

WHAT DO TEACHERS AND STUDENTS WANT FROM A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TEXTBOOK?

by

Virginie Askildson

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN
SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND TEACHING

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2008

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Virginie Askildson entitled What Do Teachers And Students Want From A Foreign Language Textbook? and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Beatrice Dupuy, PhD

Date: 21/04/08

Linda Waugh, PhD

Date: 21/04/08

Robert Ariew, PhD

Date: 21/04/08

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Dissertation Director: Beatrice Dupuy, PhD

Date: 04/21/08

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the author.

SIGNED: VIRGINIE ASKILDSON

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation could have never been brought to full fruition without the invaluable guidance and tremendous help of my three committee members: Dr. Béatrice Dupuy, Dr. Linda Waugh and Dr. Robert Ariew. I first would like to express my sincere gratitude to my dissertation director, Dr. Béatrice Dupuy, whose constant support and immediate detailed feedback at all stages of my dissertation made the process of writing it not only enriching but enjoyable too. I could not have succeeded in this accomplishment without her guidance and patience until the very end. Dr. Linda Waugh played a major role as well by providing me with meticulous comments on the drafts of my dissertation and by mentoring me closely from start to finish. Special thanks also go to Dr. Robert Ariew, who most importantly triggered my interest into the study of foreign language teaching materials, as I pursued his class on materials design in the spring 2005.

I would also like to thank my fellow teachers at the University of Arizona who all generously participated in my study and provided me with precious feedback and help from the first piloting phase to final data collection. The many students from my home institution who took part in this research project supplied an amount of data (including a wealth of open-ended answers) beyond my own expectations.

I am also deeply indebted to my three contacts across the United States, who made my study possible on a large scale. First and foremost, I would like to thank my contact in the Southeast of the country. She inspired me with her study of language teaching materials and supported this endeavor well beyond the logistics of data collection at her own institution. My sincere appreciation goes to my contact in the Northeast of the U.S. as well, who without having ever met me, graciously accepted to participate in my study and showed understanding and support as I was waiting to obtain the necessary permissions. Finally, I am thankful to my contact in the upper Midwest of the country, whose significant patience permitted the collection of data in a fourth basic language program.

Finally, I wish to thank all of you who provided me with comments and questions which ultimately helped me shape this dissertation.

DEDICATION

Without a doubt it is to my dear husband, Lance, that I want to dedicate this dissertation, who by his love, support and insights in the profession, to only name a few, fills my life with so much sunshine.



I further want to dedicate this accomplishment to my parents who, from across the ocean, have supported me in so many ways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	11
LIST OF TABLES	12
ABSTRACT	15
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	17
1.1 The FL textbook.....	18
1.2 Teacher’s beliefs	19
1.3 Students’ needs	22
1.4 Language learning and language use	24
1.5 Purpose of the study	25
1.6 Outline of the dissertation.....	27
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	29
2.1 Second Language Acquisition research	30
2.1.1 The evolution of language theory and teaching practice	30
2.1.2 Major contributions of SLA research to L2 teaching and materials design	31
2.1.3 Applying SLA Findings to FL textbooks	38
2.2 The issue of authenticity	42
2.2.1 Standard written French vs. everyday spoken French	42
2.2.1.1 <i>On</i> in everyday spoken French	47
2.2.1.2 <i>Tu /vous / ils</i> in everyday spoken French.....	51
2.2.1.3 Corpus linguistics and French textbooks.....	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS—continued

2.2.2 The Target culture.....	58
2.2.2.1 Teaching/Learning about culture.....	58
2.2.2.2 Cultural content in FL textbooks.....	60
2.2.3 Textbook tasks.....	62
2.2.3.1 The task.....	62
2.2.3.2 Task authenticity.....	63
2.3 The role of grammar.....	65
2.3.1 Focus on form Teaching.....	65
2.3.2 Processing instruction.....	73
2.3.3 Grammar instruction and FL textbooks.....	76
2.4 Technology in the FL classroom.....	79
2.4.1 CALL in SLA research.....	80
2.4.2 Technologies for teaching FLs.....	84
2.4.2.1 Computer Mediated Communication.....	85
2.4.2.2 Blogs.....	88
2.4.2.3 Wikis.....	89
2.4.2.4 Podcasts.....	90
2.4.3 A new role for the language teacher.....	92
2.5 Summary.....	94
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	97
3.1 Participants.....	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS—continued

3.1.1 Selection process.....	99
3.1.2 Basic Language programs.....	100
3.1.3 Teachers and students	101
3.1.4 Experience with textbooks.....	109
3.2 Questionnaire design.....	112
3.2.1 Online format.....	116
3.2.2 Piloting	117
3.2.2.1 Phase 1	117
3.2.2.2 Phase 2	118
3.2.3 Teacher questionnaire	118
3.2.4 Student questionnaire.....	119
3.3 Procedures for data collection.....	119
3.4 Data analysis	120
3.5 Summary	121
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	122
4.1 Quantitative and qualitative data	122
4.2 Research question # 1	125
4.2.1 Authenticity of the L2.....	125
4.2.1.1 Teachers' results	125
4.2.1.2 Students' results.....	129
4.2.2 Authenticity of the Target culture.....	133

TABLE OF CONTENTS—continued

4.2.2.1 Teachers’ results	133
4.2.2.2 Students’ results	139
4.2.3 Authenticity of the Textbook tasks	148
4.2.3.1 Teachers’ results	148
4.2.3.2 Students’ results	153
4.3 Research question # 2	160
4.3.1 Teachers’ results	160
4.3.2 Students’ results	164
4.4 Research question # 3	169
4.4.1 Teachers’ results	169
4.4.2 Students’ results	179
4.5 Summary	188
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	190
5.1 Kind of L2 that teachers and students want to find in FL textbooks	191
5.2 Teachers’ and students’ views on how culture is treated in FL textbooks .	208
5.3 Type of FL textbook tasks that matters for teachers and students	213
5.4 Teachers’ and students’ positions on grammar in FL textbooks	217
5.5 Teachers’ and students’ perspectives on how technology can complement the FL textbook	220
5.6 Implications for the FL classroom and language teaching materials design	227

TABLE OF CONTENTS—continued

5.7 Limitations of the present study.....	232
5.8 Recommendations for future research	236
5.9 Final word to materials’ developers, researchers, teachers and students....	240
APPENDIX A: Teacher Questionnaire	242
APPENDIX B: Student Questionnaire.....	252
REFERENCES	261

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. Written French grammar vs. spoken French grammar	44
FIGURE 2. Subject clitics in standard French.....	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Teachers’ basic demographics per surveyed institution	102
TABLE 2. Students’ basic demographics per surveyed institution	104
TABLE 3. Teachers’ self-perceived language and teaching skills (means)	106
TABLE 4. Students’ self-perceived language skills (means)	108
TABLE 5. Teachers and their use of textbooks	110
TABLE 6. Students and their use of textbooks	112
TABLE 7. Teachers’ means on the authenticity of the L2 (Likert scale).....	128
TABLE 8. Teachers’ mean percentages on the authenticity of the L2 (alternative-answer questions)	129
TABLE 9. Students’ means on the authenticity of the L2 (Likert-scale)	131
TABLE 10. Students’ mean percentages on the authenticity of the L2 (alternative-answer questions)	132
TABLE 11. Teachers’ means on the authenticity of the target culture (Likert scale)	135
TABLE 12. Teachers’ comments about the cultural content of French textbooks	137
TABLE 13. Teachers’ comments about teaching culture with a big C before teaching culture with a small c	138
TABLE 14. Students’ means on the authenticity of the target culture (Likert scale)	141
TABLE 15. Students’ mean percentages on the authenticity of the target culture (alternative-answer questions)	142
TABLE 16. Students’ comments about the cultural content of their French textbook.....	145

LIST OF TABLES —continued

TABLE 17. Teachers’ means on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (Likert scale)	149
TABLE 18. Teachers’ mean percentages on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (alternative-answer questions)	150
TABLE 19. Teachers’ comments about WRITTEN activities	151
TABLE 20. Teachers’ comments about ORAL activities	152
TABLE 21. Students’ means on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (Likert scale)	154
TABLE 22. Students’ mean percentages on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (alternative-answer questions)	155
TABLE 23. Students’ comments about WRITTEN activities.....	156
TABLE 24. Students’ comments about ORAL activities	159
TABLE 25. Teachers’ means on grammar instruction in FL textbooks (Likert scale)	162
TABLE 26. Teachers’ comments about input processing	164
TABLE 27. Students’ means on grammar instruction in FL textbooks (Likert scale)	165
TABLE 28. Students’ comments about input processing	167
TABLE 29. Teachers’ means on technology in language teaching materials (Likert scale)	171
TABLE 30. Teachers’ mean percentages on technology in language teaching materials (alternative-answer questions).....	172
TABLE 31. Teachers’ comments about using technology to improve speaking skills	176
TABLE 32. Teachers’ comments about using emerging technologies.....	177

LIST OF TABLES —continued

TABLE 33. Students' means on technology in language teaching materials (Likert scale)	181
TABLE 34. Students' mean percentages on technology in language teaching materials (alternative-answer questions).....	182
TABLE 35. Students' comments about using technology to improve speaking skills	184
TABLE 36. Students' comments about using emerging technologies	186
TABLE 37. Individual answers about teaching students both written and spoken French	193
TABLE 38. Individual answers about teaching students both written and spoken French per native-language	195
TABLE 39. Individual answers of the native-French instructors about having difficulty teaching double object pronouns per teaching experience in the U.S. (in months).....	199
TABLE 40. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution A	201
TABLE 41. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution B.....	202
TABLE 42. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution C.....	203
TABLE 43. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution D	204

ABSTRACT

Textbooks are essential to Foreign Language (FL) curricula. They contribute to the homogenization of instruction between multiple-language courses; they provide learners with an advance organizer; they help train novice teachers, and they supply both novice and experienced instructors with a variety of resources (Allen, in press). In a context where the textbook appears to be the pillar of FL instruction, we find numerous studies about teachers' beliefs concerning FL textbooks (Ariew, 1982; Apple, 1986; Menke, 1994; Graden, 1996; Richards & Mahoney, 1996; Masuhara, 1998; Bancheri, 2006); however, there are very few studies on students' self-perceived needs (Jan & Glenn, 1984), and equally few on both teachers' and students' perspectives on language teaching materials (Donovan, 1998). Thus, the goal of this study is to examine both students' and teachers' views of FL textbooks in light of current Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory. In so doing, this project addresses three research questions: 1) what role should authenticity of the L2, target culture, and tasks play in language teaching materials?, 2) what place should grammar take in FL textbooks?, and 3) what part should technology play in language teaching materials? 48 French teachers and 1023 learners from four major North-American universities were surveyed using an online questionnaire containing not only closed-response questions rated on a four point Likert-type scale but also open-ended questions. This mixed-design methodology allowed the researcher to draw tentative conclusions on how to reconcile language teaching materials design with SLA research, teachers' beliefs and students' self-perceived needs. Practical

implications for language teacher training programs and FL textbook development are offered.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

For those interested in the relation between FL textbooks and expectations of teachers & students, two main approaches can be taken. The first major approach is to explore the relationship from the standpoint of materials writers and publishers, and the second main approach is to investigate this relation from the view of the language instructors and L2 learners.

The present study examines the link between FL textbooks and the expectations of teachers & students from their perspectives. Several studies have already investigated this link from this standpoint; however it has often been from the view of the teachers only (Richards & Mahoney, 1996; Masuhara, 1998; Bancheri, 2006) or from the perspective of the students alone (Jan & Glenn, 1984). The current research project aims to develop a fuller appreciation of this particular side of the equation by examining both teachers' and students' views of FL textbooks. Nevertheless, the present study could not claim to grasp a more complete understanding of the expectations and practice of the textbook users without investigating how SLA research intersects with these assumptions. As a result, particular attention will be paid throughout this dissertation to current SLA theories and how these serve (or do not serve) as a basis for what teachers and student want from a FL textbook.

While it is not within the scope of the present study to investigate both sides of the equation, it may prove useful to give a brief initial overview of the relationship

between FL textbooks and expectations of teachers & students from the position of materials developers.

1.1 The FL textbook

Textbooks constitute a major component of FL teaching, especially for multiple section courses taught in basic language programs throughout a majority of North-American universities (Allen, in press). Not only do textbooks contribute to the smooth articulation of instruction between courses by providing a solid and similar basis for the content of each section, but for most of today's FL learners, textbooks still constitute their main source of contact with the Target Language (TL) aside from their teacher. Additionally, for less experienced teachers, textbooks procure guidance in lesson planning, and for the more experienced instructors they are useful in supplying them with a variety of learning resources resulting in considerable time saving (Allen, in press).

Since FL textbooks play such a dominant role in the professional lives of language teachers and in the education of L2 learners, their design is of crucial importance. Effective instructional materials are developed according to the following elements (Richards, 2005): 1) Teacher, 2) Learners, 3) Contextual variables, and 4) Theory of language learning and language use. The first element includes the instructor's preferred teaching style, L2 proficiency, ethnic background and teaching experience. The second element concerns the students' learning styles, their language needs and interests. The third element consists of the school culture, classroom conditions and the availability of teaching resources in the institutions where the materials will be used. Finally, the

fourth element encompasses SLA research. In order to understand the complexity of taking these elements into account when designing FL textbooks, I will proceed, in the following paragraphs, with an outline of teachers' beliefs (1.2) and students' needs (1.3). Particular attention will be paid to instructors' and students' views about teaching & learning and FL textbooks. Last but not least, I will examine the theory of language learning and language use (1.4) as it relates to materials design.

1.2 Teachers' beliefs

Teachers' beliefs were largely investigated during the early 1950's and 1970's. Recently these studies have reappeared to provide a rationale for teachers' actions (Richardson, 1996). However, a significant collection of research has also acknowledged inconsistencies between teachers' stated beliefs and their practices (Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2001) — referred to by Argyris & Schön (1974) as 'espoused theories' on the one hand and 'theories in action' on the other. For instance, the English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers interviewed by Kumaravadivelu (1993) claimed to be using a communicative approach in their classrooms, yet when the researcher observed them teaching, he did not find that they created more conditions for "genuine communication" than other traditional (i.e. non-communicative) teachers. A study by Graden (1996) helps us understand some of the reasons behind such discrepancies. Indeed, several teachers explained that certain constraints would hinder them from implementing their beliefs (i.e. what they originally envisioned in their lesson plan and how they intended to execute it). Among these constraints were:

- 1) Time (e.g., lack of time when dealing with large language classes; novice teachers take more time than necessary to implement their beliefs)
- 2) Inappropriate materials (e.g., teachers who decide to follow the instructor's textbook annotations despite the fact that they do not correspond to their own beliefs¹)
- 3) Poor student performance (e.g., heterogeneous classes, issues of fossilization)
- 4) Lack of motivation (e.g., students who do not take responsibility for their learning)

As a result of these constraints, teachers often have to change their plans of action and make on-line “improvisation”, in other words they have to make ‘good’ interactive decisions while teaching² (Van Lier, 1996). According to Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis (2004: 269) “Possibly, they [the teachers] will eradicate the mismatches by bringing their espoused theories more in line with their practical theories, which they develop through experience of ‘cases’ of what works for them”.

Overall, it seems that most teachers (at least since the early 1990s) believe in communicative language teaching (CLT), but the problem is that they have different views on how it can be achieved — based on their technical knowledge, their experience and/or situational constraints.

As we mentioned above, the practitioners in Graden's (1996) study stated that the materials they used were not appropriate because they did not help them (or sometimes even hindered them) in implementing their beliefs. This may explain why we found some

¹ Ariew (1982) acknowledged the reification that numerous language teachers have towards their FL textbook

² Good decisions are decisions that are suitable to the moment, not ones that follow the lesson plan

teachers (Menke, 1994; Richards, 1994; Maley, 1998) who declared making their own decisions on what parts to teach and what parts to omit in their textbook, and others (Richards *et al.*, 1996) who said that they often create their own materials to supplement a textbook lesson.

Nevertheless, a number of other studies (Richards, 1994; Richards *et al.*, 1996; Richards *et al.*, 2001) reported that teachers see textbooks in a facilitating role, such as saving time, giving directions to lessons, guiding discussion, and providing homework. The potential danger here is to have teachers rely entirely on the materials they use (Richards *et al.*, 1996) and thus the textbook becomes the curriculum. This may lead to “deskilling” (Masuhara, 1998: 247) teachers by reducing their role in instructional decisions.

From the materials producers’ standpoint, Tomlinson (1998) recognizes a clear and wide division between teachers and professional materials writers and publishers. He calls for a need to better include teachers’ wants in the materials production process. To that effect Tomlinson (1998: 253) questions the value of questionnaire surveys sent to teachers because, according to the representatives of major publishers: “a) [teachers] do not seem to have many opinions, b) [they] do not do what they say, [and] c) [they] are not cooperative in returning the questionnaires”. Tomlinson recognizes the non-user friendly format of numerous surveys which contain pedagogical jargon and vague questions. Furthermore, their length may factor in discouraging teachers who must fill out these questionnaires on their own personal time with minimal, if any, reward for completing them. Possible alternatives for materials producers to receive more (systematic) feedback

from teachers include: piloting textbooks, involving groups of practitioners in publishers' sponsored events and developing institution-based evaluations (e.g., keeping records of which parts of a FL textbook are used and which parts are not; staff meetings to assess the materials). Equally important for the materials producers is the analysis of students' needs.

1.3 Students' needs

According to Williams and Burden (1997), students' beliefs (about what they need to promote their L2 acquisition) have the strongest influence on their success as language learners, in particular when their self-perceived needs are incongruous with their teacher's intentions. The issue is further complicated by the inconsistencies found in students' self-perceived needs. Some of these are reflected in Horwitz' (1981, 1985, 1988) studies who administered the BALLI³ and FLAS⁴ questionnaires to a variety of L2 students⁵. She found that learners generally agreed with the communicative approach to teach FLs but disagreed on how to attain communicative competence in the FL classroom. For instance, some students who said they believed in CLT surprisingly declared that learning an L2 consists of memorizing vocabulary and practicing grammar. The paradox deepened when other pro-CLT students emphasized the use of translation and oral repetition. Finally, while some learners wished to be able to express themselves freely in the TL, others advocated their need for error correction, justifying it by their fear

³ Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory

⁴ Foreign Language Attitude Survey (De Garcia, Reynolds & Savignon, 1976)

⁵ i.e., French, Spanish and German

of fossilization. Kern (1995) also found a mix of students in favor of traditional language teaching with learners in favor of free production tasks⁶.

Based on the above-mentioned research, it is clear that not every student interprets SLA theories the same way, nor do learners view L2 teaching in the same fashion in their FL classrooms. So, what can textbook writers do to account for the variety of students' needs when developing language teaching materials?

First and foremost, it is important to note that learners' self-perceived needs have not been researched as thoroughly as teachers' beliefs about FL textbooks. Attempts to find out about students' wants by surveying teachers on whether their textbook satisfies their learners' needs are questionable, because, as we have seen above, they only measure teachers' perceptions of students' needs, which may not be what learners actually want (Masuhara, 1994). Tomlinson (1998) identifies three kinds of learners' self-perceived needs that must be taken into account when developing language teaching materials: 1) Personal needs (e.g., age, sex, cultural and educational background, interests); 2) Learning needs (e.g., learning styles, previous language learning experiences, theory of language, learning goals, expectations for a course), and 3) Future professional needs.

According to Tomlinson (1998), many students (and language teachers) are dissatisfied with the materials available to them. He acknowledges a demand for more consistent feedback from materials users (i.e., the students and teachers) to materials producers (i.e., writers and publishers).

⁶ i.e. in these free production tasks, errors are corrected only when they impede communication (at the elementary level)

Finally, while both terms are used interchangeably in the SLA literature, Tomlinson (1998) makes the useful distinction between needs and wants. “Wants can be distinguished from needs when there is a preference despite the fact that it may not be necessary, obligatory, encouraged, or assumed” (Tomlinson, 1998: 244). The present study is interested in what students and teachers prefer (i.e., want) even though it may not be considered important or even suitable by their instructors and/or administrators and colleagues.

1.4 Language learning and language use

The author’s view on language learning and language use will have a considerable impact on the development of language teaching materials since it will contribute to establishing the goals and focus of the textbook and the activities in the text (Richards, 2005). Usually writers will be recommended by SLA experts to embrace the latest findings. By doing so, publishers can advertise their textbooks as “based upon current theories and research”. However, since SLA has been a fruitful field of inquiry for the last twenty years, there are a lot of theories to choose from. Furthermore, these theories are not understood the same way by every textbook writer. So, which SLA theories should a FL textbook be based on?

The task of designing language teaching materials is multifaceted and depends on a variety of factors. They include the needs and wants of practitioners and students, the advice of SLA experts and also marketing constraints (i.e., what will make a textbook marketable). For a multitude of reasons (a few have already been mentioned), a clear

understanding lacks of how these factors can play with one another to shape language teaching materials. The goal of the present dissertation is to explore the area and bring answers to this dilemma.

1.5 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine students' and teachers' views of foreign language teaching materials in light of current SLA theory. I aim at determining how FL textbook design can be reconciled with SLA research, teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning, and students' self-perceived needs. The present study differs from previous research on foreign language teaching materials by focusing on both students' and teachers' wants.

Numerous issues have been discussed in the language teaching materials design literature (e.g., deskillling teachers, lack of teachers' input in the development of materials, disconnect between SLA theory and textbook content, etc.). However an examination of all language teaching materials related topics is not within the scope of the present study. Instead, this research project seeks the perspective of teachers and students on three issues that have been and still are a source of much debate: 1) the issue of authenticity; 2) the place of grammar; and 3) technology.

The following research questions will thus direct the present study:

1) **The role of authenticity in language teaching materials:**

a) What is the **teachers'** position in regard to the authenticity of the L2, target culture, and tasks found in language textbooks?

b) What is the **students'** position in regard to the authenticity of the L2, target culture, and tasks found in language textbooks?

2) **The role of grammar in language teaching materials:**

a) According to **teachers**, what role should grammar instruction play in FL textbooks?

b) According to **students**, what role should grammar instruction play in FL textbooks?

3) **The role of technology in language teaching materials:**

a) Do **teachers** consider that technology in the FL classroom complements the FL textbook? If yes, which technologies do they use to counterbalance which textbook shortcomings? When and how do they implement these technologies?

b) Have **students** experienced technologies in their FL classrooms? If so, which technologies were used? When and why do students believe they were used?

The answers to the above questions could inform language teaching materials design and have direct implications for the language classroom (i.e., teachers and students) and program administration (e.g., role of the Language Program Director—

LPD, curriculum design, etc.). Answers to the third research question can lead to practical suggestions for methods courses and workshops for pre-service and in service teachers. Finally, the nature of the present study is such that the results will be applicable to FL teaching and learning in general and not only the specific instance of L2 French.

1.6 Outline of the dissertation

This chapter has laid the groundwork for the purpose of the present study: it gave us a sense of the heterogeneity of teachers' beliefs, students' needs and language learning theories viewed as viewed by materials writers.

Chapter 2 will review the literature relevant to this study. It will first survey current SLA research in light of materials design. Then, it will review the corpus linguistics and classroom-based research on the authenticity of the French taught to L2 learners. The examination of the issue of authenticity will extend to target culture presentations and learning tasks provided in textbooks. Next, Chapter 2 will review another debated topic in the SLA literature, i.e., the place of grammar in language instruction. Finally, it will examine "emerging technologies" in regard to their application to and inclusion in language teaching materials.

Chapter 3 will reintroduce the research questions before describing the methodology used for this study. The specifics of the research context will be outlined. Then, an account of the design and rationale for the research instrument and its modifications following the two piloting phases will be provided. The data collection

protocol with the French students and teachers in the four North-American universities will be reported. Chapter 3 will end with an explanation of the analysis procedures.

Chapter 4 will describe the findings as they relate to the three research questions of the study. The results will be addressed by participant type (student or teacher) and institution. Further distinctions will be made as they contribute to shedding additional light on the dilemma of how to reconcile SLA research with teachers' beliefs and students' self-perceived needs.

The final chapter, Chapter 5, will discuss and interpret the results. Implications for FL pedagogy including concrete propositions for language teacher training programs and FL textbook development will be offered. The limitations of the study and research design will be addressed while suggestions for future research will be formulated.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 1 provided a selective overview of the link (or lack thereof) between FL textbook design and expectations of teachers & students from the perspective of materials designers. This served as an introduction to the approach that the current research project takes—namely the perspective from the materials users.

This chapter presents the theoretical background for the study. Conceptual issues and relevant empirical findings that brought about the eventual research instrument are discussed in the following sections. In section 2.1 key SLA findings that relate to the classroom generally and to implications for language teaching and materials design specifically are surveyed. Section 2.2 takes a broad look at the issue of authenticity as it pertains to the L2, the target culture and the activities found in FL textbooks. Section 2.3 reviews one of the most controversial and largely debated issue in SLA for the last 40 years (Ellis, 2001): the role of formal instruction in L2 acquisition. Consequently, the question of including grammar in language teaching materials is raised. Finally, the last section (2.4) is concerned with technology and more specifically, ‘emerging technologies’ and their role in today’s FL classrooms and subsequent teaching materials.

2.1 Second Language Acquisition research

2.1.1 The evolution of language theory and teaching practice

The developments in SLA research since the 1960s have seen a number of theories emerge to predict the best way to learn a second language. Along with these theories came ‘matching’ teaching methods and materials for implementation in classrooms.

Grammar translation is often considered to be the oldest method of teaching foreign languages (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In fact, it existed well before SLA research established itself as a field of inquiry. Following such methodology, students were taught in their native language in a teacher-centered environment; they were provided with texts containing vocabulary lists of isolated words, translation exercises, and fill-in-the blank types of activities. It was believed that such teaching method would develop learners’ cognitive skills and ultimately allow them to read the ‘great works’ (VanPatten, 2002).

The behaviorist movement and contrastive analysis enabled the birth of the audiolingual approach in reaction to grammar-translation. Unlike the latter method, this approach emphasized students speaking in the TL. The instructor’s role was to prevent learners from making errors and to help them avoid forming erroneous language habits. As a result, spontaneous speech was discouraged. Instead, students were to repeat the correct forms of sentences as uttered by their teacher (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Teaching materials in the audiolingual era included texts using repetitive drills of structural patterns in a sequential order, but it also incorporated language laboratories,

tapes and visual aids. While this method proved useful for government personnel⁷ in the United States (U.S.), it failed in producing fluency and accuracy for classroom L2 learners. Such failure led to the implementation of more communicative approaches to teaching emphasizing meaningful interaction as the route to language development. Since a comprehensive review of *all* SLA research as it has informed contemporary communicative teaching is not within the scope of the present study, I will focus instead on its *major* theoretical and research contributions to L2 teaching practice and materials development as cited in the literature.

2.1.2 Major contributions of SLA research to L2 teaching and materials design

What SLA experts learned from the above-mentioned approaches is that students need instruction that is meaning-based. All SLA researchers agree that input plays a critical role in acquisition, but they do not all agree on the form input should take to have a meaningful goal. One of the earliest and most debated views was formulated by Krashen (1985) whose Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (and other hypotheses) led to the Natural approach⁸. However, regardless of how disputed some of Krashen's views are, the Natural approach is still implemented by some very popular FL textbooks in the American academic context. Indeed, the authors of the elementary French textbook *Deux Mondes* (fifth edition) declare in the instructor resource manual that it is based on the Natural approach and explain how it is brought about in the text. For instance, all the marginal notes and advice sections in the instructor's manual are intended to help the

⁷ i.e., US army

⁸ also developed by Tracy Terrell

teacher provide relevant and comprehensible input (CI) to the students. Also, the text gives opportunities for the teacher to engage students in Total Physical Response (TPR) (Asher, 1972) exemplifying the SLA concept that comprehension precedes production.

Nevertheless, ample SLA research (Swain, 1985; Van Patten & Cadierno, 1993; Gass, 1997) – as well as practitioners – question the hypothesis that input alone is enough. Numerous experts in the field (Ellis, 1994; Pica, 1994; Long, 1996; Doughty, & Williams, 1998) concede that students need to receive not only CI but also have opportunities for conversational interactions. The approach to L2/FL acquisition known as the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1981, 1996) is based on the idea that learners cannot solely receive input, but they must be active conversational participants who collaborate to negotiate the meaning of the input they receive in order to acquire language. Long's Interaction theory made language practitioners and materials developers focus on the language classroom not just as a place where learners of various abilities blend, but as a place where the contexts for interaction are carefully designed. In order to maximize the opportunities for negotiation of meaning in the classroom, materials designers must be aware of the following conditions (Tomlinson, 1998):

- 1) There must be a genuine information gap
- 2) The successful completion of the task must depend on information being exchanged in both directions
- 3) The outcome of the activity must be predetermined
- 4) The task preferably involves narration. Examples of exercises fulfilling the above-mentioned criteria to achieve negotiation of meaning include pair activities (e.g.

conducting mutual interviews), group work (e.g. skits), and cooperative learning activities (e.g. treasure hunt).

Closely linked and interrelated with the interaction hypothesis is the notion of output. SLA researchers have come to a consensus that whenever students speak in the L2, it should be for the purpose of conveying some kind of message due to a genuine need to communicate. Moreover, for Swain (1985, 1995), when learners experience a breakdown in communication, they are forced to modify their output to make it more accurate. Thus “Pushed Output” (Swain, 1995) helps learners to notice the gaps in their own production of language. In that sense, speaking in the L2 pushes learners to move from semantic to syntactic processing. Whereas a learner can understand a message without clear understanding of the syntax, s/he will have to pay attention to the forms used when producing speech in the TL (Saville-Troike, 2006). According to Swain’s research, language teaching materials should provide communicative activities which lead students to notice the mismatch between their own variety of the L2 and the TL (or native-like usage) produced by the teacher. Examples of such activities occur during task-based learning in a student-centered environment. They consist of well-structured pair and cooperative group tasks which give the teacher or the communication partner the opportunity to give corrective feedback about the formal correctness of certain utterances (e.g., jigsaw⁹ (Kagan, 1989), information-gap activities¹⁰).

⁹ Each member of a group is responsible for a portion of the lesson. The entire lesson can be learned only by sharing information with others in the group.

¹⁰ One student has information that another one does not have but needs to successfully complete the task.

SLA experts who concur on the need for meaning-based input and output have also concluded from the research in the last twenty years that students must notice things in the input for language acquisition to occur. While all SLA researchers appear to subscribe to the idea that a focus on form is necessary but that it “should not take place in the absence of meaning” (VanPatten, 2002), they diverge as to how students’ attention should be drawn to that form. “Input enhancement” (Sharwood Smith, 1993), “input flood” (Trahey & White, 1993), and “input processing” (VanPatten, 1996) constitute a few of the actions that researchers have taken to get the learners to notice language forms in the input. Wong’s (2003) study summarizes well the fluctuating outcomes of this research because as she points out SLA experts have yet to uncover which aspects of L2 learning can most benefit from input enhancement. Wong (2003) explored pedagogic techniques to make targeted structures of the input more salient to L2 learners. Her L2 French beginning learners were assigned to one of four conditions: 1) exposure to Textual Enhancement (TE) and Simplified Input (SI), 2) exposure to SI only, 3) exposure to TE only, and 4) the Control group which received unsimplified input without TE. Past participle agreement in relative clauses was selected as the target structure of the study because it is a form of restricted communicative value in French. TE consisted in three reading texts in French in which past participle agreements were typographically modified to enhance their perceptual salience. SI consisted in simplified versions of three reading passages. Participants’ L2 acquisition was measured by an error correction task and their comprehension by free recall tasks of the readings. Wong (2003) found that TE and SI did not promote acquisition of the target structure. However, TE and SI had a

positive effect on comprehension. In relation to the lack of significant effects for acquisition, Wong (2003) hypothesized that the target form she selected was simply not responsive to TE. Also how the form is enhanced may play a role into its potential noticing and subsequent intake by L2 learners. According to Wong (2003), these questions and others remain to be researched to further our understanding of how students process input.

One way for materials developers to get the learners to notice language forms in the input is to highlight the targeted form in the textbook by underlining it, or putting it in boldface. Another technique would be to make sure that the targeted feature is present not only throughout the chapter where it is addressed but that it is also recycled in following chapters, so as to 'flood' learners with the targeted form. Finally, another possibility would be to include an instructor's resource kit with handouts containing activities that put learners in situations where they cannot understand a sentence by depending solely on context, prior knowledge or other cues (Tomlinson, 1998). For instance, if the targeted structure is past tense, all the past tense markers will be removed so that the only way for the students to know that a sentence is in the past is to actually recognize the inflection on the verb.

The last concept that I will mention in this selective review of the SLA research is the acknowledgement that learners must be ready to acquire the items being taught (Meisel, Clashen, & Pienemann, 1981). According to Meisel *et al.*'s Multidimensional Model (1981), certain L2 features such as word order develop along a predictable developmental path. Meisel *et al.* (1981) found that Interlanguage (IL) has stages but that

the acquisition of the lexicon is not affected by them. However, the input and the learner's native-language can interfere with this developmental path. The Multidimensional Model (Meisel, Clashen, & Pienemann, 1981) is often used by SLA researchers to explain fossilization¹¹.

For practitioners, the idea that learners must be ready to acquire the items being taught means that teachers should only “teach what is teachable” (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). It also helps teachers to understand why some of their students can learn certain linguistic items without any problem but struggle with other features even after extensive teaching. Readiness can be reached by language materials which make sure that the students have grasped the developmental features of the chapter well enough before introducing a new one.

Finally, for program administrators, the concept of “teach[ing] what is teachable” (Lightbown & Spada, 2006) means that syllabus planners must set the curriculum accordingly.

In the present section, I assumed the following teaching implications based on the consensus of SLA research findings discussed above:

- ☞ The input needs to be meaning-based
- ☞ Interaction is necessary to promote the negotiation of meaning
- ☞ Students' output must always have a communicative goal
- ☞ Focus-on-form should be implemented in a meaningful context

¹¹ The Multidimensional Model accounts for variation in the success of individual learners. Indeed, formal instruction directed at developmental features will only be successful if learners have mastered the prerequisite processing operations associated with the previous stage of acquisition (Ellis, 2001).

☞ Teach only what students are ready to acquire

To promote L2 acquisition, teachers should integrate attention to form and provide students with corrective feedback within communicative interaction. Instruction that focuses on form only or that is directed exclusively towards meaning will not develop L2 proficiency or L2 accuracy. The crux of the issue is to coordinate both.

Based on these implications for teaching, I also established five distinct implications for the development of language teaching materials. Thus, a language textbook should provide:

- ☞ margin notes and teaching suggestions to help the teacher make the input relevant and comprehensible to students
- ☞ activities that maximize the opportunities for negotiation of meaning (e.g., cooperative learning activities, pair/group work)
- ☞ well-structured cooperative tasks which allow the teacher/communication partner to give feedback about the formal correctness of certain utterances (e.g., jigsaw, information-gap activities)
- ☞ highlighting of the targeted forms so that learners notice them (e.g., text enhancement, input flood, input processing)
- ☞ organization of items that ensures students' readiness to acquire new features

To these suggestions I add two, proposed by Tomlinson (1998):

- ☞ a variety of activities to cater for different learning styles
- ☞ exposure to language in authentic use

Now that several implications of SLA research for designing language teaching materials have been formulated, the question remains as to whether textbooks embrace such findings.

