was used. They were also asked to focus on form and to explain the conjugation and the agreement of each verb.

**Activity 10: Meaningful drill - Dictation (focus on form and function)**

The text came from a French literature book (Jean de Florette, by Marcel Pagnol) (see appendix B). Students listened to the text once before writing. They were then given the dictation orally. At the end, the researcher read the text one more time to allow students to review the text they had written. Dictations were then collected. The researcher underlined the incorrect verb forms and gave them back to students. In pairs, they were required to make the necessary corrections, which include form and function and to explain these corrections to the group.
Activity 11: Meaningful drill - from present to past (focus on form and function)

Students were given a text in the present tense and were asked to change it to past. The text came from a French novel required in the curriculum (Jean de Florette, by Marcel Pagnol) (see appendix B). They were then put into groups to discuss the text and make the necessary corrections. Students had then to report to the whole class and explain both form and function of verbs in their final product.

Activity 12: Communicative drill- autobiography (focus on form and function)

Students were asked to write their own autobiography using passé composé and imparfait. They were given forty minutes in class and the required length was about one page. Students were allowed to use their bilingual dictionary only, not their grammar notes nor their conjugation book. Autobiographies were then discussed in groups for use of passé composé and imparfait as well as the correct form of these verbs. Final versions were collected for teacher’s feedback and then returned to students.

5.6. Questionnaire

A questionnaire was administered to the experimental class after each of the twelve activities during the treatment period. It consisted of five questions, three on a five-point scale and two open-ended ones. The first question asked students to rate the activity according to degree of interest. The second question asked them to rate the level of difficulty of the activity. The third question asked for their judgment regarding the degree of effectiveness of the activity with respect to improving their ability to use passé composé and imparfait. The first open-ended question required students to describe any change they would make to the activity and explain why they would make it. The second
question asked for any additional comments they would like to make on the particular activity (see Appendix D). The purpose of this questionnaire was mainly to provide the researcher with information regarding the degree of difficulty of treatment activities and their usefulness in helping students in the experimental group learn the form and functions of the passé composé and the imparfait.
CHAPTER 6

RESULTS

This chapter reports the quantitative results of the research. It presents results of the cloze test, compositions and dictation task (pretests, immediate posttests and delayed posttests) along with statistical analysis of the data.

6.1. Test results

This section reports results from the pretests, immediate posttests and delayed posttests. The purpose of the research was to investigate the effect of sequencing form and function instruction on grade 11 French immersion students' control over the forms and functions of passé composé and imparfait. Three classes, one experimental and two comparison, were involved in the study. The experimental class participated in a six-week treatment period. During that time, students performed three types of drills, in Paulston's (1971, 1972) terminology. The first type was designed to focus their attention on forms of passé composé (auxiliary, past participle and agreement) and forms of imparfait (verb root and agreement) isolated from context. The second type of drill was designed to allow students to apply correct forms of passé composé and/or imparfait in context. The third type required students to write based on their own experience and to put form and function back together.

Prior to the treatment period, pretests were administered to the experimental class and the two comparison classes. Immediate posttests and delayed posttests were administered to the three participating classes after the treatment period using the same series of tests. The results of the experimental class were then compared to the results of the two comparison classes that did not receive this treatment, that is, the sequencing of
instruction on form and function. The initial number of participants was 20 for the experimental group, and 20 and 12 respectively for the first and second comparison groups. The number of students, however, who were included in the statistical analysis were 16 for the experimental group, and 14 and 8 respectively for the first and second comparison groups for the cloze test: 16 for the experimental group, and 17 and 8 respectively for the first and second comparison groups for dictation: 16 for the experimental group, and 15 and 8 respectively for the first and second comparison groups for composition. This drop in numbers was due to absences related to either illness or school activities. If a student was absent for either the pretest, immediate, or delayed posttests, he/she was excluded from the analysis of that particular test.

Mean pretest results were compared for all the measures using the SPSS, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) program, and post-hoc Tukey multiple comparisons (p < 0.05) were conducted to locate the statistically significant differences. Results indicated that the students in the second comparison group were performing better on the pretests for the passé composé but not for the imparfait than students in the experimental group and the first comparison group (Tables 6.1, 6.3, 6.5, 6.7, 6.9, 6.11, 6.13, 6.15, 6.17 and 6.19). In order to adjust for this initial difference between the three classes in evaluating the effect of the treatment materials, Analyses of Covariance (ANCOVA) were conducted on immediate and delayed posttests scores using pretest scores as a covariate (Tables 6.2, 6.4, 6.6, 6.8, 6.10, 6.12, 6.14, 6.16, 6.18 and 6.20). Statistical comparisons of the growth over time of the three classes were made using a two-factor design. The within-subjects factor was time with either two levels (pretest and delayed posttest) or three levels (pretest, immediate posttest and delayed posttest). The between-subjects factor was class
with three levels (experimental, first comparison and second comparison). The purpose was to compare the results of the three classes over a period of time, that is, to determine whether there were significant differences between pre-, post- and delayed post results. Four comparisons were made: 1) The experimental class vs. the first and second comparison classes (were there differences among the classes at immediate and delayed posttesting?); 2) the first comparison class vs. the second comparison class (were there differences between the two comparison classes at immediate and delayed posttesting?); 3) the first comparison class vs. the experimental class (were there differences at immediate and delayed posttesting between the experimental class and the first comparison class, both taught by the researcher?); 4) the second comparison class vs. the experimental class (were there differences at immediate and delayed posttesting between the experimental class and the second comparison class taught by another teacher in an other school?).

6.1.1. Cloze test

6.1.1.1. Passé composé – form

Table 6.1 presents the mean raw scores and the standard deviations for the scoring of the passé composé form for all three classes on the three implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.1.
Table 6.1: Class means on the cloze test passé composé – form
(maximum raw score = 40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>M = 18.94</td>
<td>M = 32.88</td>
<td>M = 31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 10.51</td>
<td>SD = 9.08</td>
<td>SD = 8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=14)</td>
<td>M = 18.71</td>
<td>M = 23.01</td>
<td>M = 24.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 10.51</td>
<td>SD = 9.08</td>
<td>SD = 8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 33.38</td>
<td>M = 34.88</td>
<td>M = 34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 10.51</td>
<td>SD = 9.08</td>
<td>SD = 8.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1: Means of cloze test passé composé – form
(maximum raw score = 40)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, presented in table 1A (see Appendix A), reveal a significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined (F(2, 70) = 25.49, p < .001) and a significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction (F(4, 70) = 12.13, p < .001). However, for each of the two comparison classes there were no significant differences between pretests, immediate posttests and delayed posttests.
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the passé composé at each point in time, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- The second comparison class outperformed both the experimental class ($t = 3.2, p<.01$) and the first comparison class ($t = 3.15, p<.05$).
- There were no significant differences between the experimental class and the first comparison class.

**At immediate posttest**

- The second comparison class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 3.2, p<.05$), but there was no significant difference between the second comparison class and the experimental class.
- The experimental class improved significantly and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 3.15, p<.01$).

**At the delayed posttest**

- The second comparison class continued to outperform the first comparison class ($t = 3.25, p<.01$).
- The experimental class continued to outperform the first comparison class ($t = 3.24, p<.01$).
- There were no statistical differences between the experimental class and the second comparison class.
Table 6.2 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the 
*passé composé* – form for all three classes on the two posttest implementations of the 
cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.2.

**Table 6.2: ANCOVA Class means of the cloze test *passé composé* – form 
(maximum raw score = 40)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>M = 34.88</td>
<td>M = 33.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 5.82</td>
<td>SD = 5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=14)</td>
<td>M = 24.37</td>
<td>M = 23.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 5.82</td>
<td>SD = 5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 27.10</td>
<td>M = 26.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 6.45</td>
<td>SD = 6.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.2: Adjusted posttest means of cloze test *passé composé* – form 
(maximum raw score = 40)**

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 2A (see Appendix A), reveal a 
non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-
significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction. However, there was a significant difference between the groups, (F (2, 34) = 14.81, p < .001).

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the passé composé, the following pairwise comparisons were made using the prettest scores as the covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class outperformed the two comparison classes combined (t = 4.77, p<.001).
- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class (t = 5.02, p<.001).
- The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class (t = 2.77, p<.05).

**At delayed posttest**

- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class (t = 5.17, p<.001).
- The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class (t = 2.75, p<.05).
6.1.1.2. Passé composé – function

Table 6.3 presents the raw mean scores and the standard deviations for the function of the passe composé for all three classes on the three implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.3.

**Table 6.3:** Class means on the cloze test *passé composé* – function
(maximum raw score =40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>M = 21.50</td>
<td>M = 34.50</td>
<td>M = 33.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 11.39</td>
<td>SD = 9.10</td>
<td>SD = 8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison</td>
<td>M = 21.57</td>
<td>M = 24.07</td>
<td>M = 24.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 11.39</td>
<td>SD = 9.11</td>
<td>SD = 8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison</td>
<td>M = 36.50</td>
<td>M = 35.88</td>
<td>M = 36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 11.39</td>
<td>SD = 9.10</td>
<td>SD = 8.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.3:** Means of cloze test *passé composé* – function
(maximum raw score 40)
The results of the two-factor ANOVA, summarized in table 3A (see Appendix A), reveal a significant overall time effect when the three classes are combined ($F(2, 70)=14.26, p<.005$), and a significant time by group interaction ($F(4, 70)=9.33, p<.005$). However, there was no statistical evidence of any change for the two comparison classes between pretest, immediate posttest and delayed posttest.

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the *passé composé* in a context for *passé composé*, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- The second comparison class scored significantly higher than both the experimental class ($t = 3.04, p<.05$) and the first comparison class ($t = 2.96, p<.05$).
- There were no significant differences between the experimental class and the first comparison class.

**At posttest**

- The second comparison class continued to outperform the first comparison class ($t = 2.93, p<.05$).
- There were no significant differences between the second comparison class and the experimental class.
- The experimental class improved significantly and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 3.13, p<.05$).
At delayed posttest

- The second comparison class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 2.93, p<.05$).

- The experimental class continued to do significantly better than the first comparison class ($t = 2.56, p<.05$).

- There was no statistical evidence of any difference between the second comparison class and the experimental class.

Table 6.4 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the function of the *passé composé* for all three classes on the immediate and delayed cloze posttests. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.4.

**Table 6.4:** ANCOVA Class means of the cloze test *passé composé* – function (maximum raw score = 40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>M = 36.46</td>
<td>M = 35.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 5.98</td>
<td>SD = 6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 25.99</td>
<td>M = 26.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 5.97</td>
<td>SD = 6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 28.59</td>
<td>M = 29.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 6.56</td>
<td>SD = 6.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.4: Adjusted posttest means of cloze passé composé – function (maximum raw score = 40)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 4A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes were combined and a non-significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction. However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2, 34) = 10.99, p < .001).

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the passé composé in a context for passé composé the following pairwise comparisons were made using the pretest scores as covariate.

At immediate posttest

- The experimental class outperformed the two comparison classes combined (t = 4.10, p<.001).
• The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 4.87$, $p < .001$).

• The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class ($t = 2.75$, $p < .001$).

**At delayed posttest**

• The performance of the experimental class did not differ statistically at immediate and delayed posttest.

• The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 3.88$, $p < .005$).

• There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

6.1.1.3. Passé composé – total (form + function)

Table 6.5 presents the raw mean scores and the standard deviations for the total scoring of the passé composé for all three classes on the three implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.5.

**Table 6.5:** Class means on the cloze test passé composé – total (maximum raw score = 80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>M = 40.44</td>
<td>M = 67.38</td>
<td>M = 65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 21.80</td>
<td>SD = 18.12</td>
<td>SD = 17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 40.29</td>
<td>M = 46.29</td>
<td>M = 46.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 21.80</td>
<td>SD = 18.12</td>
<td>SD = 17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 69.88</td>
<td>M = 70.75</td>
<td>M = 70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 21.80</td>
<td>SD = 18.12</td>
<td>SD = 17.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.5: Means of cloze passé composé – total
(maximum raw score = 80)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, summarized in table 5A (see Appendix A), reveal a highly significant overall time effect when the three classes are combined (F(2, 70)=19.67, p<.001), and a highly significant time by group interaction (F(4, 70)=10.89, p<.001). However, there was no statistical evidence of any change for the two comparison classes between pretest, immediate posttest and delayed posttest.

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the passé composé in a context for passé composé and its correct forms, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

At pretest

- The second comparison class scored significantly higher than both the experimental class (t = 3.12, p<.05) and the first comparison class (t = 3.10, p<.05).
There were no significant differences between the experimental class and the first comparison class.

**At posttest**

- The second comparison class continued to outperform the first comparison class ($t = 3.05, p<.05$).
- There were no significant differences between the second comparison class and the experimental class.
- The experimental class improved significantly and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 3.18, p<.01$).

**At delayed posttest**

- The second comparison continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 3.12, p<.05$).
- The experimental class continued to do significantly better than the first comparison class ($t = 2.92, p<.05$).
- There was no statistical evidence of any difference between the second comparison class and the experimental class.

