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1. Introduction

The American School of the Hague (ASH), where I teach French in the Middle and High School, is an international school catering to a diverse student body. Students there hail from disparate educational backgrounds and language teaching systems. Consequently, some students arrive at ASH without having had any, or very little, instruction in grammar. As a result, they struggle to understand grammatical terms at different levels. It is therefore not only a challenge for students to learn another language without this common grammatical terminology knowledge, but it is also a challenge for teachers. As ASH offers the International Baccalaureate and Advanced Proficiency – programmes which require an extensive knowledge and understanding of grammar – it is vitally important to have a common grammatical terminology knowledge across the school levels. During a language meeting with colleagues, this particular issue arose as a challenge for language teachers in Middle and High School. There was a general consensus among the teachers that students’ grammatical terminology knowledge needed to be improved as a first step towards facilitating student grammar learning.

The topic of student grammatical terminology knowledge and teacher expectations is also interesting in light of the school’s goal of mapping the curriculum in Atlas Rubicon (an online site for displaying school curricula, which is accessible to parents). This process was initiated in the language department several years ago and, this year, we have been comparing the different levels of the language curricula, as well as discussing the expectations for the different levels. The grammar expectations will continue to also be part of this discussion next year.

The only existing data available at ASH, regarding grammatical terminology knowledge, related to students who were in Grade 7 and 8 Language Arts classes. The data showed evidence of a knowledge gap. The grammar grades, as detailed in the tables below, are based on pre-assessments. These were administered to students at the beginning of the 2009-10 school year, some of whom would have entered High School Level 1 or 2 language classes in that academic year.

The tests were conducted to assess their ability to recognise certain grammatical concepts (eg., recognition of noun, pronoun and adjective in the Grade 7 Test, and recognition of verb and subject in the Grade 8 Test).
Both tables show that a large number of students scored below average on these tests, proving that the foundation of student grammatical terminology knowledge was missing.

There was an assumption that this lack of student grammatical terminology knowledge would also be reflected in the foreign language classes. However, there was no data available to provide evidence of this, thus eliciting the need for research. The hypothesis was that there was a discrepancy between teacher
expectations and student grammatical terminology knowledge. The research was instigated in order to measure this, using the teacher’s expectations as a benchmark. To investigate the validity of the hypothesis, the essential guiding question throughout the Analytical Research was: What are teacher expectations of students’ knowledge of grammatical terminology and what do the students actually know? The results from the Analytical Research confirmed that the students’ grammatical terminology knowledge was lacking. The next step was then to improve this knowledge by means of an intervention in the Design Research. The research question underpinning this study was: How do we improve student grammatical terminology knowledge?

In the Analytical Research, the method used to describe teacher expectations was in the form of a multiple-choice questionnaire, while the method used to describe student knowledge was in the form of a test. I opted for a multiple-choice questionnaire rather than observation because the goal was to gather quantifiable data on teacher expectations of knowledge.

Aside from there being no existing data on teacher expectations, there was also none on student grammatical terminology knowledge in foreign languages. Therefore, it was necessary to test the students to determine their actual level of knowledge. By applying the list of concepts from the teacher multiple-choice questionnaire, it was possible to create a student test which determined the grammatical terminology knowledge of the students. This part of the research was in the form of structured data collection; the answers to the test gave a quantifiable result of student knowledge.

With the Design Research, I strived to improve student grammatical terminology knowledge. The method I used to encourage improvement was an intervention in the form of a lesson series, using the PACE Model. I measured the improvement by means of a pre-and post-test rather than an observation as I required quantifiable data to measure their knowledge.

The multiple-choice questionnaire that was designed to determine teacher expectations in the Analytical Research was completed by 11 teachers. All were Middle and High School level teachers of French, Dutch, German and Spanish. To ascertain student grammatical terminology knowledge, 88 students participated in the grammar test. They were High School Level 2 language students from Grade 9-12. They studied French, German, Dutch or Spanish, came from different countries, and had attended ASH for various lengths of time. In contrast to the Analytical Research, there were only two High School Level 2 classes – Dutch and French – that participated in the Design Research. These two classes totalled 36 students, aged between 15-17, who had studied languages for approximately 1.5-2 years, either at ASH or another school.

The primary goal of this research was, firstly, to find out if there was a discrepancy between teacher expectations and student grammatical terminology knowledge
and, secondly, to improve on it. In doing so we must not forget to situate this approach within a larger context; the assumption that improving student grammatical terminology knowledge would help facilitate student’s grammar learning as a whole.

The aim of this paper is to present a detailed account of the research questions, set-up, implementation and evaluation, in order to critically assess the research. From this assessment, I will distil possible ideas for future research.

2. Theory

To situate the approach to grammar proposed in this research, an overview of relevant theory on grammar is essential. Looking at grammar learning from a theoretical perspective, it seems that, historically, grammar has been a controversial topic in language learning. Different approaches to language learning have dictated the direction in which to steer language teaching. In the 1950s and 60s, the grammar methodology “was deeply rooted in structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology, the premise of this methodology was that language learning was basically the result of mechanical habit formation […]” (Wong & VanPatten, 2003). Then, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, “the behaviorist view of language learning was rejected in favor of rationalist and mentalist views. Influenced by Chomsky’s linguistic theory and by cognitive psychologists such as Lenneberg (1964) and Ausubel (1968), language was viewed as a rule-governed entity, and meaningful language learning was advocated over rote learning” (Wong & VanPatten, 2003). In the 1970s, “some attempted to bring together the behaviorist and rationalist views of language learning” (Wong & VanPatten, 2003). In the 1980s, Krashen arrived on the scene with his influential Natural Approach to language learning – in which grammar plays a very small part. This method still impacts language teaching today.

The participants in the contemporary grammar debate can be roughly divided into three groups: those in favour of grammar, those against grammar, and those who choose the middle ground. The main force in the non-grammar camp and strong proponent of the communicative language approach is Krashen who, in his Theory of Second Language Acquisition, expounds: “Language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules, and does not require tedious drills” (Rex, 2003).

At the other end of the spectrum are those who advocate an inclusion of grammar in language learning. Fellowes argues: “In learning about grammar, children develop an understanding of how language works and they are subsequently able to use the language more effectively; they are more readily able to construct understandable texts” (Fellowes, 2007).

Most recently, we find a shift towards a middle ground, where researchers argue for a combination of communicative learning (in the style of Krashen), and building students’ grammatical knowledge. Haight, Herron and Cole postulate: “The history
of language learning has oscillated between form-focused instruction, emphasizing accuracy, and meaning-focused instruction, emphasizing context and communication. In general, research suggests that focusing on form in a communicative language classroom is a more effective technique for teaching grammar than focusing on form alone or focusing purely on communication (Doughty & Williams, 1998a...”) (Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007). Based on this theory, I chose to find a teaching method for the Design Research lesson series that combined form-focused and communicative language teaching.

Methods for teaching grammar can be roughly divided into two categories: “On one end of the spectrum, there are those who argue that deductive teaching, which involves stating the rule and providing explanations before offering illustrations, is the most effective way to introduce grammatical patterns in the classroom. On the other end are grouped those who reject deduction totally, advocating instead induction through comprehensible input” (Zéphir, 2000). Presenting grammar through “comprehensible input” is in line with my teaching methods, and more fitting to a communicative classroom setting than a deductive approach. Based on this, I chose to further research inductive methods of teaching grammar.

The method that seemed most suited for basing the design of my lesson series on was the PACE model. This model is, in fact, a variation on an inductive approach. I will go into more detail about this method later on in this paper. Suffice to say that the initial reason for choosing this method was based on the fact that it combines a cognitive and communicative approach to grammar instruction. In the Presentation phase of this model, the students are exposed to grammar embedded in authentic materials in true communicative style. In the Co-construction phase of this method, students’ grammar awareness is stimulated at a cognitive level as the teacher engages in a dialogue with the students about grammar, thereby encouraging deeper-thinking skills.

A determining factor in the choice of method of instruction – the PACE model – was the fact that the focus is on declarative knowledge. In defining the term grammatical knowledge, a choice needed to be made between declarative and procedural grammatical knowledge. The difference resides in whether one wants to conduct a study into “knowing about a language” (Andrews, 2010) or “knowing how to apply language” (Andrews, 2010). This distinction is a constant thread through the study; in the Analytical Research and Design Research, I will elaborate on the reasons behind this choice.

The interpretation of the importance of grammar in foreign language learning leads to diverging theories on how to teach grammar. Although I have chosen a method from a plethora of possibilities, this study does not directly address the question of the effect of explicit or implicit grammar instruction nor the varied types of grammar instruction on foreign language acquisition; it is, rather, an attempt to measure and improve grammatical terminology knowledge. The underlying premise being that if we improve student grammatical terminology knowledge, their
progress in grammar learning will improve. Before one could even attempt to prove that connection, it would seem pertinent to explore the relationship between the teachers’ expectations and the students’ actual knowledge of grammatical terminology at ASH.

3. Analytical Research

3.1 Procedure

To research the validity of the hypothesis that there is a discrepancy between teacher expectations and student knowledge of grammatical terminology, the following descriptive research question functioned as the essential guiding question throughout the Analytical Research: What are teacher expectations of students’ knowledge of grammatical terminology and what do the students actually know? This can be broken down into three questions:

1) What is grammatical terminology knowledge?

2) What do teachers expect students to know?

3) What is the grammatical terminology knowledge of the students?

In order to define grammatical terminology knowledge it was necessary to take a closer look at what researchers say on this topic. Daniel states that: “... students should have a vocabulary for discussing language” (Daniel, 1999). He goes on to specify what he means by vocabulary in the following extract: “Schools stopped teaching any grammatical systems some time ago, as they probably should have. But the schools, at the same time, stopped teaching grammatical terminology, a mistake which has had lasting consequences. Students need to be told what ‘infinitive,’ ‘preposition’, ‘case’ and ‘predicate complement’ mean. They need the tools to think about and analyze their sentences” (Daniel, 1999). Fellowes argues along the same lines by saying: “In order for students to be able to discuss specific grammatical concepts and language use within a text, it is advantageous to provide them with a standard grammar vocabulary. The language for talking about, and describing, language is referred to as metalanguage. Developing students’ metalanguage will better equip them to engage in text and grammar analysis and dialogue, leading to the improvement of the structural aspects of their written texts. In order to develop students’ metalanguage, the teacher needs to use the terminology consistently and regularly, whenever text grammar discussions take place” (Fellowes, 2007).

When I refer to grammatical terminology in this paper, I mean the common vocabulary or metalanguage that is used across the different foreign languages at ASH to discuss language. In other words, this is terminology used to describe language concepts such as verb, subject, adjective and conjugation, to name a few. But what does having knowledge of these grammar terms mean? Mochida argues that grammatical knowledge is not only knowing the terminology but also being
able to apply it: “I will focus on grammatical knowledge from cognitive psychological views and identify ‘grammatical knowledge’ as two forms: declarative grammatical knowledge – knowledge about grammar rules, and procedural grammatical knowledge – knowledge about how to use grammar rules appropriately, meaningfully and automatically” (Mochida, 2002).