2.1.3 Applying SLA Findings to FL textbooks

I will compare the seven above-mentioned suggestions with three well-known elementary French textbooks, namely *Deux Mondes*, *Paroles*, and *Débuts*. Since I am interested in whether they encompass the findings of SLA research and not in the criticism of specific texts, they will be referred to as textbooks A, B, and C. From the specific analysis I conducted, it was interesting to note that all three texts espouse rather similar SLA theories and also behave the same way in that they (partially) disregard other findings of SLA research.

On the positive side, I found that textbooks A, B and C contain margin notes (A has the largest quantity, followed by B and C) and are accompanied by an instructor's manual full of teaching suggestions. Furthermore, they all provide a fair amount of pair/group work activities. Textbook A is the only one that includes (in its instructor's resource kit) well-structured cooperative tasks (e.g. information-gap activities). The three texts highlight targeted forms, usually using bold characters or various colors. Their

linguistic items are organized in a rather similar sequential order. Finally, textbooks A, B, and C contain a variety of activities to cater to different learning styles.

It is clear from the description above that these textbooks are appropriate to the communicative teaching era (with a focus on form), and their popularity in the form of wide usage in the US and multiple editions is an indication of this. However, after closer examination, two implications of SLA research that these textbooks claim to embrace (in their preface) are in fact largely overlooked.

Firstly, the three texts assert that they expose learners to French language in authentic use. My investigation of their written and audio dialogues compared with corpus data (Coveney, 2003; Fonseca-Greber, & Waugh, 2004; Peeters, 2006; Waugh, 2006) revealed that none of the three textbooks gives a full account of all the distinctions between standard written French and everyday spoken French. Also, the French spoken by the characters appeared to be more or less a version of the written language found in the text.

Secondly, as I concluded in section two that the key to promoting L2 acquisition is for the teacher to provide a balance between a focus on meaning and a focus on form, the same can be said about language teaching materials designers. When research started to suggest that it was necessary to draw learners' attention to form, the danger became to return to a previous era where meaning had no place. So, as VanPatten (2002) points out "the days of drilling, transforming sentences... and performing other strictly form-focused tasks should be long gone". While all three studied textbooks contained a variety of communicative activities, I did find a number of the exercises mentioned by Van

Patten (disguised as meaning-oriented activities but which were in reality largely pattern-oriented) in the text and also in their accompanying test banks. But what struck me the most when examining textbooks A, B, and C was the large number of grammatical structures treated in each text. Even though they appear to make a distinct effort *not* to design their chapters around these specific grammatical items, there is such an overwhelming number of them that the supposed *balance* between a focus on meaning and a focus on form is questionable. Moreover, with the constant evolution of communicative language methodology in the direction of oral fluency, is it necessary to include grammatical structures — such as the concomitant use of direct and indirect objects (e.g., «Rachid donne-t-il l’adresse à Camille? Oui, il **la lui** donne » [*Débuts*, 2nd edition, p. 379])¹² — which are rarely used by French native-speakers?

The lack of balance between a focus on form and a focus on meaning is supported by Aski (2003) who suggested (based on her analysis of seven elementary Italian textbooks) that many communicative language practice activities often lose ground to highly formulaic exercises. Similarly, Wong & Van Patten (2003) stated: “one can open just about any textbook at the secondary or college-level and turn to a section that introduces a grammar point. What one finds is explanation... followed immediately by pattern practice.” Thus, it seems that publishers continue to widen the gap between SLA theory and teaching materials. However, according to Aski (2003), publishers develop the materials demanded by those who use them: the teachers. In addition, publishers send the questionnaires to the same instructors who they know will send them back to the

¹² Note that the structure « donne-t-il » is also not used by native speakers in ordinary conversation.

publishing company. In her review of classroom SLA research and second language teaching, Lightbown (2000) came to the conclusion that the gap was partly due to a lack of discussion between SLA experts and practitioners.

SLA research and language pedagogy have always been two distinct fields. Nevertheless, with all the SLA studies that have recently been conducted in the L2 classroom, researchers are now able to make practical implications for L2 teaching and for the development of instructional materials. Even though current textbooks have made an effort to embrace such findings, they are still not implementing some of their most important implications for our communicative era: 1) maintaining a reasonable balance between meaning and form, and 2) exposing learners to authentic language. Teachers, on the other hand, complain of not being able to apply (their own interpretation of) SLA findings because of constraints such as time, poor student performance, lack of motivation, and inappropriate texts. So, how can we reconcile SLA research with language teaching materials and teachers' beliefs and practices? Needs analyses of both students and teachers must be conducted prior to developing language teaching materials. Teachers' participation in such needs analyses should be part of their professional development. Similarly, methods' courses for pre-service and in service teachers should include a component on materials design. More action-based research (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998) is necessary. In addition, studies should be replicated in wider classroom contexts and SLA experts should present their research at teachers' conferences. Indeed, it does not matter how pedagogically sound implications from SLA research are, if they are not incorporated well by teachers. To that effect, researchers should publish books on

second language learning in a style that makes the material accessible to practitioners, and with more implications for language teaching. Lightbown & Spada (2006) showed us that this can be done. Finally, teachers need to be included in the school textbook selection process.

A few suggestions were given on how to narrow the gap between researchers, materials producers and materials users, but much more research is still necessary to investigate how SLA experts, teachers and publishers can become three interrelated entities instead of three distinct ones.

This gap is not only characterized by a lack of balance between a focus on meaning and a focus on form in FL textbooks but it is also defined by a lack of authenticity.

2.2 The issue of authenticity

2.2.1 Standard written French vs. everyday spoken French

Written and spoken languages have never been exactly the same. The written language is usually more conservative since it is the one that carries over time. In some extreme situations, the languages used for writing and speaking within the same culture can be completely different. For instance, during the middle Ages, Latin was the sole written language, while French (next to other vernaculars) was used for speaking¹³ (Joseph, 1988). The supremacy of Latin started to be questioned when François I created the Collège Royal in 1530 where Hebrew, Greek, Latin, but also French were taught.

¹³ i.e., diglossic situation

French slowly replaced Latin by becoming the language of education, and by the wealth of intellectuals who started to write in French (e.g., Jacques Cartier, Ambroise Paré, Du Bellay, etc) and who contributed to the Renaissance movement (Walter, 1994). The French Academy, known as the “guardian of the language” (Ball, 2000: 5) was founded in 1634. Its role was to standardize French and in that intent the French Academy created a dictionary of usage called *Le bel usage*. As a consequence, one would think that twenty-first century France does not have to deal with a diglossic situation anymore. However, while standard French (i.e. interchangeably called *le bel* or *le bon usage*) is taught in schools and promoted in literary works, it is still competing with a ubiquitous French dialect, namely the language that most French people use in their everyday conversations. While there is still some debate over the origins of the breach (see Herschensohn & Arteaga, 1998 vs. Joseph, 1988), there is a wide consensus among linguists (Peeters, 2006; Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2003, 2004; Waugh, & Fonseca-Greber, 2002; Coveney, 2003, 2000; Ashby, 1992) as to its existence. The striking structural difference between written and spoken (European) French, which may be one of the most important compared to other major European languages, has been qualified as either an “almost diglossic gulf” (Waugh & Fonseca-Greber, 2002: 115), a “widening gap” (Lodge, 1993: 260) or a “linguistic schism” (Joseph, 1988: 32) to only name a few. This difference is apparent in French through various grammatical structures which I will now illustrate in Figure 1.

	Written French	Spoken French ¹⁴
Negation	<i>Je n'aime pas la vanille</i> 'I don't like vanilla'	<i>J'aime pas la vanille</i> (the <i>ne</i> is deleted)
Question formation	<i>Que fait ton père ?</i> 'What does your father do ?'	<i>Il fait quoi ton père ?</i> (no subject-verb inversion)
Relative clauses	<i>Un petit vieux qui a une bonne retraite</i> 'An old man who has a good pension'	<i>Un petit vieux qu'a une bonne retraite</i> (contraction of the relative pronoun <i>qui</i>)
Subject clitics	<i>Nous sommes contents de te voir</i> 'We are happy to see you'	<i>On est contents de te voir</i> (the subject <i>nous</i> is replaced by <i>on</i>)
Verb tenses	<i>Il se présenta à ses voisins dès lundi matin</i> 'He introduced himself to his neighbors as early as Monday morning'	<i>Il s'est présenté à ses voisins dès lundi matin</i> (here the past tense <i>passé composé</i> replaces the past tense <i>passé simple</i> used in written French)
Sentence structure	<i>Je le lui ai donné</i> 'I gave it to her'	<i>Je lui ai donné 1 euro/ Je l'ai donné à Léa</i> 'I gave her 1 euro'/ 'I gave it to Lea' (no use of double object pronouns)
Loss/reduction of various grammatical structures	- <i>Je viens avec vous</i> - <i>Il faut y aller !</i> - <i>Je lui ai écrit une lettre</i> '- I'm coming with you' '- We need to go !' '-I wrote him a letter'	- <i>Je viens avec</i> (loss of pronoun) - <i>Faut y aller !</i> (loss of subject clitic) - <i>J'ui ai écrit une lettre</i> (reduction of object pronoun <i>lui</i>)

FIGURE 1. Written French grammar vs. spoken French grammar

¹⁴ Note that the meaning of the sentences in the 'Spoken French' column is the same as the meaning of the sentences in the 'Written French' column. I therefore only wrote the English translations in the first column.

Whether the examples of spoken French above will be used by native French speakers in their conversations will depend on a variety of factors such as the speech situation¹⁵, the topic at hand, or the speaker (age, sex, social background, etc.). This emergence of another variety of French through spoken language has been repressed for a couple of centuries (especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by *L'Académie Française*) and appears to have been somewhat ignored since by literary scholars and teachers alike. However, spoken French has entered a new phase of its own beginning in the early twentieth century. The large number of essays that favored *le bon usage* (Frei, 1929) such as *Parlons-bien* (D'Harvé, 1923), *Encore le massacre de la langue française* (Moufflet, 1935), *Pour un meilleur français* (Georgin, 1951), *Clinique du langage* (Thérive, 1956) have been supplanted by a wealth of descriptive grammar articles such as *Les fautes de français existent-elles?* (Leeman-Bouix, 1994) by linguists and literary scholars who have been recognizing (and accepting) the “increasingly wide difference” (Waugh & Fonseca-Greber, 2002) between the written and the spoken language. Nowadays we can find an ever-increasing range of studies on the *ne* deletion, question formation, subject clitics and numerous other grammatical structures that do or do not exist in everyday spoken French.

Most American language teachers are now faced with a pedagogical impasse. With the current movement towards CLT where the emphasis is on students' oral performance, teachers are dealing with French textbooks that barely mention its true spoken form and focus instead on written standard French. As a consequence,

¹⁵ e.g., formal vs. informal situation

practitioners usually teach a spoken version of the written French. However not all language instructors teach standard written French only because it is what is in their FL textbook. Many actually choose to teach only *le bon usage* because of the cultural stigma still attached to everyday spoken French¹⁶. In other words, some American language practitioners teach their students “how people should speak, not how they do speak” (Waugh & Fonseca-Greber, 2002). While non-standard French is actually being used by a wide range of native well-educated French speakers, some individuals still associate it with non-educated French citizens from the lower class of society. As a result, it is quite frequent to hear study abroad students express their great surprise as to the linguistic breach between the language their host family or French friends used and what they learned in their American communicative classrooms.

The present study focuses on one grammatical feature in particular among the many that characterize non-standard French found in the everyday spoken language, interchangeably called “popular French” (Valdman, 1982), “New French” (Joseph, 1988), “ordinary French” (Gadet, 1997), and “colloquial French” (Ball, 2000). Indeed, the structural gap between standard written French and everyday spoken French emerges in its system of subject clitics (i.e., pronouns) which are summarized in Figure 2 hereunder.

¹⁶ Also some teachers may not know the everyday spoken language (e.g., non-native speakers, native speakers who have not lived in France for a long time)

1 st person singular	je	I
2 nd person singular	tu	you (& familiar)
3 rd person singular	il/elle	he/she/it
Indefinite	on	one/you/they
1 st person plural	nous	we
2 nd person plural	vous	you (& formal)
3 rd person plural	ils/elles	they

FIGURE 2. Subject clitics in standard French

In the present review of the SLA literature on authenticity, I will discuss the subject clitics *on/nous* and *tu/vous/ils* and examine their distinct semantic values in everyday spoken French.

2.2.1.1 *On* in everyday spoken French

One of the most noticeable changes between standard written French and everyday spoken French is the replacement of the subject clitic *nous* and its accompanying first person plural verb by *on* and the third person singular verb. Aside from a few obligatory contexts where *nous* and its associated verb cannot be replaced by *on* and third person singular verb (e.g. in idiomatic expressions/discourse markers such as *disons que*, or in third person singular imperative such as *allons-y!*, or when *nous* is not in the subject position), nowadays the substitution can be considered complete. Already three decades ago, Laberge (1980) in a corpus of conversational French in Montreal with 120 participants found only 2% of *nous* and Deshaies (1991) in her Quebec corpus of conversations among 50 subjects between 1977 and 1979 recorded as little as 0.5% of *nous*. Today, Coveney (2000) in his corpus from the region of Picardy with 50 French

speakers, found *nous* to occur at a rate of a mere 4.4%, and finally Fonseca-Greber & Waugh (2002, 2004) did not even find a single occurrence of *nous* in their Swiss corpus with 14 participants and observed just 1% in their Metropolitan French corpus with 13 subjects. These findings suggest that Canadian French and Continental French behave in a similar fashion in regards to the use of *on* which replaces *nous* in the spoken language¹⁷.

The subject clitic *on* has a vast range of referential values, some of which can be seen in the following conversation excerpt from Ashby (1992: 135-136) with a female worker in her fifties:

Ashby *Est-ce qu'on vous reconnaît comme Tourangeaux... euh d'après votre accent quand vous sortez de la Touraine ?*
 'Do people know you're from Tourange uhh... by your accent when you leave the Touraine region ?

Interviewee *Pas particulièrement mais enfin on (1) voit quand même qu'on (2) n'est pas de la région. Il paraît que on (3) aurait un accent mais... on (4) sait pas vraiment d'où qu'on (5) vient quand même.*
 'Not specifically but people still see that we are not locals. I've heard we have an accent but...people still don't really know where we come from.

Ashby *Hm Hm.*
 'Mmm mm'

Interviewee *Ah non... Non non ça fait par exemple que... Les Marseillais vraiment on, on, on (6) sent vraiment qu'ils viennent de Marseille. Oui. Tout le monde arrive à parler marseillais. Tandis que nous, quand même pas. On (7) sent qu'on (8) est pas du, de la région mais on (9) peut pas savoir d'où qu'on (10) vient.*
 'Well, no...No no, for example look at...the people from Marseilles, everybody knows for sure they're from Marseilles. Yes. Everybody can imitate the Marseilles accent. But as for us, we still can't. People see that we're not from, that we're not locals but people can't guess where we're from.'

¹⁷ Swiss and Canadian French could even be considered a little ahead of Metropolitan (hexagonal) French—the latter being influenced, perhaps, by the French Academy and the prestige of formal varieties of the spoken language.

In (1), (4), (7), and (9), *on* has an indefinite meaning which refers to non-identifiable experiencers¹⁸, and could be replaced by *les gens*. In (6) *on* also contains an indefinite referent, but here it aims at generalizing, and could be replaced by *n'importe qui*. Finally, in (2), (3), (5), (8), and (10) *on* takes on a definite meaning, referring to the first person plural, i.e., it is inclusive of the speaker and expresses her involvement (Waugh, 2006).

It is not always clear however what *on* refers to, i.e., sometimes the clitic “occupies an intermediate position on a scale of referential identifiability” (Ashby, 1992: 137); it could be interpreted as either *nous* or as indefinite, and it is not possible to infer its meaning given the context.

The “illusionist” (Atlani, 1984), the “chameleon” (Blanche-Benveniste, 1987) *on* can be used by the speaker to express solidarity, modesty, reproach, or distance. I illustrate each of them with the following examples:

- Solidarity: – *J'en peux plus!*
(young athletes – *Allez! On va y arriver, on y est presque, plus que 2 kilomètres !*
to their trainer) – I can't anymore !
 – Come on ! You can do it, we're almost there, just 2 kilometers
 left !
- Modesty : – *Alors la forme ?*
 – *Oh, on fait aller.*
 – So, you're doing ok?
 – Well, we make it work.
- Reproach: – *Alors on grille un feu rouge?*
(a policeman to – So...are we running a red light?
a lady in her car)

¹⁸ The discourse function is to ‘defocus’ the referent

- Distance: « *Interrogés pour quelques méfaits durant notre service aux armées, nous répondions : ‘ On ne sait pas, on n’a pas vu’. A quoi notre capitaine répondait : ‘On est un con’. »* (Morand, 2001)
 « As we were asked questions about some of our misdeeds during our military service, we responded: ‘No idea, nobody saw anything’ To that the captain responded: “Nobody” is an idiot’. »

In this last example from Morand, the two soldiers use the *on* as a face-saving device (Stewart, 1995) to deflect their own misdeeds onto the entire army.

Until the mid-1970s, phrases such as « On est un con » and « Le pronom malhonnête¹⁹ » were adopted by grammarians, teachers, and parents alike to condemn the use of *on* as it was considered unclear. Whoever used *on* instead of *nous* probably had something to hide and was thus « malhonnête » (Leeman, 1991: 112) or just an “idiot” (Leeman-Bouix, 1994: 87-88). Nowadays, *on* is not as severely condemned as it used to be since the shift from *nous* to *on* is, as previously mentioned, almost total. However, certain French speakers still claim that *on* is used only by uneducated people from a lower social class or that it is used only in colloquial or vulgar speech. Consequently, some language teachers do not teach their students this subject clitic with all its referents, because they believe that their learners once abroad may receive a negative social judgment. The cultural prejudice with the use of *on* instead of *nous* has thus survived.

On is still used for indefinite meaning, but to a lesser degree than before, because its substitution for *nous* has weakened its non-specific/generic meaning. Waugh & Fonseca-Greber (2002), in their corpus of everyday conversational European French, found that *on* took on a personal meaning (i.e. used for *nous*) as frequently as 76.3%, was

¹⁹ i.e., ‘The dishonest pronoun’

vague (i.e. impossible to determine whether it was definite or indefinite) at a rate of 18%, and finally had an indefinite meaning only 5.7% of the time. So, with the backsliding of the indefinite referent, the question is: “how do French speakers now indicate indefinite meaning since they hardly use *on* to do so?”

2.2.1.2 *Tu /vous / ils* in everyday spoken French

In the following excerpt from Moufflet’s (1935: 202-203) corpus, it is clear that *tu* does not refer to the interlocutor but has a generic meaning:

« *Je suis allé hier à la campagne. Il pleuvait. Le terrain était une éponge. Quand tu marchais, tu t’enfonçais jusqu’aux genoux.* »

‘I went yesterday to the countryside. It was raining. The ground was like a sponge. When you walked, you sank up to your knees.’

The same can be said of *vous* in the example hereunder from Waugh & Fonseca-Greber (2002: 121):

« *pis moi je dis ben...là en bas vous avez le Doubs..là vous avez le début des arbres..que vous voyez dans la—dans la..pis au fond c’est la France..hnn...* »

‘Then I I-say so...there down there you’ve got the Doubs...there where you’ve got the tops of the trees...that you-see in the—in the.. then in the distance that’s France..uh’

While the semantic shift of *on* to *nous* in everyday spoken French has been severely reprimanded by grammarians, teachers, and parents alike, it is interesting to note that the shift from *on* to *vous* and *tu* (and *ils* as we will see later in this paper) has not caused as much turmoil. According to Peeters (2006), this may be due to the fact that

because the latter shift results from the weakening of the indefinite *on*, it is still a recent phenomenon²⁰.

Now if both *tu* and *vous* are used to express indefinite meaning, are they used in the same proportion? Is one preferred over the other? Based on a variety of corpora, the answer to these questions is *tu*. Indeed, Waugh & Fonseca-Greber (2002) found in their corpus indefinite (and vague) *on* to be used 30.7% of the time, *tu* appeared as much as 68%, and *vous* was barely mentioned with only 1.3% of occurrences. Similarly to Waugh & Fonseca-Greber, Coveney (2003) recorded a smaller percentage of participants using *vous* (about 20%) compared to *tu* (approximately 80%). Well, some may say that in Ashby's (1992) corpus, it is the indefinite *vous* which appeared much more often than *tu* (240 vs. 10 occurrences), but it is important to note that when Ashby interviewed his participants, he used the definite *vous* (i.e., *situation de vouvoiement*). Thus, it seems that *vous* triggered the use of its indefinite counterpart.

The indefinite subject clitic *on*, as previously mentioned, has numerous functions (e.g., inclusiveness/exclusiveness of the speaker and/or interlocutor, neutral, etc.). Since *tu* and *vous* are also utilized (and overpowering *on*) to express indefinite meaning, are they interpreted differently? The use of indefinite *tu* or indefinite *vous* can be construed as a way for the speaker to include the interlocutor in the event s/he is narrating, as if the interlocutor would fictitiously take part into the recounted event. Indefinite *tu/vous* also allow the oral narrator to make her/his story more vivid, more 'interactive'.

²⁰ not noticed by grammarians?

Another subject clitic used for indefinite meaning that seems to be under-researched but nonetheless important is *ils*. Waugh & Fonseca-Greber (2002) found 58.1% of personal *ils* occurrences and 40.8% of indefinite *ils* in their metropolitan French corpus. So, the presence of indefinite *ils* is clearly not to be ignored. In the following example from Waugh (2006: 4), a metropolitan Frenchman Michel tells Franco-Tunisian Karim who lives in New York State his (uninformed) opinion about the U.S.:

Michel: *Dans les films américains, enfin j'sais pas [si c'est la réalité]*
 'In American films, well I dunno [if it's real]'

Karim: *[ouais, ouais]*
 '[yeah, yeah]'

Michel: *dans tous les feuilletons, ils mangent [tout le temps devant la télé]*
 'in all the TV shows (sitcoms), they eat [all the time in front of the TV]'

By using *ils*, Michel obviously distances himself from this fact but also keeps his interlocutor (Karim) out of it.

While indefinite *tu* and *vous* are used to include the interlocutor in the narrated event as if s/he is part of it, indefinite *ils* seems to be used for quite the opposite: to exclude the speaker from the topic but also the interlocutor.

As we have seen in the previous two sections, *on* is used in standard written French for indefinite meaning but in the spoken language, it is used for first person plural (as well as for indefinite and vague usage); *tu* and *vous* are used for second person singular/familiar and second person plural/formal in standard written French but are each

supplemented by an indefinite (and vague) meaning in everyday spoken French²¹. Finally, there is *ils* which only means third person plural in the written language also has an indefinite (and vague) meaning in spoken French. These are crucial differences, but do language learning materials teach them?

2.2.1.3 Corpus linguistics and French textbooks

I compare the results of the previously-mentioned corpora with the treatment of the above subject clitics in the same three well-known elementary French textbooks that I used in my analysis in Section 2.1.3 *Applying SLA findings to FL textbooks*. Once again, since I am concerned with the treatment of these particular grammatical features and not with the criticism of specific texts, *Deux Mondes*, *Paroles*, and *Débuts* are referred as textbooks A, B, and C.

When examining the grammatical explanation of subject clitics in textbook A, we find a table including *on* on the same line as *il* and *elle* translated by he/she/it/one. Three chapters later, a separate grammatical section called “Making general statements: the subject pronoun **on**” explains that *on* is similar in English to ‘you, people, they’, and that “In everyday conversation, French speakers often use *on* in place of the subject pronoun *nous*” followed by two examples. On a total of sixteen activities in this chapter, only one deals with personal *on*.

²¹ *tu* is also used in plural meaning

In the clitics table of Textbook B, *on* is absent and replaced by *c'*[est]²² on the line under *il* and *elle* and is identified as “Third person indefinite singular”. Also, under *ils* and *elles*, there is *ce* [sont] referred as “Third person indefinite plural”. Similarly to textbook A, textbook B provides a separate section on *on* two chapters later. In this section, the authors give a detailed explanation of indefinite *on* but includes only one single sentence about personal *on*: “Unlike English usage, **on** also means *we* and is often used to make suggestions” with an isolated example (*On va au cinéma ce soir?* ‘Are we going to the movies tonight? / Let’s go to the movies tonight!’). This chapter contains twenty-nine communicative activities without a single one illustrating the use of *on* for *nous*. The only input about *on* is in the form of a short written dialogue and a set of pictures (e.g., below a picture of somebody playing tennis, it says *on va jouer au tennis*).

Textbook C is the only text that includes *on* in its clitics table with not only ‘one’ as a translation but also ‘we’²³. Next to ‘one’ and ‘we’²³, we also find ‘you’, ‘people’ and ‘they’ as possible English translations for *on*. Consequently, no additional section on *on* is provided later in the book. Below the clitics table it is indicated that “The meaning of the pronoun **on** depends on the context: *one, you, people, we, they*” and one example of *on* used for *nous* (*On va où?* ‘Where are we going?’) is provided. This chapter does not contain any activity that illustrates this grammatical feature out of its fifteen exercises.

Since each text is supplemented by a video with, as claimed by the authors, “authentic French”, I decided to take a closer look at their dialogues. To make the comparison valid, I chose three video segments on the same topic, e.g. French people

²² *être* (‘to be’) is the verb used in the table to illustrate how subject pronouns function

²³ note that ‘we’ can be the indefinite ‘we’ not the personal ‘we’

talking about school. Each video clip lasts about two-and-a half to three minutes, so that all three dialogues contain approximately the same number of words (i.e., 280 - 306).

In video A, I discovered two occurrences of ‘on’, one used for *nous* (e.g., “on va faire nos devoirs”) and the second to express a reproach (e.g., the professor tells her misbehaving student: “on a besoin de parler”), all the other sentences are either *je* or *nous* utterances.

In video B, all students use *nous* when talking to each other, only once does *on* occur when the professor asks the students to stop talking: “Eh bien, on commence.”

Finally, in video C, which actually drives the content and organization of textbook C, there are very few instances of sentences meaning ‘we’ (i.e., only three), however, they are all expressed with *on* (e.g. children singing in the play yard of the school: *On peut chanter A, B, C, ...* ‘We can sing A, B, C, ...’; a little girl who is new to the school tells her father: *On repart à la maison!* ‘Let’s go back home!’; and the same girl asking her teacher: *On va où?* ‘Where are we going?’). While the speech in this dialogue is very careful (e.g. not a single *ne* deletion), there seems to be an effort to implicitly acknowledge the presence of *on* used for *nous* in spoken French.

In summary, none of the three textbooks gives a full account of all the distinctions between written and spoken norms. When they mention that *on* replaces *nous* in spoken French, they present it as a marginal phenomenon not as a radical shift as we have seen from the empirical data collected over the last fifty years among Canadian and continental French speakers. Furthermore, indefinite *tu*, *vous* and *ils* are completely ignored by all three textbooks. The brief examination of the video dialogues showed that

the French spoken by the characters was more or less a version of the written French found in the text. Numerous studies (Lemee, 2002; Nadasdi, Mougeon, & Rehner, 2003; Nadasdi et al., 2005) have shown that L2 French learners who spent time abroad (at least six weeks) are usually much better (by two to four times) at adopting French spoken norms (e.g., use *on* instead of *nous*) than students who did not go to the target country (or whose stay was too short). Would this difference decrease if students were provided with language learning materials that truly reflect (and explain) spoken French (vs. written French)? I would be tempted to say yes, but further research into textbook linguistic treatments correlated with good corpus work of study-abroad students vs. learners staying in their home country is necessary to answer such a question.

If we want our students to reach target-like fluency, we need to teach them not what we think is acceptable but what people actually speak in the target country. I am not advocating teaching only speaking but making the students aware of the great structural gap between standard written French and everyday spoken French. With the constant evolution of language methodology in the direction of the oral, true communicative French teaching materials should explain that *nous* is the written form meaning ‘we’, whereas the spoken form is *on*. Students also need to know that in spoken French, *tu*, *vous* or *ils* can bear indefinite meanings — this should not be difficult for them to acquire since it is also the case in English with ‘you’ or ‘they’. So, it is the role of the language materials developers and practitioners to teach students language structures that accurately reflect native speaker use.

It is also their role to give students opportunities to discuss things of interest to them; however, if these are censored subjects, “such topics may run counter to both US social norms and a risk-averse publishing market” (Bragger & Rice, 2000). As Ariew (1982) mentioned, by trying to reach as vast of an audience as possible, textbook publishers end up reaching (and therefore pleasing) very few. Furthermore, the questions to address are: what is the importance of integrating culture into FL study? And how should it be integrated to be as authentic as possible?

2.2.2 The Target culture

2.2.2.1 Teaching/Learning about culture

Linguistic competence alone is not enough for learners of a language to be competent in that language (Krasner, 1999). Indeed, as Di Vito (1991: 383) states, “The typical foreign language learner, when presented with any particular grammar rule, has no real-life notion of frequency of occurrence, functional range, or social appropriateness”. Therefore, the role of an instructor and the language teaching materials is to make students aware of culturally appropriate ways to address people, express gratitude or regret, make requests, etc... Students will master an L2 only when they learn both its linguistic and cultural norms. According to Peterson & Coltrane (2003), using authentic sources from the native speech communities helps to engage students in authentic cultural experiences. However textbook writers hold different views on the notion of authenticity of the target culture, and teachers approach culture in various ways in their FL classrooms. So, how can culture be taught without preconceptions?

Depending on whether it is culture with a small c ²⁴ or culture with a big C ²⁵, it may be more or less difficult to present the information in a way that does not make judgment distinctions between the students' native culture and the 'third culture' (Kramsch, 1993). The 'third culture' is seen by Kramsch as "a neutral space" that students can develop and use to reflect on [both] the target culture and the L2. Thus, the role of the practitioners is to let students discover cultural topics and interactions from their own point of view in order to allow learners to "find their own voices in the L2 speech community" (Peterson & Coltrane, 2003:1). Furthermore, teachers and language teaching materials alike must make students aware that cultures are not absolute, i.e., several attitudes and conducts are possible for any given interaction in any culture. FL textbooks which incorporate a variety of authentic materials²⁶ (from numerous sources) on similar cultural themes can help language instructors to teach culture without preconceptions.

Practitioners who wish to be more systematic and contextual (and therefore more 'authentic') in their approach to teaching culture can greatly benefit from using the Standards framework²⁷. By teaching students about cultural products and practices, teachers can help learners gain a larger cultural perspective. The three Ps²⁸ ultimately

²⁴ e.g., students' life, family, eating habits, attitudes toward clothing, friendship, love, hobbies, popular movies, immigration, racism, health, etc.

²⁵ e.g., music, fine arts, literature, history, geography, cinema, politics, education system, etc.

²⁶ Materials are considered 'authentic' if they were not initially developed for an L2 learner's audience. They must be produced by native-speakers for native-speakers. Some SLA experts will add to this definition that materials cannot be considered truly authentic if their content has been altered by the teacher/FL textbook to suit the needs of the FL students

²⁷ i.e., Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century (first draft in 1996, revised in 1999)

²⁸ i.e., the three components of the cultural framework: products, practices, and perspectives

promote students' intercultural competence so that they acquire a deeper understanding of culture overall.

2.2.2.2 Cultural content in FL textbooks

As mentioned in the previous section, culture may have different meanings for materials designers and practitioners. In addition, the FL textbook remains the main source of cultural input for the FL student²⁹. Very often it will directly or indirectly communicate a set of cultural values to the L2 learners. This “hidden curriculum” (Cunningsworth, 1995) may prove to be more effective than the official curriculum, so it is important before selecting a textbook to evaluate its cultural content carefully. The LPD and the teachers involved in the selection process should try to identify all the factors that may have influenced the textbook cultural content. Kilickaya (2004) made the following list:

- ☞ Socio-cultural factors (e.g., does it include a variety of cultures?)
- ☞ Learners' needs (e.g., what is the target student population going to do with the target culture? What is the students' background information³⁰? What is the learner's experience with the target culture? What are students' attitudes toward the foreign culture?)
- ☞ Teacher's role (e.g., what is the teacher's experience with the target culture?)

²⁹ aside from his/her teacher of course.

³⁰ e.g., age, sex, native language, socio-economic status, etc.

To this list I add the following factors that could influence how culture is approached in the FL classroom:

- œ Instructor's textbook annotations (e.g., do they give any advice on presenting the cultural topic at hand? If yes, do they offer several interpretations? Can these suggestions be viewed differently depending on the teacher?)
- œ Amount of culture with a big C and a small c (e.g., are they both treated in the text? Is one preferred over the other?)
- œ Use of visuals (e.g., are the chosen pictures/drawings representative of what the text intends to?)
- œ Age (e.g., how old is the textbook? Will the information presented still be accurate in the next five years or so?)
- œ TL vs. L1 (e.g., is the cultural content presented in the students' native-language or in the TL? If both TL and L1 are present, are they used interchangeably or are they carefully selected?)

Finally, another element that is important to consider when evaluating the cultural content of a FL textbook and how it may play a role in the way culture will be approached in the FL classroom is the *task* (e.g., what are students asked to do with the cultural content of the text?).

2.2.3 Textbook tasks

2.2.3.1 The task

“The narrow concern with *text* authenticity that characterized the early years of the communicative movement has since given way to a concern for the nature of the *tasks*” (McGrath, 2002:114). Indeed, the term *task* started to replace *text* in the mid-1980s as it was becoming a logical, ultimate extension of CLT. The task quickly evolved as an alternative to form-focused instruction. A plethora of books written by SLA experts have seen then been published, i.e. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom* (Nunan, 1989), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks* (Bygate, Skehan & Swain, 2001), *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching* (Ellis, 2003), *Task-Based Instruction In Foreign Language Education: Practices and Programs* (Leaver, 2005), *Task-Based Language Teaching* (Nunan, 2005), *Task-Based Language Education: From Theory to Practice* (Van den Branden, 2006), *Doing Task-Based Teaching* (Willis, 2007) to name only a few. As with many concepts in SLA, the exact definition of task is ambiguous. One of the first SLA researchers to define it was Prabhu (1987:24): “an activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process”. Then as we moved from a teacher-centered classroom environment to a learner-centered approach, the definition of task evolved too: “A communicative task [is] a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing and interacting in the TL while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (Nunan, 1989: 10).

Nowadays, as Freda (2004) pointed out, the notion of ‘outcome’ is more and more present in the definitions of task. This concept is probably in line with the ACTFL Proficiency guidelines (1982, 1999, 2001) which marked a change from a focus on methodology to an emphasis on outcomes and assessment. SLA experts and practitioners realized that instead of looking for a perfect method, they should establish an ‘organizing principle’ (Higgs, 1984) about the nature of the L2 proficiency so that objectives for the language curriculum can be set at the national and state level. According to Skehan (1996: 38) a task is “an activity in which: meaning is primary; there is some sort of relationship to the real-world; task completion has some priority; and the assessment of task performance is in terms of task outcome”. With this last definition comes the idea of authenticity which I will explore in the following section.

2.2.3.2 Task authenticity

Since we moved from *text* to *task*, the authenticity is not characterized anymore by the nature of the input itself but rather by the relationship between the L2 learner and the input and his/her reaction to it (Widdowson, 1978). In other words, it is the nature of the action performed by the student and how s/he carries it out that is considered authentic or not. In the 21st century it is not burdensome for language teachers to find authentic material, especially with all the emerging technologies³¹ that have appeared in the last fifteen years. In addition, recent FL textbooks usually provide practitioners with a

³¹ they will be covered in the last major section of this literature review

variety of authentic texts. The difficulty lies in what the textbook activities ask the learners to do and how the instructors adapt them in class.