Table 6.6 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the total (form plus function) of the passé composé for all three classes on the two implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.6.
Table 6.6: ANCOVA Class means of the cloze test passé composé – total
(maximum raw score = 80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>M = 71.36</td>
<td>M = 68.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 11.69</td>
<td>SD = 11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 50.37</td>
<td>M = 50.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 11.67</td>
<td>SD = 11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 55.63</td>
<td>M = 55.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 12.89</td>
<td>SD = 12.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.6: Adjusted posttest means of cloze test passé composé – total
(maximum raw score =80)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 6A (see Appendix A), reveal a
non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-
significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction.
However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2. 34) = 12.94, p < .001).
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the *passé composé* in a context for *passé composé* and its correct forms, the following pairwise comparisons were made using prettest scores as covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class outperformed the two comparison classes combined ($t = 4.45, p<.001$).

- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 5.00, p<.001$).

- The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class ($t = 2.80, p<.05$).

**At delayed posttest**

- The performance of the experimental class did not differ statistically at immediate and delayed posttest.

- The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 4.56, p<.001$).

- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.
6.1.1.4. *Imparfait* – form

Table 6.7 presents the mean scores and the standard deviations for the scoring of the *imparfait* form for all three classes on the three implementations of the cloze test.

The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.7.

**Table 6.7**: Class means on the cloze test *imparfait* – form
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>M = 17.44</td>
<td>M = 22.00</td>
<td>M = 20.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 6.32</td>
<td>SD = 4.68</td>
<td>SD = 4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison</td>
<td>M = 17.50</td>
<td>M = 18.29</td>
<td>M = 16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 6.32</td>
<td>SD = 4.67</td>
<td>SD = 4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison</td>
<td>M = 18.88</td>
<td>M = 20.00</td>
<td>M = 20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 6.32</td>
<td>SD = 4.68</td>
<td>SD = 4.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.7**: Means of cloze *imparfait* – form
(maximum raw score = 30)
The results of the two-factor ANOVA, summarized in table 7A (see Appendix A), reveal a significant overall time effect when the three classes are combined \((F(2, 70)=4.31, p<.05)\), and a significant time by group interaction \((F(4, 70)=3.03, p<.05)\).

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the *imparfait*, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**
- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

**At posttest**
- There were no significant differences among the three classes.
- The experimental class improved significantly between pretest and immediate posttest \((t = 4.75, p<.001)\).
- There was no statistical evidence of any change for the two comparison classes.

**At delayed posttest**
- The experimental class did significantly better than the first comparison class \((t = 2.58, p<.05)\).
- There was no statistical evidence of any difference between the second comparison class and the experimental class.
Table 6.8 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the scoring of the *imparfait* form for all three classes on the two implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.8.

**Table 6.8: ANCOVA Class means of the cloze test *imparfait* form**  
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>M = 22.19</td>
<td>M = 20.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.87</td>
<td>SD = 3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=14)</td>
<td>M = 18.44</td>
<td>M = 16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.87</td>
<td>SD = 3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 19.35</td>
<td>M = 20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.88</td>
<td>SD = 3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.8:** Adjusted posttest means of cloze *imparfait* – form  
(maximum raw score = 30)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 8A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-
significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction. However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2, 34) = 9.08, p < .005).

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the *imparfait*, the following pairwise comparisons were made using the pretest scores as the covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class scored higher than the first comparison class (t = 3.57, p<.005).
- There was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison class.

**At delayed posttest**

- The performance of the experimental and the first comparison class did not differ statistically at immediate and delayed posttest.
- The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class (t = 3.30, p<.01).
- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.
6.1.1.5. Imparfait – function

Table 6.9 presents the raw mean scores and the standard deviations for the function of the *imparfait* for all three classes on the three implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.9.

**Table 6.9:** Class means on the cloze test *imparfait* – function  
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 6.26</td>
<td>SD = 4.47</td>
<td>SD = 4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=14)</td>
<td>M = 20.43</td>
<td>M = 19.21</td>
<td>M = 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 6.26</td>
<td>SD = 4.47</td>
<td>SD = 4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 21.50</td>
<td>M = 21.50</td>
<td>M = 23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 6.26</td>
<td>SD = 4.47</td>
<td>SD = 4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.9:** Means of cloze test *imparfait* – function  
(maximum raw score = 30)
The results of the two-factor ANOVA, summarized in table 9A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant overall time effect when the three classes are combined, but a significant time by group interaction ($F(4.70) = 3.20, p<.05$).

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the *imparfait* in a context for *imparfait*, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

**At posttest**

- The experimental class improved significantly between pretest and immediate posttest ($t = 3.42, p<.01$) and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 3.01, p<.05$).
- There were no significant differences between the second comparison class and the experimental class.
- There was no statistical evidence of any change for the two comparison classes.

**At delayed posttest**

- There was no statistical evidence of any difference among the three classes.

Table 6.10 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the function of *imparfait* for all three classes on the two implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.10.
Table 6.10: ANCOVA Class means of the cloze test *imparfait* – function
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>M = 24.37</td>
<td>M = 22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 3.58</td>
<td>SD = 3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>M = 19.21</td>
<td>M = 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 3.57</td>
<td>SD = 3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>M = 21.03</td>
<td>M = 23.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 3.58</td>
<td>SD = 3.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.10: Adjusted posttest means of cloze test *imparfait* – function
(maximum raw score = 30)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 10A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction. However, there was a significant difference between the groups. \( F(2, 34) = 6.14, p < .01 \).
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the *imparfait* in a context for the *imparfait*, the following pairwise comparisons were made using the pretest scores as covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class scored higher than the first comparison class ($t = 3.94$, $p < .001$).
- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**At delayed posttest**

- The performance of the experimental class did not differ statistically at immediate and delayed posttest.
- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the first comparison class.
- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**6.1.1.6. Imparfait – total (form + function)**

Table 6.11 presents the mean scores and the standard deviations for the total scoring of the *imparfait* for all three classes on the three implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.11.
Table 6.11: Class means on the cloze test *imparfait* – total
(maximum raw score = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>M = 37.31</td>
<td>M = 46.13</td>
<td>M = 42.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 12.37</td>
<td>SD = 9.05</td>
<td>SD = 9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 37.93</td>
<td>M = 37.50</td>
<td>M = 36.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 12.37</td>
<td>SD = 9.05</td>
<td>SD = 9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 40.38</td>
<td>M = 41.50</td>
<td>M = 44.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 12.37</td>
<td>SD = 9.05</td>
<td>SD = 9.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.11: Means of cloze test *imparfait* – total
(maximum raw score = 60)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, summarized in table 11A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant overall time effect when the three classes are combined, but a significant time by group interaction (F(4, 70)=2.98, p<.05).
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the *imparfait* in a context for the *imparfait* and its correct forms, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class improved significantly between pretest and immediate posttest ($t = 4.13, p<.005$) and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 2.60, p<.05$).
- There were no significant differences between the second comparison class and the experimental class.
- There was no statistical evidence of any change for the two comparison classes.

**At delayed posttest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

Table 6.12 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the total scoring of the *imparfait* for all three classes on the two implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.12.
Table 6.12: ANCOVA Class means of the cloze test *imparfait* – total
(maximum raw score = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>M = 46.59</td>
<td>M = 43.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 6.34</td>
<td>SD = 7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 37.64</td>
<td>M = 36.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=14)</td>
<td>SD = 6.33</td>
<td>SD = 7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 44.34</td>
<td>M = 43.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 6.36</td>
<td>SD = 7.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.12: Adjusted posttest means of cloze test *imparfait* – total
(maximum raw score = 60)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 12A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction. However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2, 34) = 7.84, p < .005).
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the *imparfait* in a context for the *imparfait* and its correct forms, the following pairwise comparisons were made using pretest scores as covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class scored significantly higher than the first comparison class ($t = 3.86, p < .001$).

- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**At delayed posttest**

- All groups' mean scores did not differ statistically at immediate and delayed posttest.

- The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 2.61, p < .05$).

- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**6.1.2. Dictation**

**6.1.2.1. Passé composé - form**

Table 6.13 presents the mean scores and the standard deviations for the *passé composé* - form for all three classes on the three implementations of the dictation task. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.13.
Table 6.13: Class means on the dictation passé composé – form
(maximum raw score = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>M = 10.38</td>
<td>M = 12.31</td>
<td>M = 12.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.85</td>
<td>SD = 2.63</td>
<td>SD = 2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=17)</td>
<td>M = 9.94</td>
<td>M = 9.65</td>
<td>M = 10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.85</td>
<td>SD = 2.63</td>
<td>SD = 2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 12.38</td>
<td>M = 11.50</td>
<td>M = 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.85</td>
<td>SD = 2.63</td>
<td>SD = 2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.13: Means of dictation passé composé – form
(maximum raw score = 16)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, presented in table 13A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined but a significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction (F (4, 76) = 6.17, p < .001). However, the scores of the two comparison classes did not differ significantly across pretest, immediate posttest and delayed post test.
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the *passé composé*, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class improved significantly between pretest and immediate posttest ($t = 4.80, p < .001$), and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 2.90, p < .05$).
- There were no statistical differences between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**At the delayed posttest**

- There were no statistical differences among the three classes.

Table 6.14 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the dictation *passé composé* form for all three classes on the two implementations of the dictation test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.14.
Table 6.14: ANCOVA Class means of the dictation *passé composé* – form
(maximum raw score = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>M = 12.47</td>
<td>M = 12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 1.48</td>
<td>SD = 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison</td>
<td>M = 10.14</td>
<td>M = 10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=17)</td>
<td>SD = 1.50</td>
<td>SD = 1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison</td>
<td>M = 10.12</td>
<td>M = 10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 1.54</td>
<td>SD = 1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.14: Adjusted posttest means of dictation *passé composé* – form
(maximum raw score = 16)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 14A (see Appendix A) reveal a
non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-
significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction.

However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2. 37) = 9.32. p < .005).


In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of passé composé, the following pairwise comparisons were made using pretest scores as covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class scored significantly higher than the two comparison classes combined ($t = 4.13$, $p < .001$).
- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 4.52$, $p < .001$).
- The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class ($t = 3.55$, $p < .005$).

**At delayed posttest**

- The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 3.01$, $p < .05$).
- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**6.1.2.2. Imparfait - form**

Table 6.15 presents the mean scores and the standard deviations for the use of the *imparfait* - form for all three classes on the three implementations of the dictation task. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.15.
Table 6.15: Class means on the dictation *imparfait* – form
(maximum raw score = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Immediate Posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>M = 9.88</td>
<td>M = 13.31</td>
<td>M = 13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 3.19</td>
<td>SD = 3.42</td>
<td>SD = 3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=17)</td>
<td>M = 8.65</td>
<td>M = 8.53</td>
<td>M = 9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 3.20</td>
<td>SD = 3.42</td>
<td>SD = 3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 11.38</td>
<td>M = 11.38</td>
<td>M = 12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 3.19</td>
<td>SD = 3.43</td>
<td>SD = 3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.15: Means of dictation *imparfait* – form
(maximum raw score = 16)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, presented in table 15A (see Appendix A), reveal a significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined ($F (2, 76) = 12.33, p < .001$), and a significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction ($F (4,76) = 6.13, p < .001$). There were no significant
differences for the second comparison class between pre-test, immediate posttest and delayed posttest.

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the *imparfait*, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class improved significantly between pre-test and immediate posttest ($t = 5.47, p<0.001$), and outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 4.01, p<0.005$).
- There were no statistical differences between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**At the delayed posttest**

- The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 3.33, p<0.01$).
- There were no statistical differences between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

Table 6.16 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the dictation *imparfait* – form for all three classes on the two implementations of the cloze test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.16.
Table 6.16: ANCOVA Class means of the dictation *imparfait* – form 
(maximum raw score = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate posttest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>M = 13.15</td>
<td>M = 13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.43</td>
<td>SD = 2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=17)</td>
<td>M = 9.30</td>
<td>M = 10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.48</td>
<td>SD = 2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>M = 10.06</td>
<td>M = 11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 2.50</td>
<td>SD = 2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.16: Adjusted posttest means of dictation *imparfait* – form 
(maximum raw score = 16)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 16A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined and a non-significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction. However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2, 37) = 9.21. p < .005).
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the _imparfait_, the following pairwise comparisons were made using pretest scores as covariate.

**At immediate posttest**

- The experimental class performed significantly better than the two comparison classes combined ($t = 3.90, p<.001$).
- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 4.47, p<.001$).
- The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class ($t = 2.89, p<.05$).

**At delayed posttest**

- The experimental class continued to do better than the first comparison class ($t = 3.41, p<.005$).
- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison class.

**6.1.3. Composition**

**6.1.3.1. Form**

Table 6.17 presents the mean raw scores and the standard deviations for the scoring of composition - form for all three classes on the two implementations of the composition test (immediate posttest results were not included in the statistical analyses as explained in the Methodology chapter. Form A was used for both pretest and delayed
posttest and form B for immediate posttest only, and counter-balancing was not used).

The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.17 (for interrater reliability, see section 5.3.5).