Based on the above definitions, when referring to grammatical knowledge, I mean students’ understanding of the terminology and not their ability to apply grammar. In other words, are the students able to recognise for instance a verb, an adjective, and conjugated verbs? Once the basic declarative knowledge of the students has been determined, it is possible to take the research a step further and determine whether recognition of terms leads to an improvement in application. This requires analysing data in the foreign language they are learning – because application of the terms varies from language to language. Having established that the research would centre around the students’ declarative grammatical knowledge meant that the underlying premise for both the multiple-choice questionnaire of teacher expectations and the test of student knowledge was the ability to be able to recognize grammatical terminology concepts.

Having established these definitions, the following step of this research was to describe teacher expectations of student grammatical knowledge and the students’ ability to recognise the concepts the teachers expect them to know. The method to describe teacher expectations was in the form of a multiple-choice questionnaire and the method to describe student knowledge in the form of a test. It was necessary to determine teacher expectations as there was no existing factual data of what these expectations are. The data was collected in three steps. As there was no prior data available – and it was therefore not certain what concepts the teachers expected – the first two steps were an informal, unstructured preliminary research into listing grammar concepts.

The steps were as follows:

1) An informal brainstorming session of grammar terms after the first presentation of my research topic in August during a Curriculum meeting of the language department. (Appendix 1.1)

2) An informal comparison of the terms from the brainstorming session and the grammar expectations at the end of High School French I. (Appendix 1.2)

3) A formal multiple-choice questionnaire with all terms from the preliminary research, completed by a total of 11 Middle and High School teachers. (Appendix 2)

Besides there being no data on teacher expectations there was also no existing data of student grammatical terminology knowledge in foreign languages at ASH. It was therefore necessary to test the students to find out what their knowledge was. With the list of concepts from the preliminary research – including the terms in the
multiple-choice questionnaire that were considered important by the majority of teachers – it was possible to make a student grammatical terminology test (Appendix 3).

This test, which aimed to answer the question ‘what is the grammatical terminology knowledge of the students?’, was conducted among all language students in High School Level 2 (French, Dutch, German and Spanish) at the beginning of the school year. My goal was to measure the knowledge at the end of High School Level 1 after they had had a year of exposure to foreign language teaching. I assumed that the level of grammar knowledge at the end of High School Level 1 equalled the knowledge of students at the beginning of High School Level 2. There were six High School 2 classes (two French, two Spanish, one Dutch and one German). What needed to be taken into account was that students coming into Level 2 may have been exposed to grammar in another language or at another school. However, because ASH is an international school this is a variable that always needs to be considered when looking at test results.

If we look at the multiple-choice questionnaire and student test – the two instruments used to measure grammatical knowledge – in both cases, the list of concepts was in English. The motivation for choosing this format was based on an analysis of theories prevalent in recent literature. I followed the definition of grammar terminology as a metalanguage or a common vocabulary for discussing grammar. As ASH is an English-speaking school this translated into an instrument to measure teacher expectations and student knowledge in English. Furthermore, the language of the multiple-choice questionnaire and the test was English as nearly all concepts can be translated into the English language, plus it made it possible to run the test efficiently through an online questionnaire and testing programme. Furthermore, conducting the test in the target languages would have put a strain on colleagues and pushed the research beyond the allocated time span.

Looking at the multiple-choice questionnaire in more detail – when comparing the list of terms from the brainstorming session with existing curricula for Level 1 classes, I realised that there were more concepts that needed to be taken into consideration. This resulted in adding eight more concepts to the list. I took the list from the brainstorming session and split object into direct and indirect object, and added pronoun, gender, reflexive, modal, past participle and agreement. It also seemed possible to divide the terms into two categories: those terms that are concrete grammatical terms, such as pronoun and object, and those terms that are used as procedural grammar tools, such as conjugation and agreement.

I used this order to create the multiple-choice questionnaire: first, the concrete terms and, secondly, the procedural terms. The format of the multiple-choice questionnaire – in the form of an online yes/no questionnaire with 30 grammar concepts – can be considered as structured research because the choice is limited to two possible answers (with the extra options ‘Not Applicable’ if the teacher does not teach a certain term). The teachers had to decide for each concept whether they
expected language Level 1 students to be able to recognize these concepts. The cut-off line for including a concept in the final list of terms was decided by majority. This meant that if six teachers out of 11 were in favour of the concept it was included on the final list. To ensure that all possible concepts were covered there was an open question at the end of the multiple-choice questionnaire asking teachers for any additional concepts they deemed important.

From this list of terms drawn from the multiple-choice questionnaire, I created a multiple-choice test for the students based on 28 concepts. The test consisted of 39 multiple-choice questions in English. To reduce the guessing factor that is inherent in multiple-choice tests, I asked at least two questions per concept – except for those questions that were based on definitions. The definition questions were on grammatical concepts which do not exist in the English language but do in all four languages that were being tested (the concepts of agreement, reflexive, irregular and regular). In the multiple-choice questions, the students had to recognise the underlined grammatical term and choose from four possible grammar terms.

To measure the final results of the student test, I applied the grading scale used at ASH (see table below). Although 70-71% is considered an adequate grade, ASH reports home to students and parents when this grade is reached (see Appendix 6 for policy regarding this procedure). I therefore used below 72% as the cut-off line for concepts to be considered as a problem for the students.

Table 3: Grading Scale at ASH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Cut-off</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>Passing, but Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>Passing, but Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>Passing, but Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>Failing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PowerTeacher Gradebook-ASH-High School
3.2 Implementation

The first part of the data collection consisted of gauging teacher expectations on student grammatical terminology knowledge. The data that resulted from the brainstorming session on grammatical terminology knowledge with language colleagues resulted in a list of 22 grammar concepts. The setting for this brainstorming session was informal and not all language teachers were present. Therefore, this list could not be considered as a final list of terms. I added eight concepts to the list after researching ASH language curricula for Level 1. This list was the basis for the multiple-choice questionnaire.

The multiple-choice questionnaire was taken by 11 language teachers after a presentation of my research project in September. This questionnaire was then sent to the teachers through Google Docs and all teachers (except one who took it later) completed it at the same time in the same location. This made it possible to clarify that it was recognition of the concepts – and not application – that was being measured. It took the teachers about 10 minutes to complete the multiple-choice questionnaire. The results were sent directly to a spreadsheet so it was possible to view the results as a group (Appendix 4). After analysis there were 28 concepts that made the mark and were included on the final list. There were a few extra grammar concepts added to the open question at the end of the multiple-choice questionnaire, but these were too language-specific to be considered for the test.

The next step consisted of gauging student grammatical terminology knowledge with a test. This test was taken by the students online using the school-wide system, Euromoodle. One of the advantages of this system is its efficiency: most students already have an account and simply have to log-in to take the test. Additionally, the system graded the test directly and sent the data to a central data collection site. The data was then transferred to Excel format for further analysis and graphing. The test was administered to six Level 2 language classes over the time span of a week. The students were taken out of their regular classes for 30 minutes and provided with instructions and a computer to take the test. In total, there were 88 participants from one Dutch class, one German class, two Spanish classes and two French classes. Most students finished the test in 10-15 minutes (the test questions and average percentages are included in Appendix 5).

The setting for taking the test was as homogeneous as possible. The students received a hand-out with an explanation of the goal of the research; this was read with them by the test administrator. The test took no longer than 20 minutes (including technical instruction and aid). There was an IT expert on hand to help with any technical problems.

The test procedure went according to plan apart from a few extenuating circumstances. Several students were absent, either owing to illness or previous
commitments; during two sessions, it took one student longer to create an account; and another student had to take the test three times before it registered the results.

The eleven teachers that participated in this research were all Middle and High School level teachers of all languages (French, Dutch, German and Spanish). The multiple-choice questionnaire consisted of 30 grammatical terms. The answers are as shown in the graphs below:

Table 4.1: Multiple-Choice Questionnaire Results of Teacher Expectations of Student Grammatical Terminology Knowledge.

Table 4.2: Multiple-Choice Questionnaire Results of Teacher Expectations of Student Grammatical Terminology Knowledge.

Source: Analysis of Teacher Multiple-Choice Questionnaire from Analytical Research on Grammatical Terminology by A. Groeneveld.
Of the 30 grammar concepts, 28 terms received between six and 11 ‘yes’ answers. These 28 terms were included in the student test because these were the concepts the teachers expected the students to know at the end of Level 1. Two terms had five or less ‘yes’ answers and were not included in the test (adverb and modal verbs). See Appendix 4 for the multiple-choice questionnaire results spreadsheet. As regards the student test 88 students participated. They were High School language Level 2 students from grade 9-12. They studied French, German, Dutch or Spanish and were from various countries in the world; the amount of time they had been at ASH varied. I considered the question on recognition of a negation as invalid. In retrospect, there were two possible answers and including the answers to this question in the results would have distorted the average percentage of correct answers. In graph format the overall results of the remaining 27 concepts were as follows:

Table 5: Results of the Student Grammatical Terminology Test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar Concepts</th>
<th>Average % Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a comparative</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a noun</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a past participle</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a personal pronoun</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a preposition</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a question</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a subject</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a verb</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adjective</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an article</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an infinitive verb</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future tense</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflexive</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past tense</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present tense</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of Student Test for the Purpose of Analytical Research by A. Groeneveld.

Of the 27 remaining grammar terms tested, the students scored below 72% on seven terms. That meant that students had 26% less knowledge of grammar terms than teachers had expected. The percentages were based on an average of at least 1-2 questions per concept. Students scored below 72% for the following concepts (from lowest to highest):
Agreement (44%)
Demonstrative pronoun (55%)
Present tense (55.5%)
Superlative (56%)
Conjugation (62.5%)
Possessive pronoun (67%)
Direct object (68%)

It was surprising that the students scored below average on recognition of the present tense. Of the two questions on this grammatical concept, one could be read as possibly being in the future tense (given the wording of the sentence). In fact, that was the answer a majority of the students gave. However, the verb that was underlined in this question was a present tense verb – and it is within reason to expect students to be able to identify this as a present tense verb used in a possible future tense context.

Looking at the results in more detail, it seemed that, in general, understanding pronouns as a grammar concept was a problem for the students (demonstrative pronoun 55%, possessive pronoun 67%). Especially if we take into account the fact that personal pronouns only just missed the cut-off line by 1% and, arguably, could have been added to the list of problem concepts. Conjugation, present tense and agreement (in as far as it pertains to verb agreement) can be grouped under the more general heading of verbs. This would imply that students struggled with this grammatical concept.

In the test, the grammatical concept agreement was one of the questions formulated as a definition. This raises the question whether the students would have a better understanding of this concept if it was asked in the same way as the other questions. This meant it would need to be asked in the language of instruction of the students taking the test (German, Spanish, French or Dutch). Ideally, this form of questioning would be applied to all four definition questions.