Nunan (1979) makes the distinction between ‘real-world’ tasks and traditional ‘pedagogic’ tasks. The former “requires learners to approximate, in class, the sorts of behavior required of them in the world beyond the classroom” (Nunan, 1979: 40) (e.g., writing an email to an L2 native-speaker in the target country). In the latter type of task, learners perform activities that they are unlikely to do outside the classroom (e.g., responding to a set of comprehension questions about an email of an L2 native-speaker). While the rationale for creating ‘real-world’/authentic tasks is quite evident³² within CLT, it is not as obvious for developing pedagogical tasks from an SLA standpoint. As Freda (2004) states, the reasoning behind pedagogical tasks is for students to practice specific skills, particular forms, etc. The distinction between the two types of tasks is not always so clear and definite; it often depends on the school context, the students’ beliefs, the practitioners’ point of view, and of course how it is presented in the FL textbook.

To summarize this section on textbook tasks, I will quote Hall (2002) and then raise a few others questions that are fundamental to the shaping of the present study. “Because the activities we make available to our students in our foreign language classrooms fundamentally shape their development as learners and users of the TL, the choices we make about the kinds of communicative activities to include in the curriculum are of great importance” (Hall, 2002: 59). Most current FL textbooks include tasks that students are likely to perform when they are in the target country, such as ordering food

³² i.e., to mirror real-life situations in the target country

in a restaurant, asking for directions, buying a ticket at a train station, etc... The question is while these may be authentic, are they necessarily the most important tasks students need to know, and are they most likely to trigger students' interest to learn the L2? How important is the authenticity of the tasks according to students and teachers?

Before examining the study to obtain answers to the above questions, two more areas are of interest to the present research project, i.e., the role of grammar and the influence of technology in the FL classroom and language teaching materials.

2.3 The role of grammar

An area that has undoubtedly attracted a lot of scholars in the last fifteen years (Blyth, 2005) is how to draw learners' attention to form within CLT. The two main lines of research in this area are: Focus on Form teaching and Processing instruction.

2.3.1 Focus on Form teaching

It all started with the simple question: "Why teach grammar?" According to Ellis (2002a) studies in immersion in Canada have shown that input alone is not enough to achieve L2 attainment. Additionally, the failure of the audiolingual method in L2 classrooms demonstrated that production practice only was also insufficient. Ellis (2002a) added that the objective of formal instruction should be directed at explicit rather than implicit knowledge. He believes that it is not possible to intervene directly into the development of learners' IL by teaching implicit knowledge because it is too complex. The system of implicit knowledge involves intake and progressive restructuring, and Ellis

(2002a) concludes that SLA researchers still do not understand it sufficiently. So, can Focus on Form (FonF) instruction that aims at teaching explicit knowledge affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge?

Ellis (2002b) reviewed the role of FonF instruction in developing implicit knowledge for children and adult learners of intermediate to advanced L2 French, Spanish, and Japanese in several instructed settings. The eleven studies under scrutiny used various measures of acquisition ranging from free production tasks to structured activities. Ellis (2002b) found that FonF instruction:

- œ helps in the acquisition of implicit knowledge at specific proficiency levels³³
- œ has better chances of success when directed at simple morphological structures
- œ “narrows the hypothesis space” of learners’ implicit knowledge (MacWhinney, 1997)

Fotos & Ellis (1999) further explained that explicit knowledge can help students acquire implicit knowledge because explicit knowledge:

- œ makes learners more likely to notice linguistic features in the input. If learners are developmentally ready to integrate the forms into their IL system (Pienneman, 1989), they will acquire them as implicit knowledge
- œ gives students the tools to construct planned utterances which serve as input for the language processing mechanism
- œ helps learners to “monitor”³⁴ (i.e. correct) structures in communicative language use

³³ i.e., not beginners but intermediate to advanced L2 learners

According to Fotos & Ellis (1999), grammar instruction should only make students aware of a target structure; it should not make them practice it. Cognitive understanding of the feature is more important than production. Finally, formal instruction must occur during CLT (to avoid crossing the fine line with traditional grammar instruction -TGI). Now that we know how FonF instruction can promote SLA, the question is how teachers integrate it in their communicative lesson plans.

Fotos (1994) assigned English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students to one of three conditions. The Focus on Forms (FonFs) group received TGI³⁵ on the placement of adverbs and indirect objects, and on the usage of relative clauses. The second group received a Focus on Meaning (FonM) treatment consisting of three communicative tasks with no grammatical content. Finally, the third group performed three Grammar Consciousness-Raising tasks (GCR group) with the same grammatical features used in the FonFs group. To test her hypothesis that GCR tasks lead to as much L2 accuracy as teacher-fronted grammar lessons, Fotos compared the pre- to post-test³⁶ gains of the GCR group with the FonFs group. She found that both GCR and FonFs groups achieved similar significant gains. To test her hypothesis that GCR tasks lead to as much L2 production as the purely communicative approach, Fotos compared the quantity of negotiations of meaning (clarification/confirmation/repetition requests, and comprehension checks) in the GCR group with the FonM group. The quantities were

³⁴ See Krashen (1985)

³⁵ i.e., Fotos conducted three teacher-fronted grammar lessons

³⁶ the pre- and post- test contained a sentence production task and a grammaticality judgment task

quite similar for both groups. The results of Fotos '(1994) study give support to the use of GCR tasks as one possible alternative to teaching with a FonFs or with a FonM.

Ellis (2001) improved on Long's (1991) definition of FonF instruction by categorizing it into either a 'planned' FonF or an 'incidental' FonF. According to him, a large amount of the FonF instruction research (Ayouun, 2001, 2004; Leow, 2001; Wong, 2001) involved a 'planned' FonF, i.e., a FonF that was the result of prior planning by the researcher or the practitioner. In 'incidental' FonF, attention is drawn to a larger range of forms and none of these is preselected for instructional treatment (Loewen, 2003; Leeser, 2004).

Klapper & Rees (2003) conducted a longitudinal study which dealt both with planned FonF and incidental FonF. Over four years, the researchers tracked the linguistic progress of students learning German. The participants were assigned to one of two conditions. In the FonFs group, the participants received TGI. Metalanguage was provided by the teacher, followed by practice exercises. In the FonF group, the participants' attention was regularly drawn to the form during CLT. The teacher used texts that she had previously modified to ensure maximum exposure of the strong verbs in German (i.e., planned FonF). During the course of instruction, the teacher also provided the FonF students with implicit negative feedback in response to their errors (i.e., incidental FonF). L2 learners' accuracy was measured through holistic and discrete-proficiency testing instruments at the end of each school year. All students spent their third academic year in the target country. Klapper & Rees (2003) found that until the second year, the FonF group showed higher gains than the FonFs condition. However, the

FonFs students started to perform better than the FonF participants after their year abroad, because, according to Klapper & Rees (2003), explicit instruction was coupled with meaningful exposure to the language. The explicit instruction FonFs students received helped them develop their implicit knowledge. Once they were in the target country they started to notice the gaps between their IL and the TL.

Another way to name planned FonF and incidental FonF is ‘proactive’ and ‘reactive’ FonF (Doughty & Williams, 1998). While the concepts are similar, Doughty & Williams’ (1998) research is helpful in providing practical implications for the L2 classroom. For instance, Doughty & Williams’ (1998) asserted, similarly to Fotos & Ellis (1999), that the teacher must keep in mind that students have to be ready to acquire linguistic items (Pienneman, 1989). Consequently, the instructor should not go too far in his/her explanations in reaction to students’ errors or to their questions. According to Doughty & Williams (1998), reactive FonF may be quite cumbersome to apply in large classes. Unplanned instructional interventions (i.e., reactive FonF) may be more appropriate for small classes including students from similar backgrounds and L1s. In such courses, the teacher can more easily predict students’ errors or questions and is thus ready to help students when they arise.

Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis (2002) investigated the language used by intermediate ESL learners to achieve FonF during communicative activities. The authors examined twelve hours of teaching recordings from two classes in a New Zealand school. They searched for all the episodes when a FonF occurred, called Focus on Form Episodes (FFE). Basturkmen *et al.* made the distinction between pre-emptive FFEs and reactive

FFEs. Similarly to Ellis (2001) and Doughty & Williams' (1998) definitions of incidental FonF or reactive FonF, reactive FFEs usually consisted of teacher's feedback in response to students' errors. However, unlike Ellis and Doughty & Williams' concepts of planned FonF or proactive FonF, pre-emptive FFEs were not teacher-initiated (i.e., prior planning of which forms s/he will draw learners' attention to during class) but student-initiated. Pre-emptive FFEs happened when the learner decided to attend to a form even though there was no problem in the production of the form. In each type of FFEs, Basturkmen *et al.* analyzed the use of metalanguage by the two teachers and their students. In every FFE where metalanguage was used, the researchers studied students' uptakes³⁷. Basturkmen *et al.* found that metalanguage occurred much more often in preemptive (i.e., student-initiated) FFEs (55%) than in reactive (i.e., teacher-initiated) FFEs (9%). Moreover, pre-emptive FFEs containing metalanguage included more uptakes. Basturkmen *et al.*'s (2002) study shows not only that metalanguage happens during communicative activities, but also that the use of metalanguage may play a role in drawing learners' attention to form. Knowing how and when to focus on L2 features is one thing, but how do we know, as teachers, which linguistic forms the learners need to have their attention drawn to?

According to Blyth (2005), applied linguists usually base their decisions to create structural syllabi on seven major criteria (Ellis, 2002a):

☞ Linguistic (formal & functional) complexity³⁸

³⁷ i.e., students' attempts to incorporate the information provided about the form in their responses

³⁸ According to Blyth (2005), Romance aspect is formally complex (e.g., selection of correct auxiliary in *passé composé* in French) and also functionally complex (e.g., *imparfait* can be used in three various instances: for on-going actions, habitual events, and for state-of-beings). Romance aspect also has

- œ Reliability of the pedagogical rule (according to Blyth (2005) who cites Dansereau (1987), the grammatical terminology found in most FL textbooks is usually very unclear and sometimes even contradictory)
- œ Metalanguage (to avoid communication breakdowns, teaching materials and instructors must explain the L2 in a language that can be understood by the students)
- œ L1/L2 contrasts
- œ Frequency of the item in the input
- œ Redundancy³⁹
- œ Perceptual saliency (e.g., Blyth (2005) states that the phonetic similarities⁴⁰ of French past tenses make them difficult to recognize for L2 learners—i.e., they are not very salient— Ex.: *J'ai travaillé* vs. *Je travaillais*)

These seven criteria help applied linguists identify learnability problems with specific L2 features.

Despite all the above-mentioned studies in favor of formal instruction, SLA researchers are not unanimous about the role of grammar in the L2 classroom. For instance, Krashen (1999) did a selective review of the literature to find whether formally learned competence (i.e., explicit declarative knowledge) becomes “automatic” (i.e., implicit proceduralized knowledge). His interpretation of the research is that consciousness-raising does not play a role in language acquisition and that explicit

discourse functions (e.g., in French, *imparfait* is used to set the scene of the story, while *passé composé* is utilized to narrate the main events that occurred in the story).

³⁹ I will come back to the notion of redundancy in the section of this thesis called Processing Instruction

⁴⁰ or equivalence for some speakers

knowledge does not become implicit (referred as the ‘non-interface’ position by Larsen-Freeman, 2003). Krashen (1999) believes that CI remains the key component in adult SLA and only sees a small/weak role for TGI in adult SLA⁴¹. In other words, CI induces the necessary grammar which is automatically acquired. The contentions between SLA experts as to whether grammar is necessary to promote L2 acquisition, and if it is, how it can best be implemented, raises the following question: What do teachers and students think about grammar?

Schulz (1996) investigated students and teachers’ beliefs on the role of grammar and error correction in the FL classroom. Most and less commonly taught languages were surveyed. The study revealed vast discrepancies between students’ self-perceived needs and their teachers’ views toward formal instruction. Indeed, a majority (over 80%) of students in both most and less commonly taught language groups attributed a crucial role to grammar in developing their L2 acquisition, while the teachers’ percentage in both groups was lower (about 60%). However, since Schulz collected the data sixteen years ago (in 1992), the present research project is interested in asking the same question⁴² to find out whether these beliefs still hold today.

Zéphir (2000) examined practitioners’ perspectives on teaching and corroborated them with SLA research findings. The author based her research on her own experience as a teacher and as a supervisor of developing instructors at a major American university. She found teachers to be greatly influenced by the way they were taught themselves. They said that grammar and vocabulary acquisition was very important to them, but after

⁴¹ See Krashen (1985)

⁴² e.g., what is the role of grammar in instructed SLA?

having traveled in the target country, they realized the importance of communication. Teachers usually know basic SLA concepts, but they do not always choose to apply them because of practical concerns such as time constraints, students' motivation, or poor facilities⁴³. Zéphir (2000) encourages practitioners and developing teachers to engage more in action-based research to provide their teaching community and the SLA research field with valuable insights into the nature of language learning and teaching.

Another line of research on how to draw learners' attention to form within CLT besides the generous FonF literature is processing instruction. This second type of enquiry is done from a psycholinguistic perspective.

2.3.2 Processing instruction

According to Wong (2002), who follows VanPatten's approach, learners cannot take in all at once the input they are exposed to in the classroom. The parts of the input to which they attend are called 'intake'. Input Processing (IP) is the process of converting input into intake. Because it is intake and not input that develops SLA, the goal of instruction should be to help learners create more intake⁴⁴. So, how is intake created?

Wong (2002) explains that it is created when learners make form-meaning connections in the input they hear⁴⁵. In VanPatten's model of IP, more meaningful items (e.g., content words) are usually processed before less meaningful items (e.g., function words). For instance, in '*demain, je ferai la grasse matinée*' the lexical item that denotes

⁴³ As mentioned in great details in section 2.1 Second Language Acquisition research of the present study

⁴⁴ i.e., to make students attend to more input.

⁴⁵ e.g., if a learner hears '*on a beaucoup travaillé*' and understands that the action of working occurred in the past, then s/he made a form-meaning connection.

future tense ‘*demain*’ will be processed before the grammatical form that also denotes the future, ‘*ai*’. In this case, we have [+semantic value, +redundancy]. But if we remove ‘*demain*’ as in: “*je ferai la grasse matinée*”, then *-ai* is no longer next to a redundant word, and it will take on a higher Communicative Value (CV). So, then we have [+semantic value, -redundancy]. The higher the CV of a form, the more chances it has to be processed by the learner. In general, forms of low or no CV tend to be processed later or not at all. Learners can only process forms of low CV if they do not struggle with the meaning of the sentence, otherwise all their attention goes to the content and nothing is left for the form. Word order also affects processing instruction⁴⁶ (PI). In brief, PI is a type of explicit grammar instruction that takes into account inefficient strategies learners use to process input and then creates activities to pull them away from these inefficient strategies toward more optimal ones. IP forces learners to rely on form to interpret meaning. Understanding how PI operates is important, but how does it transfer to the L2 classroom?

VanPatten (1996) proposed implementing ‘structured input’ activities. These are either referentially oriented (RO) or affectively-oriented (AO). When activities are RO, the focus of the input is not on the learner but on some other third person(s). Because these activities always entail a right or wrong answer, they are usually used at the beginning of a lesson to ensure that learners are making correct meaning-form connections. This type of exercise pushes learners to rely on the target form only to get the propositional meaning of each utterance. When activities are AO, learners indicate

⁴⁶ learners usually process word-initial first and word-final second, what is medial is the last to be processed

their opinions, and/or personal preferences, and there is no right or wrong answer. VanPatten decided to include such activities to tie PI with CLT. The sentences in AO activities are usually simple and easy to process. To complete the activity successfully, learners must understand the message of the sentence and make appropriate form-meaning mappings. So, according to VanPatten (1996), to create RO and AO activities for L2 learners, instructors should teach only one thing at a time, retain meaning in focus, and keep the psycholinguistic processing strategies of the students in mind. In addition, the learners must do something with the input, use both oral and written input, and move from sentences to connected discourse.

While FonF and PI studies dominate the SLA research on how to draw learners' attention to form within CLT, one should not forget that many more techniques exist to promote noticing (Schmidt, 1990). For instance, based on Larsen-Freeman's (2003) review of the literature, this can also be done via "input enhancement" (Sharwood Smith, 1993), or "input flood" (Trahey & White, 1993). Wong (2003), in her study on the acquisition of French past participle agreement in relative clauses, used 'simplified input' as well as a form of input enhancement called 'textual enhancement'. Also, according to Larsen-Freeman (2003), other methods to shift learners' attention to form during CLT include establishing collaborative dialogues and using prolepsis (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Swain's (1995) rationale for the former method is that when learners experience a breakdown in communication, they are forced to modify their output to make it more accurate. The latter method is a scaffolding teaching-process where the teacher helps

students to reshape and increase their use of language which in turn contributes to their understanding of specific linguistic features.

After having learned about current SLA theories, the question remains as to whether FL textbooks embrace the two main lines of research on how to focus on form within CLT, i.e. FonF instruction and PI.

2.3.3 Grammar instruction and FL textbooks

Lepetit (2001) compared the SLA literature on the French subjunctive with the treatment of the same form in two textbooks⁴⁷. According to Lepetit (2001), *Rendez-vous* is based on a FonFs method while *An invitation to French* originates from a holistic approach largely rooted in CLT. In *Rendez-vous* formal instruction drives the content of the text while in *An invitation to French* each chapter is topic-based. In the former text, a lengthy explanation was presented followed by mechanical drills⁴⁸ to practice the subjunctive. In the latter text, the grammatical explanation actually followed the examples in which the subjunctive occurred. Lepetit (2001) concluded by taking an intermediate view of the presentation of grammar he discovered in the two textbooks and called for more accurate pedagogical characterization in FL textbooks based on SLA research.

⁴⁷ Rendez-vous: An invitation to French, and French in action: A beginning course in Language and Culture

⁴⁸ Paulston (1972) defines a mechanical drill as an activity in which there is a total control of the response and only one answer is possible. Learners do not need to understand the stimuli to complete the drill.

Wong & VanPatten (2003) examined whether mechanical drills in language teaching materials help students create an implicit linguistic system. According to Wong & VanPatten, the internal mechanisms that learners bring to the task cannot be manipulated by explicit instruction. Thus, mechanical drills are not necessary for SLA when it comes to developing an implicit linguistic system. Some studies (VanPatten, 1996, 2002b) have even shown that mechanical drills can have a detrimental effect on SLA. For instance, students who learn with drills have a tendency to over generalize the rules.

As previously mentioned, Aski (2003) investigated seven elementary Italian textbooks. They showed that the types of activities they use lag behind SLA research findings. Even though these textbooks claim to be communicative, they revealed a large number of mechanical drills preceded by lengthy grammatical explanations. Aski did find communicative activities that shifted learners' attention to form in the Italian texts, but there were only a few compared to the number of mechanical drills.

Glisan & Drescher (1993) compared the occurrence of specific grammatical structures in the speech of various Spanish speakers with the treatment of the same features in six Spanish textbooks. Similarly to DiVito's (1991) analysis of native-speaker norms in French textbooks, they found that the use of double object pronouns is rather rare in the spoken language but it is treated extensively in the Spanish textbooks. Moreover, like Herschensohn (1988), the authors declared that the texts were overflowing with unnecessary terminology. Glisan & Drescher (1993) concluded that the

grammar found in the Spanish textbooks does not reflect how native speakers use grammatical structures in their own speech.

Finally, Gratton (1995) examined the acquisition of direct object (DO) and indirect object (IO) pronouns of L2 French learners in France. The researcher found insignificant results. In a follow-up study, Gratton (2000) decided to investigate why the learners did not acquire these features. So, she examined how DO and IO pronouns were treated in the three French textbooks used by the university during her previous experiment. Gratton (2000) found the grammatical explanations in all three textbooks lacked coherence, clarity, and systematicity with too many exceptions cited for each rule. Moreover, it seemed that the rules on object pronouns insisted on irrelevant details⁴⁹ while missing out on important elements⁵⁰ that could help the students learn the items.

This sample of the SLA research on how to promote noticing has shown that a combination of techniques is likely to develop SLA, be it using grammar consciousness-raising tasks plus incidental FonF via implicit negative feedback, or PI and input flood. The decision for the teachers as to which form in the L2 or which learners' errors should be the focus of instruction assumes a proactive approach on their part. Beyond practical considerations, this selection should be based on the research findings concerning the learnability of the forms (Ellis, 2002a). Only the practitioners who will try to connect with the 'applied linguistics' world will be able to make informed decisions as to what their role as language teachers should be, which responsibilities their L2 learners should have, and how to adapt inadequate materials in ways that are closer to the current

⁴⁹ e.g., detailed rules on 'double object pronouns'

⁵⁰ e.g., concrete examples targeted to the areas where learners are known to make errors

understanding of how languages are learned. In addition to this, the twenty-first century language teacher will also need to know how to integrate technology into FL instruction.

2.4 Technology in the FL classroom

The goal for language teachers today is to provide a balance between attention to meaning and attention to form. However achieving this goal is not an easy task. The teacher will need to make informed decisions based on his/her beliefs about language learning⁵¹, the background of the L2 learners (age, culture, motivation, etc.) and the educational requirements (Levy, 2006). These decisions will be made regarding the language skills that need to be emphasized to achieve this balance. Whether it is listening, speaking, reading or writing, the teacher will first plunge into the classroom textbook and its traditional ancillaries (e.g., workbook, audio CD, video) for support, but s/he will soon be faced with some shortcomings. Thankfully, our new digital era will provide him/her with a vast array of options to help maintain a balanced approach. Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) has seen an increasing number of technologies emerging (especially in the last fifteen years) that can ideally complement the language textbook if they are used ‘correctly’. Indeed, CALL is not one technology but several, and as Negretti (1999: 75) states: “Different Internet technologies foster the acquisition of different learning skills”. So, it is important for teachers to base their technological choices on sound pedagogy. It is for this reason that I will start this section on technology by examining SLA research as it relates to CALL. Then, I will review some technologies

⁵¹ beliefs that most likely originate from his/her technical knowledge and experience

which I have selected based on their popularity and novelty⁵². These include Computer Mediated Communication (CMC), Blogs⁵³, Wikis⁵³ and Podcasts. Finally, I will concentrate on teachers' beliefs about their use of technologies for teaching a FL and what it really requires to be a language teacher in the twenty-first century.

2.4.1 CALL in SLA research

Numerous SLA concepts have been applied to CALL (e.g., learners interact in the L2 with an authentic audience, students perform authentic tasks, they have opportunities for exposure and production, learners can receive feedback, etc.), however, I will concentrate on two SLA theories which I believe have made a strong impact on the technologies that will be discussed in the following section.

The first one is sociocultural theory established by Lev Vygotsky (1962). This approach helps us understand “the relationship of humanity to its tools” (Warschauer, 2005). The concepts of mediation, social learning and genetic analysis (Vygotsky, 1978, 1981) are specifically relevant to CALL.

The mediation tenet entails that “all human activity is mediated by tools or signs” (Wertsch, 1991). Tools or mediational means such as computers drastically change human action by completely transforming the flow and organization of mental capacities. The concept of mediation enables us to understand how recent technologies can change prior forms of human activity. For instance, we are not dealing with the usual form of

⁵² hence the term ‘emerging technologies’

⁵³ Wikis and Blogs should be included in the previous part on CMC since they are two asynchronous modes of computer mediated communication. However, I chose to treat them in separate sections because of their recent development, great popularity, and the amount of research that has been done on both of these tools.

reading plus the computer, but instead with a completely new form of reading that needs to be taught on its own.

The concept of social learning is particularly relevant to explain how L2 acquisition operates with CMC⁵⁴ (Warschauer, 2005). According to Vygotsky, any human mental function operates at two levels, i.e. psychological and social. In terms of language learning, this means that students will learn by themselves and also through the collaboration and aid of others (e.g., classmates). The distance between these two points is called the zone of proximal development. In light of social learning, we are particularly interested in how people learn by assimilating the language of others (e.g., through email exchanges).

According to the concept of genetic analysis, mental capacities can only be understood if one examines their origins and developmental process. Vygotsky (1978) divides the origins in microgenesis (the progress of specific events), ontogenesis (the development of the person), sociocultural history, and phylogenesis (the evolution of the species). So, to understand how technologies affect language learning, we need to place them in their larger historical, social and cultural contexts.

Using technology as a learning tool, and not just “the cool new thing” (McNeely, 2005) — in other words, in reference to a means and not the end to FL education — is a concern often raised by CALL researchers. Nevertheless, as Warschauer (2005: 48) states: “yes, technology is just a tool, but like all tools, it mediates and transforms human

⁵⁴ this will be discussed in the next section

activity”, hence the importance of examining how technologies contribute to L2 acquisition from a sociocultural perspective.

The SLA perspective that is probably the most prevalent in CALL research today is the interactionist theory. Interaction in SLA research has led to numerous types of investigations from a variety of perspectives⁵⁵. Within the scope of CALL, we will examine interaction through a psycholinguistic lens.

For Ellis (1999), interaction refers not only to interpersonal communication (face-to-face), but also to “the intrapersonal activity involved in mental processing”. Chapelle (2005) extends Ellis’ view by positing that interaction includes any type of exchange, using either linguistic or nonlinguistic means (e.g., a student asking the librarian to renew a book, or renewing it online). In CALL, interpersonal communication happens electronically over a computer network. To this electronic exchange, we need to add the interaction between the learner and the computer, which is commonly known as interactivity (Chapelle, 2005). Whereas in traditional classroom interaction, we only have two types of exchanges⁵⁶, in CALL, we have three⁵⁷, thus adding one more layer to the range of opportunities that these ‘dialogues’ provide. Indeed, these exchanges offer possibilities for the negotiation of meaning which occur during face-to-face interpersonal interaction or between the learner and the computer⁵⁸. Another benefit to the learner/computer interaction is receiving enhanced or modified input. Plass, Chun, Mayer

⁵⁵ See Section 2.1.2 *Major contributions of SLA research to L2 teaching & materials design* of this thesis for a linguistic view on interaction based on Long’s (1981, 1996) and Swain’s (1985, 1995) research.

⁵⁶ interpersonal in face-to-face communication, and intrapersonal with oneself

⁵⁷ interpersonal in face-to-face communication, interpersonal in learner/computer interaction, and intrapersonal with oneself

⁵⁸ for instance, an L2 learner reads a story on the computer in an interactive format. The hypertext feature will allow him/her to negotiate with the computer the meaning of each word that s/he does not understand.

& Leutner (1998), for instance, suggested that modified input can facilitate the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. Finally, intrapersonal interaction (within the student's mind) draws attention to linguistic form in the input. In fact, as we mentioned earlier in this section and in previous sections of this thesis, it is crucial to maintain a balance between a focus on meaning and a focus on form to foster L2 acquisition. To this symmetrical equation, 21st century CALL added a third component so that the formula is now fluency plus accuracy plus agency. According to Murray (1997: 126), agency is "the satisfying power to take meaningful action and see the results of our decisions and choices". As an example we may consider a keypal⁵⁹ partnership between a school in France and a school in the U.S. In this case agency will increase students' motivation because they are not simply writing a composition for their teacher, but to a peer as they are engaging in real communication.

In this selective review of SLA research, we have seen that sociocultural theory with the concepts of mediation, social learning and genetic analysis has had a strong impact on CALL. The interactionist theory examined from a psycholinguistic standpoint with its notions of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication also has helped us develop a better understanding of the potential benefits of CALL such as drawing learners' attention to form while performing real communicative tasks. Finally, the concept of agency has made us realize how CALL can empower our students so that they not only "surf the net" but they also know "how to make waves" (Schneiderman, 1997: vii). I conclude this selective review of SLA research and CALL with Levy's (2006: 15)

⁵⁹ short for "electronic keyboard pen pal"

statement: “[there are] three points which relate to the goal of effective CALL: the first concerns theory, the second concerns the real world-classroom interface and the third concerns the need to balance curricular goals with appropriate communication technologies”. So, which technologies foster the acquisition of which skills?

2.4.2 Technologies for teaching FLs

The ACTFL⁶⁰ Performance Guidelines for K-12 learners (1998) outline language performance expectations within three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive and presentational). They include technology in the elements that should be “woven” into language learning in a standards-driven curriculum. With the guidelines, the focus is on the outcomes and not the methodology. Technology should therefore have the same emphasis. A variety of technologies can foster the reading and writing skills within the interpretive and presentational modes of communication. These include hypermedia/hypertext⁶¹, the World Wide Web (WWW), specific teaching software/programs⁶² and synchronous⁶³ & asynchronous⁶⁴ CMCs. The digital age also provides a large number of options for the teacher who wants to promote students’ listening and speaking skills within all three modes of communication. These options include the WWW, specific teaching software/programs⁶⁵, synchronous⁶⁶ &

⁶⁰ American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages

⁶¹ Includes text, graphics, audio, etc.

⁶² e.g., accompanying textbook CD-Rom, Macromedia software, etc.

⁶³ e.g., IM, chat rooms, MOOs, etc.

⁶⁴ e.g., email, discussion boards, blogs, wikis

⁶⁵ e.g., accompanying textbook CD-Rom, Macromedia software, etc.

⁶⁶ e.g., Skype, MSN messenger, etc.

asynchronous⁶⁷ CMCs and podcasts⁶⁸. The previous-mentioned technologies which can contribute to the development of the L2 learner's four skills will be examined in the following sections.

2.4.2.1 Computer Mediated Communication

CMC is the “communication that takes place between human beings via the instrumentality of computers” (Herring, 1996: 1). Since we are only interested in the technologies that can be used for the L2 classroom, we will not mention the devices⁶⁹ which, even though they are very popular, have not yet been recognized by SLA scholars as having a major potential for language learning. CMC can be categorized as either ‘synchronous’ (in real time) or ‘asynchronous’ (not occurring at the same time).

Email is the most frequent type of asynchronous CMC adopted by FL classes (probably because it does not require special equipment and does not need to be matched to teachers and students time schedules) (Lafford & Lafford, 2005). It can be used for a variety of purposes. For instance, in a Keypal project, the main objective is for students to learn about the culture of their peers in the target country. L2 Learners regularly exchange emails in their respective native languages on pre-determined topics and report their findings in the form of handouts to their instructors. Even though this type of project is logistically demanding⁷⁰, it is very beneficial in not only raising students' awareness of

⁶⁷ e.g., audio email, OLE board, VLOGS, speech recognition technologies

⁶⁸ e.g., Ipod and broadcasting

⁶⁹ e.g., personal digital assistant (PDA), cell phone text messaging (SMS), etc.

⁷⁰ e.g., process of making sure that each student has a tandem partner in the target country early in the semester, finding new partners when some keypals stop emailing the students, ensuring regular exchange of emails so that reports can be handed back in time, etc.

the target culture but also in exposing them to authentic language – which is a major benefit since most textbooks do not provide learners with real everyday spoken language⁷¹ – and increasing their motivation to use the L2 outside of the classroom. Also, since email does not require learners to process language in real time, it can facilitate a focus on form.

Threaded discussion boards constitute another type of asynchronous CMC. Online course environments such as D2L, Blackboard, WebCT or Nicenet usually offer the possibility for the instructor to post a topic to start students' discussion in the TL. This type of CMC has the advantage over emails to create a shared communicative setting (Levy & Stockwell, 2006). Depending on the software, the discussion can allow L2 learners to practice their writing or speaking skills (e.g., OLE board).

Instant Messaging (IM) is similar to emails except that it occurs in real time (i.e., synchronous CMC) so that the individuals need to be connected and 'available' at the same time in the same online IM software. While IM does give students the opportunity for interaction to negotiate meaning in the L2, it may be quite difficult to manage in the class laboratory (Thorne & Payne, 2005). Unless computers are locked with specific screen names, the danger would be to have students use their own IM account and maintain multiple IM sessions unrelated to the learning activity at hand.

Chat rooms provide a more controlled environment than IM since they offer the possibility for the instructor to assign learners to specific rooms, and may thus be more conducive to language learning.

⁷¹ See section 2.2.1 Standard written French vs. everyday spoken French of the present study

MOOs⁷² add another dimension to chat rooms, as learners are able to look at, interact with, and even change their virtual environment. Within the concept of social learning (Vygotsky, 1978, 1981), students are able to learn by assimilating the language of the other participants. Warschauer (1997) also suggested that synchronous text-based media may have the advantage over face-to-face interaction to amplify students' attention to linguistic form.

Finally, it is important to note that many if not all of the above-mentioned CMCs can be supplemented by audio through a microphone and/or video with a web cam. While adding the audio feature (given that the equipment is of good quality) has the obvious benefit of allowing students to practice their oral and aural skills, adding the video component is more controversial. Many teachers may perceive it as distracting students from the content and the form of the message while others may see it as a way of raising students' motivation to perform the task. In any case, the teacher will have to select the technology according to the pedagogical goal of the lesson (Zhao, 2004). If the objective of the activity is to improve students L2 accuracy, then an asynchronous technology may fit better. On the other hand, if the goal of the task is to develop students' fluency in the L2, then a synchronous CMC technology may be more appropriate. Also, these types of activities may prove very useful in promoting L2 acquisition when used in sequence, especially for beginning learners who are not able yet to attend simultaneously to form and meaning (Levy, 2006).

⁷² i.e., Multiuser Object-Oriented environments are the predecessors of virtual worlds

2.4.2.2 Blogs

Blogs, unlike chat rooms or MOOs, offer a personal and private space along with ownership. Web logs can serve the functions of personal electronic journals for individual pursuits, news coverage for the media, vehicle for political discussions, or scholarly journals for academics (Ducate & Lomicka, 2005). Blogs are web applications that show serial entries with date and time stamps. These entries usually contain a title, text, and links and are presented in a chronological order with the most recent entry first. Most blogs include a ‘comment’ function to allow readers to post a response or just their own thoughts to further a discussion. Blogs can display pictures and video, and store various types of files (e.g. audio files, powerpoint, etc.). Compared to other CMCs (e.g., discussion board) blogs are easily created and updated even by those with little technical knowledge (Thorne & Payne, 2005), they are easily accessible (on the WWW), and they are multilinear (e.g., postings can be easily connected with resources on the WWW).

According to Nussbaum (2004), approximately 10 million blogs were created in 2004. Today, 90% of the bloggers are between 13 and 29 years old (Nussbaum, 2004). This age range also coincides with the demographic profile of most of our FL learners, i.e. the “digital natives”⁷³ (Prensky, 2001). The collaborative aspect of the blogs is what attracted numerous FL teachers who saw a venue for ‘social learning’. For instance, the ‘comment’ feature of the blog provides students with numerous opportunities for scaffolding as they build on one another’s knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978). Blogs allow learners to engage in interpersonal and intrapersonal communication as they reflect,

⁷³ They represent the first generations to grow up with digital technology

comment, question, review and interact in an authentic environment (Pinkman, 2005). They also give students the opportunity to practice their writing and reading skills whenever they update their own blog or when they respond to other web logs.

Blogs can serve a variety of purposes in the FL classroom. For example, a language teacher can use blogs within his/her own class: students make their postings in the L2 according to predetermined topics and also comment on other classmates' blogs. Another application is to have L2 learners interact with native-speaker bloggers instead of their peers, thus adding the cultural component to the learning schema (Ducate & Lomicka, 2005). However, the latter use of blogs may bring similar problems to those mentioned earlier for keypal exchanges (see footnote 59). This leads me to consider a few caveats with the use of web logs for L2 learning purposes. Indeed, since blogs are on the WWW, they can be seen by anyone (unless it is in a strictly password-protected context) who can respond to students' postings. As a consequence, learners may be exposed to inappropriate language or topics.