Table 6.17: Class means on the composition – form
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>M = 13.44</td>
<td>M = 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 7.00</td>
<td>SD = 7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison</td>
<td>M = 13.60</td>
<td>M = 11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=15)</td>
<td>SD = 7.00</td>
<td>SD = 7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison</td>
<td>M = 16.13</td>
<td>M = 14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 7.00</td>
<td>SD = 7.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.17: Means of composition – form
(maximum raw score = 30)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, presented in table 17A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined but a
significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction (F (2, 36) = 10.16, p < .001). However, the two comparison classes did not show any significant difference between pretests and delayed posttests.

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the passé composé and the imparfait, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

**At the delayed posttest**

- The experimental class improved significantly between pretest and delayed posttest (t = 4.57, p<.001) and did better than the first comparison class (t = 3.14, p<.05)

- There were no significant differences between the experimental and the second comparison class.

Table 6.18 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the scoring of the composition - form for the three classes on the delayed implementation of the composition. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.18.
Table 6.18: ANCOVA Class means on the composition – form  
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>M = 20.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=15)</td>
<td>M = 12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8)</td>
<td>M = 12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.18: Adjusted delayed posttest means of composition – form  
(maximum raw score = 30)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 18A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined. However, there was a significant difference among the groups. (F (2.35) = 10.49, p < .001).

In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the use of the correct forms of the passé composé and the
imparfait, the following pairwise comparisons were made using prettest scores as covariate.

**At delayed posttest**

- The experimental class outperformed the two comparison classes combined ($t = 4.40, p < .001$).
- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 4.28, p < .001$).
- The experimental class outperformed the second comparison class ($t = 3.21, p < .01$).

#### 6.1.3.2. Function

Table 6.19 presents the mean scores and the standard deviations for the function scoring of composition for all three classes on the two implementations of the writing assignment (prettest and delayed posttest). The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.19.
Table 6.19: Class means on the composition – function
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>M = 16.38</td>
<td>M = 22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>SD = 7.64</td>
<td>SD = 8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 17.73</td>
<td>M = 14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=15)</td>
<td>SD = 7.64</td>
<td>SD = 8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second comparison</strong></td>
<td>M = 19.50</td>
<td>M = 16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>SD = 7.64</td>
<td>SD = 8.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.19: Means of composition – function
(maximum raw score = 30)

The results of the two-factor ANOVA, summarized in Table 19A (see Appendix A), reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined but a significant difference among the three classes as shown by the time by group interaction (F(2, 36)=6.88, p<.005). However, the scores of the first and second comparison classes did not differ significantly between pretest and delayed posttest.
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the correct use of the *passé composé* and the *imparfait*, the following pairwise comparisons were made.

**At pretest**

- There were no significant differences among the three classes.

**At delayed posttest**

- The experimental class improved significantly between the pretest and the delayed posttest (*t* = 3.11, *p* < .005) and did better than the first comparison class (*t* = 2.58, *p* < .05).

- There were no significant differences between the experimental and the second comparison class.

Table 6.20 presents the adjusted mean scores and the standard deviations for the total function score of the composition task for the three classes on the delayed implementation of the composition test. The same information is presented graphically in figure 6.20.
Table 6.20: ANCOVA Class means of the composition – function
(maximum raw score = 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=16)</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First comparison (N=15)</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second comparison (N=8 )</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.20: Adjusted delayed posttest means of composition – function
(maximum raw score = 30)

The results of the ANCOVA presented in table 20A (see Appendix A) reveal a non-significant main effect for time when all three classes are combined. However, there was a significant difference between the groups. (F (2, 35) = 6.59, p < .005).
In order to determine whether the experimental group performed better than the comparison groups on the correct use of the passé composé and the imparfait, the following pairwise comparisons were made using pretest scores as covariate.

**At delayed posttest**

- The experimental class outperformed the two comparison classes combined ($t = 3.47, p<.005$).

- The experimental class outperformed the first comparison class ($t = 3.42, p<.01$).

- There was no significant difference between the experimental class and the second comparison.

6.2. **Summary of test results**

Results indicated that the experimental group improved significantly between pretest and immediate posttest for the cloze test and dictation and between pretest and delayed posttest for the composition. The next section presents a summary of the adjusted test results and the same information is presented in table 6.21. The reader, however, should keep in mind the very small sample size and the lack of counterbalancing and unequivalence of tests (see p. 51).

6.2.1. **Cloze test**

6.2.1.1. *Passé composé*

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group outperformed the two comparison groups combined as well as each one separately at the immediate posttest for
all scoring systems (form, function and total). At the delayed posttest, the experimental group performed better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each one separately for form scoring only. In the case of function, there was no statistical change for the experimental group. It continued, however, to outperform the first comparison group but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. In the case of passé composé total, there was no statistical change for the experimental group between the immediate and the delayed posttest. but it continued to do better than both comparison groups. Within-group analyses for C1 and C2 showed no significant change from immediate to delayed posttest.

6.2.1.2. Imparfait

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group did significantly better at the immediate posttest than the first comparison group but not the second for all scoring systems (form, function and total). There was no statistical change between immediate and delayed posttest for the experimental group and it continued to do better than the first comparison group for form. There was, however, no significant difference between the experimental group and the second comparison group. There was also no significant difference between the experimental group and both comparison groups for function. In the case of imparfait total, there was no statistical change for all groups at the delayed posttest. The experimental group continued to do better than the first comparison group but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. Within-group analyses showed no change between immediate and delayed posttest for all groups.
6.2.2. Dictation

6.2.2.1. Passé composé

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group did significantly better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each one separately at immediate posttest only. At delayed posttest, the experimental group continued to do better than the first comparison group, but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. Within-group analyses showed no significant change for C1 and C2 from immediate to delayed posttest.

6.2.2.2. Imparfait

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group did significantly better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each group separately on immediate posttest only. At delayed posttest, however, the experimental group continued to do better than the first comparison group, but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. Within-group analyses showed no significant change for C1 and C2 from immediate to delayed posttest.

6.2.3. Composition

When covarying for the pretest on the composition, there was no class by time interaction since there was only the delayed posttest (see chapter 5, section 5.4.3) but there was a significant difference among the groups for form and function. The experimental group did significantly better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each of the comparison groups for form scoring. In the case of function, the
experimental group outperformed the first comparison group, but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group.
### Table 6.21:
Summary of adjusted test results for cloze, dictation and composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Delayed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Passé composé</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze form</td>
<td>E (Experimental) better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
<td>E better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within any group between immediate and delayed posttests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Passé composé</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze function</td>
<td>E better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within CI and C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Passé composé</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze total</td>
<td>E better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within E, E still better than CI and C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within CI and C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imparfait</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze form</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imparfait</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze function</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within E, no significant difference between E and CI and C1 and C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within CI and C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imparfait</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloze total</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
<td>No statistical change for all groups, E better than CI but not C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Passé composé</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>E better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imparfait</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>E better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td>No statistical change within groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition form</td>
<td>E better than CI + C2, and better than CI and C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition function</td>
<td>E better than CI but not C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No statistical difference between CI and C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE DATA AND RESEARCHER'S NOTES ON TREATMENT ACTIVITIES

This chapter reports the quantitative results of the student questionnaire completed by the experimental group after each activity throughout the entire treatment period. It presents the researcher's observations in the experimental class during the treatment period and the analysis of students' questionnaire responses, both quantitative and open-ended, with respect to students' reactions to the different activities and the amount of time needed to complete them. The purpose of this analysis is to identify the perceived level of difficulty of these activities as well as their degree of effectiveness with respect to helping students learn the correct forms and functions of the passé composé and the imparfait. If students were to enjoy the activities and be motivated, then it was important to the researcher to make sure that these activities were not too difficult and would not cause any frustration. Moreover, if the treatment was found successful, then this feedback on student reactions would allow me to refine the activities in the future.

7.1. Results of questionnaire data

Students in the experimental class were required to complete a questionnaire rating the level of interest, usefulness and difficulty of each of the treatment activities on a five-point scale. The questionnaire also included two sections for written comments (see Appendix D). Table 7.1 gives the mean scores for the twelve activities in each of the three categories. The same information is presented graphically in figure 7.1.
The first question asked students to rate the degree of interest of each activity from not interesting (1) to very interesting (5). The most popular activity was the "paires de phrases à illustrer" with a 4.6 rating. The other activities all scored between 3.0 and 3.8 but dictation scored 2.9.

The second question asked students about the degree of usefulness of each activity. Once again, the most useful activity was the "paires de phrases à illustrer" with a 4.4 rating. All the other activities, whether out of context or communicative, scored above 3.3 (3.6-3.8) with the exception of activity #9 which scored 3.3. This activity required students to underline verbs in the passé composé and the imparfait and to explain why each aspect was used.

The third question asked students about the difficulty level of each activity (a rating of 5 indicated "most difficult"). The most difficult activities were "dictation" and "from present to past" and they both scored 3.4. The least difficult was the "paires de phrases à illustrer" with a 2.2 rating. All the other activities were not considered to be difficult as they all scored between 2.7 and 3.1.

The fourth question asked students if they would make any changes to the activities but only a few made some suggestions. For example, two students commented that the Bescherelle activity focusing on the passé composé and the imparfait required more time. One wanted more verbs and different tenses and the other said that the activity was good for grammar and for learning exceptions. For the "paires de phrases à illustrer", one student suggested to add more illustrations and another recommended the use of sentences that are more difficult to allow students to get a better sense of the
difference between the two aspects. For dictation, most students reported that they did not like writing lengthy paragraphs.

**Table 7.1: Rating of treatment activities by the experimental class**
* (maximum raw score = 5.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.1: Means of rating of treatment activities by the experimental class
(maximum raw score = 5.0)

On the whole, the treatment activities had a positive rating in terms of degree of
difficulty and usefulness with respect to helping the experimental group learn the forms
and functions of the passé composé and the imparfait.

7.2. Researcher’s journal notes

The following section describes the activities and the time required to complete
them, as well as students’ reactions to the different activities. Activities 1, 3, 10, 11 and
12 were done in groups. The rest of the activities were done individually.

Activity 1 – Mechanical drill - Bescherelle activity focusing on imparfait

Working in groups, students used their Bescherelle to write the correct form of the
imparfait of different verbs from each -er verbs such as regarder, -ir verbs such as obéir,
-re verbs such as rendre and -oir verbs such as pouvoir. It took about 30 minutes for all
the groups to finish. Students seemed confused at first and some had difficulty using their Bescherelle. They were reminded that verbs were listed in alphabetical order and were directed to refer to the footnotes for additional information regarding auxiliary and special conjugation. The class then divided into two groups of their own choice and each group was assigned half the verbs from the list. Each group tested the other orally for about 15 minutes. Students enjoyed playing the game especially because of the competitive element. They reported that the activity was quite useful and helped them identify unfamiliar verb endings.

**Activity 2 – Mechanical drill – imparfait**

In this activity, students were required to write the correct form of the *imparfait* for verbs in isolated sentences. Some -re and -oir verbs were the same as in the Bescherelle activity and it was interesting to note that most of the students remembered them. This activity took about 15 minutes. Students reported that the activity was useful and they were pleased to see that they could write from memory some of the difficult conjugation patterns.

**Activity 3 – Mechanical drill - Bescherelle activity focusing on passé composé**

Students were given the same list of verbs as in the first activity and were required to use their Bescherelle to write the correct forms of the *participe passé*. This part of the activity took about 20 minutes. Students were used to looking in their Bescherelle and they seemed more confident doing it this time. The class then divided into two groups of their own choice and each group was assigned half the verbs from the list. Each group tested the other orally for about 15 minutes and they all appeared to
enjoy it. Same as in activity 1, students reported that this exercise helped them identify unfamiliar past participles.

**Activity 4 – Mechanical drill – passé composé**

Students were given a list of verbs generally conjugated with être and were required to write the correct forms of the passé composé for verbs in isolated sentences. It took 30 minutes for the whole class to finish. Students were able to remember some of the less familiar forms of the participe passé, but had difficulty with the agreement mainly because they could not always identify the gender of the subjects of the verbs, and they had to look up those nouns in their dictionary. However, in general, students reported that the activity was useful and helped them remember Mrs. Van Der Tramp (see section 5.5).

**Activity 5 – Mechanical drill – passé composé with être (reflexive verb)**

Students were given isolated sentences and were required to write reflexive verbs in the passé composé with correct agreement. It took about 30 minutes for all the class to finish. Students seemed to find it difficult at first to focus on two grammatical rules (agreement with subject in the absence of a verb direct object, otherwise agreement with verb direct object if placed before the verb) at the same time and they kept on asking each other about whether there was a verb direct object or not. By the end, however, students appeared to have developed more self-confidence and were able to complete the activity with no further help. They reported that the activity was useful and helped them practise the rules of agreement.
Activity 6 – Mechanical drill – passé composé with avoir

In this activity, students were asked to write the correct forms of passé composé for verbs in isolated sentences. It was interesting to note that some students remembered the rule from the previous activity. It took about 15 minutes for all the class to finish and they seemed generally quite confident. Students reported that the activity helped them identify the verb direct object.

Activity 7 – Mechanical drill – Combination of passé composé (Mrs. Van Der Tramp, reflexive verbs and verbs with avoir)

The purpose of this activity was to give students the opportunity to review the grammatical structures previously explained and drilled. Students received a series of isolated sentences and were asked to write the correct forms of verbs in the passé composé.