3.3 Evaluation

The question I aimed to answer in this research was: What are teacher expectations of students’ knowledge of grammatical terminology and what do the students actually know? As the results revealed, there was a slight discrepancy between teacher expectations of student grammatical terminology knowledge and the students’ actual knowledge. The expectation was that students should score at least 72% on the list of 27 concepts – yet they scored below the adequate score on seven of these concepts.

My recommendation was to focus on these seven terms in Level 2 language classes. This meant making a list of these terms and exposing students to them. To measure the results from exposure to these seven concepts, I suggested a second round of the
same student test be carried out towards the end of the academic year. This would determine whether their understanding of these concepts had improved.

Before proceeding, however, I recommended a review of the test. The definition questions could be reformulated as language-specific questions presented in the context of an example sentence to ensure a better understanding of the concept. Certain questions, such as the negation question (and possibly the present tense question), needed to be void of all ambiguity. All grammar concepts should be asked in two or more questions to eliminate the guessing factor as much as possible.

Once student grammatical terminology knowledge is above the adequate range, it would then be possible to take the research a step further – and determine whether their recognition of grammatical concepts also carries over into being able to apply this knowledge in their grammar. Therefore, in conclusion, although declarative knowledge was the main focus of this research, to answer the question fully one would also need to look into the procedural.

4. Design Research

4.1 Procedure

The results from the Analytical Research showed that the grammatical knowledge of the students at ASH was below the average range. Before being able to research if recognition of grammatical terminology translates into application of grammar, one would have to further improve the grammatical terminology. The aim of the Design Research was then to improve student recognition of grammatical terminology. The research question formulated to guide the Design Research was: How can student recognition of grammatical terminology be improved?

As a step towards answering this question, I designed a lesson series in which the students were exposed to the terminology they were struggling with. The effects of this intervention were measured by comparing the grammatical knowledge prior to, and after, the intervention. As the testing on which I based my conclusions in previous research was conducted in October, it seemed prudent to test the students again to determine which concepts they still struggled with. These pre- and post-measurements of student knowledge were determined by means of a student grammatical knowledge test similar to the one administered in the Analytical Research Project. To stay within the time and logistical limits of this research project, I retested the students on the seven concepts that were below the adequate level in the grammar test conducted in October. From the results of this pre-test, I took the four concepts that had the lowest score and created a lesson series in which these concepts were taught. A post-test at the end determined whether the students’ declarative knowledge of these grammar concepts had improved.

Following the same logic as in the Analytical Research Project, when referring to the term grammatical knowledge it is important to distinguish between the declarative
knowledge and the procedural knowledge. Students need to be able to recognise concepts before being able to apply them. In the pre- and post-test, as in the Analytical Research Test, the focus was therefore on declarative grammatical knowledge.

The research was conducted in two classes: High School French 2 and High School Dutch 2. Although these are two different language classes, they share a common grammar curriculum. As was determined in the teacher multiple-choice questionnaire in the Analytical Research Project, the concepts the students are taught at this level are the same. The number in both classes totalled 36. Statistically, according to theory on the methodology of research (Baarda & De Goede, 2006), 30 respondents is an adequate number for testing purposes. Furthermore, there is a strong professional and cooperative relationship between the Dutch teacher who teaches the High School Dutch 2 class and myself (High School French 2), which was a prerequisite for successful implementation of the intervention.

The test questions consisted of sentences in both Dutch and French, as these are the target languages in the classes. The practice material the students used in the lessons was also in both French and Dutch. In contrast to the test administered in the Analytical Research Project – which was in English – creating a test in two languages was realistically possible in this part of the research. There are only two and not four languages, which made it feasible to create a multilingual test within the time frame allotted to this project. However, the answers, in which the students show their recognition of the concepts, were in English. This is justified by the fact that a common grammatical language for all the language classes would make it easier for both students and teachers to discuss grammar, as argued by Fellowes: “In order for students to be able to discuss specific grammatical concepts and language use within a text, it is advantageous to provide them with a standard grammar vocabulary. The language for talking about, and describing, language is referred to as metalanguage” (Fellowes, 2007).

English grammar terminology is Latin-based (e.g., adjective) and is similar to Spanish (adjetivo) and French terminology (adjectif). In Dutch and German there is a choice between using target language terms (bijvoegelijk naamwoord) or the Latin-based terms (adjectief, Adjektiv). It makes sense for the students and teachers to know the English grammatical terminology as ASH is an English-speaking school – so there is already a similarity between the English terms and those in the target languages. Additionally, most foreign language teachers already use either English or both English and target language terms, and the students are also exposed to English grammar terminology in their English language classes.

When the students had taken the pre-test, I was able to establish which four concepts needed to be focused on. The next step was implementing the intervention. This was a series of lessons, which focused on the four concepts. The choice of method of grammar teaching for these lessons is based on methods advocated in
contemporary theory. Judging by recent literature on the topic, the debate amongst those in favour of the inclusion of grammar in language instruction now focuses on what the best way is to teach grammar. In theory, roughly two approaches to teaching grammar can be distinguished; a deductive approach and an inductive approach, also known as the explicit/implicit controversy. As explained by Adair-Hauck and Donato: “On the deductive side of the dichotomy is explicit grammar instruction that involves teacher explanations of rules followed by related manipulative exercises intended to practice the new structure.” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010). The problem inherent in the deductive approach is that: “Critics argue that it emphasizes form at the expense of meaning and that it does not provide comprehensible, meaning-bearing input. (VanPatten, 1993, p.436)” (Paesani, 2005).

Adair-Hauck and Donato go on to say: “The inductive approach, as presented by Krashen (1985), Terrell (1977), and Dulay and Burt (1973), rejects the need for any explicit focus on form. Proponents of the inductive teaching argue that learners can acquire language naturally if they are provided with sufficient comprehensible input from the teacher” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010). However, the problem with the inductive approach is: “… research has shown that some learners do not attend to or ‘induce’ the teacher’s preselected grammatical point on the basis of input alone” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010).

In discovering that both the deductive and inductive way of teaching grammar have their downsides, we find that theory has moved one step further and the focus is now on form through meaning. As stated by Zéphir: “Lee and Van Patten (1995a, p. 89-115) recommend that grammar be presented through “structured input activities” in which “particular features” of language are concentrated or “privileged” in a structured set of input utterances or sentences” (102). In these input utterances, learners attend to grammatical items while focusing on meaning” (Zéphir, 2000).

Adair-Hauck and Donato have formalised this way of grammar teaching by introducing a dialogic approach in their PACE model. There are two key features to this method. Firstly, the focus is on presenting grammar concepts that are embedded in meaningful language: “In contrast, the model we propose in this chapter views grammar teaching as a focus on a well-chosen form of language after meaning of this form has been established in interesting and compelling contexts, such as stories, folktales, and legends” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010).

Secondly, key in this method is a dialogue between teacher and student about a grammar rule. The aim of this dialogue is to encourage deeper thinking skills and an increased awareness and understanding of the rules. “Finally, through dialog with the teacher and each other, learners develop grammatical concepts through problem-solving activity where they are asked to reflect upon form and the relationship of forms to meaning that have been established in the context of cultural stories” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010). In short, it is to a certain extent an
inductive approach to teaching grammar but with guidance from the teacher. The guidance takes place in the form of a discussion between student and teacher on the grammar rule for a certain concept.

Additionally, the PACE model is based on the premise that one needs to first establish the declarative knowledge before proceeding to develop procedural skills. The aim is to encourage: “Use of higher-level thinking skills and language before moving to procedural skills” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010). This line of thinking fits in with the logic behind my research project. In teaching the grammar concepts to Level 2 students using the PACE model, I hope that deeper understanding will go hand-in-hand with better recognition of the grammar concepts that students are struggling with.

If we look at the PACE model in detail, it is made up of the following four steps:

“P: Presentation of meaningful language in a thematic and interactive way.
A: The teacher directs the students’ Attention to some aspect of the language used during the presentation phase.
C: Students and teacher Co-construct an explanation during this step, after their attention has been focused on the form.
E: They engage in Extension activities that provide them with the opportunity to use the new structure in creative ways” (Zéphir, 2000).

In practice, this meant that the four concepts that had the lowest average scores on the pre-test were offered in a series of six lessons to two classes (one Dutch class and one French class). Each concept was presented in three sessions totalling approximately 60 minutes. The lessons followed the structure of the PACE model. The first session covered the first four phases of the model (Presentation; Attention; Co-construction and Extension), while the second and third session repeated the last phase of the model through a set of exercises specially designed for the students to practice the concepts. In this way, the students revised what they had learnt spread out over 2-3 weeks. The first session (PACE) was between 30-40 minutes, depending on the complexity of the concept. While both the second and third session (E), in which the students took online quizzes, lasted about 20 minutes. Readers who wish a more detailed account of the set-up are referred to the lesson plans in Appendix 9.

The terminology was in English in both classes, while the practice sentences were in French or Dutch, depending on the language of the student. The exercises were offered on a self-correcting programme called Hot Potatoes (Half-Baked Software Inc, 2010), which is accessible to students via Euromoodle (Moodle Trust, 2010). The lessons were spread out over 3-4 weeks. Both the French and the Dutch class were taught during H-block. ASH has two alternating weeks, A and B; there are two lessons in an A-week and three in a B-week. I administered the pre-test, lesson series and post-test in the five weeks between February break and April break.
(March 1st-April 2nd) to ensure there would be continuity between the teaching and testing.

4.2 Implementation

The first step in the research consisted of gauging student grammatical terminology knowledge on the seven grammar concepts with a pre-test. This was in the form of a multiple-choice test. To reduce the guessing factor that is inherent in multiple-choice tests, I included four questions per concept. In total, there were 28 questions for both the Dutch and French test. In the multiple-choice questions, the students were asked to recognise the underlined grammatical term and choose from four possible grammar terms. To ensure the answers were realistic there were also other terms besides the seven concepts being tested that they could choose from. The example sentences were either in French or Dutch depending on the class being tested. The answers (terminology concepts) were in English. Both the questions and answers in the French and Dutch tests were either the same or, if this was not possible due to differences in the languages, they were adapted. In French, for instance, there is verb and adjective agreement, whereas in Dutch there is only adjective agreement. Readers who wish to see the Dutch and French test are referred to Appendix 7.

There were a total of 36 students in the High School Level 2 classes – 18 students in both the French and the Dutch class – of which 21 were male and 15 female. However, both the pre- and the post-test were taken by 17 Dutch and 17 French students (total of 34 students) as one male student from the French class and one female student from the Dutch class were absent the day of the pre-test and were therefore not included in the research. The students – whose ages ranged from 15-17 – had had 1.5-2 years of language studies either at ASH or another school.

The results from the French and Dutch pre-test were combined into one result. This was because the goal of the research was not to compare the two languages, but to improve the declarative knowledge of terminology regardless of whether the student is in a Dutch or French language class. The four concepts that were taught are concepts that both languages have in common.

The test was taken online using the school-wide system, Euromoodle and was administered to the two Level 2 language classes on Tuesday March 9th during their language class. The average time it took the students to complete the test was approximately ten minutes.