In any case, one of the main appeals of blogging is that it is a convenient tool to maintain not only L2 learners' fluency and accuracy, but also their agency. Indeed, "it provides students with a context that is controlled by them in which they can create and exchange their own meanings in the FL" (Ducate & Lomicka, 2005: 419).

2.4.2.3 Wikis

While blogs offer a personal and private space, wikis provide the opportunity for collaboratively authored textual production (Thorne & Payne, 2005). They include a set

of pages, linked in several ways to each other and to Internet resources, and an open-editing system in which anybody can revise a page. An example of ‘quick-web’ (*wiki* *wiki* means quick in Hawaiian dialect) that resulted in an online encyclopedia created by contributors around the world is ‘Wikipedia’. Wikis have been source of much debate due to their loose concept of authorship. In fact, any person who accesses a wiki page can instantly become its author.

Language teachers can use wikis for end of the semester group projects by creating individual wikipages that are password limited to the class. One of the nice features of wikis for instructors is that each addition, deletion or modification to a wiki page can be tracked. The wiki technology is another convenient tool to achieve the objective of agency, as it gives student the power and responsibility to create, change, and eliminate content. However, teachers must carefully design the task and its procedural processes such as establishing peer- and expert-editing protocols to ensure L2 learning outcomes.

2.4.2.4 Podcasts

Many CMCs used in the L2 context have been criticized for lacking the opportunities to make students practice their oral and listening skills (Thorne & Payne, 2005). Podcasting is thus a valuable addition to CALL technologies.

The fusion of the words iPod and broadcasting led to ‘podcasting’. It consists of sharing and indexing audio or video files on the Internet using simple syndication (RSS) technology for listening on computers or mobile devices (e.g., iPod). Listening to audio

files or watching videos on the Internet is nothing original, but what is cutting edge is to be able to download them on mp3 players or video iPods, so that people can now bring parts of their Internet with them wherever they go (Stanley, 2006). This means a great deal for FL teachers whose learners are part of this digitally literate generation⁷⁴ fascinated by new technologies who love to multi-task and need to be ‘connected’ at all times. Students can now listen to authentic language anywhere they are, whether they are on a bus or at a shopping mall. The opportunities for language learning presented by podcasting keep emerging as teachers are finding more and more ways to use it meaningfully with L2 learners.

Some teachers use podcasts for oral exams or make students create group projects which they publish on the web at the end of the semester. This is even going to change the design of language teaching materials. For instance, instead of putting all its audio files on CDs and video segments on VHS or DVDs, the elementary French textbook *Français-Monde* (Ariew & Dupuy, in preparation) opted for podcasts. Having the textbook audio and video files as podcasts makes their access much easier to students who can now download all the material on their iPods. It thus encourages them to do their homework and to practice their listening skills more often than they would with traditional textbooks.

⁷⁴ i.e., the “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001)

2.4.3 A new role for the language teacher

The Internet and emerging technologies have had an enormous impact on the new generation of L2 learners, the development of teaching materials, and also how language teachers conceptualize their profession in the twenty-first century classroom. The changes in language teaching methodologies already altered the role of the teacher as one of disseminating knowledge and directing learners to one of facilitator of student learning. In this new digital era, practitioners need to possess both practical and technical knowledge to be good language instructors and to avoid creating a gap between themselves and their students (Chapelle & Hegelheimer, 2004). Teachers must be aware that “the reward potential of technology hinges on its efficacious use” (Bancheri, 2006: 32) on both the theoretical and practical levels.

In addition, L2 assessment needs to be revisited with the use of technologies. Indeed, CALL requires multiple components, thus teachers must create multiple assessment criteria. Both process and outcomes ought to be assessed. Standardized tests have greatly improved in the last fifteen years in terms of feedback and evaluation. For instance, the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) evolved from a Computer Based Test (CBT) format to a configuration that allows test items to be selected by the computer to individually match the ability level of each student (i.e., Computer Adaptive Testing--CAT).

Many teachers declare that when they use technology, it increases students' motivation to perform the learning task at hand and that it also breaks up the daily routine of the classroom (Bancheri, 2006). Also, it allows even the most timid students to

participate in the learning activities. Nevertheless, it seems that many language teachers are still not taking advantage of L2 chat rooms, blogs or podcasts to only name a few. According to Tognozzi (2001: 487), fear of computers, lack of technical knowledge, teaching loads, money, and intellectual property rights are among the reasons which prevent teachers from using technology to promote L2 acquisition. To this I will add what one of my fellow language instructor told me one day: “I have realized that by the time I figured out how I can meaningfully incorporate one of the technological elements my students are fond of, and obtain the necessary equipment; it usually falls *out of style*”⁷⁵. Technology used in the FL classroom (CALL research) is indeed constantly evolving (Egbert, 2005).

CALL research is an active and growing field that has been largely influenced by SLA theories such as the sociocultural approach to language learning and the interactionist principle. While the numerous benefits of using technology in the FL classroom have already been mentioned, one main drawback remains in regard to the lack of control by the teacher of the tool being used. For example, podcasts, the WWW, Blogs, and Wikis do not all have the option of being locked in for a specific group of users. As a consequence, people from any age group, social and cultural backgrounds can have access to the FL task set by the teacher for his/her students. This aspect or risk of using certain technologies in the L2 classroom must therefore always be kept in mind by the language instructor.

⁷⁵ Anonymous comment in early fall 2007

Nevertheless, technology can be very helpful, especially in regard to overcoming the challenge that most teachers face, which is to maintain a balance between a focus on form and a focus on meaning. It even has the benefit of empowering students in this process. However, for L2 acquisition to occur, teachers must also know how to select the technologies according to their pedagogical goals. Emails, discussion boards, IM's, chat rooms, MOOs, blogs, wikis, and podcasts can be very efficient tools to promote language learning, but only if they accomplish what traditional tasks cannot do and what teachers want them to achieve. This will require students who are familiar with the tools and teachers who have sufficient practical knowledge to incorporate them. How can schools ensure that such daunting tasks will be accomplished? Incorporating CALL research and basic technological concepts in language teacher training programs is one solid answer.

2.5 Summary

A significant number of classroom-based studies of language learning and teaching have been conducted since the late 1980s, and their pragmatic findings have provided consensus among SLA scholars in order for such research to be applied to concise pedagogical principles (Lightbown, 2000). These principles in turn have led to a variety of implications for designing language teaching materials. A closer examination of three well-known elementary French textbooks confirmed what other SLA experts (Aski, 2003; VanPatten, 2002; Wong & VanPatten, 2003; Lightbown, 2000) found, i.e., there is a significant gap between SLA research findings and language teaching materials.

The breach is mostly characterized by a lack of balance between a focus on meaning and a focus on form in FL textbooks. It is also defined by a lack of authenticity.

Once again a closer investigation of the same three elementary French textbooks showed that self-proclaimed ‘communicative’ language teaching materials actually teach a spoken version of the written French instead of explaining both standard written French and everyday spoken French. Furthermore, as culture is taking on a bigger role within CLT, this literature review suggested that teachers and language teaching materials alike make students aware that cultures are not monolithic. FL textbooks which incorporate a variety of authentic materials (from numerous sources) on similar cultural themes can help language instructors to teach culture without preconceptions. Finally, one cannot discuss authenticity without mentioning what is at the center of the concept: the task. While the definition of authenticity of the task has certainly evolved since the early years of the communicative approach, it still remains fuzzy in the SLA literature. Consequently, the question of how important the authenticity of the tasks is to students and teachers was raised. Initially, the term *task* started to replace *text* in the mid-1980s, and quickly evolved as an alternative to form-focused instruction. Thus, the role of grammar today in the FL classroom and language teaching materials was also examined in the present chapter.

The sample of the instructed SLA research reviewed showed that a variety of techniques can be used to develop L2 acquisition, but once again it seems that current FL textbooks do not embrace these techniques. Thus, teachers play a vital role in how they adapt the materials in class.

Their role is just as important when it comes to using technology in the FL classroom. The survey of the CALL literature suggested that emerging technologies in particular can help teachers face the challenge of maintaining a balance between form and meaning to promote L2 acquisition. However this will require more than just materials that include these technologies⁷⁶, it will require L2 learners who know how to use the tools and language teachers who have sufficient knowledge to incorporate them in class. It seems therefore important for the present study to ask what students and teachers think about this issue.

In short, the present study hopes to elucidate how FL textbook design can be reconciled with SLA research in terms of its current key findings on L2 acquisition in general, authenticity of the language, the culture and the tasks in particular, and also the roles of grammar and technology. This dilemma cannot be resolved without asking those who use the materials: the teachers and the students. Chapter 3 will describe in detail the methodological procedures that were used in this investigation.

⁷⁶ e.g., in their ancillaries

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The first research question that directs the present study concerns the role of authenticity in language teaching materials, in particular, teachers' and students' positions in regard to the authenticity of the L2, target culture, and tasks found in language textbooks.

The second research question asked teachers and students about the role of grammar instruction in FL textbooks.

The third and final research question concerns the role of technology in language teaching materials: whether teachers consider that technology complements the FL textbook, and, if they believe that it does, which technologies they use to counterbalance specific textbook shortcomings. In regard to the learners, this third research question is interested in the technologies that students have experienced in their FL classroom, if any, and when and why they believed that they were used.

Section 3.2 provides the specifics of the research context by first describing the selection process for the four universities that participated in the present study. Then, each of their language programs is presented in terms of its overall makeup and the language teaching materials in use. Next, the French instructors and L2 learners who shape the target population are portrayed. Finally, the teachers' and students' experience with elementary and intermediate French textbooks is outlined.

Section 3.3 explains the development of the research instrument. It describes the design of the students' and teachers' questionnaires and gives a rationale for the inclusion of specific survey items.

Issues of face and content validity of the instrument are addressed in Section 3.4 via a description of the two pilot testing phases. A list of ensuing modifications to the teachers' and students' questionnaires is provided.

Section 3.5 gives an account of the methods used to collect data in four North-American universities.

Section 3.6 relates the specific procedures used to analyze this data. It explains the factors that influenced the analysis: type of survey (i.e., teacher or student), question format (i.e., close-ended or open-ended questions) and specific item under study (e.g., is it a question that was asked of both students and teachers or of one group only?).

The final section concludes chapter 3 and prepares the reader for the next chapter, in which the results of the current research project are given.

3.1 Participants

As with any project that involves the use of surveys as its main research instrument, it became evident that the generalizability of the results of the present study would depend on its sample size. Since one of the research questions concerns the authenticity of L2 French and French textbooks, which had been examined in regard to SLA issues pertaining to the other research questions, it was decided that only French teachers and L2 learners would be surveyed. The small number of French instructors and

students at my institution and the importance of sampling⁷⁷ size led me to look for additional post-secondary language programs where data could be collected. The issue then became: “On the basis of which criteria should other universities be selected?”

3.1.1 Selection process

As I started to make inquiries with college-level Basic Language Programs (BLP) in French over the U.S., I quickly realized that not every FL department utilizes a textbook. Indeed, some institutions use language teaching materials produced by their language coordinators for each specific level. So, my first criterion in selecting participating universities for the current research project was whether their BLP used a FL textbook or their ‘in-house’ materials.

Other factors that influenced the choice of post-secondary institutions to take part in the present study were:

- œ Pre-established contact with the LPD (professional acquaintances), which was considered to facilitate data collection and ensure a greater response-rate
- œ Use of *different* FL textbooks
- œ BLP size (i.e., number of French language classes offered and number of instructors teaching these courses)
- œ Variety in geographical locations (i.e., to obtain as large of a sample student population as possible)

⁷⁷ since the researcher is interested in making claims about FL textbooks in general, it was crucial for the present study to select groups of teachers and students who use more than one textbook per level (i.e., elementary/intermediate).

Now that I have established how the four participating universities were selected, I will turn to the institutions themselves, and review their French BLP in particular.

3.1.2 Basic Language programs

Since I am interested in the overall makeup of the surveyed French BLPs and not in the universities per se, they will be referred to as institutions A, B, C and D.

Institution A is located in the Southwest of the U.S. It offers four semesters of four credit-hour French language courses (i.e., elementary I & II and Intermediate I & II) taught by a range of fifteen to eighteen teachers. The textbook *Débuts* is used at the elementary level (I & II) and *Ouvertures* for intermediate learners (levels I & II).

Institution B is situated in the Southeast of the country. It offers three credit hour language classes. The BLP utilizes the French textbook *Deux Mondes* over the course of three semesters. Then, *Controverses* is employed for the next two levels. The French language courses are taught by a range of ten to twelve French instructors.

Institution C, in the Northeast, offers French language courses which meet for four class hours per week. The textbook *Rond-Point* is used in elementary French I. *Deux Mondes* is employed for the second and third semesters of study (supplemented by the video *Le Chemin du retour*⁷⁸). Sixteen to eighteen practitioners usually teach the language courses.

Institution D is located in the upper Midwest. It utilizes the text *Deux Mondes* for the first two semesters of study of the language (five credit hour classes). *Interaction* is

⁷⁸ Initially *Le Chemin du retour* was the accompanying video of the textbook *Débuts*.

then used for Intermediate French I and II (courses which also meet five times a week). The French language classes are taught by an average of twenty to twenty-five instructors.

3.1.3 Teachers and students

All instructors who teach elementary and intermediate-level French classes regardless of rank (e.g., graduate teaching assistants, lecturers, adjuncts, professors, etc) were recruited by way of their respective LPD or individually with the university and home department's permission. See Table 1 for their basic demographics.

TABLE 1. Teachers' basic demographics per surveyed institution

Institution Category	A (n = 16)	B (n = 7)	C (n = 14)	D (n = 11)	TOTAL (n = 48)
Gender	Female = 11 Male = 5	Female = 5 Male = 2	Female = 10 Male = 4	Female = 8 Male = 3	Female = 34 Male = 14
Mean Age	30.17	33.45	28	30.8	30.6
University status	French grad. student = 13 ; Grad. student in pedagogy= 2 Adjunct/ lecturer = 1	French grad. student= 4 ; Adjunct/ lecturer = 2 ; Assistant/ associate/full professor = 1	French grad. student = 10 ; Grad. student from other department ⁷⁹ = 2 ; Adjunct/ lecturer = 2	French grad. student = 8 ; Adjunct/ lecturer = 3	French grad. student = 35 ; Grad. student in pedagogy= 2 Grad. student from other department= 2 ; Adjunct/ lecturer = 8 Assistant/ associate/full professor = 1
L1	French = 8 English = 4 Other = 4	French = 2 English = 2 Other = 3	French = 3 English = 9 Other = 2	French = 4 English = 6 Other = 1	French = 17 English = 21 Other = 10
Country of origin	France = 3 ; Canada = 1 ; Francophone country in Africa = 5 ; Another francophone country ⁸⁰ = 2 ; U.S. ⁸¹ = 5	France= 2 ; Canada = 1 ; Francophone country in Africa= 1 ; U.S.= 1 ; Another non- francophone country ⁸² = 2	France = 3 ; Francophone country in Africa = 1 ; U.S. = 8 ; Another non- francophone country = 2	France = 2 ; Francophone country in Africa = 1 ; Another francophone country = 2 ; U.S. = 6	France = 10 ; Canada = 2 ; Francophone country in Africa = 8 ; Another francophone country = 4 ; U.S = 20 ; Another non- francophone country = 4

As we can see in Table 1, approximately 81% of the French teachers surveyed were graduate students (39/48), with a vast majority studying for a French M.A. or Ph.D.

⁷⁹ i.e., other department than French or pedagogy

⁸⁰ i.e., other than France, Switzerland, Canada, Haiti and a francophone country in Africa

⁸¹ i.e., the U.S.

⁸² i.e., other than the U.S.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while half of the teachers declared coming from a francophone country (24/48), only 35% (17/48) self-identified as native French-speakers.

All students enrolled in elementary and intermediate-level French courses were also asked to participate via their teacher or their respective LPD (see Table 2 for their background information). Similarly to the teachers surveyed, there were a large number of female participants (almost 70%) among the students. Their mean age and GPA was quite homogeneous across the four universities. While these students may have pursued the study of French for their major, minor or even to fulfill a FL requirement, they also showed a great deal of personal interest in learning the language. Finally, it is noteworthy to indicate that even though basic language courses are not open to native French-speakers, 7 students out of 1023 participants (.7%) declared coming from a francophone country. Several hypotheses can be made in light of this fact: 1) these students may have left the francophone country at a very young age leading to language loss⁸³; 2) they may not have used the language for political reasons (e.g., phenomenon of diglossia in certain African countries) and thus have a very rudimentary knowledge of French; or 3) it may just be that they managed to hide their native skills to enter the basic language class in order to obtain a good grade without any effort.

⁸³ assuming that their parents did not maintain their bilingual education afterwards

TABLE 2. Students' basic demographics per surveyed institution

Institution Category	A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)	C (n = 302)	D (n = 187)	TOTAL (n = 1023)
Gender	Female = 278 Male = 144	Female = 90 Male = 22	Female = 199 Male = 103	Female = 138 Male = 49	Female = 705 Male = 318
Mean Age	20.07	19.88	20.5	20.36	20.20
University status	Freshman= 201 Sophom. ⁸⁴ = 113 Junior = 66 Senior = 36 Graduate = 4 Non-degree = 2	Freshman= 57 Sophom. = 21 Junior = 17 Senior = 15 Non-degree= 2	Freshman= 112 Sophom. = 48 Junior = 94 Senior = 35 Graduate = 9 Non-degree= 4	Freshman= 90 Sophom.= 50 Junior = 10 Senior = 19 Graduate = 9 Non-degree= 9	Freshman= 460 Sophom.= 232 Junior = 187 Senior = 105 Graduate = 22 Non-degree= 17
G.P.A. ⁸⁵ (Mean)	3.27	3.45	3.19	3.24	3.28
French ⁸⁶	Major = 67 Minor = 59 Interest= 118 FL req. ⁸⁷ = 265	Major = 17 Minor = 25 Interest= 58 FL req. = 53	Major = 81 Minor = 30 Interest= 87 FL req. = 172	Major = 0 Minor = 48 Interest= 97 FL req. = 117	Major = 165 Minor = 162 Interest= 360 FL req.= 607
Grade ⁸⁸	A = 271 B = 127 C = 22 D = 2	A = 85 B = 22 C = 5	A = 170 B = 108 C = 24	A = 98 B = 78 C = 11	A = 624 B = 335 C = 62 D = 2
L1	English = 377 Spanish= 29 Other = 16	English = 88 Spanish= 15 Other = 9	English = 274 Spanish= 9 Other = 19	English = 177 Spanish= 0 Other = 10	English = 916 Spanish= 53 Other = 54
Country of origin	U.S = 394 Spanish-speaking country= 10 An other non- francophone country= 16 Francophone country = 2	U.S = 86 Spanish- speaking country= 13 Another non- francophone country= 13	U.S = 263 Spanish- speaking country= 15 Another non- francophone country= 19 Francophone country = 5	U.S = 157 Another non- francophone country= 30	U.S = 900 Spanish- speaking country= 38 Another non- francophone country= 78 Francophone country= 7

⁸⁴ i.e., Sophomore⁸⁵ i.e., 'My cumulative Grade Point Average is...'⁸⁶ i.e., 'I am taking French to fulfill my...'⁸⁷ i.e., Foreign Language requirement⁸⁸ i.e., 'The grade I expect to receive in my French class is...'

Participants were initially 51 French teachers and 1035 French students from the four above-mentioned post-secondary institutions. After analysis of the surveys, a total of 3 teachers and 12 students were removed from the study. Indeed, 10 questionnaires that contained the exact same answer one after another throughout more than 50% of the survey⁸⁹ were considered outliers. In addition, 5 surveys that had inconsistent responses to more than 25% of the questions⁹⁰ were also eliminated. It is important to note, however, that the format of the questionnaire limited the number of outliers by not only requesting participants to respond to all questions before moving on to the next page, but also by recording only fully completed surveys (once the “Done” button on the last page was clicked)⁹¹. As a result, the final participant pool included 48 French teachers and 1023 French students from the four surveyed French BLPs.

Besides inquiring about the participants’ basic demographics, the first section of the teachers’ questionnaire was designed to collect information about the instructors’ experience learning French (for non-native French⁹² instructors) or English (for native French teachers⁹³ and non-native English speakers⁹⁴). Additionally, teachers were asked if they had ever lived in a francophone country, and if yes for how long, as well as if they had previous teacher training and their teaching experience (a summary of these teachers’ answers is illustrated in Table 3).

⁸⁹ e.g., the first two pages contained a variety of responses but the last two showed ‘strongly agree’ on all answers.

⁹⁰ e.g., “What other Foreign Language have you studied besides French?” = “French”*

⁹¹ An explanation of the survey format appears in the *Questionnaire Design* section.

⁹² Referred as NNF in Table 3

⁹³ Referred as NF in Table 3

⁹⁴ Referred as NNE in Table 3

TABLE 3. Teachers' self-perceived language and teaching skills (means)

Institution Category	A (n = 16)	B (n = 7)	C (n = 14)	D (n = 11)	TOTAL (n = 48)
Oral French production	Ad. high ⁹⁵ = 1 ; Superior= 1 ; Disting. ⁹⁶ = 5 ; Native= 9	Disting.= 3 ; Native= 4	Ad. high= 3 ; Superior= 5 ; Disting.= 2 ; Native= 4	Ad. high= 2 ; Superior= 1 ; Disting.= 3 ; Native= 5	Adv. high= 6 ; Superior= 7 ; Disting.= 13 ; Native= 22
Oral English production	Adv. low= 1 Adv. high= 1 Superior= 1 Disting.= 8 Native= 5	Superior= 4 Native= 3	Adv. high= 1 ; Superior= 2 ; Disting.= 2 ; Native= 9	Disting.= 5 Native= 6	Adv. low= 1 Adv. high= 2 Superior= 7 Disting.= 15 Native= 23
Age to start learning French (for NNF)	10.81	11.52	12.71	13.12	12.04
French instruction received (for NNF)	N/A= 8 ; traditional ⁹⁷ = 3 balanced ⁹⁸ = 5	N/A= 2 ; traditional= 3 ; comm. = 2	N/A= 3 ; traditional= 4 ; balanced = 7	N/A= 4 ; traditional= 4 ; balanced = 3	N/A= 17 ; traditional= 14 comm. = 2 ; balanced = 15
Time spent in a francophone country (for NNF)	11.14 months	16.75 months	8.07 months	7.95 months	10.97 months
Started learning English at... (for NF & NNE)	13.27	9.62	10.66	9.83	10.84
English instruction received (for NF & NNE)	N/A= 5 ; traditional= 6 ; comm. ⁹⁹ = 1 ; balanced= 4	N/A= 2 ; traditional= 4 ; balanced= 1	N/A= 9 ; traditional= 1 ; comm.= 2 ; balanced= 2	N/A= 6 ; traditional= 4 ; balanced= 1	N/A= 22 ; traditional= 15 comm.= 3 ; balanced= 8
Time spent in the U.S. (for Non-Americans)	33.1 months (2.75 years)	36 months (3 years)	30.2 months (≈ 2.5 years)	36 months (3 years)	33.82 months (>2.75 years)
# of teaching methods' courses	2.4	2.8	2.1	2.5	2.45
Teaching experience in the U.S.	29.25 months (≈ 2.5 years)	47.71 months (≈ 4 years)	25.8 months (> 2 years)	49.2 months (> 4 years)	37.99 months (> 3 years)

⁹⁵ i.e., Advanced high⁹⁶ i.e., Distinguished⁹⁷ i.e., teacher-centered, grammar oriented (focus on form)⁹⁸ i.e., balance between a focus on form (grammar) and a focus on meaning (communicative)⁹⁹ i.e., communicative. It is student-centered with an emphasis on oral production (focus on meaning)

As we examined teachers' beliefs and how their previous experience as language students may influence their views on teaching in chapter 1 of this dissertation, it is interesting to note that almost as many NNF instructors declared having learned French the traditional way as those who said they were taught with a balanced approach (i.e., form//meaning). As far as NF and NNE practitioners are concerned, I found a majority of instructors who said they learned English in a teacher-centered classroom. Finally, it is also important to notice that in all four surveyed institutions, the teachers had taken at least two teaching methodology courses and/or workshops for professional development during their teaching career.

Similarly to the teacher's questionnaire, the first section of the students' survey requested more background information of the learners than their basic demographics alone. It asked students to identify their previous experience learning French or other languages and if they had ever traveled to any French-speaking countries. A summary of the students' answers is illustrated in Table 4.

TABLE 4. Students' self-perceived language skills (means)

Institution Category	A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)	C (n = 302)	D (n = 187)	TOTAL (n = 1023)
Oral French production	Nov. mid ¹⁰⁰ = 26 Nov. high= 72 Int. low ¹⁰¹ = 153 Int. mid= 119 Int. high= 26 Ad. low ¹⁰² = 26	Nov. mid = 7 Nov. high= 23 Int. low= 40 Int. mid= 26 Int. high= 6 Ad. low= 10	Nov. mid = 27 Nov. high= 53 Int. low= 125 Int. mid= 69 Int. high= 23 Ad. low= 5	Nov. mid = 20 Nov. high= 28 Int. low= 90 Int. mid= 49	Nov. mid = 80 Nov. high= 176 Int. low= 408 Int. mid= 263 Int. high= 55 Ad. low= 41
Started learning French at...	14.9	15.1	16.2	16.2	15.6
Amount of French instruction received	39.5 months (> 3 years)	36.4 months (≈ 3 years)	34.3 months (<3 years)	33.6 months (≈ 2.75 years)	35.95 months
Longest time spent in francophone country	12.5 days	46.3 days	35.3 days	10.6 days	26.17 days
Other languages studied (besides French)	None= 258 Spanish= 126 German= 12 Italian= 13 Portuguese= 8 Latin= 12 Other= 7	None= 51 Spanish= 40 German= 12 Arabic= 5 Other= 4	None= 145 Spanish= 87 German= 33 Latin= 31 Other= 6	None= 89 Spanish= 68 German= 29 Other= 1	None= 543 Spanish= 321 German= 86 Italian= 13 Portuguese= 8 Latin= 43 Arabic= 5 Other= 18
Language studied the longest	Spanish= 2.5 years	Spanish= 2.9 years	N/A	N/A	Spanish = 2.7 years

¹⁰⁰ i.e., Novice mid¹⁰¹ i.e., Intermediate low¹⁰² i.e., Advanced low

3.1.4 Experience with textbooks

The final part of the first section of the teachers' questionnaire inquired about their previous classroom experience with elementary and intermediate French textbooks. This is illustrated in Table 5 (as a reminder and for purposes of clarity, the textbooks that each BLP currently uses have also been included).

TABLE 5. Teachers and their use of textbooks

Institution Category	A (n = 16)	B (n = 7)	C (n = 14)	D (n = 11)	TOTAL (n = 48)
French textbook currently using	Débuts= 11 ; Ouvertures= 5	Controverses= 2 ; Deux Mondes= 6	Deux Mondes= 10 ; Rond-Point = 4	Deux Mondes= 8 ; Interaction = 3	Controverses= 2 ; Débuts= 11 ; Deux Mondes = 24 ; Interaction = 3 ; Ouvertures= 5 Rond-Point = 4
elementary French textbooks used during entire teaching career	A vous = 1 ; Allons-y= 2 ; Contacts = 2 ; Débuts= 11 ; Deux Mondes= 2 ; Horizons = 1 ; J'veux bien = 1 ; Motifs = 1 ; Paroles = 1 ; Rendez-vous= 2 Vis-à-Vis = 1 ; Voilà = 1	Allons-y= 2 ; Contacts= 2 ; Deux Mondes= 2 ; Entre Amis = 1 ; French in action, part 1= 1 ; Invitation au Monde Francophone= 1 J'veux bien= 1 ; Mais Oui = 1 ; Motifs = 2 ; Paroles = 5 ; Vis-à-Vis = 2	Allons-y= 2 ; Contacts= 2 ; Deux Mondes = 8 ; Invitation au Monde Francophone= 1 J'veux bien= 3 ; Rapports = 1 ; Rond-Point= 2	Allons-y= 1 ; Deux Mondes = 9 ; Discovering French (DF)! Bleu = 1 ; DF! Blanc= 1 ; DF! Rouge= 1 ; Entre Amis= 1 ; French in action, Part 1 = 1 ; Horizons= 1 ; Paroles= 1 ; Vis-à-Vis= 1 ; Voilà= 2	A vous = 1 ; Allons-y= 7 ; Contacts = 6 ; Débuts= 11 ; Deux Mondes = 21 ; DF! Bleu= 1 ; DF! Blanc= 1 ; DF! Rouge= 1 ; Entre Amis= 1 ; French in action, part1= 2 Invitation au Monde Francophone= 2 Horizons = 2 ; J'veux bien = 5 ; Mais Oui = 1 ; Motifs = 3 ; Paroles = 7 ; Rapports = 1 ; Rendez-vous= 2 Rond-Point= 2 Vis-à-Vis = 4 ; Voilà = 3
intermediate French textbooks used during entire teaching career	Bravo = 1 ; Montages= 1 ; Ouvertures = 7 ; Sur le vif = 1	Bravo = 1 ; Controverses= 1 ; Ensuite= 1 ; Sur le vif = 6	A l'oeuvre = 1 ; En bonne forme = 1 ; Ensuite = 1 ; Montages = 1 ; Quant à moi= 2 ; Sur le vif = 2	Bravo= 2 ; Explorations= 2 French in Action, Part 2 = 1 ; Ouvertures = 1 ; Sur le vif = 1 ; Interaction = 1	A l'oeuvre = 1 ; Bravo = 4 ; Controverses= 1 ; En bonne forme = 1 ; Ensuite= 2 ; Explorations= 2 French in Action,Part2= 1 Montages= 1 ; Ouvertures = 8 ; Quant à moi= 2 ; Sur le vif = 10 ;
Highest # of semesters teaching w/ the same textbook	3.29 (Débuts)	3.83 (Sur le Vif)	2.6 (Deux Mondes)	3.2 (Interaction)	3.23

It is interesting to note that the ratio of elementary textbooks used per teacher in institution B (eleven textbooks used by only seven teachers) correlates with the older average age of the instructors (33.45—see Table 1) and their longer teaching experience in the U.S. (almost 4 years—see Table 3), which differs from the teachers in institutions A, C and D. The highest ratio of textbook/teacher is also maintained at the intermediate level with four French textbooks used by seven instructors in institution B¹⁰³.

In the last part of the first section of the students' questionnaire, learners were asked to describe which textbook(s) they currently have (to determine whether the instructors used additional language teaching materials to the text requested by the BLP for each specific level). In addition, students were requested to indicate the number of textbooks they had learned from since they first started studying French and to identify them (see Table 6).

¹⁰³ i.e., at the intermediate level, the proportions of textbooks use per teacher for all four universities are as followed: Institution A =25%; Institution B = 57%; Institution C = 42%; Institution D = 54%

TABLE 6. Students and their use of textbooks

Institution Category	A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)	C (n = 302)	D (n = 187)	TOTAL (n = 1023)
French textbook(s) currently using	Allez viens= 7 Allons-y= 8 Bienvenue= 12 Débuts= 285 Ouvertures= 98 Vis-à-Vis = 7	Bon voyage= 4 Deux Mondes= 105 Rendez- vous= 3	A l'Aventure= 2 A votre tour= 3 Deux Mondes= 275 Rond-Point = 25	Destinations= 11 Deux Mondes= 70 Explorations= 39 Interaction= 68	A l'Aventure= 2 Allez viens= 7 Allons-y= 8 Bienvenue= 12 Bon voyage= 4 Débuts= 285 Deux Mondes= 450 Explorations= 39 Interaction= 68 Ouvertures= 98 Rendez-vous= 3 Rond-Point= 25 Vis-à-Vis = 7
Since I started learning French I have used the following number of French textbooks:	2.5 (majority of Allez viens)	2.2 (majority of Deux Mondes)	2.03 (majority of Deux Mondes)	2.9 (majority of Deux Mondes)	2.4

3.2 Questionnaire design

Given the scope and objectives of the present study, it was determined that the use of questionnaires as the main research instrument would facilitate the implementation of the study on a large-scale and permit to cover a wide geographic area. Furthermore, as Dornyei (2003) pointed out, surveys have other advantages including time efficiency on the part of the researcher and low cost, thus making the data collection with four universities across the U.S. feasible.

Since this research project is quite unique in the sense that it investigates both teachers and students' views of FL textbooks on three specific topics (i.e., authenticity,

grammar and technology), I decided that creating my own questionnaires (one for the teachers and one for the students) would be more appropriate for the present study. However, to ensure reliability of the research instruments I consulted with a specialist in test and questionnaire design (including evaluation and measurement). We met on several occasions to discuss issues involved in designing any survey instrument such as the types of questions that surveys can answer and the different response and question formats.

The first draft of both students' and teachers' written questionnaires included closed-response questions only. Surveys of the closed type generate uniform data across questions and are easy to answer for the participants and easy to code and analyze for the researcher (Brown, 2001). Despite the above-mentioned advantages, closed-response questions present a narrow range of possible answers and they are not as exploratory in nature (Brown, 2001). Consequently, I explored the possibility of administering oral interviews in parallel to the written questionnaires. However, for logistical reasons, only a small number of participating teachers and students from my home institution could be interviewed. This would lead to an inevitable wide numerical gap between the quantitative data and the qualitative data, thus making comparisons and interpretations quite difficult or even irrelevant at times.

Thus, taking these factors into account, it was decided that the best option to obtain follow-up information for the present study would be to combine closed-response questions with open-ended questions. Such a combination allows researchers to receive general information and related follow-up details at the same time. While the open-ended questions were certainly not intended to replace the oral interviews, their addition was

meant to add the qualitative component that closed-response questionnaires alone lack and that interviews add. Furthermore, open-ended questions (in anonymous written surveys) have the advantage of giving participants more time and freedom to express themselves than in oral interviews. Finally, the combination of closed-response and open-ended questions addresses the issue of internal validity of the questionnaire. Indeed, its internal validity is bolstered with multiple sources of data (quantitative and qualitative) originating from a large and diverse number of participants. Consequently, the variety of background settings for the data collection increases the external validity of the present study.

As previously mentioned, two surveys were developed for the present study: one for the teachers, and one for the students. The first section of both questionnaires inquires about the participants' personal information¹⁰⁴. The second and main section of both students' and teachers' surveys is divided into three categories:

- 1) Beliefs about authenticity of French textbooks
- 2) Beliefs about the role of grammar in French textbooks
- 3) Practices and beliefs about technology in French language teaching materials

After several revisions following discussions with SLA experts and the specialist in test and questionnaire design, the teachers' survey included 63 items rated on a four-point Likert-type scale, 18 yes/no items and 10 open-ended questions. Similarly, the

¹⁰⁴ See section 3.2.3 *Teachers and students* in the present paper

students' questionnaire included 50 items rated on a four-point Likert-type scale, 24 yes/no items and 12 open-ended questions.

By eliminating the neutral option in the Likert scale, participants were 'forced' to reflect on the closed-response questions. Indeed, they were only given the possibility of either agreeing or disagreeing with the questions (i.e., strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree). This being said, it is evident that some teachers or students may have remained undecided despite a deep reflection on a specific question, but the risk of participants randomly marking the neutral option was greater than those being truly undecided for a majority of questions.