Thus, it was their knowledge and recall of the rules of agreement that allowed them to get the right answer. Students were constantly discussing subject, complément d’objet direct as well as gender. It took about 30 minutes for all the class to finish. By the end of this activity, students appeared more at ease with conjugation patterns and rules of agreement and seemed to be more interested in accuracy. They reported that the activity allowed them to review the different rules of agreement and to better differentiate between the passé composé with être and the passé composé with avoir.

Activity 8 – Meaningful drill - Paires de phrases à illustrer

Students were shown pairs of pictures representing events in the passé composé and the imperfect to clarify the distinctions in meaning between the two tenses. Students
received a list of paired sentences and were asked to draw pictures to illustrate the aspectual difference between the *passé composé* and the *imparfait*.

Even though this activity was originally developed for grade 6, students had fun doing it and tried to be creative with their drawings while focusing on the distinction in meaning between the two aspects. The students did not have to think about grammatical rules for agreement and seemed to appreciate the visual aspect of the activity. This activity was the least time consuming as it took 10 minutes for all groups to finish. Students reported in the open-ended part of the questionnaire that being able to visualize the action helped them better understand the aspectual difference between the *passé composé* and the *imparfait*.

**Activity 9 – Meaningful drill - Identification of function and form**

In this activity, students were given a text from one of the required readings and were asked to underline verbs in the *passé composé* and in the *imparfait*. They had to explain why each aspect was used and give a reason for the particular agreement of each verb.

This activity was by far the most time consuming. It took about 50 minutes for all the class to finish. The underlining part was done very quickly. However, the explanation part was somewhat problematic. Students seemed to have more difficulty explaining the choice of aspect rather than the particular agreement. Some of their arguments were about the abstract nature of the definitions of both aspects compared to the clearer and more tangible rules of agreement. Moreover, students reported that they were trying to visualize the action as in the previous activity, but had difficulty because it
was more than one sentence. They indicated, however, that this activity helped them familiarize with both aspects.

**Activity 10 – Meaningful drill - Dictation**

This activity consisted of two parts. In the first part, students were given an oral dictation using a text from a French literature book (Rue Deschambault by Gabrielle Roy). The papers were collected after about 15 minutes and returned the next day with the incorrect verb forms underlined.

In the second part of the activity, students were required to work in pairs and to make the necessary corrections and explain them in writing. Students discussed the rules of agreement at length and it took about 15 minutes for all the pairs to finish.

Students were more familiar with the rules of agreement and it was interesting to note the improvement in the level of confidence. Dictations were collected one more time and students were given feedback by the researcher regarding their written explanation. Students reported in the questionnaire data that this activity was one of the most difficult but they found it quite useful.

**Activity 11 – Meaningful drill – From present to past**

This activity consisted of two parts. In the first part, students were given a text from a required French novel (Jean de Florette by Marcel Pagnol) and were asked to change it into past tense. It took about 20 minutes for the whole class to finish. In the second part, students were divided into groups of four of their own choice and were asked to discuss the text and make the necessary corrections. Students then reported to the whole class and explained both function and form of verbs in their final product. This
part of the activity took about 40 minutes. Students enjoyed doing this activity because they were familiar with the story. The groups' discussions focused mainly on aspect. It was interesting to note students' different perspectives with respect to the imperfective versus perfective aspect of the same event. For example, some students wrote "... lorsqu'il était plus près, il a vu ..." and others wrote "... lorsqu'il a été plus près il a vu ...". Both were counted as correct. This activity was also rated as difficult in questionnaire data because students had to understand the meaning of the text before deciding which aspect to use.

**Activity 12 – Communicative drill - Autobiography**

Students were given 20 minutes to write their own biography using the passé composé and the imparfait. They were allowed to use their bilingual dictionary for vocabulary and gender purposes, but they were not allowed to use their Bescherelle and grammar notes. Students were then given 15 minutes to discuss their autobiography in groups of three of their own choice. Papers were then collected for teacher's feedback and later returned to students. The group enjoyed doing this activity because students were writing about themselves. They had fun sharing their stories with their partners. In this activity, students were not provided with any information and were required to write based on their own experiences. Yet, they reported a difficulty rating slightly lower than that of activities 10 and 11 (see table 7.1), maybe indicating a higher level of confidence and a greater ability to focus on function while form is kept in mind.

**7.3. Summary**

The purpose of the present study was to allow FI students to focus first on the forms of the passé composé and the imparfait and then on their functions. taking into
consideration their limited attentional capacity. Treatment materials presented above were developed to move students from instruction on form isolated from context to instruction on function in meaningful and communicative contexts, that is, to move from an emphasis on form to an emphasis on function. Results of students’ questionnaire, test results and students’ growth indicated, overall, a positive reaction towards the different activities with respect to level of difficulty and usefulness. Therefore, I personally feel that there is no need to change the treatment if I were to undertake this research again.
CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the research and the results. It presents the limitations of the study as well as the implications for future research.

8.1. Summary of the study

The research set out to examine the effect of sequencing instruction on form and function on the learning of the forms and functions of passé composé and imparfait by grade 11 French immersion students. Instruction on form referred to Allen's (1983) structural-analytic component and entailed systematic instruction of the forms of the passé composé and the imparfait (conjugation patterns, choice of auxiliary, correct past participle and agreement), memorization of grammatical rules and features, drills isolated from context. Instruction on function referred to the functional-analytic approach advocated by Allen (1983) and Stern (1990, 1992), and entailed the correct use of the passé composé and the imparfait in meaningful and communicative contexts. The purpose of sequencing instruction on form and function was to allow students to concentrate first on target forms only and memorize them (forms of passé composé and imparfait) so that they could later focus on function (use of passé composé and imparfait) without interfering with linguistic accuracy.

In the beginning, fifty-two students were involved in the study. The experimental group consisted of twenty students and was taught by the researcher, but only sixteen students were included in the analyses, six males and ten females. There were two comparison groups: the first consisted of twenty students and was also taught by the
researcher, but only fourteen students were included in the analyses, five males and nine females. The second comparison group consisted of twelve students and was taught by another teacher in a different school in the same school board, but only eight students were included in the analyses, two males and six females (see section 6.1. for an explanation for the drop in number of participants).

Pretests, immediate and delayed posttests were administered to the three classes and consisted of a modified cloze test, a composition and a dictation task.

Immediately following the pretests, treatment materials involving mechanical, meaningful and communicative drills, in that order, were completed by the experimental group. The purpose of sequencing the three types of drills was to allow students to focus on the target forms and to practise these forms to the extent of memorization. Students were then given the opportunity to use these forms accurately in context.

The study also included a questionnaire that was administered to the experimental class after each of the twelve activities during the treatment period. The purpose was to record students' reactions to the different activities, especially with respect to their degree of difficulty and usefulness in helping the experimental group learn the forms and functions of the passé composé and the imparfait. The researcher's observations of the group during the treatment period were also reported. Statistical analyses using SPSS_x two-factor ANOVA were used to compare the test results of the three classes between pretests, immediate posttests and delayed posttests, and SPSS_x ANCOVA's were conducted to compare the three classes at immediate and delayed posttests for cloze and dictation, and at delayed posttest only for composition, while controlling for pretest scores.
8.2. Summary of the results

As reported in chapter 6, within the experimental group, scores improved significantly between pretest and immediate posttest for cloze test and dictation, and between pretest and delayed posttest for composition. There was no statistical change between immediate and delayed posttest for any of the groups on the cloze test and dictation. The reader should, however, keep in mind the non-equivalence (no counter-balancing) of tests. The next six sections present the adjusted results of cloze test, dictation and composition using pretest as a covariate.

8.2.1. Cloze test - passé composé

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group outperformed the two comparison groups combined as well as each one separately at the immediate posttest for all scoring systems (form, function and total). At the delayed posttest, the experimental group performed better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each one separately for form scoring only. In the case of function, there was no statistical change for the experimental group. It continued, however, to outperform the first comparison group but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. In the case of passé composé total, there was no statistical change for the experimental group between the immediate and the delayed posttest, but it continued to do better than both comparison groups. Within-group analyses for C1 and C2 showed no significant change from immediate to delayed posttest.
8.2.2. Cloze test - *imparfait*

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group did significantly better at the immediate posttest than the first comparison group but not the second for all scoring systems (form, function and total). There was no statistical change between immediate and delayed posttest for the experimental group and it continued to do better than the first comparison group for form. There was, however, no significant difference between the experimental group and the second comparison group. There was also no significant difference between the experimental group and both comparison groups for function. In the case of *imparfait* total, there was no statistical change for any of the groups at the delayed posttest. The experimental group continued to do better than the first comparison group but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. All the within-group analyses showed no change between immediate and delayed posttest.

8.2.3. Dictation - *passé composé*

When covarying for the pretest, the experimental group did significantly better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each one separately at immediate posttest only on the *passé composé* score in the dictation task. At delayed posttest, the experimental group continued to do better than the first comparison group, but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. Within-group analyses showed no significant change for any of the groups from immediate to delayed posttest.
8.2.4. Dictation - *imparfait*

When covarying for the pretest *imparfait* score on the dictation task, the experimental group did significantly better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each group separately on the immediate posttest only. At the delayed posttest, however, the experimental group continued to do better than the first comparison group, but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group. Within-group analyses showed no significant change for any of the groups from immediate to delayed posttest.

8.2.5. Composition

When covarying for the pretest on the composition, there was no class by time interaction since there was only the delayed posttest (see chapter 5, section 5.4.3) but there was a significant difference among the groups for form and function. The experimental group did significantly better than the two comparison groups combined as well as each of the comparison groups for form scoring. In the case of function, the experimental group outperformed the first comparison group, but there was no significant difference between the experimental and the second comparison group.

8.3. Discussion of the findings

This study started with the hypothesis that sequencing instruction on form and function would improve the acquisition of the forms and functions of *passé composé* and *imparfait* by grade 11 French immersion students. It implied that French immersion students need first to learn and memorize grammatical structures to be able to use them correctly in contexts. Test results suggested some benefits to the experimental group
where students were exposed to treatment materials. These materials consisted of twelve activities. The first seven involved mechanical drills with focus on form isolated from context. The remaining five activities were meaningful and communicative drills and involved a focus on form and function, that is, form in context.

There is empirical evidence that focus on form instruction may improve the language of French immersion students (Harley, 1989; Day & Shapson, 1991; Green & Hecht, 1992; Lyster, 1994; Harley, 1998), and that focus on forms and focus on form, as characterized by Norris and Ortega (2000), are both effective. The problem seems to lie in finding a method that will enable students to focus on both forms and form (as labeled by Norris & Ortega) or both form and function (as defined in the present study) while taking into consideration the limitations of their attentional capacity (VanPatten, 1990).

Some researchers have proposed the use of input enhancement techniques to draw students’ attention to the target form (Ellis, 1991; Sharwood-smith, 1993). These techniques make the aspect of the target forms visually salient to learners so that they may direct their attention to form while focusing on function/use. However, DeKeyser (1998) proposed sequencing learning activities to allow students to develop and practice declarative knowledge because when well practised, these activities require less attention on the part of the learners and automatization can begin.

Therefore, the treatment used in the present study drew on 1- the structural-analytic and functional-analytic dimensions in second language teaching as characterized by Allen (1983), where structural-analytic strategies focus on grammar and formal features of language and functional-analytic strategies focus on communication functions, discourse and sociolinguistics; 2- DeKeyser’s (1998) proposition of sequencing learning activities
to provide students with opportunities to develop procedural knowledge: 3- Paulston's (1971, 1972) gradation of mechanical, meaningful and communicative drills to allow learners to move from grammar practice to independent language use.

The present study seems to be the first to date in a French as a second language context to suggest sequencing the presentation of the forms and functions of passé composé and imparfait through memorization of conjugation patterns and rules agreement followed by application in context. The purpose was to allow FI students to practise the target forms using mechanical drills to instill automaticity. Students were then able to focus on the functions of the passé composé and the imparfait while keeping the target forms in mind and without any text enhancement techniques and without interfering with linguistic accuracy.

The research questions under investigation are combined, and discussed in the following order: 1- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on correct forms of the passé composé and the imparfait? 2- Do students who receive the treatment perform better than the comparison groups on the use of the passé composé and the imparfait in their appropriate contexts?

8.3.1. Forms of the passé composé and the imparfait

With respect to the forms of passé composé and imparfait, treatment materials seem to have helped students in the experimental group memorize, at least in part, the correct use of the auxiliary and the rules of agreement for the past participle in the passé composé, and the conjugation patterns and the verb endings in the imparfait. The use of mechanical drills provided students with opportunities to practice the target forms and to develop explicit knowledge of these forms.
With respect to the distinctions in meaning between the passé composé and the imparfait, treatment materials seem to have helped students in the experimental group understand the aspectual difference between the two aspects. The use of meaningful and communicative drills allowed students to use the two aspects in appropriate contexts while keeping their accurate forms in mind. According to Andersen (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig and Bergström (1996), the use of the passé composé by second language learners decreases from achievements to accomplishments to activities and then to states, whereas the use of the imparfait is more frequent for states and lower for achievements. Moreover, research indicates that in second language learning, the passé composé emerges first followed by the imparfait (Bardovi-Harlig, 2000). Harley’s (1992) research conducted in French immersion classes also provided evidence that the imparfait seems to develop more slowly than the passé composé. This is evident in the present study for all groups including the second comparison group who started out much stronger than the experimental group on the passé composé but not on the imparfait. The experimental group, however, improved over time and caught up with the second comparison group.