The post-test was exactly the same as the pre-test and was administered after the intervention on Wednesday March 31st during H-block. The same 17 students who took the pre-test in the Dutch and French classes also took the post-test. The two students who were absent during the pre-test did not participate in the post-test.
To expose the students to the four grammar concepts that they struggled with, I designed four classes which followed the PACE model. We chose to start with a relatively easy concept, namely demonstrative pronouns, then focus on direct objects, as prior knowledge of this concept facilitates understanding verb agreement in French. The grammar classes finished with the easier concept of superlatives in the fourth lesson. Each of these four classes went through all four PACE stages. To ensure retention of the concepts, we revised all four concepts again in two consecutive classes before administering the post-test. The materials for all exercises – whether in the presentation or extension stage – were presented in the target languages (Dutch and French). Based on the premise that I wished to improve the students’ declarative grammatical knowledge, the exercises in all stages focused on the recognition of terminology. For a detailed account of the lesson series the reader is referred to Appendix 9.

In short, in the lesson series the (P) Presentation stage of the classes were in the form of a fairytale adapted from Alice in Wonderland (Carroll, 1917) to teach the demonstrative pronouns; a picture prompt and question/answer format to teach the direct object; a short mystery story for French and a video from Sesame Street (NPS, 2009) for Dutch to teach agreement; a song by Alpha Blondy for French and a song by Marco Borsato for Dutch to teach the superlative. The students were asked questions about the content or meaning of the extracts and then their answers were discussed after the presentation.

Overall, the students’ reaction to this presentation stage was enthusiastic and there was a high level of participation. As both teachers and students became more at ease with this method, it was easier to find a manner in which to conduct a discussion on the topic during the presentation. The discussions progressively became longer and by the time we introduced the Alpha Blondy and Marco Borsato songs, we were having in-depth discussions with students in the target language. The method used for each presentation (fairytale, song, written text, video clip, picture prompt) requires a different set of teaching skills. This meant preparing each presentation carefully to increase the effectiveness. Seen from this perspective, teaching grammar topics in this way is a challenge to start with but, with practice, will become easier. The PACE method advocates a lengthier input period per concept at this stage and, ideally, more exposure over a longer period of time would have been beneficial to the students’ understanding of the concepts. Having said that, a fair degree of understanding was obtained despite the lack of time for more exposure. This may have been due to the fact that the students were familiar with the concepts, in varying degrees, and not learning them for the first time.

The (A) Attention stage of the classes was initiated by a question that focused the attention of the students on the form. As we assumed the students were already familiar with the concepts – our aim being to revise and increase deeper understanding – we assumed that the students would be capable of recognising the concepts if we used the English names for them. The students were asked to underline, circle or recognise the concepts depending on the presentation form.
offered. Generally speaking, this stage went very quickly with the exception of the concept agreement in French where there are two similar concepts – adjective and verb agreement – that needed to be covered. Not all students knew directly what the concepts meant at this stage (demonstrative pronoun and superlative in French), but by having them work in pairs or table groups they were able to help each other. In Dutch, it was the concepts direct object and agreement that the students were the least familiar with. For both the French and Dutch class, this lack of knowledge may have been due to less exposure to these concepts than the others – or it may have been a while ago that they were covered.

In the next stage, (C) Co-construction, the students co-constructed the concept rule. The big difference with the purely inductive approach is that the students were given some form of scaffolding from the teacher to help them structure the rule. As stated by Adair-Hauck and Donato: “Teachers need to be aware that the help they provide is graduated and may range from brief hints about the target form to explicit instruction if needed. (Aljaafreh, 1992; Aljaafreh & Lantolf 1994)” (Donato & Adair-Hauck, 2000). This meant that the teacher offered a few clues; they drew attention to differences (e.g., masculine/feminine or plural/singular); presented a structure in which to place the rule (demonstrative pronouns, superlatives); or, in the case of the direct object, instructed the students to find which questions need to be asked to find the concept.

As a general observation, at this stage I started in French, but soon realised that it was too difficult to have a dialogue at this level with the students in the target language, so I reverted to English. This is supported by theory: “The use of English for co-construction of grammatical knowledge may be necessary depending on the level of the class and the structure under investigation” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010).

As both teachers and students became more familiar with this way of working, it was easier to adapt to students’ needs. Some concepts required more scaffolding than others. In French, for instance, the most help was needed for the superlative. To make this concept clear, I needed to compare the superlative with adjectives and comparatives. Generally speaking though, not only was a deeper sense of understanding of individual concepts achieved, but also an understanding of connections between grammar concepts. This became particularly obvious in the Dutch class when students came up with the word “dependence” for agreement. In the French class the students became aware that there is a connection between verb and adjective agreement and a connection between direct objects and agreement.

The final stage (E) Extension was divided into two different sets of exercises. The first set was administered directly at the end of the lesson in which the concept was revised. To help students to improve their recognition skills, they made sentences illustrating the concept, exchanged them with another student and then underlined the word or words that demonstrated this concepts. There was also a second extension exercise that was not necessarily linked to practicing with the concept –
but using meaningful language based on the content or form presented in the presentation: “The extension activity phase closes the circle of the PACE lesson and puts the ‘whole’ back into story-based language teaching” (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2010). That means that all exercises should be linked in topic to the presentation stage and not be a line of disconnected practice sentences. Unfortunately, we did not always have time to do these extension exercises and the students completed some of these exercises at home (e.g., writing a fairytale).

In the second set of extension exercises the students practiced with the concepts through online exercises in either Dutch or French, depending on the target language of the class. These exercises, like the first exercises in the first set, also focused on recognition of the concepts: they were either in the form of true/false questions, or in the form of questions with multiple-choice answers (see Appendix 10 for some examples). In essence, these exercises did not fit in the extension stage of the PACE model as they were not connected to the presentation stage. However, I included them as the aim of these exercises was to give the students a chance – within the time available for this research – to practice working with the concepts before taking the post-test.

The very nature of the PACE method, which is to encourage deeper thinking skills among students, provides the opportunity to approach grammar from a more holistic perspective. In this method, students are invited to take a step back from the details, look at the bigger picture and discover patterns not only within concepts but also connections between them. Just from observation of the students’ questions and answers as a result of using the PACE method, it was obvious that the students were operating at a higher thinking level. By teaching the concepts according to the PACE model, we not only carved out time to work on improving students’ understanding of the four concepts, but also – as a spin-off – created time to check students’ general understanding of grammar at a higher level. Generally speaking, this feeling was shared by the students when we asked them in an informal survey to reflect on what they had learnt (See Appendix 11 for the questions). Here are some of the answers they gave:

“Knowing why something is structured the way it is helps me be more fluent than parroting examples ... then I can construct phrases more easily.”

“It will help you to make sense out of the language instead of just memorizing certain rules.”

“Yes, this really made my grammar understanding improve. I will be able to write better sentences and be able to acknowledge different parts of speech. It will help me with reading, as well as writing.”
4.3. Evaluation

The guiding question in the Design Research was: how to improve student grammatical terminology knowledge? To answer this question I first established which concepts needed to be improved by administering a pre-test to the students in two Level 2 language classes at ASH.

In this pre-test, I focused on the seven concepts that had the lowest results in the test conducted last October as part of my Analytical Research Project. The average correct answers are based on the combined results from the Dutch and French pre-tests, as illustrated in the table:

Table 6: Results of the Grammar Pre-Test.

![Grammar Pre-Test graph]

As you can see, the four concepts that the students struggled with most were:

- Demonstrative pronoun (38.3%)
- Direct object (54.5%)
- Superlative (51.5%)
- Agreement (39.6%)
Having pinpointed the four concepts that needed to be improved, I designed a lesson series based on the PACE model. Once the lesson series was completed, the two classes took the post-test to establish whether or not there had been an improvement of grammatical terminology knowledge. The combined results of the French and Dutch test (Appendix 8) are represented in the following table, which shows both the pre- and post-test.

Table 7: Results of the Grammar Pre- and Post-Test.

![Grammar Pre- and Post-Test](image)

Source: Analysis of Student Results for Design Research by A. Groeneveld.

As the table shows, there is a significant improvement in the understanding of the four concepts that were taught:

- Demonstrative pronoun went from 38.3% to 82.50% – (44.2% improvement)
- Direct object went from 54.5% to 78.63% – (24.13% improvement)
- Superlative went from 51.5% to 99.25% – (47.75% improvement)
- Agreement went from 39.6% to 87.13% – (47.53% improvement)

Of the four concepts, the direct object underwent the smallest improvement. This could be explained by the fact that student understanding of this concept prior to the intervention was at a higher level than that of the other three concepts and...
therefore the post-intervention result is less impressive. There is, however, still quite a significant difference in percentile improvement between the direct object and the other three concepts. Possible explanations for this may be as follows. It is probably the most difficult concept of the four taught; the direct object is easily confused with the indirect object; and there are quite a few exceptions to the rule for this concept – in the PACE model, the focus is on the general rule not the exceptions.

Interestingly, the knowledge of the other concepts – the three that were not included in the intervention – had also undergone an improvement, albeit to a significantly lesser degree than the knowledge of the other four concepts:

Conjugated verb: from 59.5% to 72.38% – (a 12.88% improvement)
Possessive pronoun: from 63.4% to 70.75% – (a 7.35% improvement)
Present tense: from 64.6% to 70.88% – (a 6.28% improvement)

In looking at these improved results for the taught and the non-taught concepts, we must not forget that the students were taking the test for a second time – the pre- and post-test were identical – and this will have had a slight effect on the results. Another factor that needs to be taken into account when looking at these improved figures is that the students will have undergone a certain degree of autonomous development in the three weeks between the pre- and the post-test. However, it is not unthinkable that the slight improvement of the three non-taught concepts is linked to the significant improvement of the four taught concepts. This is a plausible theory if we consider that the aim of the PACE method is to instill deeper thinking patterns in students’ grammar learning. As we have worked on the students’ meta-cognitive skills, it would be possible to believe that their understanding of the three non-taught concepts has been pulled along in the wake of their deeper understanding of the four taught concepts. In all likelihood, if we focused on the remaining three concepts, they would also improve to a similar degree as the four taught concepts.

Although it is not possible, based on this research, to draw conclusions about PACE as the only possible model to achieve positive results, one can conclude that the use of the PACE model has been a determining factor in the outcome of this research. The added value of the PACE model has manifested itself in a couple of ways. The Co-construction stage of this model engages students in deeper thinking skills and thus encourages them to see the concepts they are learning as part of a larger grammar spectrum where concepts are interlaced and dependent on each other. In the words of a student in responding to the informal survey on their learning: “... I can understand why I am writing what I am writing.”

Seeing grammar in a broader context – or rather at a meta-grammar level – makes it possible for students to take the next step and see it as one of the many ingredients that make up a language. This, in turn, ties in with the essence of the PACE model. As we saw in the Presentation stage, grammar is presented in the form of meaningful
language. First comes the meaning, then the grammar. The PACE model is set up in such a way that it emphasises grammar as a means to an end; a tool necessary to learn how to communicate more fluently. Grammar is not an isolated factor, it is part of a language. And, by improving it, the goal is ultimately to improve language learning as a whole. The recognition and understanding of the concept is facilitated through meaningful input. It should then be easier to take the next step: application of this concept. But is this true? Does having a deeper understanding of the terminology translate in improved application of grammar?