Given the fact that issues of authenticity, grammar and technology in language teaching materials were to be explored in light of SLA research, the following constraints were imposed on the design of the questionnaires:

- œ Simplifying the SLA jargon and putting pedagogical notions in lay terms so that all questions could be easily understood by teachers and students
- œ Providing examples of concepts that could be interpreted differently by the participants
- œ Not using the term 'authenticity' to avoid certain biases or prejudices
- œ Keeping the questionnaire as concise as possible considering the fact that teachers and students would have to complete it on their own time outside of class

3.2.1 Online format

To facilitate data collection with the four participating BLPs, the surveys were placed online on a website that I host¹⁰⁵. The questionnaires were developed using a professional online survey maker which ensured complete anonymity of the respondents by blocking I.P.¹⁰⁶ addresses. Consequently, to be able to track the number of participants per university, I had to create eight web pages (i.e., one for the teacher and one for the students for each of the four institutions). Each of these web pages contained a copy of either the teacher questionnaire or the student survey. The data was directly saved in eight individual folders on the professional online survey maker website.

In addition to the ability of collecting a large amount of data in a short amount of time and the minimal cost of deployment, it was hoped that the online format would also increase the return rate on the questionnaire. Indeed, one of the most common problems that survey researchers face with mail-in questionnaires is their low response rate. When dealing with a relatively young population of teachers (mean age 30.6—see Table 1) who are mostly graduate students, and also learners, who are part of the ‘Net generation’, an online format seemed better suited to the target population than a paper questionnaire. The latter type of survey could have appeared too long to complete and mailing it could have been considered cumbersome by most participants too, especially when no incentive is offered.

To address the issue of face and content validity of the surveys, both students’ and teachers’ questionnaires were piloted in early Fall 2007.

¹⁰⁵ www.askildson.com

¹⁰⁶ i.e., Internet Protocol address

3.2.2 Piloting

The surveys were piloted on two separate occasions and only with teachers and students who did not take part later in the data collection for the present study. Each piloting phase was intended to test specific aspects of the research instrument as explained in the following subsections.

3.2.2.1 Phase 1

Late August 2007, twenty-four intermediate French students and three French instructors completed their corresponding questionnaires. However, in order to ensure that participants would focus on the content of the surveys and the specific items and not be distracted by the online format itself, only paper-based versions of the questionnaire instrument were piloted initially. The teachers and students were asked to carefully respond to all items on their questionnaire. The participants were then prompted to give feedback on the formatting of the surveys, the wording of the questions, and any other comments they wanted to add.

As a result of this first piloting phase, both questionnaires were modified. Some items appeared to create confusion among students so that they had to be rephrased in simpler terms. A variety of comments given by the teachers led to create more open-ended questions on their survey. Finally, some yes/no questions were modified into several closed-response questions for both questionnaires.

3.2.2.2 Phase 2

The second piloting phase was aimed at testing the online format specifically. In mid-September 2007, ten elementary French learners and four French instructors completed the modified online surveys.

The lack of responses on certain questions by a few students led me to explore the whole range of data collection possibilities offered by the professional online survey maker. After some discussion with researchers using this website, I was able to set the option that all questions must be answered before moving on to the next page.

Also, I was pleased to see that both students and teachers' answers to the open-ended questions were much more extensive than they were in the first pilot testing with the paper questionnaires.

3.2.3 Teacher questionnaire

The final version of the teacher questionnaire includes a total of 19 multiple-choice questions, 82 items rated on a four point Likert-type scale, 21 yes/no items and 12 open-ended questions (see Appendix A).

The first online page of the teacher questionnaire contains Section 1 called "Background information" with 19 multiple-choice questions. Section 2 "The French language, culture and activities in textbooks" is on the second page. It includes 50 statements rated on a Likert scale, 3 yes/no items and 4 open-ended questions (the items about the L2, target culture and tasks are all mixed within this section of the survey). The third page of the online teacher questionnaire is entitled "Grammar in French textbooks".

It contains 24 statements rated on a Likert scale and 1 open-ended question. The fourth and final online page was labeled “Technology and French language teaching materials”. It includes 8 statements rated on a Likert scale, 18 yes/no items and 7 open-ended questions.

3.2.4 Student questionnaire

The final version of the students’ questionnaire includes 16 multiple-choice questions, 55 statements rated on a four point Likert-type scale, 47 yes/no items and 11 open-ended questions (see Appendix B).

The first online page called Section 1 “Background information” includes 16 multiple-choice items. On the second page, section 2 “The French language, culture and activities in textbooks” contains 18 statements rated on a Likert scale, 33 yes/no items and 3 open-ended questions (similarly to the teacher questionnaire, the items about the L2, target culture and tasks are mingled in this section of the survey). The third page of the online questionnaire is called “Grammar in French textbooks”. It has 24 statements rated on a Likert scale and 1 open-ended question. The final page was labeled “Technology and French language teaching materials”. It includes 13 statements rated on a Likert scale, 14 yes/no items and 7 open-ended questions.

3.3 Procedures for data collection

The following materials were used to conduct this multicenter study: a disclaimer form and two versions of a questionnaire placed online. Each specific institution

disclaimer form appeared on the computer screen before the online survey (the disclaimer text preceded the survey popper). My contacts in the other three participating BLPs besides my own institution explained the research project to their French instructors and students by reading a prepared recruitment script aloud to them. I personally recruited students and teachers in my home institution.

Since the teachers' and students' questionnaires were online, the participants were able to fill them out at their own convenience, in the location of their choice, and without the presence of the principal investigator of this study. To ensure a greater response-rate and to monitor the number of instructors and learners who complete the surveys more closely, a ten-day-window period was given for each BLP during which teachers and students could take part in the study. Giving precise deadlines to the participants helped to focus their attention on what was requested from them. Indeed, I noticed that in three of the four universities, the numbers of participants nearly doubled-up the last two days.

3.4 Data analysis

No personal identifying information was collected at any point during the study. The participants were assigned random numbers as they completed the surveys. The data was directly saved in eight individual folders (i.e., one for the teachers and one for the students for each of the four institutions) on the professional online survey maker's website. Participants' data from the surveys were associated with their randomized and anonymous identification code.

The data from the closed-response questions were submitted to a series of analyses that generated descriptive statistics. The data from the open-ended questions were analyzed qualitatively. All teachers' and students' responses were examined separately according to each research question. According to the framework set by Huberman & Miles (1994), the qualitative data were contracted by means of three intertwined processes: data reduction (i.e., coded and then classified), data display (i.e., presented in charts) and conclusion drawing. This process helped to determine patterns and themes from the answers to the open-ended questions. Finally, the results from the closed-response questions were triangulated with the data from the open-ended questions.

3.5 Summary

The present study investigates the roles of authenticity, grammar and technology in language teaching materials in light of SLA research. The methodology used to survey teachers and students on these three issues was outlined in chapter 3. The rationale for the development of the research instrument including the combination of two types of questions that generate complementary data was provided. The procedures for data collection and analysis were also reported. The next chapter will examine teachers' and students' answers as they pertain to the three research questions of the present study from a quantitative and qualitative standpoint.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the analyses that were conducted on the current research project are explained and the results are described. Chapter 4 is structured mainly around the three research questions introduced in Chapter 1 and reformulated in Chapter 3. Only simple explanations of the results are offered in this chapter since the main discussion and interpretation of the findings occur in Chapter 5.

4.1 Quantitative and qualitative data

As Dörnyei (2005) points out, it is possible to combine quantitative and qualitative methods in a way that brings out the best while canceling out the weaknesses of each method. Indeed, closed-response questions in surveys make large-scale studies feasible by, among other factors, facilitating the coding and analysis of data for the researcher. On the other hand, the type of data obtained is not so exploratory in nature. Thus, it was decided that adding a qualitative component in the form of open-ended questions would allow us to:

- œ obtain extra-information from all the participants in the four universities across the U.S.¹⁰⁷
- œ refine the quantitative coding categories by adding a wider range of possible answers
- œ make the study more exploratory

¹⁰⁷ which face-to-face or even telephone interviews would not permit

receive general information *and* related follow-up details at the same time (Brown, 2001)

The present study uses an *integrated* mixed methods approach (Bazeley, 1999) based on the premise that confidence in findings is increased if diverse forms of data support the same conclusion (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Huberman & Miles, 1994). Finally, the data of the current research project is also triangulated by using multiple sources (i.e., teachers and students) in order to avoid biases interjected by people in different roles (Brown, 2001).

The main goal of this dissertation is not to *compare* teachers' and students' views of FL textbooks but to obtain specific information about their various needs in language teaching materials (i.e., *What do teachers and students want from a FL textbook?*). Thus, numerous questions on both teachers' and students' questionnaires are not parallel in structure and even often ask very different things. For instance, the questions asked of native-French teachers about the authenticity of the French found in FL textbooks need to be different than those asked of elementary French learners. Similarly, questions concerning the possession and use of an Ipod are asked of students but not of teachers. Also, questions about using technology to replace inadequate textbook content are directed to instructors only¹⁰⁸. Therefore, the findings that resulted from the closed-response questions in both teachers and students' questionnaires are examined using descriptive statistics. While some questions directed to practitioners and L2 learners are

¹⁰⁸ See Appendices A and B for the list of various questions asked to students and teachers

indeed parallel in structure (e.g., ‘Grammar is the central focus of teaching French’ versus ‘Grammar is the central focus of learning French’), their presence in the research instruments are too infrequent and unsystematic¹⁰⁹ to examine their results using inferential statistics. In fact, performing statistical tests only on these particular items would seem random and most importantly, it would not contribute to the purpose of the present study.

To analyze the qualitative data, I took a number of methodological steps including “data reduction”, “data display” and “conclusion drawing” within the conceptual framework set by Huberman and Miles (1994:429). First, I transferred all answers to the open-ended questions on both surveys into separate computer files¹¹⁰. Having all the responses gathered per category (e.g., ‘authenticity of the target culture’) into separate files (e.g., ‘students’) allowed me to capture a general idea of the responses in each researched area from a ‘wide angle lens’ (Tomison & Goddard, 1999). As I read through each document multiple times, I found specific words reoccurring in the answers. So, I used the word search function (‘find’) of my word processor to help me establish patterns and themes that emerged from the answers. To systematize and summarize this data, I displayed the responses in matrices (presented in the following sections.). Finally, in the ‘conclusion drawing’ step, I studied and interpreted the displayed data.

¹⁰⁹ Again no effort was made to organize similar but distinct questions in each of the three categories (authenticity, grammar technology) because the goal of the study is not to *compare* teachers to students’ view (or vice-versa) but to find out what each of them wants from a FL textbook. In that respect, questions were designed to pertain to the particular needs of each target population.

¹¹⁰ thanks to the online format of the research instrument, this was a fairly easy process

4.2 Research question # 1

The first research question that directs the present study concerns the role of authenticity in language teaching materials. It inquired about the teachers' and students' positions in regard to the authenticity of the L2, target culture, and tasks found in language textbooks. To facilitate the reading and comprehension of the results, they will be presented into three separate sections as they pertain to the authenticity of the L2, target culture, or tasks found in language textbooks.

4.2.1 Authenticity of the L2

4.2.1.1 Teachers' results

Despite the choice of using a 4-point Likert scale ($SD = 1$; $SA = 4$) to encourage respondents to reflect on the questions, it was still possible to generate group means on each survey item. Indeed, 2.5 indicates a mathematical neutral position from a group perspective. Therefore, any result inferior to 2.5 will be considered in disagreement with the questionnaire item and any mean superior to 2.5 will be viewed in agreement with the survey question. All the teachers' results on the authenticity of the L2 in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 7. The means of their answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in Table 8 (ranked from strongest to weakest reaction from a group perspective).

While teachers across all four institutions largely recognize deleting the *ne* in everyday spoken French ($M = 3.11$), a majority of them say that they try not to forget this

part of the negation when speaking in front of their students ($M = 3.33$). This issue will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

French teachers agree that there is a wide gap between written and spoken French (item 11). In addition, they disagree that the way they speak in their daily life mirrors the French in their textbook (item 1) and disagree that their current textbook shows a gap between the written and spoken language (item 12). The teachers' agreement on items 2 ($M = 3.01$) and 4 ($M = 2.69$) and their disagreement on item 3 ($M = 2.34$) also confirm that, in their opinions, FL textbooks contain mostly standard written French. All this being said, why do they agree with item 15 stating that the French used in textbooks is the French that we need to teach our students, but then say that it is important to teach students both written and spoken French (item 13)? To understand the origins of this contradiction, I decided to look at the numbers and participants more closely. First of all, while the mean of item 15 is above the mathematical average of 2.5, it supersedes it by only .08 points ($M = 2.58$). This may be interpreted as a sign of almost neutral position resulting from disagreement among the participants on that issue. Second, calculating the standard deviation for the means also proved useful in interpreting item 13 ($M = 3.09$). The standard deviation of a group of numbers is an average of the distance of all answers from the mean. For item 13, I found $sd = 1.88$. This number certainly indicates a high degree of dispersion among responses and deserves to be studied more carefully. Consequently, it will be interesting to examine individual answers on item 13 according to the participants' characteristics (e.g., does their age influence their answer? Does their

origin¹¹¹ play a role in whether they believe that both written and spoken French should be taught? Does their field of study impact their response?) in Chapter 5.

Finally, the issue of teaching double object pronouns in French (and other languages such as Spanish) has been heavily discussed in the SLA literature, as mentioned in the second chapter of the present study. The inclusion of lengthy grammatical explanations on their use in French, which are found in most FL textbooks, is still a source of much debate and creates a dichotomy between materials' developers and SLA researchers. I will pursue this discussion in Chapter 5 by examining the results found on items 7 and 16 of the teachers' questionnaire. While the question in item 16 addressed the group of teachers as a whole, item 7 was only directed to Native-French speakers, thus their answers will be treated and analyzed separately.

¹¹¹ native vs. non-native French instructors

TABLE 7. Teachers' means on the authenticity of the L2 (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				Tot. (N = 48)
	SD ← 1	D 2	A 3	SA → 4	
Item.10 However, I try not to forget the 'ne' when I speak in class in front of my students	3.27	3.83	3.50	2.75	3.33
Item.5 When I speak INFORMALLY French (e.g., with my francophone friends, family) I more often use 'on' than 'nous' to express 'we'	3.20	3.00	3.40	3.25	3.21
Item.9 I often omit the 'ne' when I say negative French sentences in my daily life (e.g., j'aime pas ça)	2.87	3.17	3.40	3.00	3.11
Item.13 It is important for students to be taught BOTH versions: standard written French and daily spoken French	3.06	3.14	3.14	3.00	3.09
Item.8 When I speak informally French in my daily life, I often use 'tu' to express a generic meaning (e.g., «La classe de Madame Martin commence toujours à exactement 10h00. Si tu arrives en retard (par exemple à 10h05) TU es sûr qu'elle refuse que TU rentres. »)	3.53	2.50	2.90	3.25	3.04
Item.2 When I speak in the francophone country that I know, I would be comfortable using some of the expressions proposed by my textbook for FORMAL encounters (e.g., asking for directions, buying a ticket at a travel agency, etc.)	3.20	2.67	3.20	3.00	3.01
Item.11 There is a WIDE gap between written and spoken French	3.40	2.67	3.00	2.50	2.89
Item.4 When I write FORMALLY (e.g., job application, letter of complaint, email to my boss, etc.) in French, I use SIMILAR expressions to what the textbook I am currently using proposes	3.13	2.50	2.90	2.25	2.69
Item.15 The French used in textbooks is the French that we need to teach our students	2.50	2.67	2.40	2.75	2.58
Item.6 When I speak FORMALLY French (e.g., with my francophone boss) I more often use 'on' than 'nous' to express 'we'	2.20	2.00	3.30	2.25	2.43
Item.3 When I write INFORMAL French emails or letters (e.g., to francophone friends, colleagues, family) it is SIMILAR to the French found in the textbook I am currently using	2.53	2.00	2.60	2.25	2.34
Item.1 The way I speak French in my daily life with my francophone friends, colleagues, and family is the same as the French found in the dialogues of the textbook I am currently using	2.67	1.83	2.40	2.25	2.28
Item.14 I do not speak French like the French found in the textbook I am currently using but I should	2.33	2.50	2.40	1.75	2.24
Item.7 As a FRENCH NATIVE-SPEAKER, it is difficult for me to teach double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je LE LUI ai déjà donné)	2.30	1.75	2.25	2.00	2.07
Item.12 The TEXTBOOK I am currently using SHOWS a wide gap between written and spoken French	2.20	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.05

TABLE 8. Teachers' mean percentages on the authenticity of the L2 (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Item.16	A (n = 16)		B (n = 7)		C (n = 14)		D (n = 11)		Total (N = 48)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je LE LUI ai déjà donné) are rarely used in everyday spoken French	46.7%	53.3 %	33.3 %	66.7 %	60 %	40 %	25 %	75 %	41.25 %	58.75 %

4.2.1.2 Students' results

Students' means on the 'authenticity of the L2' in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 9. The means of students' answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in order from strongest to weakest reaction (whether it is 'yes' or 'no') from a group perspective in Table 10.

While most students never spent more than two months in a Francophone country (see item 2 in Table 10) and only about half of them know somebody who did (see item 1 in table 10), they almost all express the wish to travel to one in the future (see item 8 in Table 10). As a consequence over 73% of students want to learn the French of the Francophone country that they intend to visit (see item 9 in Table10). Given students' lack of experience with everyday spoken French, it is interesting to note that they seem very much aware of the specificities of popular French including the use of 'on' (see item 1 in Table 9), 'ne' deletion (see item 4 in Table 9) or generic 'tu' (see item 3 in Table 9). This could be partly explained by the connections students have with Francophone

friends (see items 4 and 3 in Table 10) but these results will certainly need to be more investigated in the following chapter.

While students acknowledged the varieties of spoken French, they were most in agreement with item 2, stating that learning about double object pronouns is important ($M = 3.25$ on a four-point likert scale across four universities). Does this mean that students are well aware of what spoken French is yet want to learn written French? Or, is it just a misjudgment on their part due to novice skills with L2 French? The result on item 2 in Table 10 may provide us with a clearer answer to these questions. Indeed, 92% of surveyed students want to learn ‘authentic’ French, i.e., the real French that is spoken among people their age in their daily life in France. However, students’ reaction to item 5, stating that it is more important to learn standard written French than daily spoken French (see Table 9), cannot be ignored. Even though this item resulted in mild agreement since the average score is just above 2.5 by .02 points¹¹², it does show a divide between the students who want to learn standard French (i.e., the French found in their textbooks) and those who want to learn the French spoken today by young people in France and other francophone countries. This will again be source of much deeper analysis in Chapter 5.

Finally, please note that no qualitative data was analyzed on the authenticity of the L2 since no open-ended questions were addressed to teachers and students in this section of the questionnaire because of the already large number of survey items on this

¹¹² Similarly to the teachers’ results on the authenticity of the L2, I calculated the standard deviations for all students’ results. For item 5 (see Table 9) —and all other items— I did not find a number that would indicate a high degree of dispersed response (the standard deviations fall in a range of 1.0 to 1.3).

issue¹¹³ and the need to obtain some quantitative data first to determine relevant open-ended questions.

TABLE 9. Students' means on the authenticity of the L2 (Likert-scale)

Survey Item	Institution				Tot. (N = 1023)
	SD ← 1	D 2	A 3	SA 4 →	
Item 2. Learning about double object pronouns (e.g., Ce livre? Oui je LE LUI ai déjà donné) is important	3.23	3.39	3.16	3.23	3.25
Item 1. In popular French, 'on' often replaces 'nous' to express 'we'	2.42	2.67	2.74	2.85	2.67
Item 4. In popular French, the 'ne' is often omitted in negative sentences (e.g., j'aime pas ça)	2.68	2.41	2.32	3.15	2.64
Item 3. In popular French, 'tu' is often used to express a generic meaning (e.g., «La classe de Madame Martin commence toujours à exactement 10h00. Si tu arrives en retard (par exemple à 10h05) TU es sûr qu'elle refuse que TU rentres.»)	2.54	2.57	2.44	2.62	2.54
Item 5. It is more important to learn standard written French than daily spoken French	2.68	2.25	2.74	2.42	2.52
Item 6. I find surprising that my current teacher does not speak like the French in my textbook	1.85	1.67	2.03	1.71	1.81

¹¹³ Just the Authenticity section of the questionnaire contained 7 questions on textbook tasks, 12 questions on culture (one question contained a list of topics which will be divided in separate items in Table 11 to facilitate the reading and comprehension of the results) and 16 questions on the authenticity of the L2.

TABLE 10. Students' mean percentages on the authenticity of the L2 (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Survey item	A (n = 422)		B (n = 112)		C (n = 302)		D (n = 187)		Total (N = 1023)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 8. I intend to travel to a francophone country in the future	92.6 %	7.4 %	92.2 %	7.8 %	98%	2 %	92.3 %	7.7 %	93.77 %	6.23 %
Item 2. I spent more than 8 consecutive weeks in a francophone country	4.2 %	95.8 %	15.7 %	84.3 %	4 %	96%	2 %	98%	6.47 %	93.53 %
Item 7. I want to learn 'authentic' French, i.e., the real French that is spoken among people my age in their daily life in France	94.7 %	5.3 %	86.3 %	13.7 %	96%	4 %	92.3 %	7.7 %	92.32 %	7.68 %
Item 4. I have francophone friends with whom I regularly talk	19%	81%	19.6 %	80.4 %	14 %	86%	15.4 %	84.6 %	17%	83%
Item 3. I have francophone friends with whom I exchange emails	19%	81%	17.6 %	82.4 %	20 %	80%	15.4 %	84.6 %	18%	82%
Item 6. My current teacher speaks like the French in my textbook	65.6 %	34.4 %	84.3 %	15.7 %	54%	46 %	92.3 %	7.7 %	74.05 %	25.95 %
Item 9. I want to learn the French of the francophone country where I intend to travel in the future	77.8 %	10.1 % ¹¹⁴	66.7 %	13.7 % ¹¹⁵	80%	4 % ¹¹⁶	69.2 %	15.4 % ¹¹⁷	73.43 %	10.8 % ¹¹⁸
Item 1. I know very well somebody who has spent more than 8 consecutive weeks in a francophone country	55.6 %	44.4 %	68.6 %	31.4 %	48 %	52%	53.8 %	46.2 %	56.5 %	43.5 %
Item 5. My current teacher is a French native speaker	50.8 %	49.2 %	86.3 %	13.7 %	42 %	58%	46.2 %	53.8 %	56.33 %	43.67 %

¹¹⁴ N/A (for students who do not intend to travel to a francophone country in the future) = 12.1%¹¹⁵ N/A= 19.6%¹¹⁶ N/A= 16%¹¹⁷ N/A= 15.4%¹¹⁸ N/A= 15.77%

4.2.2 Authenticity of the Target culture

4.2.2.1 Teachers' results

All teachers' means on the 'authenticity of the target culture' are presented in Table 11 (ranked from highest to lowest agreement). Given the current trend for integrating culture in CLT at all levels and the number of culture-related projects¹¹⁹ that have blossomed across the U.S. within the last decade, one result appeared rather unexpectedly. Indeed, teachers disagreed ($M = 2.38$) with the following statement: "What I enjoy the most is teaching anything that has to do with culture" (see item 8). When examining the four institutions individually, I found a few differences. Institution A appears in neutral position ($M = 2.5$), Institutions C and D are in disagreement with the statement ($M = 2.10$, $M = 2.25$) but teachers in University B agree with it ($M = 2.67$). However for a variety of reasons, it is too early to conclude that there is a gap between the practitioners in Institutions A, C, and D and the teachers in University B. Nevertheless, it seems that based on the average of the means of the four BLPs, there is reluctance on the part of the teachers to teach culture in general.

In Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation, I cited studies (e.g., Graden, 1996) about practitioners who put inappropriate teaching materials at the top of their list of constraints that hinder them from implementing their beliefs about CLT in the FL classroom. In that respect, it should not be so surprising to find that teachers were largely in agreement with items 7 ($M = 3.06$) and 6 ($M = 2.81$) indicating that they often search for text and images to *add* information or to *replace* culture topics in the textbook they are currently using.

¹¹⁹ e.g., blogs, keypal project, webquests, table francophone, 'cultura' project, etc.

Consequently, item 4, relative to the cultural content of the textbook being very accurate, showed disagreement among teachers ($M = 2.30$), as well as item 3 stating that they rarely question the cultural content of the textbook ($M = 1.99$). A closer investigation of these results in the following chapter will be helpful in finding the reasons behind the teachers' very high agreement with item 5 ('I like to add personal anecdotes when I teach cultural topics from French textbooks'; $M = 3.42$).

It is also very interesting to note that item 1, relative to the usefulness of textbook reading passages to introduce cultural information about *France*, showed more agreement among teachers ($M = 2.66$) than item 2, concerning the usefulness of textbook reading passages for introducing cultural information about other *Francophone countries* ($M = 2.35$).

Finally, there seems to be a loss of wanting to teach culture with a big C over culture with a small c as teachers disagreed with both items 10 ($M = 20.03$) and 9 ($M = 2.01$). However, when teachers do teach culture with a big C, they mostly teach history (see item 25; $M = 3.21$), the educational system (see item 28, $M = 3.08$), music (see item 22, $M = 3.08$), cinema (see item 29, $M = 3.01$) and geography (see item 26, $M = 2.85$). They *do not* teach politics, literature or fine arts (see items 23, 24 & 27; $M < 2.5$). It should probably not be too surprising to find out that instructors also prefer to teach culture with a small c because they expressed no difficulty at all in teaching all the eleven topics mentioned in the survey (see negatively keyed items 11 to 21, $M < 2.5$).

TABLE 11. Teachers' means on the authenticity of the target culture (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				Tot. (N = 48)										
	A (n = 16)	B (n = 7)	C (n = 14)	D (n = 11)											
	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">SD</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">D</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">A</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">SA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">←</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">→</td> </tr> </table>				SD	D	A	SA	←	1	2	3	4	→	
SD	D	A	SA												
←	1	2	3	4	→										
Item 5. I like to add personal anecdotes when I teach cultural topics from French textbooks	3.53	3.50	3.40	3.25	3.42										
Item 25. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>History</i>	3.07	3.33	3.20	3.25	3.21										
Item 28. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH the <i>Education system</i>	3.20	3.50	2.90	2.75	3.08										
Item 22. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>Music</i>	3.40	3.17	3.00	2.75	3.08										
Item 7. I often search for text and images to ADD information on the culture topics in the textbook I am currently using	3.20	3.50	2.80	2.75	3.06										
Item 29. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>Cinema</i> (serious films such as politically engaged movies, historical films, etc.)	2.73	3.67	2.90	2.75	3.01										
Item 26. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>Geography</i>	2.93	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.85										
Item 6. I often need to search for text and images to REPLACE the culture topics in the textbook I am currently using	3.07	3.50	2.70	2.00	2.81										
Item 1. Reading passages in the textbook I am currently using are helpful to introduce cultural information about FRANCE	2.93	2.33	2.40	3.00	2.66										
Item 23. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>Politics</i>	2.53	2.67	2.40	2.25	2.46										
Item 8. What I enjoy the most is teaching anything that has to do with culture	2.50	2.67	2.10	2.25	2.38										
Item 2. Reading passages in the textbook I am currently using are helpful to introduce cultural information about other FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES	2.13	1.67	2.60	3.00	2.35										
Item 12. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>The relationship of the French to the media</i> (television, internet, press, etc.)	2.47	1.67	2.60	2.50	2.31										
Item 4. I found the cultural content of the textbook I am currently using very accurate	2.13	2.33	2.50	2.25	2.30										
Item 15. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Attitudes towards clothing</i>	2.13	2.00	2.60	2.50	2.30										
Item 24. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>Literature</i>	2.13	2.67	2.00	2.25	2.26										
Item 17. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>City life vs. rural life</i>	2.20	2.17	2.40	2.25	2.25										
Item 27. When I teach culture with a big C, I TEACH <i>Fine Arts</i>	2.47	2.33	2.40	1.75	2.24										
Item 20. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Hobbies of young French people</i>	2.27	1.83	2.60	2.00	2.17										
Item 19. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Racism/immigration</i>	2.13	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.15										
Item 16. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>The French and their health</i>	2.20	2.00	2.30	2.00	2.12										

Item 21. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Popular movies</i>	2.33	1.67	2.60	1.75	2.08
Item 18. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Friendship/love</i>	2.13	1.50	2.70	2.00	2.08
Item 10. I think we should teach culture with a big C (arts, literature, cinema, etc.) before we teach culture with a small c (daily life behaviors, how people think, etc.)	1.80	2.33	2.00	2.00	2.03
Item 9. Culture with a small c (daily life behaviors, how people think, etc.) is given too much importance in the textbook I am currently using	1.93	2.00	2.10	2.00	2.01
Item 3. I rarely question the cultural content of French textbooks	2.27	1.50	1.70	2.50	1.99
Item 11. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Student's life</i>	2.27	1.83	2.10	1.50	1.92
Item 13. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Family</i>	2.13	1.50	2.30	1.75	1.92
Item 14. When teaching culture with a small c, I find DIFFICULT to teach <i>Eating habits/food</i>	2.00	1.50	2.00	1.25	1.68

From the responses given to the two open-ended questions on the authenticity of the target culture in the teacher's survey, and after elimination of 12 outliers, a total of 64 statements¹²⁰ across the four BLPs were recorded in the qualitative data base¹²¹.

Three main categories (and a fourth one called 'Other') summarize the majority of teachers' responses to the item 'I rarely question the cultural content of French textbooks' (item 3, Table 11). The categories that emerged from the data are: 'It is too generalized / stereotyped'; 'It is too focused on France'; 'It is outdated'. The results are illustrated in Table 12. A few examples of comments¹²² are given under each category.

¹²⁰ 48 participants x 2 questions = 96 answers in theory; 96-12 outliers = 84 answers. However, a total of 20 teachers did not answer one of the two questions (or both). Hence 84 – 20 = 64 statements

¹²¹ Please note that I have decided to place all the comments in one table instead of categorizing them per institution similarly to my quantitative data, because of the scarcity of answers for specific BLPs at times.

¹²² I have refrained from correcting grammatical and syntactic mistakes.

TABLE 12. Teachers' comments about the cultural content of French textbooks

Item 3. I rarely question the cultural content of French textbooks	
I disagree because...	Percent of occurrence
<p>It is too <u>generalized</u> / <u>stereotyped</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "They often tokenize or omit aspects of French and francophone cultures" - "[...] they are sometimes simple facts that can't be verified or sometimes they are based on stereotypes" - "the cultural content can be so generic that it is either misleading or can increase stereotypes" - "[...] some of the cultural products presented in textbooks are somewhat superficial" - "[...] it tends to generalize both French and American cultures" - "often it presented in an overly generalized, 'folkloric' way" - "Because the cultural content is always very "cliché" [...]" - "[...] a very IDEALIZED and unrealistic picture of France [...]" - "[...] for me French culture is not limited to French cheese and wine [...]" - "It might not always be representative of real situations" 	51%
<p>It is too <u>focused on France</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[...] I feel that Deux mondes does not do a very good job of exploring ethnic communities within French society. Quebec is also very absent from this book and Francophone Africa is rarely mentioned" - "[...] fixated on the "Hexagon" " - "[...] too much on France and, within that, on Paris" - "I haven't spent enough time in France to feel like an expert of French culture [...]" - "after speaking to colleagues native from France, I realize some of the information is inaccurate [...]" 	30%
<p>It is <u>outdated</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I do question the cultural content a lot, because it is outdated [...]" - "it is dated" - "[...] I prefer using supplementary readings from the Internet [...]" - "It's not always up to date" 	14%
<p><u>Other</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I rarely question the cultural content of French textbooks because the french culture is so wide that only one individual textbook cannot include all that is applicable in it [...]" - "It is one person's view" - "[...] Sometimes too much of a focus on majority culture(s), male, middle-class." 	5%

Four main categories summarize most of the teachers' answers to the second open-ended question (item 10). They include: 'Small c culture is more relevant to the students'; 'Small c culture interests students more'; 'Culture with a big C should not be taught at the beginning level' and 'One culture should not be superior to another'. The

fifth category contains a variety of statements; it is called 'Other'. The results are illustrated in Table 13. Some examples of comments are given under each category.

TABLE 13. Teachers' comments about teaching culture with a big C before teaching culture with a small c

Item 10. I think we should teach culture with a big C before we teach culture with a small c	
I disagree because ...	Percent of occurrence
<p>Small c culture is more relevant to the students :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Culture like literature is abstract, thus it hinder any real communication and students perception of the language" - "students can probably identify better with culture with a small c [...]" - "[...] our students need what can be directly applicable to daily life and that they can put to use if they have the opportunity to visit a french-cultural setting" - "[small c culture] is what they can compare themselves to [...]" - "Small c culture is more immediately relevant to the students. Big C culture becomes relevant after they decide they are interested in the small c culture." - "they need to be able to compare their life and themselves with the other culture" - "The majority of students will not specialize in cultural studies and do not need and even do not have the time to focus on the arts, literature, cinema, and others." - "students find it [small c culture] more relevant" - "The courses we teach are only of general French and could better be focused on practical readily usable aspects the language" 	32%
<p>Small c culture interests students more:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "students are more interested in daily habits, etc. [...]" - "I feel that it [small c culture] is more interesting and engaging to the students" - "I think that everyday life is what interest students when they first learn the language [...]" - "what's most appealing to them [...]" - "students' interest" - "I believe that the small things are what matter more to a student [...]" - "[...] Students also find small c culture to be more interesting at times because it is often quite different than their own." 	28%
<p>Culture with a big C should not be taught at the beginning level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[...] it all depends on why someone is talking a foreign language and how much one would decide to pursue the learning of the specific foreign language" - "[...] at the beginner level, it's interesting to talk about it a bit, but the "small culture" should have a bigger spot I think" - "if students only take a few semesters of French, then they need to know [...], that is culture with a small c" - "Not to beginners... that depends on the level of proficiency and the goal of the course. If our aim is communication, then everyday life/culture has to be known since knowing a language is as much speaking as being aware of a country's cultural norms. Culture (big C) is very interesting and important and could be addressed (of course) with beginners, but what would be the point for communication? For them to acquire greater Knowledge" 	24%

(with a big K), fine, but 50 minutes 3 times a weeks...to 101 students, it may not be very wise.” - “[small c culture] is more important for elementary levels.” - “The big Culture should come later. If students continue studying French then they will be willing to learn about art, history...”	
One culture should not be <u>superior</u> to another: - “I think that we should not necessarily teach "Culture" before "culture" [...]” - “it is not a matter of hierarchy [...]” - “Giving more importance to Culture would mean that one culture is superior to another (elite vs. popular culture) which is not something I personally believe. it would also mean that knowing the names of writers and work of painters helps you behave in a foreign setting, which I know from experience is not exactly true.” - “It is as important as culture with a small c” - “No one should be put above the other. This dichotomy seems a bit outdated, though. I think that considering culture with the Standards framework: practices, products and perspectives is more fruitful. What is crucially missing in many language textbooks and classroom instruction are native informants perspectives on such practices and products: helping students understand the whys below the surface representations of culture.”	12%
Other: - “[...] Culture is also "lived" not just institutionalized.” - “I believe that Culture (arts, literature, and cinema) is a reflection of daily life behaviors and cultural impressions...”	4%

This qualitative data will be more carefully examined in parallel to the quantitative data in the next chapter of the present study in order to draw tentative conclusions on what the position of the teachers is in regard to the authenticity of the target culture in FL textbooks.

4.2.2.2 Students’ results

Students’ means on the ‘authenticity of the target culture’ in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 14. The means of students’ answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in order from strongest to weakest reaction from a group perspective in Table 15.