The findings of the present research seem to support the possibility of applying DeKeyser’s (1998) proposition of sequencing learning activities whereby students need to be given enough time to develop and practise declarative knowledge first and then carefully proceduralize this knowledge before automatization can begin. Practising the forms of the passé composé and the imparfait provides French immersion students with explicit knowledge of these forms and allows students to use them accurately in context. The use of mechanical drills allows students to learn conjugation patterns and rules of
agreement (DeKeyser, 1998), and moving on to meaningful and communicative drills allows learners to move from formal practice to independent language use. Results in the present study, however, indicated that the experimental group was unable to outperform the second comparison group who turned out to be a very strong group. Unfortunately, we do not have any evidence of what this group learned in grade 10 with respect to the two aspects and the information reported by the grade 11 teacher does not provide any indication about sequencing of activities and the exact amount of time spent reviewing the passé composé and the imparfait.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that some of the experimental grade eleven students, now (2000-2001) in the researcher’s OAC classes, still remember the conjugation patterns and the grammatical rules taught during the research and are able to provide explanations for the choice of the two aspects as well as for particular verb agreements. This observation may lend support to the sequencing model and the use of mechanical drills for learners to acquire conjugation patterns. Moreover, students in the experimental group reacted positively to the treatment materials with respect to the perceived level of difficulty of these activities as well as their usefulness in helping students learn the correct forms of both aspects.

8.4. Limitations of the study

The limitations of the present study are discussed in terms of its design and the testing instruments used.

Due to its controlled environment, experimental research has the advantage of yielding specific results. However, this methodology is also reductionist and the results cannot always be generalized to other situations. The small sample of thirty-eight
students may indeed limit the generalizability of the findings. Only three classes participated in the study and only sixteen students were involved with the treatment activities. This small sample may interfere with the accuracy of the results and may not be adequately representative of the French immersion students' population (Johnson, 1992).

Another limiting factor may involve the content validity of the testing instruments that were selected. The cloze tests and the writing assignments were originally developed for grade six French immersion students. Some language adjustments were made by the researcher on the cloze test as explained in chapter 6, but the equivalence of the two forms A and B was based on the original version of the test and was not redetermined. The modified cloze tests were, however, piloted with a small group of grade 11 students. It may also be argued that using the two test versions (A and B) alternatively for the whole group rather than having half the group write version A and the other half write version B (counter-balancing) may have affected the results. Moreover, results of the composition immediate posttests were not included in the analyses since comparability of the two forms was not determined (see chapter 6). Including the immediate posttest may have given different results. With respect to the dictation task, students had to write the same text three times for pretest, immediate posttest and delayed posttest. This repetition may have caused a learning effect.

Also, there was no spontaneous oral production measure. Therefore, it is hard to know just how automatized the use of passé composé and imparfait had become.
Finally, students in the experimental group may have been more motivated since they could relate the testing to the treatment activities while students in the comparison groups may have lost interest in writing the same tests over again.

8.5. Implications for teaching

My study addresses the issue of improving the grammatical competence of French immersion students to promote accuracy in their written production. The statistically significant improvement made by the experimental group points to an increasing awareness of the rules of agreement for the passé composé and the imparfait as well as a better understanding of the difference in meaning between the two aspects. The treatment materials were oriented towards sequencing instruction on form and function to take into consideration students' limited attentional capacity and to avoid the use of enhancement techniques. This sequencing entailed isolating form from function and using mechanical drills to help students memorize the target form before applying it in context. Students may then focus on the function of the two aspects while keeping in mind their correct forms. This pedagogical approach may have an influence on classroom practice since most FI teachers recognize students' grammatical weaknesses and the inaccuracy of their linguistic output, especially in written production.

With respect to the distinctions in meaning between the passé composé and the imparfait, French immersion teachers may increase students' awareness of the aspectual difference between the passé composé and imparfait by presenting these aspects based on Bardovi-Harlig's (2000) definition of them and allowing students to practise past tense with both stative and dynamic verbs; that is, students should be provided with
opportunities to hear, read and use stative verbs in the *passé composé* and dynamic verbs in the *imparfait*.

### 8.6. Implications for future research

The results of the present study provide tentative support for the hypothesis that sequencing instruction on form and function may improve French immersion students' learning of the forms and functions of *passé composé* and *imparfait* even at grade 11. The statistically significant improvement made by the experimental group on the forms and functions of the two aspects seems to indicate that automatization of the target forms may lead to accuracy in written French by taking into consideration students' limited attentional capacity and allowing them to direct their full attention to function.

This study needs to be replicated under different conditions and using different testing instruments. As was pointed out in the limitations section, many factors may limit the generalizability of the findings. Therefore, more research is needed to determine whether the findings of this study are generalizable to other learning contexts (different age, different class composition) or to other linguistic features (different tenses, idiomatic expressions). Moreover, a replication of the study with different testing instruments is needed to support more strongly the hypothesis of sequencing instruction on form and function. For instance, testing materials could be developed specifically for grade 11 FI students (instead of adaptation of existing materials), and students' oral production may be evaluated through oral interviews to determine the effect of sequencing instruction on form and function on the accuracy of FI students' oral output of *passé composé* and *imparfait* and to assess the role and importance of automatization more broadly.
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Appendix A

ANOVA and ANCOVA tables
Table 1A: ANOVA for cloze test passé composé - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.98 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(79.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.49 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.13 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(15.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects
* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

Table 2A: ANCOVA for cloze test passé composé – form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.16 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.81 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(56.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(5.35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects
* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001
* = covarying for pre cloze passé composé (form).
Table 3A: ANOVA for cloze test *passé composé* - function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.09 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(84.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.26 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.33 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x $S$ within group</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(20.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S = $ subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

Table 4A: ANCOVA for cloze test *passé composé* - function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.84 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.99 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(63.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x $S$ within group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(6.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S = $ subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

*a* = covarying for pre cloze *passé composé* - function.
**Table 5A:** ANOVA for cloze test *passe composé* – total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(324.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.67****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.89****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$ x $S$ within group error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(69.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S$ = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

**Table 6A:** ANCOVA for cloze test *passe composé* – total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant $^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.11****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.94****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(236.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$ x $S$ within group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(20.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S$ = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

$^a$ = covarying for pre cloze *passe composé* - total.
Table 7A: ANOVA for cloze test *imparfait* - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(22.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.31 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(9.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S = \text{subjects}$

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

Table 8A: ANCOVA for cloze test *imparfait* - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant $^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.63 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.08 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(14.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(8.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S = \text{subjects}$

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

$^a$ = covarying for pre cloze *imparfait* - form.
**Table 9A**: ANOVA for cloze test *imparfait* – function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(20.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(10.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects  
* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001  

**Table 10A**: ANCOVA for cloze test *imparfait* - function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.29 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.14 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(17.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(8.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects  
* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001  

a = covarying for pre cloze *imparfait* function.
**Table 11A:** ANOVA for cloze test *imparfait* - total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(83.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(38.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

**Table 12A:** ANCOVA for cloze test *imparfait* - total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.13 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.84 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(61.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(33.49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

* = covarying for pre cloze *imparfait* - total.
Table 13A: ANOVA for dictation *passé composé* - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(6.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.17 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$ x $S$ within group error</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S$ = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

Table 14A: ANCOVA for dictation *passé composé* - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant $^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.17 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.32 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(4.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$ x $S$ within group error</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S$ = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

$^a$ = covarying for pre dictation *passé composé.*
**Table 15A:** ANOVA for dictation *imparfait* - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(9.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(2.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

**Table 16A:** ANCOVA for dictation *imparfait* - form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariant a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(10.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Covariant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

a = covarying for pre dictation - *imparfait*. 
**Table 17A: ANOVA for composition - form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(43.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.16 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T x S within group error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(16.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects
* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

**Table 18A: ANCOVA for composition – form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariant (^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.94 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.49 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(29.73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and S = subjects
* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001
\(^a\) = covarying for pre composition - form.
Table 19A: ANOVA for composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(49.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.88 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T \times S$ within group error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(27.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S$ = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

Table 20A: ANCOVA for composition – function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariant $^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.8 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.59 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$ within-group error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(47.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Values in parenthesis represent mean square errors and $S$ = subjects

* = .05; ** = .01; *** = .005; **** = .001

$^a$ = covarying for pre composition - function.
Appendix B

Treatment activities
ACTIVITY 1: MECHANICAL DRILL - BESCHERELLE ACTIVITY FOCUSING ON IMPARFAIT (FOCUS ON FORM)

A l'aide de votre Bescherelle, conjuguer les verbes suivants à l'imparfait.

1. interroger (il)
2. désigner (elles)
3. crier (nous)
4. manger (vous)
5. vouloir (vous)
6. répondre (je)
7. découvrir (tu)
8. lire (nous)
9. avoir (je)
10. mettre (elles)
11. faire (elle)
12. faire (vous)
13. apprendre (nous)
14. choisir (vous)
15. dire (ils)
16. naître (il)
17. connaître (tu)
18. mourir (elle)
19. envoyer (nous)
20. aller (ils)
21. finir (je)
22. recevoir (elles)
23. donner (nous)
24. vendre (tu)
25. résoudre (vous)
ACTIVITY 2: MECHANICAL DRILL – IMPARFAIT (FOCUS ON FORM)

Mettez les verbes suivants à l'imparfait et faites l'accord sans utiliser vos notes de grammaire:

1. Mes amies (venir) _________ chez moi tous les vendredis soirs.

2. Avant d'acheter mon vélo. je (aller) _________ toujours à l'école en autobus.

3. Vous (étudier) _________ toujours dans votre chambre.

4. Nous ne (comprendre) _________ jamais ce que le professeur (dire) _________

5. D'habitude Marc (avoir) _________ un faible pour les blondes.

6. Toi. tu (être) _________ toujours en retard.

7. Nous (écrire) _________ souvent quand nous (être) _________ en vacances.

8. A cinq ans Paul (aimer) _________ déjà le tennis.

9. Un grand jardin (s'étendre) _________ au loin.

10. Des ombres nous (envelopper) _________ de partout.

11. Les arbres nous (entourer) _________.

12. Vous (prendre) _________ toujours des fleurs pour maman à l'occasion de son anniversaire.
ACTIVITY 3: MECHANICAL DRILL - BESCHERELLE ACTIVITY FOCUSING ON PASSE COMPOSE (FOCUS ON FORM)

A l’aide de votre Bescherelle, trouvez le participe passé des verbes suivants et conjuguez-les:

1. interroger (il)
2. désigner (elles)
3. crier (nous)
4. manger (vous)
5. vouloir (vous)
6. répondre (je)
7. découvrir (tu)
8. lire (nous)
9. avoir (je)
10. mettre (elles)
11. faire (elle)
12. faire (vous)
13. apprendre (nous)
14. choisir (vous)
15. dire (ils)
16. naître (il)
17. connaître (tu)
18. mourir (elle)
19. envoyer (nous)
20. aller (ils)
21. finir (je)
22. recevoir (elles)
23. donner (nous)
24. vendre (tu)
25. résoudre (vous)
ACTIVITY 4: MECHANICAL DRILL – PASSE COMPOSE WITH ETRE (MRS. VAN DER TRAMP) (FOCUS ON FORM)

Mettez les verbes suivants au passé composé et faites l'accord si nécessaire sans utiliser vos notes de grammaire:

1. (entrer) Elles __________ dans le salon.
2. (retourner) Vous __________ tout de suite.
3. (monter) Est-ce que vous __________ à cheval?
4. (arriver) Qui __________ ?
5. (sortir) Mes amis __________ ce soir.
6. (descendre) Dès que la cloche a sonné, nous __________ en courant.
7. (venir) Ma tante __________ pour aider mes parents.
8. (devenir) Ma cousine __________ canadienne cet été.
9. (revenir) Ils __________ pour aider mes amis.
10. (aller) Pierre, Anne, est-ce que vous __________ au cinéma hier soir?
11. (mourir) J'ai marché dix kilomètres et je __________ de fatigue!
12. (partir) Les élèves __________ en vacances.
ACTIVITY 5: MECHANICAL DRILL – PASSE COMPOSE WITH ETRE – REFLEXIVE VERBS (FOCUS ON FORM)

Mettez les verbes suivants au passé composé et faites l'accord si nécessaire sans utiliser vos notes de grammaire:

1. Ma petite soeur ____________ (se laver) toute seule.
2. Elle ____________ (se promener) dans le jardin.
3. Les enfants ____________ (se réveiller) en retard.
4. Nous ____________ (se fâcher) sans raison.
5. Richard ____________ (se brosser) les dents après avoir mangé son chocolat.
7. Marie ____________ (se blesser) gravement.
8. Les feuilles ____________ (se détacher) des arbres.
9. Ils ____________ (se parler) une dernière fois.
10. Les élèves ____________ (se lever) par respect.
11. Il ____________ (se couper) le doigt.
12. Mon amie ____________ (se casser) la jambe.
ACTIVITY 6: MECHANICAL DRILL – PASSE COMPOSE WITH AVOIR
(FOCUS ON FORMS)

Mettez les verbes suivants au passé composé et faites l’accord si nécessaire sans utiliser vos notes de grammaire:

1. Regardez ces belles fleurs: je les _____________ (acheter) au marché.
2. Il _______________ (pleuvoir) toute la journée.
3. Nous _______________ (finir) nos devoirs à 6 heures.
4. Elles _______________ (lire) tous les livres de cet auteur.
5. La compagnie que vous _______________ (fonder) est extraordinaire.
6. Maman le lui _______________ (dire) trois fois depuis hier.
8. Je _______________ déjà _______________ (prendre) ce cours.
9. Les élèves _______________ (écouter) la leçon, mais ils _______________ la _______________ _______________ (ne … pas comprendre).
10. La voiture qu’elle _______________ (choisir) ne me plaît pas du tout.
11. Elles _______________ (signer) les chèques.
12. La contribution que nous _______________ (faire). _______________ (être) appréciée.
ACTIVITY 7: MECHANICAL DRILL – COMBINATION OF PASSE COMPOSE
(MRS. VAN DER TRAMP, REFLEXIVE AND VERBS WITH
VOIR) (FOCUS ON FORM)

Mettez les verbes suivants au passé composé.