In this paper, I took a step in the direction of finding the answer to that question. Although I achieved my aim – to improve students’ declarative knowledge of grammar – there remain some concepts still to be improved. Once the declarative knowledge of all the concepts is at an adequate level of understanding, it will open up further research into the relationship between declarative and procedural grammatical knowledge.

Chapter 5 Conclusions and Accountability

If we take a step back and look at the research questions, set-up, implementation and conclusions with a critical eye, not only does it give us some idea about how we might adapt and improve the research, but it might also show us the way forward. By scrutinising the guiding questions in both research projects, we can determine whether they are essential. Are they worded in such a way that they pertain to the essence of the research? And are they, in fact, relevant: do they address a real problem at the school? In this case, ASH.

The Analytical Research question comprises two parts. Firstly, determining teacher expectations of grammatical terminology knowledge. And secondly, determining what grammatical terminology the students actually know. In this respect, the question is essential to the research project. Both parts are covered in the question, and in a logical order – without knowing teacher expectations, we would not have a benchmark with which to measure student knowledge. As a follow-up to the conclusion drawn from the Analytical Research, the Design Research question aimed at finding a way to improve student grammatical terminology knowledge. This cuts to the essence of the Design Research: improving student grammatical terminology knowledge is a constant thread throughout both the research and intervention.

The relevance of the questions can be argued on three different levels. On a personal level, researching the grammatical terminology knowledge of students – whether or not one agrees such an understanding is essential to their grammar learning – has increased my own awareness of the students’ ability in this field. On a departmental level, there was a general consensus that students lack grammatical terminology knowledge. This constitutes a problem: ASH is an international school and offers the International Baccalaureate and Advanced Proficiency – programmes which require an extensive knowledge of grammar. While looking at the relevance of the questions from a school-wide perspective, one could argue that – in light of the curriculum
review in the language department – researching the grammatical knowledge would benefit this process.

In examining the set-up of the Analytical Research and the Design Research, there are three different angles to consider: functionality, attainability and precision. Determining the functionality of the set-up requires closer scrutiny of the degree to which it enables us to answer the research questions. The aim of the set-up in the Analytical Research – as echoed in the research question – was to ascertain teacher expectations and student knowledge of grammatical terminology. Prior to the Analytical Research, there was no data available. Therefore, two instruments were created to measure both these factors: a teacher multiple-choice questionnaire and a student test. In terms of functionality, this set-up enabled us to answer the research question: what grammatical terminology knowledge do teachers expect and what do students know? Subsequently, the lesson series in the Design Research were constructed in order to improve student grammatical knowledge, with the pre- and post-test serving as a measure of gauging any improvement. Viewed from this perspective, we can conclude that the set-up of the Design Research is indeed functional because it answers the fundamental question: how do we improve the students’ grammatical terminology knowledge?

The attainability of the set-up pertains to the degree in which it translates from theory into practice. Choosing the declarative knowledge – when defining the research question for the Analytical Research – meant that, in practice, the focus was on recognition of grammar concepts. Adopting the dialogic approach for the Design Research determined that the understanding of grammar concepts would be achieved through a discussion on the topic between the teacher and students.

The determining factors in making the set-up of the tests and intervention attainable were collegiality, technology and language. I had the opportunity to present my objectives and specify my expectations regarding the research in the form of a meeting. This made it easier to get colleagues on board. It also gave me the opportunity to prepare them for the multiple-choice questionnaire by emphasising that we would be researching the declarative knowledge. The availability of online programmes, Euromoodle (Moodle Trust 2010) and Hot Potatoes (Half-Baked Software Inc., 2010), simplified both the testing process and grading of exercises. While the multiple-choice option on these programmes made the correcting, collecting and analysis of the data less time-consuming. Finally, one decisive factor in enabling the testing of a large number of students in the Analytical Research – within the time constraints – was the use of English. Creating the test sentences in all four languages would have put a strain on the workload of colleagues – who would have had to design and correct the tests. It would also have extended the research period considerably. Unlike the Analytical Research, the Design Research only involved two languages so it was therefore possible to create a test in both target languages. However, as we were looking for a common grammatical terminology that would span the different languages, in both the Analytical and the Design Research we used the English names for the grammatical concepts.
There were certain factors in the set-up – related to space, resources and time – that jeopardised the attainability of the research. In the Analytical Research, the large number of students involved meant that the testing took one week, was conducted in several classrooms, and with a variable number of laptops. Logistically, this was a great challenge and I owe it to the collegiality of the staff at ASH that this rather formidable undertaking turned into a seamless event. In the Design Research, the greatest challenge was the lack of time, resulting in limited attainability of the PACE model. If we had rigorously applied the model then the presentation and extension phase would have been longer.

The third element of the set-up analysis – precision – requires close scrutiny of the degree of detail in the research. Determining which way to steer the research required absolute precision when qualifying the definitions in the research questions. The decision to gauge the declarative – instead of procedural – knowledge was based on a theoretical study. Similarly, a choice was made to apply a dialogic approach to teaching the grammar concepts.

A comparable amount of detail in determining which concepts would be used for the tests can be found in the Analytical and Design Research. The precision in this part of the research resides in the detailed account of the steps taken in creating the concepts for the research. This included informal brainstorming, adapting the list of concepts, and producing a final list of concepts. The latter formed the basis for the teacher survey and, naturally, there was rigour in measuring the results. The detail in the Analytical Grammar Test and the Design Research pre- and post-tests can be found in the description of these tests. This we can break down into two parts: the content and the way in which the results would be measured. For the content, this included details on the choices made and why – and included the multiple-choice format, the amount of concepts and questions, and the decision to opt for the declarative knowledge. In terms of the way in which the results were measured, this differed for the Analytical Research Test and the Design Research Test. The former was calculated according to the school’s grading scale, while the latter was determined by the concepts students struggled with most.

On a critical note, there could have been greater precision in the results of the Analytical Research – had there had been more questions per concept. If all questions had been void of ambiguity – and all definition questions had been transformed into several target language questions instead of one question – this would have reduced the guessing factor inherent in multiple-choice testing and put these questions in line with the non-definition questions. This point was included in the conclusions drawn from the Analytical Research – and taken into account when creating the Design Research pre- and post-test. Similarly, the Design Research test results could also have been more precise if the pre- and post-test had been based on the initial 28 concepts – instead of just seven. Ideally, re-testing all the concepts would have afforded more accurate results: students may have become less
proficient in some of the concepts due to the time lapse and could have benefited from a review. Unfortunately, time constraints limited this part of the research.

If we look more closely at the intervention – the lesson series according to the PACE model – what stands out is the detailed account of the reasoning behind the choice of this method. Why less classes (two) and more languages (French and Dutch, instead of just English) were used and how technology can aid the lessons. Likewise, the description of the PACE model – which by the very nature of its set-up (in four clear steps) makes it a very easy tool to use and follow – is clearly presented. However, as was the case with the testing, time constraint issues forced us to limit the number of concepts to be re-taught to four. Ideally, all concepts below the grading scale limit of 72% would need to be re-taught. Additionally, had time and space not been an issue, it would have been possible to create a control group alongside an experimental group. By teaching half the classes according to the PACE model – and the other half using the traditional method – we would have been able to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the PACE model.

Regarding the implementation of the research, one can look at the degree to which it is verifiable: is it in line with the set-up? The degree to which it is professional: is it ethical and aimed at answering the research questions? And to what extent it is trustworthy: are all variables accounted for? The only deviation from the planned set-up, as stated in the Analytical Research Project, was that the students needed to be re-tested in the Design Research. However, this set-up was adapted before the onset of the Design Research so, in that sense, is verifiable. The reason behind this change of plan was the time lapse between the Analytical Research and Design Research. Additionally, the decision was taken to reduce the amount of concepts in the pre-test to seven in order to stay within the time limit of the research.

The sole purpose of the multiple-choice questionnaire and grammar tests in the Analytical Research was to answer the research question so, in that sense, the set-up was professional. The students were informed of the purpose of the tests and assured that the test results would not affect their grade and be anonymous. Likewise, in the Design Research, the implemented pre- and post-tests – and intervention – were only used to address the research question.

As regards to the degree of trustworthiness of the implementation, there are two variables that needed to be taken into account. The first one – the nomadic nature of the students – is inherent in international schools. In the context of this research, this meant that we had no control over the grammar knowledge that students had acquired previously at other schools. As this is an intrinsic aspect of the school, one could argue, in fact, that it is a constant and not a variable. Based on this premise, I therefore decided to disregard this variable. The second variable was absenteeism due to illnesses. This occurred during the testing and was taken into account when calculating the results.
Finally – to complete the analysis of the research – a closer examination of the conclusions and recommendations is necessary. Are the conclusions and recommendations acceptable; are they in agreement with the questioning? Are they adequate; do they provide an answer to the problem? The conclusion – that there was a discrepancy in student grammatical terminology knowledge – is acceptable because it is a direct answer to the Analytical Research question: what grammatical terminology knowledge do teachers expect and what do students know? The next step – the recommendation that their knowledge should be augmented – initiated the Design Research question: how do we improve student grammatical terminology knowledge? The conclusion drawn from the Design Research – that the intervention improved their knowledge – addresses the question posed in the Design Research.

If we then analyse the solution that emerged from the Analytical Research, we can ask ourselves if it adequately solves the problem, i.e. the lack of student grammatical terminology knowledge. The recommendation was to re-teach these concepts. The fact that the test results showed a significant improvement in the students’ grasp of grammatical terminology following the intervention, constituted a remedy to this particular problem.

In fact, one could go a step further and argue that it is not so much the adequacy of implementing a lesson series that needs to be considered, but rather the adequacy of the method chosen to solve the problem. The modus operandi in this case was the PACE model. Following implementation, research results revealed that there was a significant improvement in student terminology knowledge. Yet we are left wondering whether the PACE model had a direct influence on the results – or if these positive results were due to other factors, such as teaching skills or chance. More research would be necessary to determine whether specifically the PACE model was responsible for this improvement.

### Chapter 6  Recommendations

The conclusions deduced following a critical evaluation of the Analytical and Design Research point towards certain recommendations. If we look at the research in terms of the degree of the validity – did we measure what we set out to measure? – then for both the Analytical Research and Design Research, this was in fact the case. However, although we succeeded in determining the initial grammatical terminology knowledge – and subsequent improvement following an intervention – the degree of validity could be increased in two fundamental ways. We could broaden the scope of the research and involve more teachers in the re-teaching of grammatical terminology – not just limit ourselves to two teachers and two classes. Or, we could opt for a limited number of teachers, as was the case in the Design Research, and plan the lessons over a longer period of time. Or, we could combine both a larger pool and a longer time-span, depending on the time and resources available. Any of these choices would result in a more comprehensive assessment of student grammatical terminology knowledge.
Additionally, when considering further testing it would be advisable to measure all concepts – rather than just seven, as was the case in the Design Research. This would increase the degree of validity of the test – and therefore the research – as, due to lack of exposure, some student grammatical terminology knowledge may have deteriorated in the interim period between the testing. Furthermore, in choosing to use sentences in the target languages meant the Design Research had a higher level of validity than the Analytical Research. Having sentences in the target language reflects a more authentic situation, being typical of those students are exposed to in their foreign language lessons. The choice to use English as the language in which the grammatical concepts were expressed was based on the need for a common grammatical metalanguage pertinent to ASH. Using English enabled communication across the different language classes and grade-levels. This, however, is a decision each school will have to make based on the principal language of the school.