Based on the above qualitative data, specifically what teachers said about their L2 learners, it is not astonishing to find that students were mostly in agreement with item 1, stating “What I enjoy the most is learning anything that has to do with culture” (M = 3.08, Table 14). However, similarly to teachers, they disagreed with the item referring to learning culture with a big C before culture with a small c (see item 5, M = 1.97, Table 14). Hence, the items that received the weakest reactions concern the topics about culture with a big C (the percentages for most of the ‘Yes’ are in the 60s and low 70s— which is quite low compared to all the small c culture answers which fall in the 80s, see Table 15). The only topic of interest about culture with a big C, which is at the top of the students’ list, is *Music*¹²³ (see item 15, Table 15). Nevertheless, students expressed difficulty in being tested about *both* kinds of culture (see items 7, M = 2.56 and 6, M = 2.51, in Table 14). It will be interesting to examine in Chapter 5 whether the current textbook of the student (see Table 6) plays a role in students’ interest to learn more or less about the target culture.

It is also quite revealing to observe that students, contrary to teachers, agreed with not only the item indicating that textbook reading passages are useful to learn about France (item 3, M = 2.81, Table 4) but also with the item stating that they are useful to learn culture about other francophone countries (see item 3, M = 2.81, Table 14).

The only negative answer in Table 15 came with item 1. Indeed, it seems that a vast majority of students do not expose themselves to ‘authentic’ French culture by reading French newspapers, novels, websites, etc.

¹²³ Note that music could be considered both culture with a big C and culture with a small c

Item 2 (Table 15), regarding students' enjoyment when the teacher adds personal anecdotes, was agreed upon by virtually all students across the four institutions surveyed (Yes = 96.85%). This seems to go along with teachers' own ratings on the same question. What does not match instructors' perception, though, is students' trust of the cultural content of their textbook (see item 3 in Table 15). This particular issue and the previously mentioned results will be further investigated in Chapter 5.

TABLE 14. Students' means on the authenticity of the target culture (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				Tot. (N = 1023)							
	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td>SD</td> <td>D</td> <td>A</td> <td>SA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>← 1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4 →</td> </tr> </table>	SD	D	A		SA	← 1	2	3	4 →	A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)
SD	D	A	SA									
← 1	2	3	4 →									
Item 1. What I enjoy the most is learning anything that has to do with culture		3.16	3.20	3.14	2.85	3.08						
Item 2. Reading passages in my textbook are helpful to learn about FRENCH culture		3.10	3.10	2.96	3.08	3.06						
Item 3. Reading passages in my textbook are helpful to learn about the culture of OTHER FRANCOPHONE countries than France		2.92	2.88	2.54	2.92	2.81						
Item 7. Being tested about culture with a big C is difficult		2.50	2.50	2.48	2.77	2.56						
Item 6. Being tested about culture with a small c is difficult		2.49	2.49	2.44	2.62	2.51						
Item 4. Culture is given too much importance in my textbook		2.08	2.04	1.92	1.92	1.99						
Item 5. We should learn culture with a big C (arts, literature, cinema, etc.) before we learn culture with a small c (daily life behaviors, how people think, etc.)		2.08	1.96	1.86	2.00	1.97						

TABLE 15. Students' mean percentages on the authenticity of the target culture (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Question	A (n = 422)		B (n = 112)		C (n = 302)		D (n = 187)		Total (N = 1023)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 2. I like when my teacher adds personal anecdotes when s/he teaches cultural topics from the textbook	96.3 %	3.7 %	94.1 %	5.9 %	98.4 %	1.6%	98.6 %	1.4%	96.85 %	3.15 %
Item 4. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>Student's life</i>	90.5 %	9.5 %	90.2 %	9.8 %	93.9 %	6.1 %	98.9 %	1.1%	93.37 %	6.63 %
Item 11. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>Friendship/love</i>	89.4 %	10.6 %	98%	2%	92.7 %	7.3 %	92.3 %	7.7%	93.1 %	6.9%
Item 6. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>Family</i>	89.9 %	10.1 %	96.1 %	3.9 %	84.3 %	15.7 %	97.8 %	2.2%	92.03 %	7.97 %
Item 13. What interests me in learning culture with a small c are <i>Hobbies of young French people</i>	87.8 %	12.2 %	96.1 %	3.9 %	87.8 %	12.2 %	91.4 %	8.6%	90.78 %	9.22 %
Item 7. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>Eating habits/food</i>	87.8 %	12.2 %	94.1 %	5.9 %	82%	18%	98 %	2%	90.48 %	9.52 %
Item 15. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>Music</i>	93.7 %	6.3 %	78.4 %	21.6 %	89.9 %	10.1 %	84.6 %	15.4 %	86.65 %	13.35 %
Item 10. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>City life vs. rural life</i>	83.1 %	16.9 %	90.2 %	9.8 %	74.3 %	25.7 %	84.6 %	15.4 %	83.05 %	16.95 %
Item 12. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>Racism/immigration</i>	76.2 %	23.8 %	86.3 %	13.7 %	76.1 %	23.9 %	92.3 %	7.7%	82.73 %	17.27 %

	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 8. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>Attitudes towards clothing</i>	85.7 %	14.3 %	88.2 %	11.8 %	77.9 %	22.1 %	76.9 %	23.1 %	82.18 %	17.82 %
Item 3. I trust the cultural content of my French textbook	80.4 %	19.6 %	86.3 %	13.7 %	76.1 %	23.9 %	84.6 %	15.4 %	81.85 %	18.15 %
Item 21. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is the <i>Education system</i>	80.4 %	19.6 %	68.6 %	31.4 %	84.4 %	15.6 %	83.2 %	16.8 %	79.15 %	20.85 %
Item 14. What interests me in learning culture with a small c are <i>Popular movies</i>	83.1 %	16.9 %	78.4 %	21.6 %	78.2 %	21.8 %	76.9 %	23.1 %	79.15 %	20.85 %
Item 5. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>The relationship of the French to the media (television, internet, press, etc.)</i>	81.5 %	18.5 %	72.5 %	27.5 %	84.3 %	15.7 %	76.9 %	23.1 %	78.8 %	21.2 %
Item 22. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>Cinema (i.e., serious films such as politically engaged movies, historical films, etc)</i>	84.7 %	15.3 %	74.5 %	25.5 %	66.6 %	33.4 %	74.1 %	25.9 %	74.98 %	25.02 %
Item 9. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is <i>The French and their health</i>	75.7 %	24.3 %	78.4 %	21.6 %	64.4 %	35.6 %	69.2 %	30.8 %	71.92 %	28.08 %
Item 1. In my spare time, I read in French (e.g., internet, WWW, newspaper, novels, etc)	32.3 %	67.7 %	35.3 %	64.7 %	22.2 %	77.8 %	23.1 %	76.9 %	28.22 %	71.78 %
Item 16. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>Fine Arts</i>	85.2 %	14.8 %	78.4 %	21.6 %	57.6 %	42.4 %	61.5 %	38.5 %	70.67 %	29.33 %

	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 18. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>History</i>	76.2 %	23.8 %	66.7 %	33.3 %	68.5 %	31.5 %	69.2 %	30.8 %	70.15 %	29.85 %
Item 20. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>Politics</i>	63.5 %	36.5 %	66.7 %	33.3 %	72.1 %	27.9 %	76.9 %	23.1 %	69.80 %	30.20 %
Item 19. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>Geography</i>	59.8 %	40.2 %	68.6 %	31.4 %	64.7 %	35.3 %	84.6 %	15.4 %	69.43 %	30.57 %
Item 17. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is <i>Literature</i>	72%	28%	72.5 %	27.5 %	60.6 %	39.4 %	69.2 %	30.8 %	68.58 %	31.42 %

From the responses to the single open-ended question posed to students on the authenticity of the target culture, and after elimination of 99 outliers, a total of 603 responses¹²⁴ across the four universities were recorded in the qualitative data base¹²⁵.

Nine main categories summarize the majority of students' responses to item 3, while three smaller categories each contain less than 2% of the total number of answers, so these final three categories were put together under 'Other'. The nine main categories that emerged from the data in reaction to "I trust the cultural content of my French textbook because..." are: 'My teacher confirms the information in it'; 'I don't know if it would be incorrect anyway'; 'It has been published'; 'It was chosen by the department/my teacher'; 'The people who wrote it are experts'; 'It is recent'; 'It seems right'; 'Why should I not trust it?'; 'It correlates with what I heard from native French

¹²⁴ 321 comment sections were missing left blank

¹²⁵ For the sake of consistency, I have decided to place all the comments in one table instead of categorizing them per institution

speakers' and Other. Students' comments are illustrated in Table 16. A few examples¹²⁶ are given under each category.

TABLE 16. Students' comments about the cultural content of their French textbook

Item 3. I trust the cultural content of my French textbook	
I agree because...	Percent of occurrence
<p>My teacher <u>confirms</u> the information in it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "My teacher has related his own experiences along with explaining the cultural texts in the book" - "My French teacher is from Paris, and deems it to be accurate." - "my professor agrees with it sometimes." - "my teacher seems to say that the book knows their stuff considering she is from France." - "Her anecdotes are amusing and it is helpful to hear stories in French to improve listening skills. I believe that the cultural content in my textbook is valid because my teacher is French and will tell stories that relate to that content." - "[...] my teacher often comments on it or adds to it" - "[...] our teacher provides information to follow up the culture in the book." - "my teacher went there to study and can add to them or put her own experiences. [...]" - "My teacher has spent time in France and can verify most of the cultural information" - "[...] My teacher lived in a francophone country and has real accounts of the culture, its not only more interesting but feels more like life." - "[...] my teacher seems to think its right so it must be!" - "It usually matches up with some of the things my teacher tells us." - "my teacher has been to France and tells us stories which relate to the cultural content." - "My teacher can back it up because she is from France and understands the culture." 	21%
<p>I don't know if it would be incorrect anyway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "What else do I have? My first french teacher was Chinese and had not been to France. My second teacher was from Cameron and my french friends were upset--they said I would not learn proper french from her." - "It is really the only thing I base my knowledge from." - "I have no other basis on which to go off of. I trust the book to be true." - "what other opinion do I have?" - "know little of the french culture. So the majority of its culture i will learn from the book and teacher." - "Because I don't know where they are getting that from and who is interpreting that. [...]" - "it is reasonable and i don't know if it were to be incorrect anyway." - "i don't know enough about French to disagree" - "I have nothing else to relate it to." - "I have nothing to compare it to in order to disagree with it." - "Its the only resource I have to go by" - "there is little else I have to rely on" - "I don't really know any difference." 	17%

¹²⁶ I have refrained from correcting grammatical and syntactic mistakes

<p><u>It has been published:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “books can't lie. It's unheard of.” - “it's a textbook. It should have correct content.” - “its in a book [...]” - “They seem to be a valid source...how else would they be in print?” - “its a text book for a reason, if the cultural info was false it wouldnt be printed or chosen by the department. So I do believe the cultural topics.” - “its a text book, you expect accuracy.” - “I don't think they would lie about the French culture or any other subject.” - “it's proofread and someone will pick up the fact that it's wrong if it is indeed wrong.” - “it should.” - “its published in my book” - “I assume it has been verified by someone.” 	13%
<p><u>It was chosen by the department/my teacher:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “it is a published book that has been used repeatedly to teach French” - “I trust that my school would not give me cultural content that is inaccurate.” - “[...] That may seem ignorant but apparently the University trusts it so why shouldn't I?” - “because my professor uses it.” - “it is an educational tool” - “They should be a reliant source since they are the only source we have in the classroom.” - “there is a reason why my instructor chose to use this book.” - “[...] if the cultural info was false it wouldnt be printed or chosen by the department. - “It is what the teacher deems suitable for the class and we have been using it a lot” 	12.5%
<p><u>The people who wrote it are experts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “I figure it had to be read by multiple people who know the material well.” - “I assume French people have written the textbook and they know what is relevant” - “It would be pretty bad if the creators of my book didn't know what they were talking about.” - “Because it was written and published by professionals [...]” - “I believe that they know what they are talking about” - “I assume the writers know more about french culture than I do” - “I trust their research” - “They wouldn't get into so much detail over something if they were going to lie about it. It simply seems unlikely that it's made up.” - “it is written by professors and i just trust it.” - “It is the authors job to know the information” 	9%
<p><u>It is recent:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “it seems like a new text book” - “it is frequently updated with each edition” - “It mentions pretty modern concepts, such as that of the ghetto culture in France.” - “It seems current and relevant.” - “depending on the edition could determine if the information is up to date or not.” - “It seems relevant to recent events and does not seem outdated.” - “It has many pop culture references to recent movies [...]” 	7.5%
<p><u>It seems right:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “it seems legit” - “It seems like the book has good credentials” - “it seems reliable.” - “it seems logical and well researched.” 	7.5%

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “It seems realistic” - “it seems accurate” - “It makes sense” - “the book looks sincere” - “It seems fairly realistic and not too off-the-wall” - “it appears to be factual” 	
<p><u>Why should I not trust it?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “I have no reason not to” (x 14) - “I do not know why I wouldn't. I take it all with a grain of salt.” - “why shouldn't I trust it?” - “you either trust something or you dont. There is no why.” - “I can.” 	6.5%
<p><u>It correlates with what I heard from native French speakers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[...] because it follows the cultural aspects of life that I have heard of from people who have visited or lived in France.” - “I have many friends from francophone countries and some of the things that they talk about I have heard from my friends.” - “it correlates with the (French/European) news and what I experienced in France.” - “I have experienced most of them and I do know that they are truly evident there.” - “Most of it is very straight forward and simple statement. Some of the <i>colloquial uses</i> I don't know if I approve.” - “[...] their research and the cultural contents that are in my textbook are ones that I have experienced in a Francophone country, which was France.” - “[because] i have been to France and i know how it really is” 	4%
<p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “It was written a long time ago” - “[because] in every french textbook, they're always the same.” - “Each chapter includes thematic principles that are captivating and relate to a movie that we watch in class; the movie takes place in France with french speaking people. The french speaking people seem genuine and the images are representative of french culture.” 	2%

Once again, the above qualitative data will be more carefully examined in parallel to the quantitative data in Chapter 5 in order to draw tentative conclusions on what the position of the students is in regard to the authenticity of the target culture in FL textbooks.

4.2.3 Authenticity of the textbook tasks

4.2.3.1 Teachers' results

All the teachers' results on the authenticity of the textbook tasks in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 17. The means of their answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in Table 18 (ranked from strongest to weakest reaction).

According to the surveyed teachers, FL textbooks contain a majority of communicative activities (see item 4, $M = 2.58$, Table 17); they cover the most important tasks students need to know (see item 5, $M = 2.61$, Table 17) and are thus relevant (see item 1, $M = 2.64$, Table 17).

In a CLT context, where the emphasis is placed on the benefits of using tasks that mirror real-life situations in the target country, one striking result was found in response to item 6 (Table 17). Indeed this item, which was most strongly agreed upon by teachers ($M = 3.11$), states that it is more important for a textbook to include activities that engage learners even though they may not be what students encounter in real-life *than* to include activities that reflect life in a francophone country but may not motivate students very much. Along this line, teachers disagreed with item 2, relative to the textbook containing engaging content for students ($M = 2.31$, Table 17) while indicating that the activities present in the textbook mirror real-life situations in the target country (see item 3, $M = 2.54$, Table 17).

Finally, two other surprising results were also found with teachers' answers to items 7 and 8 (see Table 18). Teachers are satisfied not with the textbook *written*

activities but with its *oral* activities. In fact, as many as 65% agree that their textbook provides appropriate oral activities. The question is whether the 60% who believe that the textbook written activities are inappropriate think so because of the above-mentioned results (e.g., item 2, content is not engaging for students). The follow-up qualitative data obtained from teachers on items 7 and 8 will help us better understand these results.

TABLE 17. Teachers' means on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				Tot. (N = 48)
	SD (n = 16)	D (n = 7)	A (n = 14)	D (n = 11)	
Item 6. It is more important for a textbook to include activities that engage learners even though they may not be what students encounter in real-life (e.g., fill in the blanks of the lyrics of a song) THAN to include activities that reflect life in a francophone country but may not motivate students very much (e.g., ask for directions)	2.87	2.71	3.50	3.36	3.11
Item 1. The textbook I am currently using presents content that is RELEVANT for students	2.87	2.50	2.70	2.50	2.64
Item 5. The textbook activities cover the most important tasks students need to know	2.67	2.17	3.10	2.50	2.61
Item 4. This textbook contains a majority of communicative activities — Activities designed around a realistic situation and for which there is a meaningful reason for the students to exchange information (e.g., information transfer, information gap, problem solving, role-playing activities, etc.)	2.60	2.17	2.80	2.75	2.58
Item 3. The activities proposed by the textbook I am currently using mirror real-life situations in a Francophone country	2.50	2.50	2.40	2.75	2.54
Item 2. The textbook I am currently using presents content that is ENGAGING for students	2.27	2.33	2.40	2.25	2.31

TABLE 18. Teachers' mean percentages on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Survey item	A (n = 16)		B (n = 7)		C (n = 14)		D (n = 11)		Total (N = 48)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 8. My current textbook provides appropriate ORAL activities	73.3 %	26.7 %	57.14 %	42.86 %	50%	50%	81.81 %	18.19 %	65.56 %	34.44 %
Item 7. My current textbook provides appropriate WRITTEN activities	43.75 %	56.25 %	33.3 %	66.7 %	35.71 %	64.29 %	45.45 %	54.55 %	39.55 %	60.45 %

A total of 52 statements¹²⁷ were transferred in my qualitative data computer file based on the teachers' answers to 'my current textbook provides appropriate/ inappropriate *written* activities because...' (Item 7, Table 18) and 'my current textbook provides appropriate/ inappropriate *oral* activities because...' (Item 8, Table 18) and after elimination of eight outliers.

Four main categories (and a fifth one called 'Other') summarize the majority of teachers' responses to item 7. The categories that emerged from the data are: 'Not enough written activities', 'Written activities do not engage students', 'They are not meaningful', 'I have to supply the written activities'. The results are illustrated in Table 19. A few examples of comments are given under each category.

¹²⁷ 36 comment sections (out of 96) were left blank

TABLE 19. Teachers' comments about WRITTEN activities

Item 7. My current textbook provides appropriate WRITTEN activities because...	
I find them inappropriate because...	Percent of occurrence
<p><u>Not enough written activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "there is such a communicative emphasis that we have to supply the written activities ourselves." - "[...] not enough writing activities [...]" - "there are lots of oral activities" - "Most of the written activities are found in the workbook, where they are frequently lost." - "There could be more" - "It is important to have more writtten activities [...]" - "[...] the textbook is somewhat lacking in this respect." - "I do wish that there were more emphasis on written activities in this book, however." - "[most of the textbook activities] require students to USE what they're learning in class [...]" 	34%
<p><u>Written activities do not engage students:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[...] they are boring" - "[...] students don't find them interesting; they don't know what to write about. And very often they don't match what we have been doing during the chapter." - "I have been very unsatisfied with the written activities in Deux mondes because, quite frankly, they lack any originality. They are often boring and do not take up the content of the chapter in creative ways." - "The activities are not framed in a way so as to interest the students." - "[...] they are of no interest to my students." - "[...] they force students to practice [...]" 	26%
<p><u>They are not meaningful:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Débuts has some written activities, and they are in context with what is being studied, but they really don't seem to be that meaningful." - "They are not meaningful." - "they are somewhat artificial" - "they are usually pretty mechanical and focused only on vocabulary or only on grammar. Rarely do they combine the two in a way that causes the student to create and exchange a real message." 	17%
<p><u>I have to supply the written activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[...] Most of the time I creat my own writing activities." - "I do not use the written activities in the book. Our department faculty work jointly to come up with written assignments and we use electronic media as well." - "I always have to supply these." - "I prefer to give written activities outside of the textbook" 	16%
<p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "they don't reflect today's life in France or in Francophone countries" - "they are not very well written" 	7%

Three major categories (and a fourth one called ‘Other’) outline most of the teachers’ reactions to ‘My current textbook provides appropriate/inappropriate *oral* activities because...’ (Item 8, Table 18). These categories include ‘There are many oral activities’, ‘They are meaningful’ and ‘They engage students’. The corresponding qualitative data is presented in Table 20 with some quotes.

TABLE 20. Teachers’ comments about ORAL activities

Item 8. My current textbook provides appropriate/inappropriate ORAL activities because...	
I find them appropriate because...	Percent of occurrence
<p>There are <u>many</u> oral activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “There are enough oral activities in the textbook” - “[...] many oral activities” - “there are many opportunities [...]” - “[that’s what] it is all about” - “the text contains plenty of oral activities” - “Each grammatical structure and vocabulary review section in Début features at least one oral activity.” 	29%
<p>They are <u>meaningful</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[...] oral activities that are in context and meaningful.” - “it’s Communicative.” - “There are dialogues [...]” - “the students are encouraged to discuss the answers with their peers and practice using the language in a meaningful way.” 	28%
<p>They <u>engage</u> students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “stimulating and diverse” - “engaging, communicative [...]” - “on topics students can relate to.” - “Engaging” 	26%
<p><u>Other</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Yes, it is a largely communicative model-oriented book and I use it mainly for small oral activities although I cannot say I like the majority of them. Still, the students purchased the book and I make a point to use it.” - “Practice of main vocab and grammar targeted.” 	17%

It is quite astonishing to notice that the above categories are in complete opposition with the preceding ones (e.g., ‘They are not meaningful’ vs. ‘They are meaningful’). Furthermore, they are almost in the same rank order. Did the fact that the questions were asked one after another played a role in these parallel answers by the teachers? This deserves further analysis in Chapter 5.

4.2.3.2 Students’ results

Students’ means on the ‘authenticity of the textbook tasks’ in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 21. The means of students’ answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in order from strongest to weakest reaction from a group perspective in Table 22.

From a wide angle lens, learners seem to show a very positive attitude towards textbook tasks since they are in agreement with all seven items from the students’ questionnaire on that specific topic. ‘Being engaged’ is a recurring theme, as students too think that it is more important for a textbook to include activities that *engage* them even though they may not be what they encounter in real-life than to include activities that reflect life in a francophone country but may not interest them very much (see item 5, $M = 2.97$, Table 21). However they still rate item 2, relative to the textbook presenting content that is engaging to them, rather high ($M = 2.85$, Table 21).

Finally, it is very interesting to observe, especially after having partially analyzed teachers’ open-ended answers on the same topic, that a large majority of learners (81%)

believes that their textbook provides appropriate *written* activities (see item 6 in Table 22). Fewer students agree that the *oral* activities are appropriate although the proportion is still fairly high (see item 7, Table 22). Now, it will be helpful to examine the qualitative data from the students to find out what they mean by *appropriate* written and oral activities.

TABLE 21. Students' means on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (Likert scale)

Question	Institution				A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)	C (n = 302)	D (n = 187)	Tot. (N = 1023)
	SD ← 1	D 2	A 3	SA → 4					
Item 1. My textbook presents content that is relevant to me					2.98	3.16	2.98	3.08	3.05
Item 5. It is more important for a textbook to include activities that ENGAGE ME even though they may not be what I may encounter in real-life (e.g., fill in the blanks of the lyrics of a song) THAN to include activities that REFLECT life in a francophone country but MAY NOT INTEREST ME very much (e.g., ask for directions)					3.10	2.83	3.06	2.91	2.97
Item 3. My textbook contains a majority of communicative activities — Activities designed around a realistic situation and for which there is a meaningful reason to exchange information (e.g., role-playing, information gap activities, problem solving, etc)					2.98	3.04	2.86	3.00	2.97
Item 4. The activities in my textbook cover the most important tasks I need to know					2.77	2.96	2.82	3.00	2.89
Item 2. My textbook presents content that is engaging to me					2.79	2.90	2.78	2.92	2.85

TABLE 22. Students' mean percentages on the authenticity of the textbook tasks (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Question	A (n = 422)		B (n = 112)		C (n = 302)		D (n = 187)		Total (N = 1023)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 6. My current textbook provides appropriate WRITTEN activities	82.5%	17.5%	86.3%	13.7%	78%	22%	76.9%	23.1%	80.92%	19.08%
Item 7. My current textbook provides appropriate ORAL activities	64.6%	35.4%	78.4%	21.6%	50%	50%	69.2%	30.8%	65.55%	34.45%

Based on the students' responses to the two open-ended questions on the authenticity of the textbook tasks, and after elimination of 89 outliers, a total of 1021 open-ended answers¹²⁸ across the four universities were recorded.

Six main categories could be drawn from the majority of students' responses to item 6, while four smaller categories contain each less than 3% of the total number of answers, so these final four categories were summed up as 'Other'. The six main categories that emerged from the data in reaction to "My current textbook provides appropriate *written* activities" are: [they] 'expand grammatical and vocabulary knowledge', 'reflect what is learned in class', 'deal with real-life situations, 'are helpful', 'give good practice', and 'are meaningful'. The themes based on the students' answers are illustrated in Table 23 with a few examples for each category.

¹²⁸ 936 answers were missing (students left the comment section blank)

TABLE 23. Students' comments about WRITTEN activities

Item 6. My current textbook provides appropriate WRITTEN activities because...	
I find them appropriate because they...	Percent of occurrence
<p>expand <u>grammatical and vocabulary</u> knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "they cover important material i need to know; such as, tenses and vocabulary" - "they require you to correctly conjugate the sentence in a specific way." - "they let us learn different vocabulary while learning how to use it in a sentence / conversation" - "they help me to learn how to write in french in relation to the activities in which I am learning." - "These acitivities teach you how to form sentences." - "There are a lot of activities in each chapter that help with writing verbs and using vocabulary" - "They work well to help learn the given verbs or tenses [...]" - "Yes i feel as if they help me learn the grammar." - "they teach the skills needed for formal writing conjugations and stuff" - "incorporate new grammar while also being generally helpful with learning important vocabulary" - "They cover important grammer concepts." - "They help me to understand the verb conjugations and also how to structure the sentences so that I can speak them as well" - "they allow us to use rthe grammar we are learning effectively and in the correct context..." - "it asks us to conjugate and write a sentence completely." - "they use the grammar in the lesson and require us to use it t answer the questions" - "they expand grammatical knowledge." - "They help me improve my written grammar as well as absorb new vocabulary." - "They are good drills for learning vocab and grammar rules." - "There are multiple practice activities for each grammatical point made by the textbook." - "allow us to practice conjugating verbs for all the different subjects (je, tu.. etc.). They also provide context- like when to use new vocab- like in chapter 6, when we learned idiomatic reflexive verbs" 	21.5%
<p>reflect <u>what is learned</u> in class:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the ones we did pertained to what we were leraning in class [...]" - "they involve the topic we are going over at the time" - "they are relevant to the lesson and they are relevant to what might happen and things you might have to say." - "They cover the topics we are dicussing in class" - "they always have to do with the lesson being taught" - "they correspond to class and the current lesson." - "they apply to what were learning at a certain time" - "They are relevant to the subject matter being discussed in the chapter" - "They are exercises that really support what we are learning." - "They all fit the theme of the chapter [...]" - "they have to do with what we're learning about" - "they coincide with the lessons being taught" 	19.5%

<p>deal with real-life situations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “They pertain to what it would be like in a French spoken country.” - “they include true to life activities” - “They are about common, everyday things that my come up in life.” - “It makes me think about what i could say if i visited a french speaking country.” - “you think about real life situations” - “they are based on current happenings in France and Europe, however it is open enough to allow for discussion with even more current events presented in European news.” - “They refer to realistic situations.” - “They will help me if i ever decide to study in France” - “they apply to real-world scenarios” - “gives you examples to learn the technique and proper usage of the language” - “[...] useful for REAL everyday French” - “they relate to real life situations in a francophone country and how you could be encountered in certain social settings.” - “they bring up real life situations and allow me utilize the information I learn” 	16%
<p>are helpful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “they help me understand the lesson better.” - “They help practice the lessons” - “They help clarify the topic we are learning” - “it helps you to memorize the content” - “helps me learn, gets me active and understanding” - “The examples given in the book help with the writing process.” - “they help with all aspects including: vocab, language, and culture.” - “they help me with writing skills” - “they help me to apply what is learned and help me to fully understand the content” - “They assist in the improvement of written French.” - “They help me undersand the french culture” - “they help me to understand the material” 	13.5%
<p>give good practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “They make you practice” (x9) - “The written activities give practice in basic French.” - “stress practicing certain skills” - “They provide alot of practice to helping me achieve a good grade on the test.” - “They give me practice with the skills a need to know to learn the french language” - “The written activites provide practice for the structures.” - “they encourage practice and proper application of the material in order for the students to learn effectively” - “provide good practice for the lessons” - “the exercises in the blue pages of the text allow me to practice what I am learning” 	12.5%
<p>are meaningful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “they force you to “think” about the answer, and not just plugging in a vocabulary word.” - “they allow you to engage with another person in the same position as yourself [...]” - “They require thought.” - “You actually need to apply newly learned knowledge to the written assignments in order to get the correct answers.” - “They are useful and sometimes they are challenging.” - “They make me really think through how I need to write a certain written exercise. Once i get thinking, my overall speaking and comprehension abilities improve.” - “The activities are appropriate within the Deux Monde textbook because it requires you to use logic to often figure out the context. This is helpful because it prevents students from translating word for word.” 	11%

<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “There are a lot of writing activities” - “Yes. As they say in Russian, "Repetition is the mother of all learning."” - “The activities are good for in class work as well as homework. They make the process of learning French streamlined for both the teachers and the students.” - “they are fun and interesting” 	6%
---	-----------

Most of students’ responses to item 7 could be reduced to four major categories (plus a fifth one called ‘Other’). These categories that resulted from the statement: “My current textbook provides appropriate ORAL activities because...” are: [they] ‘are made to be communicative’, ‘are relevant’, ‘improve oral skills’ and ‘reflect what is learned in class’. The results are presented in Table 24 with a sample of students’ quotes per category.

TABLE 24. Students' comments about ORAL activities

Item 7. My current textbook provides appropriate ORAL activities because...	
I find them appropriate because they...	Percent of occurrence
<p>are made to be <u>communicative</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Yes, because they are developed for interactions between persons." - "expect 2 students to talk together" - "There are many partner/ group activities" - "They are practice for speaking" - "they involve the whole class" - "it has many oral examples to practice from" - "There are interactive speaking activities" - "They are often between two people" - "Good group activity prompts" - "It involves the classmates to interact with their peers and teacher" 	38%
<p>are <u>relevant</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "they go along (for the most part) with things that have to do with my life." - "they encourage us to speak with a partner about relevant info" - "They are about things that are helpful to know [...]" - "they are relevant and challenging." - "you think about real life situations" - "they prepare me for possible French conversations" - "the topics are commonly talked about." - "they present real life situations and help me practice appropriate conversational french" - "most are opinionated and therefore relevant to me." - "They cover important living activities and let the student give his/her opinion." - "They are effective and useful." - "we get to practice speaking to our classmates about our opinions and experiences that are relevant to our every day life." 	24%
<p><u>improve oral skills</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "[...] help me develop my french accent" - "they heighten my oral ability" - "They help with pronouncing words" - "Good practicing speaking" - "they give us a chance to learn to pronounce words" - "They help me develop the skills I need to effectively communicate" - "i learn how to speak well" - "I use correct pronunciation" - "they are great practice" - "They are great ways for me to practice my spoken French and be corrected by the teacher for mispronunciations." - "they develop your understanding of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation" 	24%
<p>reflect <u>what is learned in class</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "they go over certain material that we have already discussed in class" - "they are relevant to the writing activities that are being done at the same time." - "they coincide with the lessons being taught" - "they require using the language techniques we are learning in class." 	10%

Other: - “It provides different topics to discuss about.” - “they expand grammatical knowledge.”	4%
---	-----------

4.3 Research question # 2

The survey was also designed to address the role of grammar instruction in FL textbooks. Similarly to the previous results for the first research question, teachers and students’ answers about grammar will be treated in two separate sections.

4.3.1 Teachers’ results

All teachers’ means on the role of grammar in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 25.

Even though teachers disagree that grammar is given too much importance in FL textbooks (item 22, $M = 2.28$),¹²⁹ and that they are overflowing with unnecessary grammatical terminology (item 15, $M = 2.45$), they do not believe that grammar is the central focus of teaching French (item 1, $M = 2.02$) (as one could assume based on these two items alone). In addition, item 3 (‘I like teaching grammar’) shows disagreement by practitioners ($M = 2.27$). Given these two results (items 1 & 3), it could be interpreted that teacher’s agreement with item 5 (‘Students improve their French most rapidly if they practice the grammar’) suggests that students should take responsibility for their learning process and practice on their own—in other words, outside of class.

¹²⁹ despite the fact that SLA research has shown that most of today’s language teaching materials still emphasize form

The level of the L2 learners seems to play a role in when and how students should learn grammar. For instance, there is (moderate) agreement on item 10 stating that learners need to have sufficient vocabulary knowledge to understand grammatical rules (M = 2.56) but this does not mean that the place of grammar is with intermediate learners and up (see item 11, M = 2.10, Table 25). Consequently, teachers disagreed with the negatively worded item that beginning students *do not* need grammar to communicate (see item 9, M = 2.06, Table 25). Furthermore, the language in which formal instruction is delivered seems to play an important role for teachers since they (moderately) agreed with item 13 ('Grammar explanations in *intermediate* textbooks should be in French', M = 2.53) but disagreed with item 12 ('Grammar explanations in *elementary* textbooks should be in French', M = 2.04).

The lack of consistency in textbook activity types exemplified by numerous SLA experts (e.g., presence of mechanical drills alongside communicative activities) seems to reflect on teachers' perceptions as well, since they agree that their textbook processes input (item 21), encourages learners to make form-meaning connections (item 20) and draw students' attention to the form in context (item 8). However, at the same time, they also agree that it contains mechanical drills (item 6) and non-meaningful activities (item 18). All this being said, it appears that teachers emphasize context the most when dealing with grammar (item 17, M = 3.25).

The qualitative data obtained from the practitioners on the treatment of grammar should help us refine these results and maybe clarify some unknowns.