1. Les étudiants _____________ (descendre) de l’autobus à 8 heures.
2. Le professeur _____________ (corriger) les projets et les _____________
   (rendre) aux élèves.
3. L’enfant _____________ (casser) son nouveau jouet.
4. Ma soeur _____________ (cueillir) des fleurs pour notre mère.
5. Les cadeaux que je _____________ (recevoir) à Noël me _____________
   (plaire).
6. Il _____________ (se lever) tôt et il _____________ (se laver) les cheveux.
7. Les parents _____________ (ne pas aimer) les notes que leurs enfants
   _____________ (avoir).
8. Mes grands-parents _____________ (revenir) hier de Floride.
9. Mes amis _____________ (s’amuser) à la fête de Daniel.
10. La musique _____________ (plaire) à tous ceux qui la _____________
    (entendre).
11. Ma cousine _____________ (partir) en Californie pour travailler.
12. Les participants _____________ (se réveiller) à 6 heures du matin pour se
    préparer.
13. Les trains _____________ (arriver) à l’heure.
14. Est-ce que vous _____________ (comprendre) la leçon?
15. Tout le monde _____________ (s’asseoir) pour voir le film.
ACTIVITY 8: MEANINGFUL DRILL - PAIRES DE PHRASES A ILLUSTRER
(FOCUS ON FUNCTION)

VIVE LA DIFFÉRENCE

(COPIE de l'acétate)

Les photos de mon cousin

Il dégringolait l'escalier

Il a dégringolé l'escalier

Elle a rempli son verre de lait

Elle remplissait son verre de lait

Le bébé vidait le tiroir

Le bébé a vidé le tiroir

MLC/OISE, 1983

[Image of illustrations and phrases]
Vous référant aux illustrations de l’acétate, faites un dessin pour illustrer la différence aspectuelle entre le passé composé et l’imparfait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Le pilote déployait son parachute.</th>
<th>Le pilote a déployé son parachute.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Elle a perdu ses pantoufles.</td>
<td>Elle perdait ses pantoufles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Il est mort de faim.</td>
<td>Il mourait de faim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>L’auto a glissé sur la route verglaçante</td>
<td>L’auto glissait sur la route verglaçante.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>L’enfant pataugeait dans la boue.</td>
<td>L’enfant a pataugé dans la boue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Simone lavait son chien.</td>
<td>Simone a lavé son chien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Le garde a fermé la grande porte de la prison.</td>
<td>Le garde fermait la grande porte de la prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Une tornade s’abattait sur la ville.</td>
<td>Une tornade s’est abattue sur la ville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Le second cheval a dépassé le premier.</td>
<td>Le second cheval dépassait le premier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Elle a grimpé l’échelle.</td>
<td>Elle grimpait l’échelle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Marc soufflait les bougies de son gâteau.</td>
<td>Marc a soufflé les bougies de son gâteau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Mme. Laplante cueillait des fraises.</td>
<td>Mme. Laplante a cueilli des fraises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Le couturier a confectionné une robe.</td>
<td>Le couturier confectionnait une robe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIVITY 9: MEANINGFUL DRILL - IDENTIFICATION OF FUNCTION AND FORM (FOCUS ON FORM AND FUNCTION)

Soulignez les verbes au passé composé et à l'imparfait. Expliquez le choix de l'aspect ainsi que l'accord des verbes sans utiliser vos notes de grammaire.

Très tôt le matin, nous sommes parties maman et moi pour aller là-bas.

En route, j'ai demandé:

- Est-ce que vous avez enfermé Alicia?

Maman a essayé de rire.

- Enfermée! Quelle idée! Mais non: elle est très bien. Elle est soignée par les meilleurs médecins.

Mais la petite ville où nous sommes arrivées avait un air sombre et pas comme une autre ville. Du moins, je l'ai vue ainsi. Il se peut que ce fût à cause de moi. J'ai remarqué, depuis ce temps-là, que nos pensées ont un grand et curieux pouvoir sur les choses: elles peuvent certains jours faire paraître belle une vieille bicoque grise: mais il leur arrive de rendre très laid quelque chose qui ne l'est peut-être pas en soi. Cette ville m'a paru silencieuse, ennuyée, rouge et comme mal à l'aise au soleil. Sur une petite colline, un peu en dehors de la ville, se dressait une grande et haute maison encore plus silencieuse et plus sévère que tout le reste: c'est vers cette maison que nous nous sommes dirigées.

Mais, que je n'oublie pas: maman en arrivant dut demander son chemin, et elle le demanda en rougissant, à voix basse et malheureuse. A présent, nous connaissions le chemin: nous avancions vers la haute maison de briques et bientôt nous avons distingué qu'elle se tenait au centre d'un assez beau parc avec des allées. des bancs, des balançoires même et beaucoup d'arbres.

ACTIVITY 10. MEANINGFUL DRILL - DICTATION (FOCUS ON FORM AND FUNCTION)

Ecoutez le texte une première fois sans écrire. Commencez la dictée à la deuxième lecture.

Les funérailles ont eu lieu le sur lendemain. A l’horizon, le soleil ne faisait que des ombres grises. Une petite brise froide coulait dans les arbres frissonnants. Deux hommes sont venus aider Ugolin, pendant que les femmes s’habillaient dans les chambres, et ont chargé la boîte sur la charette. la mère et la fille cachait des visages brûlés par les larmes de la nuit. A la messe, elles ont vu des gens qu’elles ne connaissaient pas. Puis le maire les a saluées et leur a dit qu’il regrettait de n’avoir pas connu Jean.

Jean de Florette – Marcel Pagnol
ACTIVITY 11: MEANINGFUL DRILL - FROM PRESENT TO PAST (FOCUS ON FORM AND FUNCTION)

Ecrivez le texte suivant au passé. Utilisez le passé composé et l'imparfait sans référer à vos notes de grammaire.

Jean de Florette. Marcel Pagnol

L’équipage paraît.

Deux mulets traînent à grands efforts une charrette, dont le chargement, caché sous des bâches, est dangereusement haut. Le charretier tire la première bête par la bride et avance à reculons en poussant des cris rauques dont le vallon retentit.

Derrière la charrette marche un homme, qui, vu de loin, paraît immense. Lorsqu’il est plus près, Ugolin voit qu’il est d’une bonne taille, mais qu’il porte, à cheval sur son cou, une fillette dont les mains sont croisées sur les cheveux noirs de sa monture.

Enfin, plus loin derrière eux, une femme d’un blond roux paraît. Elle se berce en marchant et son visage est pâle et rose.

Ugolin, stupéfait, pense que ces gens se sont perdus. mais l’homme qui porte la fille sur son dos crie au charretier et s’arrête devant la maison du coin.
ACTIVITY 12: COMMUNICATIVE DRILL - AUTOBIOGRAPHY (FOCUS ON FORM AND FUNCTION)

Ecrivez votre autobiographie. Utilisez le passé composé et l'imparfait sans reférer à vos notes de grammaire.
Appendix C

Tests
CLOZE TEST
EXERCICE: "LE VOL"

Form A

Ecrire les verbes entre parenthèses à l'imparfait ou au passé composé et faire l'accord si nécessaire.
LE VOL

Ce matin-là, en s’approchant des bâtiments de la Sécurité Nationale, monsieur Leblanc a remarqué quelque chose d’anormal devant le laboratoire de physique. Il y (avoir) des voitures noires rangées côte à côte et tout le monde (parler) de l’événement: “Vers onze heures hier soir, le gardien de nuit a été attaqué par des inconnus. On (retrouver) le pauvre homme inconscient dans le corridor du département de physique. On l’(emmener) d’urgence à l’hôpital.”

Monsieur Leblanc qui (vouloir) avoir plus de détails sur l’affaire, (se précipiter) dans le bâtiment. Au même instant, son ami le professeur Pelletier (arriver) en courant, suivi de plusieurs personnes. “On (voler) mes dossiers secrets. le résultat de 15 ans de recherche” a crié le professeur. qui (travailler) pour la Sécurité Nationale. Il venait d’inventer un remède efficace contre les radiations atomiques.


- Qui (être) au courant?” (demander) le reporter.
- Personne, absolument personne." Soudain le visage du professeur (changer) de couleur et il (se retourner) brusquement vers son confrère, monsieur Leblanc, qui, lui, (sursauter).

Plus tard en parlant avec sa femme, le professeur Pelletier a dit : "Quand la police m'a interrogé, je n'ai pas voulu leur faire part de mes soupçons. Claude, mon jeune assistant, qui avait toute ma confiance (connaître) l'importance de mes travaux. Il (être) la seule personne à savoir où se (trouver) mes papiers. Le matin du vol, il (entrer) dans mon bureau, au moment où André Leblanc et moi, nous consultons mes notes. Nous (avoir) rendez-vous tous les trois avec le Directeur de la Sécurité Nationale, alors j'(arranger) mes dossiers. je les (mettre) dans le tiroir devant lui, et puis nous (sortir)."

Ainsi tout (désigner) Claude comme le coupable.

Après plusieurs semaines d'enquête, l'inspecteur de police ( convoquer) le professeur Pelletier. "Voilà votre coupable" a annoncé l'inspecteur, en désignant un homme assis au fond du bureau. "On (relever) ses empreintes à l'intérieur du tiroir dont vous seul (posséder) la clé. On ( retrouver) l'outil qu'il (utiliser) pour forcer la serrure et on ( découvrir) tous vos dossiers dans sa valise. alors qu'il les ( apporter) à ses complices contre un forte somme d'argent." 

Le professeur. (quitter) la pièce rapidement, accablé par les preuves que l'inspecteur lui donnait. Il ne pouvait pas y croire: André Leblanc, un de ses
plus anciens collègues et amis, (faire) ______________ partie d'un réseau d'espionnage!
EXERCICE: "LE MONSTRE"

Form B

Ecrire les verbes entre parenthèses à l’imparfait ou au passé composé et faire l’accord si nécessaire.
Hier soir, Charles (venir) ___________ nous voir à la maison et il nous a raconté une histoire très bizarre. Veux-tu la connaître? Alors, la voici: Charles (se reposer) ___________ chez son oncle à la campagne. Son oncle (posséder) ___________ de nombreux livres et tous les après-midis Charles (lire) ___________ parce qu’il aimait beaucoup les histoires surnaturelles. Un jour, alors qu’il (être) ___________ assis dans le salon lisant comme d’habitude une histoire surnaturelle, il (avoir) ___________ une expérience extraordinaire.

Charles était encore plongé dans son histoire lorsque, distraitement, il (lever) ___________ les yeux vers la fenêtre ouverte. Soudain, devant lui, il (voir) ___________ un monstre qui (descendre) ___________ peu à peu la colline. Tout de suite Charles a pensé qu’il (devenir) ___________ fou. Pourtant il avait vu le monstre. il (pouvoir) ___________ même le décrire: une tête énorme, une bouche à l’extrémité d’une longue trompe avec de chaque côté des défenses brillantes. Mais le plus étrange (être) ___________ la tête de mort dessinée sur sa poitrine. Au moment où Charles (voir) ___________ les mâchoires s’ouvrir. il (crier) ___________ de peur. Son oncle (arriver) ___________ à toute vitesse. Tout surpris. il (demander) ___________ à Charles: “Que se passe-t-il ici?” Après avoir écouté les explications de Charles. il (ajouter) ___________: “Tu lis trop, tu devrais sortir et faire de l’exercice. Toute cette histoire n’est qu’un rêve”.

Mais Charles (être) ___________ sûr d’avoir vu le monstre et depuis cette vision, il avait vraiment peur. Pour lui, (ça être) ___________ le signe que quelque chose de terrible arriverait.
Quelques jours plus tard, alors que Charles et son oncle se (trouver) dans le même salon. Charles (voir) le monstre pour la seconde fois. En même temps, il (saisir) le bras de son oncle et lui (montrer) la fenêtre. Son oncle (regarder) mais il n’y (avoir) déjà plus rien. Tout de suite son oncle l’(interroger) sur la forme, la couleur et la grosseur du monstre. Comme Charles (répondre), l’oncle a souri. Il (aller) prendre un livre dans la bibliothèque et il (lire) à haute voix: “Sphinx, famille des Crépusculaires. classe des insectes. bouche en forme de trompe. mandibules en forme de défenses. sur le corps dessin d’une tête de mort”.