In terms of the design of the intervention, the most significant constraint I encountered was not being able to judge whether it was the PACE model that influenced the outcome of the research – or if it was due to other factors. I would therefore recommend both an experimental group and a control group when doing further testing. This ties in with the limitations regarding the validity of the research and again implies testing a larger group of students and having access to more time and resources. Having a control group would enable a comparison which would then deliver necessary information on the value of the PACE model. Furthermore, if one was interested in measuring the full extent of the influence of the PACE model, it would be advisable to not only implement a larger group, but also consider exposing the students to this model over a longer period of time. Ideally, to reap the full benefits of the model, the Presentation and Extension phases of PACE should be spread out over a longer period of time. I would therefore recommend a lengthier version of these phases in future research.

In terms of the set-up and implementation of the research, the recommendation to continue exposing students to the declarative knowledge – before moving on to the procedural – still holds true. Once the declarative knowledge is up to par, the next step would be to measure the transfer from recognition to application of grammar. This could be achieved, for instance, by comparing grammar tests over a certain time-span. Only then would we be able to determine whether recognising grammatical terminology has an effect on application.

Looking at the test results, the goal of the research – to ascertain and consequently improve student knowledge of grammatical terminology – has been achieved. Regarding the critical evaluation, there are certain aspects of this research that – if carried out again – would arguably need to be adapted. In terms of increasing validity of the test, one could consider adding more concepts and keeping the sentences in the target language. The validity of the intervention could be further augmented by using more concepts, involving more teachers and extending teaching
hours. Similarly, more teaching hours – and consequently prolonged exposure to the grammar concepts in the presentation and extension phase – would enable us to profit from the full effect of the PACE model. Finally, the addition of a control group would enable us to measure the effect of the model. Ideally, these are the changes that would move the research forward. However, one must not forget that the obstacle that hindered this research the most was: a lack of time. This is typical of a teaching environment and, if future research were to be successful, it would necessitate a careful balancing act between teaching schedules and research time.

Although the immediate problem has been solved – student grammatical terminology has improved – the raison d’être for this research, namely the belief amongst language teachers at ASH that improving grammatical terminology knowledge will improve student grammar learning, has yet to be proven. From this perspective, one could consider the research to be the first tentative step towards proving that there is a link between grammatical terminology knowledge and grammar learning. More research, however, would be required to bridge the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge and answer the question: how does improved declarative knowledge of grammatical terminology impact student grammar learning as a whole?

♦ ♦ ♦
Literature


Summary in Dutch

De American School of the Hague (ASH) waar ik les geef, is een internationale school met leerlingen afkomstig van diverse schoolsystemen. Het gevolg hiervan is dat sommige leerlingen weinig tot geen grammatica onderwijs hebben genoten. Het is een worsteling voor hen om mee te kunnen komen in de klas en een hele karwei voor de docent om ze zonder kennis van grammaticale terminologie te onderwijzen. ASH heeft in de bovenbouw het International Baccalaureate en Advanced Proficiency – twee programma’s waarin een goede grammaticale kennis een vereiste is. Om het onderwijs te vergemakkelijken is het belangrijk dat iedereen dezelfde grammaticale terminologische kennis beheerst. Onder de leraren op de school is er een consensus dat deze kennis van de leerlingen moet worden verbeterd. Verbeterde grammaticale terminologische kennis zou dan weer leiden tot verbeterde toepassing van grammatica.

De hypothese afgeleid van deze probleemstelling was dat er een verschil bestond tussen de verwachtingen die leraren hebben van de grammaticale terminologische kennis van de leerlingen en hun werkelijke kennis. Aangezien er geen data was om deze hypothese te onderbouwen, heb ik een onderzoek gedaan naar de validiteit van deze hypothese. De beschrijvende onderzoeksvraag die uit de hypothese volgde was als volgt: Wat zijn de verwachtingen van de leraren met betrekking tot de grammaticale terminologische kennis van leerlingen en wat is de werkelijke kennis van de leerlingen?

Om dit te kunnen onderzoeken was het eerst noodzakelijk om vast te stellen wat grammaticale terminologie is. In de theorie staat dat grammaticale terminologie een "standard grammar vocabulary" (Daniel, 1999) of een "metalanguage" (Fellowes, 2007) is, dat gebruikt kan worden door leerlingen als “the tools to think about and analyze their sentences” (Daniel, 1999).

Uit deze argumentatie vloeide de beslissing voort om Engels te gebruiken als de taal waarin de leerlingen worden geacht de grammaticale terminologie te kennen. Immers, Engels is de voertaal op school en is zodoende de aangewezen taal om de terminologische benamingen in te zetten.

Om duidelijkheid te verschaffen wat betreft de begrippen, rustte mij nog om het begrip 'kennis' te definiëren. In de theorie wordt een onderscheid gemaakt tussen declaratieve en procedurale grammaticale kennis. Ik koos ervoor de declarative kennis te onderzoeken aangezien het in dit onderzoek in eerste instantie ging om vast te stellen in welke mate de leerlingen in staat zijn om de terminologie te kunnen herkennen. Pas daarna zou men kunnen onderzoeken of ze deze kennis ook kunnen toepassen.

De instrumenten die ik heb gebruikt om de variabelen te meten zijn: een enquête en een test. In de enquête vroeg ik de leraren aan te geven welke grammaticale concepten zij verwachten dat de leerlingen kunnen herkennen. Om de kennis van de
leerlingen te meten heb ik de lijst met concepten die voortkwam uit de enquête gebruikt om een grammatica test te maken.

Aan de enquête namen 11 docenten deel, die allen op High School niveau les geven in de talen Frans, Duits, Nederlands en Spaans. Aan de test namen 88 leerlingen deel, die allen in een High School niveau 2 les zaten in de talen Frans, Duits, Nederlands en Spaans.

Uit het resultaat van de test bleek dat de hypothese valide was. De werkelijke grammaticale terminologische kennis van de leerlingen was minder hoog dan de verwachtingen van de leraren. Om dit gebrek aan kennis te verbeteren heb ik in het Ontwerp Onderzoek een interventie gedaan. Met deze interventie – in de vorm van een lessenserie – zocht ik een antwoord op de vraagstelling: Hoe kunnen we de grammaticale terminologische kennis van de leerlingen verbeteren?

De methode die ik gebruikte voor deze lessenserie was gebaseerd op het PACE model. Deze methode kenmerkt zich door met name de Presentation fase waarin materiaal op een thematische en interactieve wijze wordt aangeboden. In dit materiaal komt een bepaald grammaticaal concept voor. Echter, de aandacht wordt pas later in de Attention fase op dit grammaticaal concept gericht. Een tweede kenmerk van deze methode is dat de leerlingen tijdens de Co-construction fase samen met de docent een dialoog aangaan over het concept en samen proberen zij een regel op te stellen. De toegevoegde waarde van deze fase is dat de leerlingen ertoe worden aangezet om op een meta-cognitief niveau na te denken over de grammatica. In de laatste fase, de Extension fase, oefenen de leerlingen met het gebruik van de nieuwe structuur binnen een context die aansluit bij het thema van de presentatie fase.

Om te meten of er een verbetering had plaatsgevonden in de grammaticale terminologische kennis heb ik, na de interventie, een pre-en post-test afgenomen. In tegenstelling tot de test in het Analytisch Onderzoek waren de zinnen in het Frans en Nederlands – de twee talen van de klassen die getoetst werden. Dit was mogelijk omdat het slechts twee talen betrof in de lessenserie en tests. De concepten zelf waren echter in het Engels in navolging van de redenering bij het Analytisch Onderzoek.


In conclusie, zou ik kunnen stellen dat de doelstellingen van dit onderzoek, namelijk het bepalen en verbeteren van de grammaticale terminologische kennis van de
leerlingen zijn bereikt. Ik zou echter twee kanttekeningen willen plaatsen bij de resultaten. Het is op basis van dit onderzoek niet mogelijk om een uitspraak te doen over de invloed van het PACE model op de resultaten. Hiervoor zou er naast een experimentele groep ook een controle groep moeten zijn. Het is ook niet mogelijk om te bepalen of verbeterde grammaticale terminologische kennis ook betekent dat de leerlingen beter zijn in grammatica. Om dit te kunnen meten en om te kunnen bepalen wat de invloed van het PACE model is, zou men dieper en uitgebreider onderzoek moeten doen. Wat we wel kunnen zeggen is dat de eerste stap is gezet in het onderzoeken of er een verband bestaat tussen declaratieve en procedurale grammaticale kennis.
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22 concepts

verb past tense
subject present tense
object future tense
conjugation

demonstrative pronoun regular/irregular
possessive pronoun singular/plural

22 concepts

personal pronoun negation
demonstrative pronoun question

Appendix 1.2 List of Concepts for Teacher Multiple-Choice Questionnaire

30 concepts

concrete grammar concepts
verb present tense
adjective past tense
comparative future tense
superlative reflexive pronoun: added
adverb modal verbs: added
possessive past participle: added

procedural grammar concepts
preposition conjugation
article agreement: added

verb

adjective
comparative
superlative
adverb
possessive
demonstrative
preposition
article
noun
personal pronoun
pronoun: added
subject
direct object: added
indirect object: added
negation
question
singular/plural
gender: added
regular/irregular
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Appendix 3  Student Grammar Test for Analytical Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 4</th>
<th>Teacher Multiple-Choice Questionnaire Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes no yes yes yes yes yes yes N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superlative</td>
<td>no yes yes yes no yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>no yes no yes no no yes no yes yes yes no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>no yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes N/A yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>no yes yes yes no yes yes no yes no yes no yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>yes yes yes no yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>pronoun yes yes yes yes yes no yes yes yes no yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Object</td>
<td>yes yes no yes no no no yes no yes yes no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect object</td>
<td>yes yes no yes no no no yes no yes no yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present tense</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past tense</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes no yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense</td>
<td>no yes yes yes yes yes yes yes no yes N/A no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>no yes no yes no yes no yes no yes yes no yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Verb</td>
<td>no yes no yes no yes no no no no no no no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past participle</td>
<td>yes yes yes no yes yes no yes yes no yes no yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugation</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>yes yes yes yes yes yes yes yes no yes yes yes no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

- Predic
- Ate
- Noun

**Accentuation**

- Subject pronouns.