TABLE 25. Teachers' means on grammar instruction in FL textbooks (Likert scale)

Item survey	Institution				Tot. (N = 48)
	SD ← 1	D 2	A 3	SA → 4	
Item 17. In textbooks, the grammatical structure should first appear in context and then be followed by its grammatical explanation	3.27	3.50	3.00	3.25	3.25
Item 7. The organization of the grammar rules in the French textbook I am currently using DOES NOT ensure students' readiness to acquire new grammatical features (i.e., some rules should be presented before others so that students do not get lost)	2.73	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.81
Item 23. This textbook recycles grammatical rules (i.e., students can reuse what they learned in following chapters)	2.73	2.83	3.10	2.50	2.79
Item 21. The textbook I am currently using processes input (i.e., it teaches only one thing at a time + it has activities that are meaningful + it requires students to do something with the grammatical item + it moves from sentences to connected discourse)	2.67	2.50	2.80	2.75	2.68
Item 6. The textbook I am currently using contains mechanical drills (i.e., activities in which there is a complete CONTROL of the response, and ONLY ONE answer is possible. Also learners do not really need to understand what is being said to complete the activity)	2.67	2.83	2.40	2.75	2.66
Item 5. Students improve their French most rapidly if they practice the grammar	2.60	2.33	2.60	3.00	2.63
Item 16. The textbook I am currently using presents grammar in a gradual manner (i.e., logical progression of the rules)	2.73	2.83	2.80	2.25	2.65
Item 20. The textbook I am currently using has a majority of activities that encourage learners to make form-meaning connections (i.e., understand a grammatical concept through a meaningful context)	2.60	2.33	2.80	2.75	2.62
Item 14. Awareness is more important than performance (i.e., French textbooks should aim at making students aware of important grammatical concepts instead of expecting accuracy from the students)	2.87	2.50	2.80	2.25	2.60
Item 19. The textbook I am currently using focuses on areas of grammar known to cause problems to French learners	2.40	2.83	2.30	2.75	2.57
Item 10. Learners need to have sufficient vocabulary knowledge to understand the grammatical rules	2.67	2.33	2.50	2.75	2.56
Item 13. Grammar explanations in INTERMEDIATE textbooks should be in French	2.60	2.17	2.60	2.75	2.53
Item 15. French textbooks are overflowing with unnecessary grammatical terminology (i.e., the wording of the rules is too complicated and there are too many unnecessary rules)	2.57	2.52	2.30	2.41	2.45

Item 24. Grammar pages should be at the end of each chapter (rather than throughout the chapter)	2.33	2.50	2.80	2.00	2.41
Item 2. Grammar teaching consists of giving explicit rules	2.27	2.33	2.30	2.50	2.35
Item 8. The textbook I am currently using DOES NOT HIGHLIGHT the grammatical items (via italics, bold characters, multiple repetitions,...) WELL ENOUGH for learners to notice them	2.33	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.33
Item 18. The textbook I am currently using includes activities that challenge students by involving them intellectually	2.60	2.33	2.40	2.00	2.33
Item 22. Grammar is given too much importance in the textbook I am currently using	2.51	2.52	2.10	2.00	2.28
Item 3. I like teaching grammar	2.13	2.50	2.20	2.25	2.27
Item 4. French textbooks should more extensively treat the use of double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je LE LUI ai déjà donné)	2.13	2.00	2.20	2.25	2.14
Item 11. The place of grammar is with intermediate learners and higher	2.33	1.83	2.00	2.25	2.10
Item 9. Beginning students DO NOT NEED grammar to communicate (they use chunks of words and formulaic speech)	2.27	1.67	2.30	2.00	2.06
Item 12. Grammar explanations in ELEMENTARY textbooks should be in French	2.00	1.83	2.10	2.25	2.04
Item 1. Grammar is the central focus of teaching French	1.93	1.83	2.10	2.25	2.02

From the teachers' open-ended responses to the single question posed within the grammar section, and after elimination of 2 outliers, a total of 28 statements¹³⁰ were transferred into the qualitative data computer file.

Two main categories summarize the majority of teachers' responses in favor of item 21. The categories that emerged from the data are 'it makes students learn gradually' and 'it uses meaningful input' (plus a third category called 'other'). The qualitative data is illustrated in Table 26. A few examples of comments are given under each category.

¹³⁰ 18 comment sections were left blank

TABLE 26. Teachers' comments about input processing

Item 21. The textbook I am currently using processes input	
I agree because...	Percent of occurrence
<p>it makes students learn <u>gradually</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Many activities aim at practicing the newly introduced grammatical structure, one at a time" - "Gradual information in a logical way. From words to expressions, to output." - "order of activities" - "it presents an idea then engages students in activities." - "it teaches grammatical points separately and gradually" - "There is definitely a progression in this textbook that I appreciate." - "Grammatical structures introduced gradually with recycling throughout the lesson (e.g. grammar embedded in vocabulary input, practiced with increasing focus on communication, reused in readings if we want to engage students in analytical thinking (i.e. identifying structure in reading context and articulating rationale behind its use)." - "Activities organized from mechanical to meaningful to communicative towards more personalized and creative use of French." - "[...] it evolves from "sentences to connected discourse"." 	63%
<p>it uses <u>meaningful</u> input:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I agree because grammar notions are first introduced through dialogues, and followed by activities in which the notion is expanded on. [...]" - "Connected discourse exist already" - "the activities are meaningful" 	27%
<p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "I agree because it follows the Natural Approach" - "This is a strength of Deux mondes" 	10%

4.3.2 Students' results

Students' means on the role of grammar instruction in FL textbooks in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 27.

In line with previous research on learners' beliefs about the role of grammar and error correction in the FL classroom (e.g., Schulz, 1996), I found that students were most in agreement with item 2, indicating that 'Grammar learning consists of *receiving explicit* rules' (M = 3.06). Consequently, it is not surprising to note that items 1 ('Grammar is the

central focus of learning French’) and 3 (‘I like learning about grammar’) also showed agreement by students ($M = 2.97$ & $M = 2.58$). What may be more intriguing, though, is that learners agreed with both items 24 (‘I would rather have/ I like to have grammar pages at the end of each chapter’) and 17 (‘In textbooks, the grammatical structure should first appear in context and then be followed by its grammatical explanation’) ($M = 2.89$ & $M = 2.74$).

Finally, it seems that the learners’ position on their interlanguage continuum plays a role in how they perceive the need for grammar to be introduced in the FL classroom. Indeed, students agreed with item 10 (‘I need to know enough vocabulary to understand the grammatical rules’; $M = 3.01$), disagreed with items 9 (‘At the beginning level, I *do not need* grammar to communicate; $M = 2.12$) and 12 (‘Grammar explanations in *elementary* textbooks should be in French’; $M = 2.08$), but (moderately) agreed with item 13 (Grammar explanations in *intermediate* textbooks should be in French; $M = 2.58$).

TABLE 27. Students’ means on grammar instruction in FL textbooks (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)	C (n = 302)	D (n = 187)	Tot. (N = 1023)
	SD ← 1	D 2	A 3	SA 4 →					
Item 2. Grammar learning consists of receiving explicit rules					3.10	3.19	3.06	2.91	3.06
Item 20. My textbook has a majority of activities that encourage me to understand a grammatical concept through a meaningful context (e.g., when the main character of my textbook says that 'Marie est belle', and that 'Paul est beau'; with this meaningful context I understand that in French adjectives can be feminine or masculine depending on the subject)					2.91	3.09	3.02	3.09	3.03
Item 10. I need to know enough vocabulary to understand the grammatical rules					3.10	3.00	3.02	2.91	3.01
Item 5. I improve my French most rapidly if I practice the grammar					2.95	3.15	2.90	3.00	3.00
Item 1. Grammar is the central focus of learning French					2.94	3.11	2.92	2.91	2.97

Item 4. French textbooks should more extensively treat the use of double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je LE LUI ai déjà donné)	2.87	3.00	2.76	3.00	2.90
Item 24. I would rather have/I like to have grammar pages at the end of each chapter	2.85	3.04	2.94	2.73	2.89
Item 16. My textbook presents grammar in a gradual manner (i.e., logical progression of the rules)	2.82	2.96	2.82	2.91	2.88
Item 23. My textbook recycles grammatical rules (i.e., I get to reuse what I have learned in following chapters)	2.78	2.89	2.84	2.91	2.85
Item 6. My textbook contains mechanical drills (i.e., activities in which there is a complete CONTROL of the response, and ONLY ONE answer is possible. Also I do not really need to understand what is being said to complete the activity)	2.83	2.87	2.78	2.91	2.85
Item 18. My textbook includes activities that challenge me by involving me intellectually	2.86	2.79	2.80	2.82	2.81
Item 21. My textbook processes input, which means that it teaches only one thing at a time + it has activities that are meaningful + it requires students to do something with the grammatical item + it moves from sentences to connected discourse	2.75	2.89	2.80	2.73	2.79
Item 19. My textbook focuses on areas of grammar known to cause problems to us, French learners	2.67	2.79	2.71	2.91	2.77
Item 17. In textbooks, the grammatical structure should first appear in context and then be followed by its grammatical explanation	2.80	2.83	2.61	2.73	2.74
Item 14. Awareness is more important than performance (i.e., French textbooks should aim at making me aware of important grammatical concepts instead of expecting me to be accurate)	2.70	2.74	2.69	2.82	2.73
Item 7. The organization of the grammar rules in my French textbook DOES NOT ensure that I am ready to acquire new grammatical features (i.e., some rules should be presented before others so that I do not get as easily lost)	2.87	2.72	2.53	2.82	2.73
Item 13. Grammar explanations in INTERMEDIATE textbooks should be in French	2.56	2.70	2.47	2.73	2.61
Item 3. I like learning about grammar	2.61	2.83	2.43	2.45	2.58
Item 11. The place of grammar is with intermediate learners and higher	2.39	2.47	2.45	2.45	2.44
Item 15. French textbooks are overflowing with unnecessary grammatical terminology (i.e., the wording of the rules is too complicated and there are too many unnecessary rules)	2.46	2.34	2.33	2.55	2.42
Item 8. My textbook DOES NOT HIGHLIGHT the grammatical items (via italics, bold characters, multiple repetitions,...) WELL ENOUGH for me to notice them	2.42	2.19	2.04	2.09	2.18
Item 22. Grammar is given too much importance in my textbook	2.13	2.02	2.18	2.27	2.15
Item 9. At the beginning level, I DO NOT NEED grammar to communicate (beginning students use chunks of words and formulaic speech)	2.12	2.09	2.02	2.27	2.12
Item 12. Grammar explanations in ELEMENTARY textbooks should be in French	2.00	2.02	1.94	2.36	2.08

From the answers given to the single open-ended question addressed to students on the role of grammar instruction in FL textbooks, and after elimination of 113 outliers¹³¹, a total of 511 responses across the four universities were recorded in the qualitative data base.

Three main categories summarize the majority of students' responses to item 21 ('My textbook processes input [it means that it teaches only one thing at a time + it has activities that are meaningful + it requires students to do something with the grammatical item + it moves from sentences to connected discourse] because...'), while two smaller categories each contain less than 3% of the total number of answers and were therefore put together under 'Other'. The three main categories that emerged from the data are: 'it follows a logical progression', 'it is meaningful/connected', 'it does not move too fast'. Students' comments are illustrated in Table 28. A few examples are given under each category.

TABLE 28. Students' comments about input processing

Item 21. My textbook processes input	
I agree because...	Percent of occurrence
<p>it follows a <u>logical progression</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Each chapter includes a series of things to learn." - "Nothing seems out of place or out of order." - "the textbook moves linearly" - "[...] It focuses on one thing, then moves to the next. It doesn't complicate anything." - "usually only one thing at a time is taught [...]" - "For the most part the textbook chapters follow a pretty logical progression" - "It does tend to teach things one at a time [...]" 	34%

¹³¹ Even though the question (related to item 21) was simplified after the piloting phases, it seems that it remained difficult for students to understand as 28 comments included statements such as "I don't really understand what this question is asking". Undoubtedly, it increased the number of outliers on top of the usual blank answers (n = 399)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “gradually teaches what one would need to know if visiting to living in France” - “It is well organized with many activities” - “Most of the material followed a logical progression” - “It gives us new rules one at a time and in order rather than just giving us tons of rules. By doing this, it is easier to understand the grammatical rules.” - “it only teaches one tense at a time and then gives you activities to practice that before you move onto the next one.” - “For the most part this is how the teaching occurs. One step at a time!” - “The textbook is very well organized in a way which makes everything very logical for me and helps me to learn more easily” - “It has the gradual progression that is described in the question.” - “the set up of chapters is logical and progressive” - “The blue pages in Deux Mondes do progress in this logical order all the way to connected discourse, although I am not sure that it does this last step as well as it could.” - “I agree because there are specific grammar points that seem to be in a logical fashion.” 	
<p><u>it does not move too fast</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “the textbook flows from one rule to the next without combining too much.” - “it did not go too fast and had a lot of practice available” - “[...] It doesn't move too fast, and chapters typically use words, sentence structures, and grammar that we have previously learned to keep us practicing.” - “their are many activities throughout the chapters but it has logic to what we are studying and does not move on too fast” - “The textbook moves smoothly between concept and application.” - “it gives you time to digest the learned information before moving onto the next material.” 	34%
<p><u>it is meaningful/connected:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “the text book really makes you think about the answer, but several times it goes over more than one thing at a time; however, the concepts are apprtiately relative” - “[...] requires students to use the grammar they have learned in increasingly complex ways. In that sense I suppose you could say the activities are meaningful, although they are very basic” - “[...] several things are connected and taught simultaneously.” - “they attempt to connect everything.” - “the information is presented together at one time” - “the textbook may teach more than one thing at a time, but the things taught are related.” - “it has meaningful activities and teaches a variety of subjects about the french language.” - “it has exercises relating to the material we just learned” - “Each chapter is focused on one thing and the next being connected to the previous” - “The textbook often focuses on one main item but sometimes will tie in other topics while teaching the first one.” 	27%
<p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “when the book teaches a new grammatcal lesson it starts off by just applying the concept, and it slowly starts to get harder forcing the student to think about the lesson so th he/she knows what to do.” - “the book presents a rule, explains it, gives exaplmes, and then offers exercises” - “This is the progression of each chapter: introduce concept with pictures- so we get the idea of the context of when to use this particular tool (ex. passe compose). Then the text provides a Q+A about things that happened in the past, and asks us to respond, simply yes or no usually. Then after we learn the technique, we can apply the grammar and make our own constructions.” 	5%

4.4 Research question # 3

The third and final research question that directs the present study concerns the role of technology in language teaching materials. It inquired whether teachers consider that technology complements the FL textbook, and, if they believe that it does, which technologies they use to counterbalance specific textbook shortcomings. In regard to the learners, this third research question is interested in the technologies that students have experienced in their FL classroom, if any, and when and why they believed that they were used.

4.4.1 Teachers' results

Teachers' means in reaction to statements on technology rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 29. The means of their answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in Table 30 (ranked from strongest to weakest reaction from a group perspective).

After having analyzed the quantitative data for the other two research questions (i.e., authenticity & grammar), what is the most striking when examining the teachers' overall results on technology is the number of items that elicited very high or even unanimous responses. For instance, just for item 3 ('If I do not use technology with my students it is because I am not comfortable with it', Table 30) 100% of the participants in three out of the four universities answered 'No'. Items 11, 15, 17 and 10 (Table 30) elicited unanimous responses from two out of the four universities surveyed, and items 16, 5, 4, 1 and 18 (Table 30) from one institution. Also when examining teachers' means

in reaction to the statements rated on a Likert scale (Table 29), I find numerous items that showed strong agreement. In fact, item 2 ('Using a course website facilitates my teaching') demonstrated the strongest level of agreement among teachers compared to all other results based on Likert-scale statements for all three research questions (item 2, $M = 3.51$, Table 29).

Teachers were also in strong agreement with item 8, indicating that (today) a good French instructor must possess both *practical* and *technical* knowledge ($M = 3.41$, Table 29). In that same line of thought, they also agreed that computers changed how they approach teaching a FL (item 7, $M = 3.17$, Table 29) and that technology helps to provide a balance between focusing students' attention on grammar and focusing their attention on communication (item 5, $M = 3.28$, Table 29).

With such enthusiasm towards the use of technology in the FL classroom, it was thus somewhat surprising to find that only 55% of the practitioners declared that if they had the necessary equipment and training, they would use *various* technologies with their students at least twice a week. This will be further investigated in Chapter 5 of the present study.

Most of the emerging technologies seem to find very little use among teachers (see items 15, 17, 16 and 18, Table 30), while the Web appears as an excellent resource for finding reading passages to replace those in the textbook (see item 10, $M = 87\%$, Table 30).

Finally, the item that showed the least level of agreement by teachers is item 1 (Table 29), which states 'I *cannot* think of any technology that could provide my students

with practice for speaking French' ($M = 1.78$)'. Given that technology is still rather behind with voice-recognition tools in general and more specifically with such tools designed for learning FLs, it will be interesting to explore what teachers understand that statement to mean when the qualitative data are analyzed below.

TABLE 29. Teachers' means on technology in language teaching materials (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				Tot. (N = 48)
	SD (n = 16)	D (n = 7)	A (n = 14)	D (n = 11)	
Item 2. Using a course website (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my teaching	3.57	3.67	3.57	3.25	3.51
Item 8. A good French instructor must possess BOTH PRACTICAL knowledge (i.e., experienced with the subject matter – French – and with teaching techniques) and TECHNICAL knowledge (i.e., know how and when to use technology)	3.53	3.50	3.60	3.00	3.41
Item 5. Technology helps to provide a balance between focusing students' attention on grammar and focusing their attention on communication	3.47	3.50	3.40	2.75	3.28
Item 2. Using a course website (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my students' learning	3.50	3.33	3.25	3.00	3.27
Item 7. Computers changed how I approach teaching a foreign language	3.20	3.33	3.40	2.75	3.17
Item 4. The textbook I am currently using and its ancillaries (workbook, audio CD, video, etc.) are sufficient to develop the students' 4 skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)	2.20	2.00	2.60	2.25	2.26
Item 6. The audio CDs (or video or website) that come with the textbook are sufficient in developing my students listening skills	1.80	1.50	2.00	2.00	1.82
Item 1. I CANNOT think of any technology that could provide my students with practice for speaking in French	1.73	1.83	2.30	1.25	1.78

TABLE 30. Teachers' mean percentages on technology in language teaching materials (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Question	A (n = 16)		B (n = 7)		C (n = 14)		D (n = 11)		Total (N = 48)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 3. If I do not use technology with my students it is because I am not comfortable with it	18.75 %	81.25 %	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	4.68 %	95.32 %
Item 11. The only writing activities that I give in class to my students are those found in their textbook	13.3 %	86.7 %	0%	100%	7.14 %	92.86 %	0%	100%	5.11 %	94.89 %
Item 15. In my classes, I have already used <i>Instant Messaging (IM)</i>	6.7%	93.3 %	16.7 %	83.3 %	0%	100%	0%	100%	5.85 %	94.15 %
Item 17. In my classes, I have already used <i>Wikis</i>	6.7%	93.3 %	33.3 %	66.7 %	0%	100%	0%	100%	10%	90%
Item 10. When I do not like the reading passage of the textbook, I go online to see if I can find something more appropriate for my students	100%	0%	100%	0%	78.57 %	21.43 %	72.73 %	27.27 %	87.82 %	12.18 %
Item 16. In my classes, I have already used <i>Blogs</i>	20%	80%	33.3 %	66.7 %	7.14 %	92.86 %	0%	100%	15.11 %	84.89 %
Item 7. When I use technology, I base my technological choice on what the students can't do with just the textbook	93.3 %	6.7%	66.7 %	33.3 %	78.57 %	21.43 %	90.91 %	9.09 %	82.37 %	17.63 %

	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 5. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what INTERESTS students in order to MOTIVATE them	81.25 %	18.75 %	100%	0%	71.42 %	28.58 %	72.73 %	27.27 %	81.35 %	18.65 %
Item 4. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what is available to me at a given time	81.25 %	18.75 %	66.7 %	33.3 %	71.42 %	28.58 %	100%	0%	79.84 %	20.16 %
Item 13. In my classes, I have already used <i>Emails</i> (e.g., as part of a project such as having students exchange emails with other learners in a francophone country)	18.75 %	81.25 %	16.7 %	83.3 %	7.14 %	92.86 %	45.46 %	54.54 %	22.01 %	77.99 %
Item 8. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what's NEW (i.e., on the latest technologies that came out	18.75 %	81.25 %	33.3 %	66.7 %	28.58 %	71.42 %	9.09 %	90.91 %	22.43 %	77.57 %
Item 12. I would like/I like to have the workbook (that goes along the textbook I am currently using) online	73.3 %	26.7 %	83.3 %	16.7 %	92.86 %	7.14 %	27.27 %	72.73 %	69.18 %	30.82 %

	Yes	No								
Item 14. In my classes, I have already used <i>Discussion boards</i> (from a course website such as Blackboard, etc)	46.7 %	53.3 %	83.3 %	16.7 %	71.42 %	28.58 %	72.73 %	27.27 %	68.54 %	31.46 %
Item 1. I use technology (Internet, the world wide web, computer software, etc.) with my French students at least once a week	33.3 %	66.7 %	57.14 %	42.86 %	100%	0%	45.46 %	54.54 %	58.97 %	41.03 %
Item 18. In my classes, I have already used <i>Podcasts</i>	18.75 %	81.25 %	0%	100%	50%	50%	72.73 %	27.27 %	35.37 %	64.63 %
Item 9. If I had the necessary equipment and training, I would use various technologies with my students at least twice a week	66.7 %	33.3 %	57.14 %	42.86 %	71.42 %	28.58 %	27.27 %	72.73 %	55.63 %	44.37 %
Item 2. If I do not use technology it is because I do not have the necessary equipment	81.25 %	18.75 %	33.3 %	66.7 %	21.43 %	78.57 %	54.54 %	45.46 %	47.64 %	52.36 %
Item 6. If I use technology, it is primarily to break up the routine	46.7 %	53.3 %	42.86 %	57.14 %	50%	50%	54.54 %	45.46 %	48.52 %	51.48 %

Two open-ended questions were directed to the teachers, i.e., the first one requested them to comment on item 1 (Table 29) which states ‘I *cannot* think of any

technology that could provide my students with practice for speaking French’, and the second question asked practitioners to comment on the emerging technologies they have used in their class. Thus, based on the teachers’ responses to these two questions, and after elimination of 3 outliers, a total of 90 open-ended answers¹³² from the four universities were transferred to the qualitative database.

Four main categories (plus one called ‘Other’) could be drawn from the majority of the teachers’ responses to item 1 (Table 29). The four main categories that emerged from the data are: ‘language laboratories’, ‘Voice boards’, ‘synchronous CMCs’ and the ‘Internet/WWW’. The themes based on the teachers’ answers are illustrated in Table 31 with a few examples for each category.

¹³² 3 answers were left blank

TABLE 31. Teachers' comments about using technology to improve speaking skills

Item 1. <i>I cannot think of any technology that could provide my students with practice for speaking French</i>	
I disagree because students can use...	Percent of occurrence
<p>language laboratories :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Digital language labs" - "Recordings." - "I think students could use tape recorders (or mics on the computer) to record themselves and listen for accent, pronunciation, etc." - "Phonetics labs." - "lab (recording oneself, speaking with one or more peers)" 	27%
<p>Voice boards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "our own OLE board provides the tool for speaking but which is unfortunately limited capacity and cannot allow the students to practice any time they like." - "audio-visual" - "Recording themselves with instruments like OLE, recording commercials, etc. to get feedback from instructor." - "wimba voice tools" (x 21) - "Voice boards are used in our intermediate and elementary courses and they have proven very useful" - "Wimba" 	27%
<p>synchronous CMCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "chatroom, msn video conferences, things like that" - "skype" - "Using a video interview [...]" - "chat rooms" - "[...] I also believe that we could profit from telephony or skype programs to connect with other francophone speakers and encourage students to practice their speaking skills." - "voice chat rooms" - "Skype (for exchange programs)" - "Tandem plus, chat rooms etc. " 	20.5%
<p>the Internet/WWW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Online activities and language learning sites such as the one provided by the University of Texas for beginners, and many FLE sites are helpful for improving speaking." - "There are a variety on line" - "De voce software, podcasting combined with powerpoint presentation, quick time recordings." - "Things online, prompts, recordings" - "various programs that assess pronunciation/intonation (not very reliable, though)" 	15.5%
<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Some of the textbooks come with tapes or CDs. I also recommend my students to listen to news on Internet and repeat words, expressions and sentences..." - "I think students could use tape recorders (or mics on the computer) to record themselves and listen for accent, pronunciation, etc." - "Videos are a great demonstrator of how they can use their knowledge of the language. Watching scenarios and coming up with their own. [...]" 	10%

<p>3) to practice writing: - “practice fluency in writing” - “Writing practice (expression, not correctness)”</p> <p>4) to save time: - “Because it is a quick way to assess students on participation [...]” - “Mainly to save class time [...]” - “To get students to express opinions and react to peers' at their own pace, also if not enough time in class.”</p>	<p>18%</p> <p>5%</p>
<p><u>Podcasts:</u></p> <p>1) for listening comprehension: - “I have found no drawbacks and they are wonderful because they are free and they allow my students to hear native speakers.” - “I use them for listening comprehension activities.” - “I used podcasts that were relevant as warm up activities for my classes.” - “we mainly used it as a means of exchanging and sharing audio files. I also created a podcast for my students for pronunciation purposes.”</p> <p>2) for a cultural project - “students created podcasts in english about a feature of francophone culture. Great activity for them and pleasant to grade and correct for the teacher.” - “We used podcasts for a cultural project--they were done outside of class and were in English. I think they went over very, very well.” - “Podcasts were done as an individual cultural project, in English.” - “the benefits is that the project was fun for the students. They were using other tools besides the text book” - “each student had to pick one topic about French culture and talk about that. then they had to upload them on itunes” - “creativity, time-consuming to listen to students' production”</p>	<p>51%</p> <p>49%</p>
<p><u>Blogs:</u></p> <p>1) students can see and comment on each other's work - “Informal writing, learning to reflect in a longer writing samples where they glean information from other students' blogs and the internet and respond to various cultural events as they are happening.” - “Gives them a chance to see and comment on each other's work, practice more outside of class easily. No drawbacks that I can think of, except maybe thorough preparation required on teacher's part to find appropriate topic/make sure everyone posts, etc.”</p> <p>2) Other: - “journals” - “I like how blogs can get students to interact with one another without the instructor”</p>	<p>68%</p> <p>32%</p>
<p><u>Emails:</u></p> <p>1) Pen-pal projects - “I've tried penpal and I was expecting that students will practice to communicate at both written and speaking levels bc it was via emails so it's written (vocab, grammar and so on) but also unformal so they could learn more about idiomatic expressions...” - “Tandem partnership with French students [...] different cultural perspectives on topics addressed in course and/or of interest to students.”</p>	<p>50%</p>

2) exposure to informal language - “Exposure to various forms of informal writing” - “Vocab. and stylistics of email communication” - “Authentic language input, non-textbook ahh aah! (idiomatic) French”	50%
Other: - “I’ve used it [IM] for a class-wide debate.” - “[Wikis]:A class-wide writing project, so students can build on what others have come up with, especially in a creative way.”	100%

4.4.2 Students’ results

Students’ means on the role of technology in language teaching materials in reaction to statements rated on a Likert scale are presented in order from highest to lowest agreement in Table 33. The means of students’ answers on the same topic but in response to alternative-answer questions are illustrated in order from strongest to weakest reaction from a group perspective in Table 34.

Similarly to teachers, students’ means are fairly high compared to other results on previous research questions. Students were most in agreement with item 10 (Table 33, $M = 3.16$) indicating that a good French instructor must possess both *practical* knowledge and *technical* knowledge. Based on tables 33 and 34, students want technology to be more integrated in language instruction in order to: ‘engage them more in the lesson’ (item 2, Table 33, $M = 2.98$), ‘break up the routine’ (item 3, Table 33, $M = 2.85$), ‘help them focus their attention simultaneously on grammar and on communication’ (item 1, Table 33, $M = 2.99$), and ‘facilitate their life as students and language learners.’ Examples of the latter are: using a course website (item 6, Table 33, $M = 3.13$) and being able to download the textbook *audio* material on their ipod (item 4, Table 34, $M =$

67.25%). Surprisingly, students do not seem as interested in downloading *video* material on their ipod since only 51% responded ‘Yes’ to item 5 (see Table 34).

Finally, about half of the students can think of technologies that could provide them with practice for speaking French (item 8, Table 34, $M = 49.75\%$). The qualitative data should help us refine this answer.

TABLE 33. Students' means on technology in language teaching materials (Likert scale)

Survey item	Institution				Tot. (N = 1023)										
	A (n = 422)	B (n = 112)	C (n = 302)	D (n = 187)											
	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">SD</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">D</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">A</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">SA</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">←</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">→</td> </tr> </table>				SD	D	A	SA	←	1	2	3	4	→	
SD	D	A	SA												
←	1	2	3	4	→										
Item 10. A good French instructor must possess BOTH PRACTICAL knowledge (i.e., experienced with the subject matter – French – and with teaching techniques) and TECHNICAL knowledge (i.e., know how and when to use technology)	3.24	3.37	3.15	2.90	3.16										
Item 6. Using a course website (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my life as a student	3.36	3.37	2.91	2.90	3.13										
Item 4. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what we can't do with just the textbook	3.15	3.17	3.02	3.00	3.08										
Item 7. Using a course website (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my learning	3.15	3.36	2.76	2.78	3.01										
Item 1. When my teacher uses technology, s/he seems to base her/his technological choice on what is AVAILABLE to her/him at a given time	3.10	3.00	2.91	3.00	3.00										
Item 1. Technology helps to provide a balance between focusing my attention on grammar and focusing my attention on communication	3.06	3.09	2.91	2.90	2.99										
Item 2. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what interests me in order to ENGAGE ME MORE in the lesson	2.95	3.22	2.94	2.80	2.98										
Item 9. Computers have changed how I approach learning a foreign language	2.90	3.02	2.81	2.70	2.86										
Item 3. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what interests me in order to BREAK UP the ROUTINE	2.92	2.91	2.89	2.70	2.85										
Item 12. My textbook and the material that comes with it (workbook, audio CD, video, etc.) are sufficient to help me develop my language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)	2.81	3.04	2.62	2.70	2.79										
Item 5. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what's NEW (i.e., on the latest technologies that came out such as Ipod, wikis, blog, etc.)	2.51	2.76	2.64	2.60	2.63										
Item 8. The audio CDs (or video or website) that come with my textbook are sufficient in developing my listening skills	2.68	2.87	2.38	2.50	2.61										
Item 11. My teacher should use technology more often in class	2.50	2.65	2.57	2.40	2.53										

TABLE 34. Students' mean percentages on technology in language teaching materials (alternative-answer questions)

Institution Question	A (n = 422)		B (n = 112)		C (n = 302)		D (n = 187)		Total (N = 1023)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 13. In my French classes at university, I have already used <i>Wikis</i>	4.5%	95.5%	2.2%	97.8%	0%	100%	0%	100%	1.67%	98.33%
Item 11. In my French classes at university, I have already used <i>Instant Messaging (IM)</i>	7.9%	92.1%	6.5%	93.5%	1.32%	98.68%	0%	100%	3.93%	96.07%
Item 2. I use a computer everyday	94.9%	5.1%	93.5%	6.5%	95.7%	4.3%	100%	0%	96.02%	3.98%
Item 14. In my French classes at university, I have already used <i>Podcasts</i>	16.9%	83.1%	21.7%	78.3%	4.3%	95.7%	3.74%	96.26%	11.66%	88.34%
Item 12. In my French classes at university, I have already used <i>Blogs</i>	22.5%	77.5%	21.7%	78.3%	2.1%	97.9%	2.14%	97.86%	12.11%	87.89%
Item 3. I have an ipod	77%	23%	82.6%	17.4%	85.1%	14.9%	80.21%	19.79%	81.23%	18.77%
Item 6. The only writing activities that I do with my teacher in class are those from my textbook	23.6%	76.4%	17.4%	82.6%	21.3%	78.7%	19.79%	80.21%	20.52%	79.48%
Item 9. In my French classes at university, I have already used: <i>Emails</i> (e.g., as part of a project such as having students exchange emails with other learners in a francophone country)	27%	73%	21.7%	78.3%	8.5%	91.5%	30%	70%	21.8%	78.2%
Item 1. I have taken/I am taking a French class when technology (Internet, the world wide web, computer software, etc.) was/is used at least once a week	73%	27%	82.6%	17.4%	72.3%	27.7%	70%	30%	74.47%	25.53%

	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Item 4. I would like to be given the opportunity to download AUDIO files used in my French class on my Ipod	65.7 %	34.3 %	65.2 %	34.8 %	68.1 %	31.9 %	70%	30%	67.25 %	32.75 %
Item 7. I would like/I like to have my workbook online	67.4 %	32.6 %	82.6 %	17.4 %	63.8 %	36.2 %	49.73 %	50.27 %	65.88 %	34.12 %
Item 10. In my French classes at university, I have already used <i>Discussion boards</i> (from a course website such as Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.)	50.6 %	49.4 %	91.3 %	8.7 %	17%	83%	19.79 %	80.21 %	44.68 %	55.32 %
Item 5. I would like to be given the opportunity to download VIDEO files used in my French class on my Ipod	61.8 %	38.2 %	58.7 %	41.3 %	53.2 %	46.8 %	30%	70%	50.93 %	49.07 %
Item 8. I CANNOT think of any technology that could provide me with practice for speaking in French	57.9 %	42.1 %	47.8 %	52.2 %	53.2 %	46.8 %	40.11 %	59.89 %	49.75 %	50.25 %

The same two equivalent open-ended questions posed to the teachers were also asked of the students ('I *cannot* think of any technology that could provide me with practice for speaking French' and 'Identify the emerging technologies that you have experienced in your French class and the benefits/drawbacks of using them'). Thus, based on the students' responses to these two questions, and after elimination of 120

outliers, a total of 831 open-ended answers were recorded in the qualitative computer data file.

Five major categories (plus one called ‘Other’) could be drawn from most of the students’ answers to item 8 (Table 34). The five main categories that emerged from the data are: ‘video/audio’, ‘online workbook’, ‘voice-recognition computer software’, ‘synchronous CMCs’ and ‘Voice boards’. The students’ qualitative data based on item 8 is presented in Table 35.

TABLE 35. Students’ comments about using technology to improve speaking skills

Item 8. <i>I cannot think of any technology that could provide me with practice for speaking French</i>	
I disagree because I can use...	Percent of occurrence
<p><u>video/audio</u> :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “A tape recorder” - “Audio files that you listen and repeat” - “I think that downloadable audio and video files would help.” - “Audio files are helpful so that you can practice at home if you want to.” - “Videos, music, and audio clips in French.” - “Video or audio files found on the internet, perhaps special programs for computers to make learning french easier.” - “computer listening comprehension videos/audio” - “I feel that being able to download activities, films, or music to my computer/ipod would be very useful.” - “the use of an Ipods to listen to French is a great idea.” - “listening to French music and learning songs on the computer” 	28%
<p><u>online workbook:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “- “I think that the help of online workbooks would help alot because it is more practice.’ - “The current format with Quia homework online seems effective.” - “The online workbook Quia is very useful in helping me practise my french. It has various activities that allow me to practise my listening comprehension, my speaking skills, my vocabulary, and my understanding of grammatical concepts.” - “the online workbook” - “Quia that is done online aids in teaching pronunciation because the student can learn how each word is pronounced, and developing listening skills.” 	25%

<p><u>voice-recognition computer software:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[...] Over the next 10-30 years many things will become possible [...] Speech recognition software will revolutionize language learning software, especially at the introductory and intermediate levels of language learning. [...] If I was to make a guess, though, I bet there's already a lot better software for Japanese people to learn English than there is for English speaking people to learn anything else.” - “Using dictation software, voice recognition, and voice commands would allow a computer to anilize and correct a persons speaking.” - “There are also programs for the computer that I would be interested in trying-for instance there are some French programs that allow you to speak French and then correct your pronunciation, which would be very useful.” - “The most important technology items would be files on the computer with speaking and instructions on pronunciation.” - “some sort of voice recording system that could be graded and get feedback from so we can practice pronunciation.” - “Something with mimicry. And there are softwares that evaluate accent and pronuciation and "grade" your preformance but I don't know how well they work.” - “A program where you speak French into a microphone and it shows you how your pronunciation compares to that of a native French speaker's” 	14.5%
<p><u>synchronous CMCs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “A penpal through a chat applet such as MSN Messenger or Yahoo that would allow just an instant messaging for elementary language levels and voice or video chat for more advanced language levels.” - “Computers can be used to video chat with french students in france, or another french speaking provence. Modern pen pals.” - “Instant Messengers” - “using an application such as Skype to speak with other French speakers (either other students or native speakers)” - “video chat?” 	14.5%
<p><u>voice boards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “making/uploading videos of yourself speaking” - “Oleboard” - “OLE board helps, maybe more discourse with OLE” - “we post our oral exams on OLE onlne and our teacher gives us feedback...this is technology” - “The Ole board that our class uses.” - “Programs like ole board could help” 	10%
<p><u>other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “just listening to podcasts” - “Robots. That speak french, of course.” - “The webcam or microphone” 	8%

Four main categories summarize the majority of students’ responses to the question asking them to identify the emerging technologies they have experienced in their FL classroom (as well as emails and/or discussion boards) and their major

interpretation of the findings and their implications for the FL classroom and language teaching materials' design. Finally, it will address the limitations of the current research project and offer suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

What do teachers and students want from a FL textbook? To answer this question, quantitative and qualitative data was collected from 48 teachers and 1023 students in four different universities across the U.S. Teachers completed an online survey that contained 103 closed-response questions and 12 open-ended questions. Students filled out an online survey with 102 closed-response questions and 11 open-ended questions. One of the most arduous tasks for a researcher when conducting any large-scale questionnaire study is to synthesize and meaningfully interpret the vast number of results so that specific findings are not put forth while others are overlooked. In that respect, an effort was made to systematically group the results and examine them in correlation with the participants' background information, SLA research and above all the qualitative data that was available.