Cela décrivait exactement le monstre. Après un moment, il (refermer) le livre et il (venir) s’asseoir à la place de Charles. Pendant qu’il (regarder) par la fenêtre il s’est exclamé: “Ah, le voilà! Il est sur la colline. Oh, un bel animal, mais pas aussi gros que tu (penser). Il avance maintenant sur un fil d’araignée le long de la fenêtre. Ton œil (te tromper), la bête était trop près de toi. et le livre que tu (lire) trop impressionnant. Il faut se méfier des illusions d’optique Charles.

Charles (terminer) son histoire avec un sourire mystérieux et il nous (demander) si nous avions déjà eu une telle expérience. Et toi, t’est-il déjà arrivé quelque chose de pareil?
COMPOSITION
Students were required to write about their best vacation and were specifically instructed in French to write their stories in past tense and to write the correct forms of verbs.
Si tu avais à raconter à quelqu'un les plus belles vacances de ta vie, qu'entre que tu lui dirais?
Students were required to write about an event in their life that could have been tragic and were specifically instructed in French to write their stories in past tense and to write the correct forms of verbs.
Si quelqu’un te demandait de lui raconter une aventure qui t’est arrivée et qui aurait pu être tragique, qu’est-ce que tu répondrais?
DICTATION
Students were instructed to listen to the text once before writing the dictation.
Entrevue avec Steven Spielberg

Dans un entretien au journal “Le Monde”, le réalisateur américain a expliqué pourquoi il a choisi de filmer l’expérience de la guerre dans “Il faut sauver le soldat Ryan”.

Interviewer: Votre premier film, tourné lorsque vous aviez 13 ans, était un film de guerre. Pourquoi avez-vous attendu aussi longtemps pour revenir à ce genre?

Spielberg: 1941, l’Empire du soleil et la liste de Schindler traitaient directement de la guerre mais ne comptaient aucune séquence de combat. Je cherchais depuis des années à faire un film sur la seconde guerre mondiale et le débarquement mais il me fallait trouver une histoire appropriée. Celle d’“Il faut sauver le soldat Ryan” est guidée par des préoccupations morales et la lecture du scénario était pour moi la preuve que je tenais mon film de guerre. Mon père était la première personne à me parler du débarquement car les membres de ma famille qui ont été impliqués dans cette guerre, ont été dirigés vers le Pacifique. Mais c’est surtout grâce à un ami que j’ai réussi à faire mon film sur le débarquement. J’étais avec lui dans la salle de montage d’un autre film de guerre dont plusieurs parties avaient été coupées par les producteurs à cause de la violence des combats. Mon ami m’a dit qu’il devais faire un jour un film sur le débarquement. en racontant les choses comme elles se sont passées. Moi, j’ai la chance d’être mon propre producteur. Une guerre est forcément violente. La question était de savoir à quel degré je pouvais dévoiler cette violence. J’ai pris le risque car j’étais prêt à beaucoup sacrifier en échange de la vérité.
Appendix D

Questionnaire completed by the experimental group
Activité 1

Etude de la forme de l'imparfait: Exercices de pratique et jeu.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes de l'imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

________________________

________________________

________________________

5. Autres commentaires

________________________

________________________

________________________
Activité 2

Étude de l’accord de l’imparfait.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes de l’imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
Activité 3

Etude de la forme du passé composé: exercices de pratique et jeu.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressant</td>
<td>Peu intéressant</td>
<td>Assez intéressant</td>
<td>intéressant</td>
<td>Très intéressant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à écrire correctement les différentes formes du passé composé?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Activité 4

Etude de l'accord du passé composé avec être.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes du passé composé avec être?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Activité 5

Etude de l’accord du passé composé (à la forme pronominale).

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes du passé composé à la forme pronominale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

5. Autres commentaires
Activité 6

Etude de l’accord du passé composé avec avoir.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes du passé composé avec avoir?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
Activité 7

Etude de l’accord du passé composé avec être, à la forme pronominale et avec avoir.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes du passé composé (être, avoir, forme pronominale)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Activité 8

Paires de phrases à illustrer.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à comprendre l’usage du passé composé et de l’imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Activité 9

Identification des verbes à l'imparfait et au passé composé.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes et à comprendre l’usage du passé composé et de l’imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Activité 10

Dictée

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes et à comprendre l’usage du passé composé et de l’imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Autres commentaires

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Activité 11

Du présent au passé.

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes et à comprendre l’usage du passé composé et de l’imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquel et pourquoi?

5. Autres commentaires
Activité 12

Autobiographie

1. Est-ce que cette activité était:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas intéressante</td>
<td>Peu intéressante</td>
<td>Assez intéressante</td>
<td>Intéressante</td>
<td>Très intéressante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Est-ce que cette activité vous a été utile et vous a aidé à apprendre à écrire correctement les différentes formes et à comprendre l’usage du passé composé et de l’imparfait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas utile</td>
<td>Peu utile</td>
<td>Assez utile</td>
<td>Utile</td>
<td>Très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quel était le degré de difficulté de cette activité?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Très facile</td>
<td>Facile</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>Très difficile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Feriez-vous des changements à cette activité? Si oui, lesquels et pourquoi?

5. Autres commentaires

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________
Appendix E

Grammatical rules and instructions in the experimental class
DISTINCTION IN MEANING BETWEEN THE PASSÉ COMPOSE AND THE IMPARFAIT

The following instructions were given in French to the students.

Both passé composé and imparfait refer to past time, but each expresses a different perspective on the past.

Passé composé refers to events viewed as having taken place at or by a certain particular time. It is used to express situations in narratives or a situation interrupting another on-going situation in the past.

Imparfait refers to events viewed as incomplete in the past and without any specific beginning or end. It is used to describe background in the past, habitual past situations, incomplete past situations or interrupted on-going events.

The emphasis is that the difference in use between the passé composé and the imparfait is mainly a difference of perspective rather than a difference in the event itself, and either one can be used depending on the person's perception of that particular event.
RULES OF AGREEMENT FOR PASSE COMPOSE

The following instructions were given in French to the students.

- *Passé composé with avoir*

  - The past participle used with avoir does not change in the absence of a direct object of the verb in the sentence.
    
    Ex: vous avez gagné.

  - The past participle used with avoir does not change if the direct object of the verb is placed after the verb in the sentence.
    
    Ex: Jacques a perdu son ballon.

  - The past participle used with avoir agrees in gender and in number with the direct object of the verb if it is placed before the verb in the sentence.
    
    Ex: les livres que tu m'as donnés sont très intéressants

N.B. You may identify the direct object of the verb by asking the question using *qui? Ou quoi? after the past participle.*

In the previous example:

Q. Tu m'as donné(s) quoi?

R. Les livres (direct object of the verb, masculin plural).

- The past participle with avoir and preceded by a personal pronoun agrees in gender and number with this pronoun if it is a direct object.

N.B. You may determine the gender and number of the pronoun by finding the word or group of words it replaces.
Ex: Cette question, vous l’avez déjà posée.

l’ replaces question (feminin singular).

- **Passé composé with être (Mrs. Van Der Tramp)**

  The past participle agrees in gender and in number with the subject of the verb (noun or pronoun).

**N.B. You may determine the subject of the verb by asking the questions qui est-ce qui? or qu’est-ce qui? before the verb.**

Ex: Ma soeur est partie ce matin.

Q. Qui est-ce qui est partie?
A. ma soeur (subject of the verb. feminin singular).

- **Passé composé with être (reflexive verbs)**

  - The past participle agrees in gender and in number with the direct object of the verb if it is placed before the verb in the sentence.

  Ex: Ils se sont battus

  Q. Ils ont battus qui?
A. Se (direct object of the verb. masculin plural)

  - The past participle does not change if the direct object of the verb is placed after the verb in the sentence

  Ex: Elle s’est lavé les cheveux.

  Q. Elle s’est lavé quoi?
A. Les cheveux (direct object of the verb).
The past participle agrees in gender and in number with the subject of the verb in the absence of a direct object of the verb.

Ex: Elle s'est évanouie.

Q. Qui est-ce qui s'est évanouie?
A. Elle (subject of the verb, feminin singular).
RULES OF AGREEMENT FOR *IMPARFAIT*

The conjugation patterns for the *imparfait de l'indicatif* are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>er verbs 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; group</th>
<th>ir verbs 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; group</th>
<th>ir. re. oir verbs 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Je</strong> 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person singular</td>
<td>ais</td>
<td>issais</td>
<td>ais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tu</strong> 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person singular</td>
<td>ais</td>
<td>issais</td>
<td>ais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Il, elle, on</strong> 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person singular</td>
<td>ait</td>
<td>issait</td>
<td>ait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nous</strong> 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person plural</td>
<td>ions</td>
<td>issions</td>
<td>ions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vous</strong> 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person plural</td>
<td>iez</td>
<td>issiez</td>
<td>iez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ils, elles</strong> 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person plural</td>
<td>aient</td>
<td>issaient</td>
<td>aient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Samples of drills given to the first comparison group
Mettez les verbes suivants à l'imparfait et faites l'accord:

1. Il ____________ (faire) noir et nous ____________ (avoir) peur.
2. L'année dernière, je ____________ (jouer) au tennis tous les jours.
3. Lorsqu'on ____________ (aller) le voir, on ____________ (rester) trois jours.

Mettez les verbes suivants au passé composé et faites l'accord:

1. Les examens que je ____________ (corriger) étaient difficiles.
2. La chatte que mon frère ____________ (trouver) ____________ (mourir).
3. Elles ____________ (descendre) à la cuisine.

Mettez les verbes suivants au passé composé ou à l'imparfait et faites l'accord:

Vendredi passé, vers une heure, je ____________ (retirer) de l'argent au guichet de ma banque. Il y ____________ (avoir) beaucoup de monde, une vingtaine de personnes ____________ (patienter). Tout à coup, deux bandits masqués ____________ (entrer).

L'un d'eux ____________ (sauter) par-dessus le comptoir et l'autre ____________ (braquer) son revolver sur les clients...

(Grammaire française plus – Hélène Mignault)
Appendix G

Senior secondary student questionnaire
SENIOR SECONDARY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(Based on the OISE (MLC) survey)

This survey is part of a research project on French immersion. The questions ask about your language and school background and about your future plans.

Please answer all questions as best as you can. Your answers will be strictly confidential. No one will see them beside the researcher.

Thank you for your help.

Name: ___________________________ Male ___ Female ___

School: ____________________________

The last French course I took was:

last semester ___ two semesters ago ___ more than two semesters ago ___
Student Questionnaire

1. a) Please check every grade you were in an immersion or extended French program in the elementary level (to grade 8), and
   b) indicate the number of courses taken where French was the language of instruction at the secondary level (grade 9 to OAC level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Immersion/Extended French</th>
<th>b) No. of courses taken in French</th>
<th>c) Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kindergarten ___</td>
<td>Grade 9/Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 1 _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 2 _____</td>
<td>Grade 10/Year 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 3 _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 4 _____</td>
<td>Grade 11/Year 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 5 _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 6 _____</td>
<td>Grade 12/Year 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 7 _____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 8 _____</td>
<td>Grade 13/OAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Were you born in Canada? Yes _____ No _____

   If NO: a) in which country were you born? ________________________

   b) how old were you when you came to Canada? ____________________

3. Were both your parents born in Canada? Yes _____ No _____
If NO: a) in which country were your parents born?

mother ___________________ father ________________

4. Is French the childhood language of:

your mother  Yes _____ No _____

your father  Yes _____ No _____

5. What language do your parents, or other family members, speak other than English?

________________________________________________________________________

6. How often is English, and any other language, spoken in your home? Please write in the name(s) of the other languages. Circle the most appropriate response for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>About half the time</th>
<th>Most or all the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Can you understand any language, other than English and French?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES:
a) Please list the language(s) you can understand. (Circle the one you’re best at.)

________________________________________________________________________

b) How often do you use the language(s)? (If you use more than one, answer for the language you use most often.)

Rarely _____ Monthly _____ Weekly _____ Daily _____

c) Compared to French, how easy is it for you to use this language?

(If you’ve written down more than one language above, answer this question for the language you know best.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much easier</th>
<th>Somewhat easier</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Somewhat more difficult</th>
<th>Much more difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What do you think you’ll end up doing after graduating from high school? (If you plan to take a year off, then continue your education, please indicate briefly both plans for the coming year and your future educational plans.)

_____ go to university

_____ go to community college or other business/technical school

_____ get a full time job
9. If you go to university or community college, what program do you want to take?

   __________________________________________________________________________

10. Ideally, what proportion of your courses would you want to take in French? What proportion do you expect you’ll take in French? Please circle the appropriate answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. If you expect to take fewer courses in French than ideally want, why is it so?