- Stem changing

- Verbs.
### Appendix 5 The Students Test Questions and Percent Correct Answers per Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tower of Pisa is smaller than the Eiffel tower. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a comparative</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cats sat on an enormous mat. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris grows her own plants. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a demonstrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This clown is funny and that clown isn't. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clooney throws the ball at Brad Pitt. The underlined phrase is:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina hasn't done her homework. This sentence is:</td>
<td>a negation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lopez watches television every evening. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a noun</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Depp loves pirates. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a noun</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have biked to school. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a past participle</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The snake has bitten the parrot. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a past participle</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are excited about the results of this test. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a personal pronoun</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher looked at my homework. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Johnson is on the ladder trying to catch the parrot. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a preposition</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Johnson's parrot has escaped and is in the tree. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a preposition</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Mr. Johnson's parrot been caught yet? This sentence is:</td>
<td>a question</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The elephant danced in a circle. The underlined phrase is:</td>
<td>a subject</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue is listening to her iPod in class. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a subject</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nile is the biggest river in Egypt. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David will go to school tomorrow. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a verb</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny walks the little dog in the park. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a verb</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Johnson has messy hair. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>an adjective</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Johnson talks to the green parrot. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>an adjective</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parrot is looking at Mr and Mrs Johnson from a branch in the tree. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>an article</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parrot is looking at Mr. and Mrs. Johnson from a branch in the tree. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>an article</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel wants to dance this weekend. The underlined phrase is:</td>
<td>an infinitive verb</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement means:</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something is regular, it:</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something is irregular, it:</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David will go to school tomorrow. The underlined word is in the:</td>
<td>future tense</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender defines a word that:</td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a verb is reflexive it:</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cats sat on an enormous mat. The underlined word is in the:</td>
<td>past tense</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna has talked the whole class long. The underlined words are in the:</td>
<td>past tense</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's raining cats and dogs. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are excited about the results of this test. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny walks the little dog in the park. The underlined word is in the:</td>
<td>present tense</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Muriel wants to dance this weekend. The underlined phrase is: present tense 21
The cat in the hat is back! The underlined words are: singular 79
Anna has talked the whole class long. The underlined words are: verbs 91

Appendix 6   Information from ASH High School Handbook 2009/2010-page 21

Progress Reports
Teachers continually assess student progress throughout the semester. Three times in each semester, teachers review the cumulative progress of students and make relevant comments in cases where the cumulative average is C- or below and post the information on PowerSchool. Any student earning a grade of C- or below will receive a Progress Report. Parents and students can view academic information by accessing parent and student areas of PowerSchool. (ASH, 2009/2010)
Appendix 7.1 Dutch Grammar Test
Appendix 7.2 French Grammar Test
## Appendix 8.1

Dutch Grammar Pre and Post Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Answer's text</th>
<th>Pre Test Average</th>
<th>Post Test Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bent u gisteren uit geweest? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue wil dit weekend komen. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris heeft de bloemen op de markt gekocht. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pip gaat een banaan eten. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die man heeft een grote neus. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat jonge heet Piet. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze boeken liggen op de verkeerde plaats. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat kind gooit graag met een bal. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pattinson gooit de bal naar Nikki Reed. De onderstreepte woorden zijn:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet koopt een cadeau voor Natalie. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuur mij alsjeblieft een ansichtkaart. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De leraren hebben het aan de studenten gegeven. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb jij jouw huiswerk gemaakt? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie en haar broer gaan op bezoek bij hun familie in de Verenigde Staten. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze Nederlandse vrienden zijn op vakantie. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is deze Peugeot 205 uw auto? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clooney gaat naar het cafe met zijn vriendinnetje. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina wil Brad niet meer zien. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Pitt luistert naar de radio. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wat kan ik voor u doen? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Nijl is de grootste rivier van Egypte. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dit gebouw is het oudste in deze buurt. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze schoenen zijn de mooiste in de winkel. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meryl is de beste actrice allertijden. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietje is een klein meisje dat in Wassenaar woont. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther is het liefste meisje van de klas. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De leraar heeft lelijke pakken. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan heeft een groot paard. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 8.2**

French Grammar Pre and Post Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Answer's text</th>
<th>Pre Test % Correct</th>
<th>Post Test % Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vous êtes sortis hier soir? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>35.0 %</td>
<td>69.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pip va manger une banane. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>76.0 %</td>
<td>81.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue peut venir ce weekend. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>88.0 %</td>
<td>88.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris a acheté les fleurs au marché. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a conjugated verb</td>
<td>47.0 %</td>
<td>63.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vous n'entends pas cette annonce.</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>53.0 %</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le train n'est pas sur cet horaire. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>24.0 %</td>
<td>81.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces amis sont américains. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>41.0 %</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel n'a pas entendu cette annonce. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>34.0 %</td>
<td>86.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoie-moi une carte postale. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>53.0 %</td>
<td>88.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre achète un cadeau pour Natalie.</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les professeurs ont donné aux élèves. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>53.0 %</td>
<td>81.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pattinson lance le ballon à Nikki Reed. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a direct object</td>
<td>71.0 %</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'est votre voiture, le Peugeot 205? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>71.0 %</td>
<td>81.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle a sorti ses amis de côté en Paris. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>41.0 %</td>
<td>69.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est-ce que tu as fait tes devoirs? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>65.0 %</td>
<td>69.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces amis aux Pays-Bas sont partis en vacances. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
<td>63.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'est votre voiture, le Peugeot 205? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a possessive pronoun</td>
<td>59.0 %</td>
<td>70.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clooney va au café avec sa petite copine. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>47.0 %</td>
<td>56.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina ne veut plus voir Brad. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>76.0 %</td>
<td>81.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que désirez-vous? The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>71.0 %</td>
<td>75.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Pitt écoute la radio. The underlined word is:</td>
<td>a present tense</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces chaussures sont les plus jolies dans ce magasin. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>18.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cet immeuble est le plus vieux dans ce quartier. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>35.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Nil est le plus grand fleuve en Égypte. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>47.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meryl est la plus grande actrice depuis longtemps. The underlined words are:</td>
<td>a superlative</td>
<td>41.0 %</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les garçons sont grands. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>47.0 %</td>
<td>88.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous nous sommes lavés. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>29.0 %</td>
<td>88.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il l'a envoyée. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>53.0 %</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La fille est petite. The relationship between the underlined words is:</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
<td>47.0 %</td>
<td>94.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % Correct | 61.5 % | 75.3 % |
Appendix 9  Lesson Series

Appendix 9.1  Lesson Plan for Demonstrative Pronoun (Monday H-block)
Goal: students relearn the demonstrative pronoun, construct a rule and practice recognising this concept.

P(resentation) (5-10 min.)
**Dutch/French**
1. Write on the board (before students arrive): Dream or reality?
2. Ask students to listen to the story and ask the following questions before reading:

Gist-questions (in French or Dutch):
1. Who is the story about?
2. Tell the students the second question will be asked at the end of the story. (*Is het een droom of is het werkelijkheid? Est-ce qu’un rêve ou la réalité?*)
3. Go over the questions after the story.

A ttention) (5-10 min.)
**Dutch/French**
1. Give the students a copy of the story.
2. Read it again. While you read, ask them to underline the demonstrative pronouns. Let them do this without discussing what a demonstrative pronoun is. Tell them to guess if they are not sure.
3. Let the students compare their answers.

C(o-construct) (5-10 min.)
**Dutch/French**
1. Go through the story with the students and write the demonstrative pronoun on the board and ask the students to form a rule.
2. Go over the answers with the class and make sure there is a clear rule.

E xtension) (10 min.)
**Dutch/French**
Exercise 1:

a. Each student writes 5 sentences with demonstrative pronoun in them.
b. Another student underlines the demonstrative pronoun in these sentences.
c. They hand it back and the students corrects it.
Exercise 2 (Possibly): Write a fantasy story in which dream and reality merge.
Er was eens een meisje en dit meisje had heel veel fantasie. Op de dag dat zij zich zou moeten verloven, rende ze weg en viel door een gat in een boom. Zij belandde in een andere wereld. Daar in die fantasie wereld liep alles altijd anders dan in deze, echte wereld. Zij ontmoette daar vele vreemde mensen. Een van deze mensen was de Rode koningin die een heel groot hoofd had. Op dat hoofd had zij een enorm bos rood haar. Er was ook een hoedenmaker. Die man was gek en sprak in riedels. De rode koningin voerde oorlog tegen de witte koningin. Die koningin was mooi en aardig in tegenstelling tot haar zus, de rode koningin. Die zus was gemeen en lelijk. Uiteindelijk versloeg het meisje de draak van de Rode Koningin. Zo redde zij het koningrijk van de witte koningin van de ondergang. Ze dronk een magisch drankje en kwam weer terug in de echte wereld. Maar je zou je kunnen afvragen: droomde dit meisje deze wereld of was deze wereld echt?
Il était une fois une fille et cette fille possédait une grande imagination. Le jour ou elle devait se fiancer elle s'échappait et tombait dans un trou dans un arbre. C'était l'entrée à un autre monde. Dans ce monde tout était différent. Dans ce monde-là tout se passait toujours d'une autre façon que dans ce monde-ci. Elle y rencontrait beaucoup de gens bizarres. Une de ces personnes était la Reine Rouge qui avait une tête énorme. Sur cette tête elle portait une perruque rouge. Il y avait aussi un chapelier. Cet homme était fou et parlait en devinettes. La Reine Rouge menait une guerre contre la Reine Blanche. Cette reine était belle et gentille à la différence de sa soeur, la Reine Rouge. Cette reine était malfaisante et laide. Enfin la fille tuait le dragon de la Reine Rouge et sauvait le Royaume de la Reine Blanche. Elle buvait une potion magique qui la transportait dans le monde réel. Mais on pourrait se demander: est-ce que ce monde n'était qu'un rêve de cette fille ou est-ce que ce monde était réel?
Appendix 9.2    Lesson Plan for Direct Object (Wednesday H-block)

Goal: students relearn the direct object, make a rule and practice with recognising direct objects.

P(representation) (5-10 min.)
French and Dutch:
1. Show students the picture of the girl with a box and the shoes (see attachment) and ask questions about it. A certain amount of questions are formulated in such a way that there’s a direct object in them.
2. Write the answers which have these direct objects in them on the board.

A(ttention) (5-10 min.)
Circle the direct objects in the sentences on the board.

C(o-construct) (5-10 min.)
1. Ask the students to come up with the function of this word in the sentence. If they have difficulty with this question, ask them to choose between certain options (subject, direct object and indirect object).
2. Ask the students to think about how they can find the direct object in a sentence (which question do they need to ask?).
3. Go over the answers and create the rule together.

E xtension) (10 min.)
1. Exercise:
   a. Brainstorm a couple of nouns with the students. Write them on the board. They write 5 sentences with these nouns as direct objects. They exchange these sentences with each other and underline the direct objects in each others’ sentences.
   b. They give the sentences back to the person who made it for correction. The teacher monitors to ensure the students have understood the concept.

2. Possibly:
   a. Students make a drawing or look for a photo of a person. They make up a story with this picture, just as the teacher did at the beginning of the class. Who is it? How old is he/she? Etc.
   b. Fellow students ask questions about the picture, and the student answers.
Direct object questions

Introductie vragen: creeër een personage met de klas

Wie is dit?
Hoe oud is ze?
Waar komt ze vandaan?
Waar gaat ze vandaag naartoe?
Wat heeft ze vanochtend gedaan?
Wat zit er in de doos?
etc.

Schrijf op het bord:

1. Wat heeft Marie in haar handen? Zij heeft een cadeau.
7. Wat dragen haar vrienden? Zij dragen Uggs en skinny
8. Wat eet Marie op het feest? Zij eet taart en chips.
Direct object questions

Questions d’introduction: crée un personnage avec la classe

Intro
C’est qui?
Quel âge a-t-elle?
Elle vient d’où?
Ou est-ce qu’elle va aujourd’hui?
Qu’est-ce qu’elle a fait ce matin?
Qu’est-ce qu’il y a dans la boîte?

1. Qu’est-ce qu’elle a dans les mains?          Elle a un cadeau.
2. Elle donne le cadeau à qui?               Elle donne le cadeau à son amie.
3. Qu’est-ce qu’elle donne à son amie?       Elle donne des chaussures à son amie.
4. Qu’est-ce qu’elle donne encore à la fête? Elle donne des fleurs.
5. Qu’est-ce qu’elle voit à la fête?         Elle voit ses amis.
6. Qu’est-ce qu’elle porte?                  Elle porte un haut (sport maillot).
7. Qu’est-ce que ses amies portent?          Elles portent des Uggs et des skinny jeans.
8. Qu’est-ce qu’elle mange à la fête?        Elle mange des chips et du gâteau.
EXERCISE

1. Écris 5 phrases avec un “direct object.” Donne cette exercise à ton/ta voisin(e).

2. Il/Elle souligne les “direct objects.”

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

INVENTE UN PERSONNAGE

1. Dessine une personne ou cherche une photo de quelqu’un (dans un magazine).

2. C’est qui? Invente un personnage. Pense à au moins 10 choses que tu pourrais dire sur ton personnage.

Quel âge a-t-elle ou il?
Elle/il vient d’où?
Où est-ce qu’elle/il va aujourd’hui?
Qu’est-ce qu’elle/il a fait ce matin?
Etc.


4. Pose des questions à ton voisin au sujet de son image (au moins 10 questions).
Appendix 9.3  Lesson Plan for Agreement (Friday H-block)

Goal: students relearn the concept agreement, make a rule and practise with recognising it.

P(resentation) (5-10 min.)

Dutch: a video of Sesame Street (the three piglets) in which there is “adjective agreement.”

Gist question: what is the difference between the old and the new version of the three piglets?

French: students read a mystery story.

Gist question: How does the story end? Write the end of the story in three sentences.

A(ttention) (5-10 min.)

Dutch:

Have another look at the video. The teacher writes a few nouns on the board (e.g., “spel” and “verhaal”). Then he/she asks the students to write down the sentences they hear with the nouns in them (“een nieuw verhaal; dat nieuwe verhaal, het bekende verhaal, ons leuke spel, een leuk spel, het oude verhaal” etc.).

French:

1. 2nd reading: students read the text and underline the adjectives.
2. 3rd reading: students read the text and underline the “past participle”

C(o-construct) (5-10 min.)

Dutch:

1. Ask students: write in groups the rules for adjectives.

2. Go over the answers as a class and make sure there is a clear rule/structure on the board.

3. Students invent a name for the grammatical concept. Accept answers that could be acceptable names for the concept, but make sure the students are aware of the official term of agreement.

French:
1. Ask students: write in groups the rules for adjectives and past participles.
2. Go over the answers as a class and make sure there is a clear rule/structure on the board.
3. Students invent a name for the grammatical concept. Accept answers that could be acceptable names for the concept, but make sure the students are aware of the official term of agreement. Make a distinction between verb and adjective agreement.

**E xtension) (10 min.)**

1. Exercise:

   **Dutch:**
   a. The students write 5 sentences with adjective agreement. They give these to a fellow student who underlines the agreement.
   b. They give the exercise back for correction. The teacher monitors to make sure all students have understood the concept.

   **French:**
   a. The students write 3 sentences with adjective agreement. They give these to a fellow student who underlines the agreement.
   b. They give the exercise back for correction. The teacher monitors to make sure all students have understood the concept.

2. Possibly:

   **Dutch:**
   a. Students make their own new version of the three piglets in the form of a dialog.
   b. Presentation to the class.

   **French:**
   a. Students work out the ending of the story in script form (in groups). (They started this process at the beginning of the class).
   b. Roleplay/film: students present their story to the class.
1. Souligne les adjectifs

2. Souligne les participes passés

3. Qu’est-ce qui se passe? Décris la fin de cette histoire.

4. Présente ton histoire à la classe (role play/film).

Simple suggestion  Fernando Sorrentino

Mes meilleurs amis disent que je suis très influençable. Je crois qu’ils ont raison. A titre d’exemple, ils citent une petite anecdote qui m’est arrivée jeudi dernier.

Ce matin-là j’étais en train de lire un roman d’horreur et, bien qu’il fit grand jour (even though it was daytime), je me laissais influencer. Sous l’influence, je me mis en tête que dans ma cuisine il y avait un assassin féroce et méchant; et cet assassin, brandissant un poignard (dagger) énorme, attendait que j’entre dans ma petite cuisine pour se jeter sur moi et me planter son couteau dans le dos (back). De telle sorte que (to the extent that), bien que (even though) je sois assis en face de la porte de ma cuisine, bien que personne n’aurait pu y entrer sans que (without) je l’aie vue (had seen) et bien que, mise à part cette porte verte, ma cuisine n’offrit pas d’autre possibilité d’y accéder; malgré toutes ces évidences, moi, j’étais quand même totalement convaincu que l’assassin m’attendait derrière la porte close. (Mes amis par contre étaient convaincus que j’étais fou!)

Et c’est ainsi que j’étais totalement sous influence et que je ne risquais pas à entrer dans ma cuisine. Et cela me préoccupait* (worried) car* (because) l’heure du repas approchait et il allait être indispensable que j’entre dans ma cuisine.

C’est alors qu’on sonna* (rang) à ma porte.
—Entrez —criais-je sans me lever—. La porte n’est pas fermée.
Le concierge entra avec deux ou trois lettres fermées. Il les avait gardées dans un sac.
—Ma jambe s’est endormie —lui dis-je—. Pourriez-vous aller jusqu’à la cuisine et me rapporter un verre d’eau?
Le concierge dit «Bien sûr», il ouvrit la porte de ma cuisine et entra.

Traduction: Michel Casana
Adaptation: Annika Groeneveld
Source: http://www.badosa.com/bin/obra.pl?id=n084-fr
Appendix 9.4 Lesson Plan for Superlative (Tuesday H-block)

Goal: students relearn the superlative, make a rule and practise with recognising superlatives.

P resentation (5-10 min.)

1. Dutch:
   Play Marco Borsato: De meeste dromen zijn bedrog.
   Gist questions (in Dutch): 1) What’s the song about? 2) What does the title mean? 3) What are the different kinds of dreams he sings about?

2. French:
   Play Alpha Blondy: Les Journalistes en Danger.
   Gist questions (in French): 1) Which person is he singing about? 2) Which country is he singing about? 3) What is the message he is trying to convey?

When going over the answers with the students, give them some background information on the story he’s singing about.

A ttention (5-10 min.)

Dutch/French
1. Give the students the lyrics.
2. Play the songs again and ask the students to circle the superlatives on their sheets.

Dutch/French
C (o-construct) (5-10 min.)
1. Ask the students to construct the rule for superlatives (in groups). Let them write out the steps of comparison (adjective, comparative and superlative).
2. Go over their answers and formulate a rule together.

E xtension (10 min.)

Dutch:
Exercise: write 5 sentences about your own dreams and use a superlative in each sentence
**French:**

a. Students write 5 sentences with superlatives. They give these to another student who underlines the superlatives.
b. They give it back and the other student corrects it. The teacher monitors to ensure the students have understood the concept.

Exercise 2: (Possibility)

a. Students write a song, or poem with at least 2 superlatives.
b. They perform the song or poem to the class.

**Alpha Blondy**

**Journalistes En Danger (Démocrature)**

Au clair de la lune  
Mon ami ZONGO  
Refusa de bâillonner (1) sa plume  
Au Burkina Faso  
Et Zongo est mort brûlé par le feu  
Que justice soit faite pour l’amour de Dieu

La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure  
C’est comme ça  
La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure  
Ça se passe comme ça  
La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure  
C’est comme ça  
La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure  
Ça se passe comme ça

Entre le marteau et l’enclume (2)  
Les plumes (3) se barricadent derrière leur UNE (4)  
La liberté y a laissé des plumes  
Journalistes incarcérés…  
Journalistes assassinés…  
Les voix des sans voix tuées  
Tout ça doit changer  
La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure  
C’est comme ça  
La démocratie du plus fou est toujours la meilleure  
Ça se passe comme ça

Les gouvernants font la pluie (5) et le beau temps  
Le peuple meurtri (6) fait semblant d’être (7) content
Une rafale (8) de mitraillette balaya (9) le président
   C'est un regrettable accident
   Le même rituel sanglant
   Autant en emporte le vent
   Le sang appelle le sang

Certains chefs d'Etat se prennent pour (10) des rois
   Des roitelets (11) plus royalistes que le roi
   Ils ont la boulimie du pouvoir
   Et ça, il faut le savoir
   Et ça, il vaut mieux savoir

La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure
   C'est comme ça
La démocratie du plus fort est toujours la meilleure
   Ça se passe comme ça
   Au clair de la lune mon ami ZONGO

From Lyrics Mania  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ss-2UpUdFcI

1 bâillonner: muzzle (to silence in this context)

2 Entre le marteau et l'enclume: to be caught between an rock and a hard place
   (difficult to please both parties involved)

3 Les plumes: nibs (on old-fashioned feather pens)

4 UNE: front page in newspaper (page Une)

5 la pluie: the rain

6 meurtri: wounded (hurt self-esteem)

7 fait semblant d'être: to pretend

8 Une rafale: gust of wind

9 balaya: swept (away)

10 se prennent pour- se prendre pour: to think you are; to play (a part)

11 Des roitelets: kinglets (small kings)
Les exercises

LES SUPERLATIFS

1. Écris 5 phrases avec le superlatif.
2. Ton voisin/ta voisine soulignera les superlatifs.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

CHANSON/POÈME

Écris une chanson (rap ou autre) ou un poème avec au moins 2 superlatifs (8 phrases).
Appendix 10

Examples of the Practice Quizzes
Appendix 11  Student Reflection Questions

1) What differences did you notice in your learning between the traditional method of learning grammar and the method we used in the last couple of weeks?

2) In what ways did you find the computer exercises helpful?

3) How do you feel having a deeper understanding of the grammar topics will help you as a language student?