   __________________________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________________________

12. If you want to take courses in French, what kind of student mix would you prefer?
a) A course where most students are francophones

b) A course with about equal numbers of francophones and immersion graduates

c) A course where most students are immersion graduates

d) don’t know

13. Do you intend to get a job where you will use French?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU
Appendix H

Summary of interrater reliabilities for the tests in the study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation between scorers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passé Composé</td>
<td>Cloze (form)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloze (function)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imparfait</td>
<td>Cloze (form)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloze (function)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition (form)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition (function)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Case study of the student who improved the most
This appendix presents the pretest and delayed posttest compositions of the student in the experimental class who improved the most. It has the following sections: First, a description of the scoring procedures for compositions for the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* including both form and function is presented (see section 5.3.2). Second, a description of obligatory contexts with respect to the distinction in meaning (aspectual difference) between the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* is given (see section 5.3.3). Third, the compositions are presented and discussed with respect to correct forms and functions of the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* in order to look qualitatively at the growth of the experimental group as indicated by the compositions scores.

**Description of scoring procedures of the *passé composé* and the *imparfait* for both form and function**

Each composition was scored using the first fifteen conjugated verbs. Each aspect was assigned a raw score of four points, two for form and two for function. If function was incorrect, the score was zero regardless of form. For *passé composé* form, one point was given for correct auxiliary including correct agreement, and one point for correct past participle including correct agreement. For *imparfait* form, one point was given for correct root and one point for correct agreement.

**Description of obligatory contexts with respect to the distinction in meaning between the *passé composé* and the *imparfait***

The following were considered "function" errors:

1. The use of a verb form other than the *passé composé* in a context requiring the *passé composé* or the *passé simple*. (see vii below).
ii. The use of a verb form other than the *imparfait* in a context requiring the *imparfait*.

iii. The use of a mixed form (auxiliary together with the *imparfait, passé simple*, or infinitive).

iv. The use of the second person plural present tense ending (*ez*) or the infinitive ending (*er*) instead of the *passé composé* or the *imparfait*.

v. The use of the past participle without the auxiliary in *passé composé*.

**The following were not considered as errors:**

vi. The use of the *passé simple* instead of the *passé composé* (did not appear in any of the compositions).

vii. Any other tense that was acceptable in an obligatory context (e.g. present, future).

**Analyses of compositions**

For the qualitative analysis, I adopted Andersen's (1989, 1991) distinction between stative verbs and dynamic verbs including activities, accomplishments and achievements originally identified by Vendler (1967) (see section 4.2.). The purpose was to analyse and discuss this student's ability to use the *passé composé composé* and the *imparfait* (according to Andersen and Bardovi-Harlig and Bergström's findings, to produce the correct forms of these aspects, and to illustrate the growth indicated by the quantitative results on the part of the experimental student from pretest to delayed posttest. Analyses were based on the first fifteen conjugated verbs. These verbs were categorized into stative and dynamic verbs by the researcher.
Pretest (function = 6/30; form = 4/30)


Delayed Posttest (function = 28/30; form = 27/30)


In the first sample, the student seems to have difficulty distinguishing the difference in meaning between the passé composé and the imparfait. Only three verbs out of fifteen are functionally correct. There is also a tendency to overuse the passé composé in a context for the imparfait (avons levé. avons mangé), especially for dynamic
verbs as indicated by Andersen’s (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig and Bergström’s (1996) acquisitional sequence. The only verb in the imparfait is stative (était) and the two verbs in the passé composé are dynamic (allé).

With respect to form, the student seems to confuse the passé composé with être and with avoir (j’ai allé, avons levé) and to omit the auxiliary when using the passé composé (resté, allé).

In the second sample, treatment materials appear to have resulted in great improvement for this particular student. The sample reveals good understanding of the distinction in meaning between the two aspects. Out of the fifteen verbs used, fourteen are functionally correct. The imparfait is used appropriately for dynamic verbs (enlevaient, mettaient, parlait), not only for stative verbs, and the passé composé is used for one state verb (ai eu) instead of dynamic verb. This indicate greater sophistication or movement towards a target-like command of the system in Anderson’s (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig and Bergström’s (1996) terms. Moreover, the student uses a variety of different verbs with a good balance of passé composé and imparfait.

With respect to form, the student appears to have a good knowledge of the use of the appropriate auxiliary and the rules of agreement for past participle verb’s endings in the imparfait ( sommes arrivés, enlevaient).
Appendix J

Sample compositions (pretest and delayed posttest)
The following three excerpts are from students in the experimental group.

**Excerpt one**

**Pretest (function = 30/30; form = 29/30)**


**Delayed Posttest (function = 30/30; form = 29/30)**

Excerpt two

Pretest (function = 18/30; form = 15/30)


Delayed Posttest (function = 18/30; form = 18/30)

Je lui dirais du temps quand ma famille et moi avons visité la ville de Hamilton en Ontario. Nous sommes arrivés là vers les voiles de la reine Elizabeth, à exactement douze heures midi. Comme d’habitude, pendant nos vacances. nous restions à la plus belle motel de ville. Quand nous étions là, chaque jour nous visitions la plus belle partie de la ville, l’usine de Defasco sur la rivière. Chaque soir. nous allions à le centre de ville pour observer la vraie culture de cette ville. la ville la plus culturelle de tout le monde. Nous restions là pour deux semaines. et nous sommes retournés à Toronto par la même manière qu’on est arrivé par l’autoroute fabuleux, les voiles de la reine Elizabeth. C’était extraordinaire.
Excerpt three

Pretest (function = 18/30; form = 17/30)


Delayed (function = 20/30; form = 19/30)

L’été dernière je suis allé à un petit maison en Grand Bend. J’ai resté là pour une semain avec ma famille est quellequ’un de nos amis. La plage la était si belle. L’eau était presque claire, on a nagé presque tous les jour que j’étais là. La dernière jour que j’étais là ils ont fait un grand demonstration de “fireworks” et on a dansé. C’était si belle.

The following three excerpts are from students in the first comparison group

Excerpt one

Pretest (function = 20/30; form = 16/30)

Je lui dirai du vacance. il y a 7 ans que j’ai prit avec ma famille à Myrtle Beach. Pour moi, c’était le meilleur vacance de ma vie. Je nageais dans l’eau claire de l’ocean, je me relaxais sur la plage avec ma famille. et je jouais, presque tous les jours le golf sur les plus beaux courses que j’ai jamais vu dans ma vie. Durant cette semaine. j’ai vraiment développé une sense d’appréciation pour la nature et pour ma famille. La
température et le climate était parfait pour tous les jours de mon visite et j’ai pas disputé pour une seconde même avec les membres de ma famille. Chaque jour, on a mangé chez des restaurnts superbes. et j’ai dépensé plus que 200 dollars sur des nouveaux vêtements et des nouveaux clubs de golf.

Delayed (function = 16/30; form = 12/30)

Mes plus belles vacances se sont passées il y a trois ans au nord de l’Ontario, proche de la Baie-Georgienne. Ma mère a gagner un concours sur le radio pour aller chez un cottage qui a supposé être spectaculaire, énorme, riche, avec un bateau, un canoe, etc. Par contre, quand ma famille est arrivé, toute excité à voir ce cottage spectacleaire, nous avons réalisé que le concours que ma mère a gagné n’a pas été très honnête. Le cottage était minuscule (pas plus grand que ma cuisine). Il n’y avait pas de bateau, pas de canoe, seulement 2 lits. loin du lac. dans le milieu de la forêt. Par contre, ces vacance avec ma famille ont été superbes car moi et ma famille ont été force à faire le bonheur et le fun nous-mêmes. On a joué le “Monopoly”. regardé des films sur une petite télévision. et se promené dans le forêt. Ses vacances ma a montré que dans la vie, on n’a pas besoin des choses matériales pour trouver de la bonheur.

Excerpt two

Pretest (function = 14/30; form = 13/30)

J’ai visité Jérusalem. le Jordan et plusieurs autres parties. mais j’ai du pas aller a l’autre côté du monde parce que tout était a un pays. la Colombie.

Tout a commencé a 3hr du matin le 25 juin. Après avoir dit aurevoir a ma mère je avait monté à l’avion en savoir que je la verrai pas pour deux mois. Trois heures après
j’arrivait à Miami et attend quatre heures pour mon vol, et trois heures et demi après ça j’arrive à Colombie. Ma tante et mon oncle m’attendent et c’était le commencement de mon aventure. Durant mes vacances j’avais voyagé partout. Je suis allée au Pereira, Cali, Pamira, Medellin et des autres parties comme celles dont j’avais parlé au commencement. La Colombie est vraiment une belle pays, chaque vendredi j’allait au discothèque et danse jusqu’au deux ou trois heures du matin.

**Delayed Posttest** *(function = 16/30; form = 15/30)*

Les plus belles vacances de ma vie étaient ceux que j’ai pris à huitième année. C’était un échange qu’on a fait à Chicoutimi. Pour un semain on voyagéait partout Québec dans un grand auto bus mais pas auto bus d’école, un avec des télévisions pour chaque personne. On est rendu au ville de Québec, des musées, restaurants et des centres commerciaux. Mon partenaire était très formidable et sa famille aussi. On est allé à Mont St. Édouard pour faire de le ski sur des collines très hautes, ça prenait trente minutes pour monter et dix minutes pour descendre. C’était vraiment une belle expérience.

**Excerpt three**

**Pretest (function = 26/30; form = 21/30)**

J’ai pas pris beaucoup de vacances et ce que j’ai pris, j’ai pris quand j’étais petite alors je dirais rien par ce que je ne le rappelle pas.

Mais si je pouvais inventer quelque chose je dirais que la plus belle vacance que j’ai pris c’était que je suis allé au Aspen pour le ski et j’ai rencontré les Backstreet Boys et “N Sync”. Mais vraiment la plus belle vancance que j’ai pris c’est que je suis allé à
Angleterre pour le mariage de mon cousin Dalton. Je n'étais pas là longtemps alors j'ai pas rappelé beaucoup. C'était beaucoup du fun et j'ai rencontré des relatives nouveaux. La seule chose que j'ai pas aimé c'est quand je suis revenu j'avais l'accent.

**Delayed (function = 18/30; form = 13/30)**


The following excerpt is from a francophone student in the second comparison group whose results were not included in the statistical analysis. Both parents are French Canadians and they all speak French at home.

**Pretest (function = 28/30; form = 28/30)**

Si je devais raconter à quelqu'un mes plus belles vacances de ma vie, je lui dirais à propos de la fois où je suis allé à Cancun au Mexique durant les vacances de mars l'année dernière. J'y suis allé pour une semaine et j'ai eu tellement de plaisir. Il y avait beaucoup de personne des Etats-Unis qui avaient le même âge que moi et j'ai rencontré une fille Mexicaine qui travaillait à l'hôtel où nous avons resté. Nous avons joué du golf ensemble et elle m'a apporté aux meilleurs places pour acheter des souvenirs. Je suis allé

Delayed (function = 26/30; form = 24/30)

Lorsque j'étais jeune j'aimais beaucoup voyager en avion. Alors quand mes parents nous avaient annoncé que nous allions allé en Floride, nous étions tous très heureuses mes soeurs et moi. C'était un voyage très excitant et nous avons beaucoup fait. Le pilote avait laissé une de mes soeurs et moi aller voir les contrôles en avant et nous avait expliqué un peu comment tout fonctionne. Ensuite, en Floride, nous avons vu Mickey Mouse et sommes allées à Bush Gardens, Disney World, Epcot Centre, etc. Nous y sommes allés pour 2 semaines et faisait toujours soleil et la température était toujours très belle. Les plages étaient belles aussi et l'océan était très claire et bleu. Nous sommes aussi aller faire du magasinage et nous avons chacun eu un petit souvenir pour nous rappeler de ce merveilleux voyage....
Appendix K

Letters of permission
Dear Sir,

This letter is to request permission to conduct an investigation in the grade 11 French immersion class as part of my doctoral studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. My research project involves the development of curriculum materials to improve the grammatical accuracy in French of immersion students.

I will be administering three tests in grade 11 immersion classes at school A and school B for comparison purposes. In order to obtain oral data, one of the activities will involve tape-recording some of the students. The results of the testing will not be used to calculate students' mark in French. In order to ensure confidentiality, students will not be identified by name but by a numerical code.

A letter of permission will also be sent to the parents or guardians of the students involved in the study.

I look forward to your reply.

Thank you for your attention and consideration regarding the above matter.

Yours truly,

Magda Manoli
PARENTS

Dear parents or guardians,

This letter is to request your permission to have your son or daughter participate in a research project involving the development of curriculum materials to improve the grammatical accuracy in French of immersion students. I will be administering three tests in grade 11 immersion classes. In order to obtain oral data, one of the activities will involve tape-recording some of the students. The results of the testing will not be used to calculate your son or daughter’s mark in French; they will be used only for purposes of the research. In order to ensure confidentiality, students will not be identified by name but by numerical code. Your son or daughter may withdraw from the testing at any time.

The project is part of my doctoral studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, and it has been approved by the school board and by the school principal.

If you have any questions about the study, I can be reached at (name of school and phone number).

Please return by ____________________.

I give permission for ________________________________ to participate in the French immersion testing.

I do not give permission for ________________________________ to participate in the French immersion testing.

Signature of parents or guardians: ________________________________