By defining what teachers and students want from a FL textbook in the area of authenticity, grammar and technology, the present study aimed at finding ways to reconcile FL textbook design with SLA research, teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning, and students' self-perceived needs. Below is a review of the highlights of the findings that were reported in Chapter 4 with further analysis and interpretation of specific results. Implications for the FL classroom (i.e., teachers and students) and language teaching materials' design will be drawn from the preceding discussion. The limitations of the present study will be addressed, while offering suggestions for future

research. Chapter 5 will conclude with a final word to language teaching materials developers, SLA researchers, language teachers and L2 learners.

5.1 Kind of L2 that teachers and students want to find in FL textbooks

As seen in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, there is a wide consensus among linguists (Peeters, 2006; Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2003, 2004; Coveney, 2003, 2000) that an “almost diglossic gulf” (Waugh & Fonseca-Greber, 2002: 115) exists between standard written French and everyday spoken French. This difference manifests itself through a variety of grammatical structures (see Figure 1 p. 36, Chapter 2) including negation (i.e., “ne... pas”). In line with this research, it was found that the teachers in all four institutions of the present study largely recognize deleting the “ne” (item 9, Table 7, $M = 3.11$) when they speak “colloquial French” (Ball, 2000). However, they try not to forget the “ne” when speaking in front of their students (item 10 was ranked the highest by the practitioners on the L2 authenticity section of their survey, Table 7, $M = 3.33$). So, why would they modify their speech in class? A number of hypotheses can be made but we will focus on two possibilities that seem relevant in the context of the present study.

The first and most plausible hypothesis within the research done in the corpus linguistics field concerns the choice to teach *le bon usage* because of the cultural stigma still attached to everyday spoken French. In other words, most of the surveyed practitioners who agreed with item 10 teach their students “how people should speak, not how they do speak” (Waugh & Fonseca-Greber, 2002).

The second hypothesis (related to the first one) that can be advanced is that teachers consciously match their spoken French to the French found in their textbook *when* they are in class¹³⁴. Indeed, the results on the survey indicate that these teachers are fully aware of the linguistic breach between the written and spoken norms (item 11, Table 7) but that this gap is not shown in their FL textbook (item 1, Table 7). This was confirmed by a detailed analysis conducted on the four institutions' elementary textbooks (*Débuts* for University A and *Deux Mondes* for Institutions B, C and D) in Section 2.2.1.3 Corpus linguistics and French textbooks of the present study. So, if teachers match their spoken French to the French found in their textbook, it is logical that they subscribed to the idea that 'the French used in textbooks is the French that we need to teach our students' (Item 15, Table 7, M = 2.58).

However, while they agreed with item 15 they also expressed agreement with item 13 stating that 'it is important to teach students both written and spoken French' (Table 7, M = 3.09). To understand the origins of this contradiction, I calculated the standard deviation of each result and found $sd = 1.88$ for item 13, thus revealing a high degree of dispersion among responses. The next step is now to examine the individual responses for each university for item 13 to discover where the vast differences are. The individual answers are illustrated below in Table 37.

¹³⁴ It could be argued that this is not a credible hypothesis because teachers disagreed with item 14 ('I do not speak French like the French found in the textbook I am currently using but I should', Table 7). However, this statement addresses the general use of the language (not specifically when teachers are in front of their students).

TABLE 37. Individual answers about teaching students both written and spoken French

Institution A (n = 16) M = 3.06	SD	D	A	SA
	4		3	9
Institution B (n = 7) M = 3.14	SD	D	A	SA
		3		4
Institution C (n = 14) M = 3.14	SD	D	A	SA
	3	1	1	9
Institution D (n = 11) M = 3.00	SD	D	A	SA
	1	4		6

Then, thanks to the format of the online questionnaire, I was able to track each individual response and match it with the respondent's personal characteristics to find out whether a specific category of practitioners would answer one way or the other. I did not find any pattern for *gender*, *age* or *university status* as their answers were spread across the Likert scale for all four institutions. It would have been interesting to examine whether *field of study* influenced their responses as well but there were too few graduate students in pedagogy (n = 2) to make a valid comparison with teachers studying French

literature (n = 35). Nevertheless, one characteristic did appear to have an impact on teachers' responses. It seems that teachers' *native-language* played a role in whether they agreed or disagreed that 'it is important to teach students both written and spoken French' (item 13, Table 7). Practitioners' answers with their L1 are presented in Table 38.

TABLE 38. Individual answers about teaching students both written and spoken French per native-language

Institution A (n = 16) M = 3.06	SD	D	A	SA
	4		3	9
	French=4		French=2; Other=1	French=2; English=4; Other=3
Institution B (n = 7) M = 3.14	SD	D	A	SA
		3		4
		French= 2; Other=1		English=2; Other=2
Institution C (n = 14) M = 3.14	SD	D	A	SA
	3	1	1	9
	French=2; English=1	French=1	English=1	English=7; Other=2
Institution D (n = 11) M = 3.00	SD	D	A	SA
	1	4		6
	French=1	French=2; English=2		English=4; Other=1; French=1

Apart from Institution A where they are almost equally distributed, it appears that the majority of native-French teachers in each BLP *disagreed* that it is important to teach

students *both* versions of French, whereas almost all non-native instructors agreed. Why this discrepancy? It could be hypothesized that growing up in a French-speaking environment, where the spoken form is automatically taken care of outside of school, then school becomes the place where formal French is taught and used, and native French teachers are simply reproducing this here in the American classroom. For the non-native teachers of French, it is the case that they went abroad having only encountered formal French before departure and the first contact was a shock, hence the tendency for wanting exposure to both.

Since history and research have shown that people in France (with the *Académie française*) are usually much more conservative about the French language than other Francophone countries, I decided to further investigate the background of the native-French teachers to determine whether their country of origin also influenced their response. In fact, French grammarians repressed the spoken language for almost two centuries¹³⁵ and today French TV shows such as *Apostrophes*, *Les dicos d'or*, *La dictée de Pivot* are a few examples of how France is still torn between tradition and change. On the other hand, certain francophone countries are quite progressive with respect to the French language. For instance, Canada, in 1979, was the first country to implement the feminisation of titles and professions names in French, followed by Switzerland in 1988 and Belgium in 1993¹³⁶. I thus proceeded with a closer investigation of each francophone respondent in the four surveyed institutions. However, after careful examination of their

¹³⁵ between the 17th and 18th centuries

¹³⁶ In France, the issue was not seriously considered until 1998 when the Prime Minister Lionel Jospin published a circular that prescribed the rules for feminization.

respective backgrounds according to their responses, I did not find any pattern emerging from the data of the present study. The teachers from French and Francophone origin were spread across the answers, thus invalidating my previous hypothesis. An interesting way to replicate this study would be to select the participants beforehand, to ensure a much larger number of teachers from France and the Francophone world to determine if their country of origin does indeed make a difference.

Numerous studies (DiVito, 1991; Glisan & Drescher, 1993; Gratton, 1995) have investigated the use of double object pronouns in the everyday spoken language and their corresponding treatment in FL textbooks. For instance, DiVito (1991) found that the use of double object pronouns is quite rare in spoken French but that it is treated extensively in French textbooks. The finding on item 7 of the teachers' questionnaire was therefore quite astonishing. Indeed, the native-French instructors in all four surveyed institutions expressed disagreement with the following statement: 'As a French native-speaker, it is difficult for me to teach double object pronouns' (item 7, Table 7, $M = 2.07$). Once again, it is only in light of the teachers' specific background that one can try to interpret this result.

Consequently, I tracked each individual response among the native-French practitioners in the four BLPs to match it with the respondent's personal characteristics to find out if these would influence their choice or not. I did not find any pattern for *gender*, *age*, *university status*, *number of language teaching methodology courses/ workshops*, or *length of stay in the U.S.* as their answers were spread across the Likert scale for all four institutions. However, I did find that *teaching experience in the U.S.* factored into the

native-French teachers' choice of agreeing or disagreeing with item 7, 'As a French native-speaker, it is difficult for me to teach double object pronouns' (their results are illustrated in Table 39 below). From the results of table 39, it appears that the less experience native-French teachers have, the more difficult it is for them to teach double-object pronouns. However, with more teaching experience (and maybe becoming more acquainted with FL textbook content) they have much less difficulty (if any) in teaching this relatively rare grammatical occurrence in spoken French.

TABLE 39. Individual answers of the native-French instructors about having difficulty teaching double object pronouns per teaching experience in the U.S.¹³⁷ (in months)

Institution A (n= 8)	SD	D	A	SA
		36 months; 36 months; 18 months; 72 months;	18 months; 36 months; 6 months	6 months

Institution B (n=2)	SD	D	A	SA
	72 months	36 months		

Institution C (n = 3)	SD	D	A	SA
	18 months		6 months	6 months

Institution D (n = 4)	SD	D	A	SA
	72 months	36 months; 72 months	6 months	

¹³⁷ The length of teaching experience was calculated as the median of the range given by each teacher

The above results thus still confirm the finding from previous corpus linguistics research that double object pronouns are a rather rare occurrence in spoken French but are still extensively treated in FL textbooks in the U.S. In light of this explanation, the result to item 16 (Table 8) once again came as a surprise. The alternative-answer question ('Yes/No') was directed not only to the native-French teachers but also to the non-native instructors and requested all of them to confirm whether double object pronouns were rarely used in everyday spoken French. The answer selected by the majority was not Yes, but No by 58% of the total number of teachers (item 16, Table 8). If I would not have previously discovered that certain teachers declared having no problem teaching double object pronouns (item 7, Table 7), I would have had expected to find a majority (if not all) native-French teachers in the 'Yes' column while non-native French instructors would be distributed in both 'Yes' and 'No' columns. However, because of the already unexpected result with item 7 (Table 7), I knew that it would not be that simple. So, I decided to examine each single teacher's response on item 16 ('Double object pronouns are rarely used in everyday spoken French') in light of her/his personal background information to determine whether any characteristic would play a role in the answers. Categories of possible interest per teacher are illustrated in Table 40 for Institution A, in Table 41 for Institution B, in Table 42 for Institution C and in Table 43 for Institution D.

TABLE 40. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution A

Item.16 Double object pronouns are rarely used in everyday spoken French	
Institution A	
Yes (n = 7)	No (n = 9)
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 6 months	L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 18 months
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 6 months	L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 36 months
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 18 months	L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 36 months
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 36 months	L1 = French Teaching experience in the US = 72 months
L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months	L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months
L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months
L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = is from a francophone country in Africa	L1 = other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country =3.5 months
	L1 = other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = is from a francophone country in Africa Teaching experience in the US=36 months
	L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = is from a francophone country in Africa Teaching experience in the US=48 months

TABLE 41. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution B

Item.16 Double object pronouns are rarely used in everyday spoken French	
Institution B	
Yes (n = 2)	No (n = 5)
<p>L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 36 months</p> <p>L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 24 months</p>	<p>L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 72 months</p> <p>L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months</p> <p>L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months</p> <p>L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = never</p> <p>L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 24 months</p>

TABLE 42. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution C

Item.16 Double object pronouns are rarely used in everyday spoken French Institution C ¹³⁸	
Yes (n = 8)	No (n = 6)
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 6 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 6 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 18 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months
L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months
L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 18 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months
L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 18 months	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months
L1= other (non francophone country) Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = never	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 18 months
L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = is from a francophone country in Africa	

¹³⁸ Note that institution C is the only university that had more teachers responding yes than no

TABLE 43. Teachers' Yes/No answers to rarely using double object pronouns in everyday spoken French for Institution D

Item.16 Double object pronouns are rarely used in everyday spoken French	
Institution D	
Yes (n = 3)	No (n = 8)
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 6 months	L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 72 months
L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 36 months	L1= French Teaching experience in the US = 72 months
L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months	L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = never
	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months
	L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months
	L1= English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 9.5 months
	L1 = English Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 18 months
	L1= other Longest consecutive time spent in a francophone country = 3.5 months

The first observation that can be made when examining the four above tables is that native-French teachers are spread in both 'Yes' and 'No' columns (except for Institution C—see Table 42). Second, once again it seems that teaching experience affects native-French teachers in their opinion regarding double object pronouns. From the above data, it appears that native-French teachers who have a relatively long

experience¹³⁹ teaching with American FL textbooks disagree that double object pronouns are rare in everyday spoken French, whereas the native-French teachers who just started teaching in the U.S. (i.e., first semester) agree that they are rare. This finding does not mean that all native-French speakers who have been teaching and presumably living in the U.S. for a while may experience something similar to language loss in the sense that they would lose all notion of frequency of occurrence of certain items in their own language. It only means that for this particular study native-French teachers who disagreed about double object pronouns being seldom used in spoken French also appeared to be the ones who had taught in the U.S. (using American FL textbooks¹⁴⁰) for at least 72 months. Finally, as far as the non-native French instructors are concerned, there are too many irregularities between the four universities to state that the amount of consecutive time spent in a francophone country influences their answer on item 6.

While French double object pronouns are a source of much discrepancy among teachers, this is not the case among students. In fact, item 2 indicating that ‘learning double object pronouns is important’ was the statement that was the most agreed upon by students in the section on L2 authenticity of their questionnaire (item 2, M = 3.25, Table 9). This result does not automatically mean that students would rather learn standard written French than everyday spoken French. It may just mean that students want to be taught more grammar and believe that their ultimate success in acquiring the language

¹³⁹ no pattern can be established from 18 or 36 months of teaching experience but it seems that after 72 months of teaching experience, Native-French teachers start disagreeing with the statement that “Double object pronouns are rarely used in everyday spoken French”

¹⁴⁰ possible influence of the FL textbook’s content on the native-French teachers

can only go through practice of the grammar as found in previous research on L2 learners' beliefs about the role of formal instruction in the FL classroom (Schulz, 1996).

In addition, students' agreement with the use of 'on', 'ne' deletion and generic 'tu' in popular French may not show either their knowledge of the specificities of everyday spoken French, considering that only 6% of all the respondents reported spending more than eight weeks in a francophone country, and most importantly considering the little exposure to popular French they receive in the FL classroom via their teacher or textbook, as previously seen. Students' agreement may just result from the wording of the questions on the survey. Indeed, it is easier to agree or disagree with a statement than let's say produce it. In a replication of this study it would be interesting to ask students the simple open-ended question: "Beyond vocabulary, do you know any other differences between everyday spoken French and standard written French?"¹⁴¹

Now if students may not know about 'authentic' French, they certainly want to learn it, as their strong agreement (92%) with item 7 shows (Table 10). On the other hand, learners' positive reaction to item 5 (Table 9) stating that it is more important to learn standard written French than daily spoken French, cannot be ignored ($M = 2.52$). At first hand, this shows a divide between the students who want to learn the French in their textbooks and those who want to learn the French spoken today by young people in France and other francophone countries. Why would students say that it is more important to learn standard written French than daily spoken French if they also

¹⁴¹ As mentioned earlier, no open-ended questions were asked on the L2 authenticity part of the survey because of the already large number of items in that section of the questionnaire and also because of the need to obtain some quantitative data first to determine relevant open-ended questions. This is a perfect example of a suitable open-ended question that, based on the quantitative results, could meaningfully replace items 1, 4 and 3 (Table 9) in a replication of the present study.

overwhelmingly agreed to learn ‘authentic’ French? First, as mentioned numerous times by students in the culture section of the questionnaire, the textbook is very often their only source to learn French (aside from their teacher) and the one on which they base all their knowledge. So, if the textbook does not contain any daily spoken French, it is probably because it is not as important as standard written French. Here are some open-ended answers given by students in the next section of the questionnaire¹⁴²: “it’s a textbook. It should have correct content”, “They seem to be a valid source...how else would they be in print?”, “it’s a textbook for a reason [...]”, “it is a published book that has been used repeatedly to teach French”, “it is written by professors and I just trust it”. So, the results found on item 7 and item 5 should not be seen in diametrical opposition. It may most likely be that the students who intend to spend some time in a francophone country would rather learn ‘authentic’ French than standard written French. For all the others, it may just be that while they ‘know’ that standard French is more important than daily spoken French, they still want to learn ‘authentic French’. Reasons for this could include: to relate better with the content of the material being taught, to be able to exchange emails with pen pals, to understand the content of popular French movies and songs, etc.

What kind of L2 do teachers and students want to find in their French textbooks?

In summary: based on the present study, native-French teachers want standard written French to be taught, whereas non-native French teachers want both written and everyday

¹⁴² comments made in response to “do you trust the cultural content of your textbook?”

spoken French to be included in the text. In addition, it seems that *teaching experience in the U.S* (i.e., using American FL textbooks) alters native-French instructors' views of frequency of occurrence of specific linguistic items in spoken French (e.g., double object pronouns). It also alters their ability to teach them. Students 'recognize' that standard written French is more important than everyday spoken French (because it is in their textbook and most often the FL textbook is their sole source of input aside from their teacher) yet they want to learn 'authentic' French as well, the real French that is spoken by young people their age in their daily life in the francophone world.

5.2 Teachers' and students' views on how culture is treated in FL textbooks

The very first result that needs to be discussed is teachers' reluctance to teach culture in general. Given the current trend for integrating culture in CLT, this finding came as rather unexpected. So, how can this result be meaningfully interpreted? This is where the qualitative data comes into play to make the present study more exploratory.

The two open-ended questions directed to teachers in the 'culture' section of their questionnaire generated a tremendous number of answers. One recurring teacher comment was that their French textbook is too focused on France instead of the Francophone world. When looking at the countries of origin of the native-French teachers only (given that the non-native French instructors have traveled extensively in the francophone world¹⁴³ ...), I find 10 teachers from France and 14 from a variety of Francophone countries. This may explain certain comments from teachers: "I haven't

¹⁴³ Actually a few individual responses from non-native French instructors included the answer 'never'

spent enough time in France to feel like an expert of French culture¹⁴⁴”, “after speaking to colleagues native from France, I realize some of the information is inaccurate”, “I prefer using supplementary readings from the Internet”. One student’s answer to the question do you trust the cultural content in your French textbook, is also particularly revealing: “My French teacher is from Paris, and deems it to be accurate”. The fact that teachers may not be familiar with the cultural content of their French textbook or that they have to find supplementary material to teach other cultural topics is certainly not the only explanation to their reluctance to teach culture in general¹⁴⁵. In addition, 51% of all teachers’ comments were directed at the overgeneralizations made by French textbooks: “They often tokenize or omit aspects of French and francophone cultures”, “the cultural content can be so generic that it is either misleading or can increase stereotypes”, “for me French culture is not limited to French cheese and wine”. Some of their comments (14%) also addressed the issue that the cultural content of their French textbook is outdated. This information sheds light on why teachers agreed that they often search for text and images to *add* information or to *replace* culture topics in their FL textbook.

A lack of wanting to teach culture with a big C over culture with a small c was also observed in the present study. 32% of the teachers explained in their open-ended answers that *small c culture is more relevant to students*: “[small c culture] is what they can compare themselves to”, “Culture like literature is abstract, thus it hinders any real

¹⁴⁴ This is an interesting comment because from a pedagogical point of view, teachers are not expected to be experts, but to be more aware of how to guide students to explore a culture. They seem too much rooted in the factual transmission of culture.

¹⁴⁵ Next to 14 teachers from a variety of Francophone countries and 10 teachers from France, there were also 20 teachers from the U.S. and 4 from other non-francophone countries that participated in the present study.

communication and students perception of the language”, “small c culture is more immediately relevant to the students. Big C culture becomes relevant after they decide they are interested in the small c culture”. 28% of teachers’ answers further explained that *small c culture interests students more*: “I believe that the small things are what matter more to a student”, “students are more interested in daily habits, etc.” Finally, 24% of the teachers believe that *culture with a big C should not be taught at the beginning level*: “[small c culture] is more important for elementary levels”, “The big C culture should come later. If students continue studying French then they will be willing to learn about art, history...”

The item in the culture section of the teachers’ questionnaire that reached the strongest agreement was: ‘I like to add personal anecdotes when I teach cultural topics from French textbooks’. Some of the reasons behind their very high agreement have already been mentioned. Other reasons may be found through the students’ own perspective on the topic. Their open-ended answers include: “My teacher lived in a francophone country and has real accounts of the culture, its not only more interesting but feels more like life”, “my teacher went there to study and can add to them or put her own experiences”, “Her anecdotes are amusing and it is helpful to hear stories in French to improve listening skills. I believe that the cultural content in my textbook is valid because my teacher is French and will tell stories that relate to that content”. Consequently, 96% of the students in all four institutions declared that they like it when their teacher adds personal anecdotes.

Based on the above results and the teacher's qualitative data, it thus did not come as a surprise to find that students were mostly in agreement with item 1 stating "What I enjoy the most is learning anything that has to do with culture". However, not any type of culture, since students also showed a distinct preference for learning about culture with a small c over culture with a big C.

One question that was posed in Chapter 4 of the present study was whether the students' current textbook's emphasis on culture would play a role in their interest to learn more or less about it. The standard deviation of item 4 ('Culture is given too much importance in my textbook', Table 14) did not show a high degree of dispersion among the answers ($sd < 1.0$). This was also confirmed by a careful examination of each individual's response according to the textbook in use (see Table 6 for a list of all textbooks). No pattern could be observed across all four universities.

Finally, a very interesting result in the student survey appeared in the form of item 3: 'I trust the cultural content of my French textbook' (Table 15). While most teachers declared questioning the cultural content of their French textbook (for the above-mentioned reasons), students seem to overly trust it (81% of the responses). Once again the qualitative data became very useful for understanding the numerous reasons behind their choice. Indeed, after thorough analysis of their comments, as many as nine categories emerged from the data. These include *My teacher confirms the information in it* [21% of occurrence] (e.g., "My teacher has spent time in France and can verify most of the cultural information", "My teacher can back it up because she is from France and understands the culture"); *I don't know if it would be incorrect anyway* [17% of

occurrence] (e.g., “it is really the only thing I base my knowledge from”, “I know little of the French culture. So the majority of its culture I will learn from the book and teacher”); *It has been published* [13% of occurrence] (e.g., “it’s a textbook, you expect accuracy”, “it’s proofread and someone will pick up the fact that it’s wrong if it is indeed wrong”) ; *It was chosen by the department/my teacher* [12.5% of occurrence] (e.g., “there is a reason why my instructor chose to use this book”, “I trust that my school would not give me cultural content that is inaccurate”); *The people who wrote it are experts* [9% of occurrence] (e.g., “It would be pretty bad if the creators of my book didn’t know what they were talking about”, “I figure it had to be read by multiple people who know the material well”); *It is recent* [7.5% of occurrence] (e.g., “it mentions pretty modern concepts, such as that of the ghetto culture in France”, “it has many pop culture references to recent movies”); *It seems right* [7.5% of occurrence] (e.g., “it seems like the book has good credentials”, “it seems fairly realistic and not too off-the-wall”); *Why should I not trust it?* [6.5% of occurrence] (e.g., “I do not know why I wouldn’t [trust it]. I take it all with a grain of salt”, “why shouldn’t I trust it?”) and *It correlates with what I heard from native French speakers* [4% of occurrence] (e.g., “I have been to France and I know how it really is”, “Some of the colloquial uses I don’t know if I approve”, “it follows the cultural aspects of life that I have heard from people who have visited or lived in France”)¹⁴⁶. This data confirms that the FL textbook remains students’ only or most relevant source of information about the target language (apart from their teacher) and because of that, they overly rely on it.

¹⁴⁶ The last category is *Other* [2% of occurrence]

What are teachers' and students' views on how culture is currently treated in FL textbooks? In summary: based on the present study, some teachers show a certain reluctance to teach culture in general because they may not be familiar with the cultural content of the FL textbook (more specifically French textbooks have a tendency to focus on France instead of the Francophone world as a whole). Furthermore, teachers declared that often the cultural content is so overgeneralized or outdated that they have to search for text and images to *add* information or to *replace* culture topics in their textbook. Personal anecdotes that teachers like to add to the cultural content of the FL textbook are well appreciated by students. Culture with a small c takes precedence over culture with a big C for both teachers and students. Finally, the cultural content of the FL textbook that many teachers question gains students' almost complete trust because "it is really the only thing [they] base their knowledge from".¹⁴⁷

5.3 Type of FL textbook tasks that matters for teachers and students

The first result on the teachers' questionnaire which was unexpected was their agreement with item 6 (Table 17). In a CLT context, where the emphasis is on designing tasks that reflect real-life in the target country¹⁴⁸, it was surprising to find teachers agreeing that it is more important for a textbook to include activities that engage learners even though they may not be what students encounter in real-life than to include activities that reflect real life in a francophone country but may not motivate students very much (item 6, Table 17). In other words, the authenticity of the task does not matter as much

¹⁴⁷ Anonymous students' comment (I replaced the subject pronoun 'I' by [they])

¹⁴⁸ i.e., as previously mentioned, there is a wealth of literature on task-based teaching

for teachers as long as the learner ‘connects’ with its content. Teachers’ mild disagreement with item 2 (‘the textbook I am currently using presents content that is *engaging* for students’, Table 17) may have led them to place more emphasis on the role of affect and motivation in the FL classroom. Other factors completely independent from the FL textbook that lead teachers to privilege motivation over authenticity include large class sizes, number of students pursuing their study of French to fulfill a language requirement and high range of students’ performance within the same course.

On the positive side, practitioners are satisfied with the majority of the communicative activities proposed by their FL textbooks because they cover the most important tasks students need to know and are thus relevant (even though they are not always engaging).

When including items 7 and 8 in the teacher questionnaire, I expected that if a disagreement would occur it would be with item 8 (‘My textbook provides appropriate oral activities’) not with item 7 (‘My textbook provides appropriate written activities’). Nevertheless, the opposite happened. Almost as many teachers who said that they were satisfied with the oral activities of their current textbook (item 8; 65%) also disapproved of its written activities (item 7; 60%). The qualitative data really helped to explain the teachers’ choice. It was very revealing to analyze the data set for each answer in parallel. Indeed, when teachers wrote in response to item 8 that their textbook contains *many oral activities* [29% of occurrence] (“the text contains plenty of oral activities”, “[that’s what] it’s all about”) they said for item 7 that there are *not enough written activities* [34% of occurrence] (“the textbook is somewhat lacking in that respect”, “there is such a

communicative emphasis that we have to supply the written activities ourselves”). When teachers stated that the *oral activities are meaningful* [28% of occurrence] (“the students are encouraged to discuss the answers with their peers and practice using the language in a meaningful way”, “[...] oral activities are in context and meaningful”), they responded on the other questionnaire item that *written activities are not meaningful* [17% of occurrence] (“they are somewhat artificial”, “they are usually pretty mechanical and focused only on vocabulary or only on grammar [...]”). Finally, when the teachers explained that *oral activities engage students* [26% of occurrence] (“stimulating and diverse”, “on topics students can relate to”), they argued that *written activities do not engage students* [26% of occurrence] (“they are boring”, “students don’t find them interesting; they don’t know what to write about. [...]”). The only category that did not have its corresponding match in the other item’s comment section was *I have to supply written activities* [16% of occurrence] (“Most of the time I creat my own writing activities”, “I always have to supply these”) for item 7¹⁴⁹. Do teachers place written and oral activities in such a dichotomy because FL textbooks favor oral activities over written activities (“[that’s what] it’s all about”)? Or, is it just a traditional way (i.e., skill-building) to view SLA? In my opinion, it is difficult to give a unique and definite answer to this question. Indeed, it is clear that within CLT, the emphasis is placed on students’ oral performance. Nevertheless, one cannot see the skills as always so separate. Very often, some writing will be involved in a communicative activity (e.g., treasure hunt, information gap activity, etc) and written activities do not only consist of essays... This

¹⁴⁹ The ‘other’ category had 7% of occurrence in item’s 7 data set and 17% of occurrence in item’s 8 answers.

being said, the type of writing involved in certain textbook activities may also be form-based whereas practitioners may want more meaning-based activities.

Contrary to teachers, students appear highly pleased (80%) with their textbook written activities. Their open-ended comments provide clear answers about the origins of their satisfaction. The first category that emerged from the qualitative data is: written activities *expand grammatical and vocabulary knowledge* [21.5% of occurrence] (“they teach the skills needed for formal writing conjugations and stuff”, “they cover important material i need to know; such as, tenses and vocabulary”). This finding is far from astonishing, as SLA research has shown multiple times that L2 learners want to learn more grammar while teachers want to teach less. The second major reason given by students for their appreciation of written textbook activities is that *they reflect what is learned in class* [19.5% of occurrence]. So, does this mean that despite practitioner’s desire to focus equally on meaning and form, grammar is still explicitly taught in the FL classroom? In this case, it does not, since most of the students’ comments were topic-related (“they all fit the theme of the chapter [...]”, “they involve the topic we are going over at the time”). In addition, 16% of the students explained that written activities *deal with real-life situations* (“they will help me if i ever decide to study in France”) and 13.5% declared that *they are helpful* (“helps me learn, gets me active and understanding”). *Good practice* [12.5% of occurrence] (“stress practicing certain skills”) and *meaningful* [11% of occurrence] (“they force you to ‘think’ about the answer [...]”) were the last two categories that emerged from the students’ data¹⁵⁰. Except for the first

¹⁵⁰ and ‘other’ [6% of occurrence]

category (i.e., *expanding grammatical and vocabulary knowledge*), somewhat similar reasons were found for why students believe that their current textbook provides appropriate *oral* activities. In fact, the first category was replaced by *they are made to be communicative* (“expect 2 students to talk together”, “good group activity prompts”).

Overall, students seem very satisfied with FL textbook tasks since they agreed on all seven items of their questionnaire on that section (only one item was ‘negatively’ keyed: ‘it is more important for a textbook to include activities that *engage* me even though they may not be what I encounter in real-life than to include activities that reflect life in a francophone country but may not interest me very much’).

What is the type of FL textbook tasks that matters for teachers and students?

In summary: based on the current research project, the authenticity of the tasks does not matter so much for teachers and students alike. What matters is that the tasks engage learners and keep them motivated. Whether it is for ‘beneficial’ or ‘detrimental’ reasons, both teachers and students are pleased with current FL textbook tasks. This general feeling of satisfaction is a bit toned down by meaning-based written activities which teachers believe are lacking (to the disadvantage of oral activities) in most FL textbooks.

5.4 Teachers’ and students’ positions on grammar in FL textbooks

In contrast to SLA researchers (Aski, 2003, 2005; Wong & VanPatten, 2003) practitioners disagree that FL textbooks are overflowing with unnecessary grammatical terminology. However, this does not mean that teachers want to include more grammar as

exemplified by their disagreement with item 4 ('French textbooks should more extensively treat the use of double object pronouns'). Indeed, what is very interesting to note is that even though the majority of native and non-native French teachers received traditional language instruction when they were young (see Table 3), they almost all disagreed that grammar is the central focus of teaching French. Thus, in the present study, the instruction that teachers received did not influence their current beliefs about language teaching and learning.

In addition, instructors recognized that FL textbooks still contain mechanical drills but agreed that they also include an abundance of communicative activities. The main categories that emerged from the teachers' qualitative data on input processing are the textbook *makes students learn gradually* [63% of occurrence] ("gradual information in a logical way. From words to expressions, to output") and *it uses meaningful input* [27% of occurrence] ("Connected discourse exist already")¹⁵¹.

As predicted, for students, grammar plays a central role. The majority of learners across all four universities concurred that grammar learning consists of receiving explicit rules. Therefore, it was also expected that students would want to see a more extensive treatment of double object pronouns in their French textbook¹⁵². Nevertheless, learners' agreement with both items 24 and 17 shows that they could also try to balance a focus on form with a focus on meaning ('I would rather have grammar pages at the end of each

¹⁵¹ and 'other' [10% of occurrence]

¹⁵² This result is in line with previous students' finding that learning double object pronouns is important (see comments under section 5.1 of the present study).

chapter’ and ‘In textbooks, the grammatical structure should first appear in context and then be followed by its grammatical explanation’).

Finally, the students had to respond to the same open-ended question about input processing as the teachers. Aside from the different wording, a lot of their comments were comparable to the practitioners’ answers. As a result two categories that emerged from their data are similar to the main teachers’ categories: *it follows a logical progression* [34% of occurrence] (“it focuses on one thing, then moves to the next. It doesn’t complicate anything”) and *it is meaningful/connected* [27%] (“[...] requires students to use the grammar they have learned in increasingly complex ways”). The last major category that could be identified from the students’ data is *it does not move too fast* [34% of occurrence] (“it gives you time to digest the learned information before moving onto the next material”).¹⁵³

What is the teachers’ and students’ position on grammar in FL textbooks?

In summary: based on the present study, teachers and students are satisfied with the amount of grammar in FL textbooks. In other words, they do not complain that there are too many unnecessary rules or that grammar is given too much importance. They also think that grammar explanations should be in English in elementary textbooks and in French at the intermediate level. However, this is where most similarities between instructors and learners end. Despite their satisfaction with the quantity of grammar covered in the FL textbook, teachers do not place grammar at the center of teaching

¹⁵³ and ‘other’ [5% of occurrence]

French. Students, on the other hand, demand more focus on form. The main two drawbacks to FL textbook's formal instruction that were identified in the current research project are: the presence of mechanical drills (at least in teachers' view it is a hindrance) and the *organization* of the grammar rules that does not ensure students' readiness to acquire new grammatical features (according to teachers and students).

5.5 Teachers' and students' perspectives on how technology can complement the FL textbook

Teachers strongly agreed that (today) a good French instructor must possess both *practical* and *technical* knowledge and that technology helps to provide a balance between focusing students' attention on grammar and focusing their attention on communication. Therefore, it was rather surprising to find that only 55% of the practitioners declared that if they had the necessary equipment and training, they would use various technologies with their students at least twice a week. How can this result be meaningfully interpreted?

First of all, the statement is directed toward a variety of technologies, not just one. As previously seen, teachers make great use of the Web to add follow-up information to a reading passage or to replace inappropriate textbook content. Other technologies such as the "emerging technologies" (e.g., wikis, blogs, podcasts, etc.) however find very little use among practitioners. This happens not only because of the lack of resources available. For instance, in response to item 2 (Table 30) 'If I do not use technology it is because I do not have the necessary equipment', two out of the four universities surveyed

said No (66% and 78%). The little use of “emerging technologies” does not automatically result from lack of training either. Assuming that a technology component was included, all the participating teachers had already taken an average of two teaching methodologies courses / workshops. In a replication of the present study, it would be fruitful to include a couple of closed-response questions such as “did you learn about technologies in your methods’ course(s)/workshops?”, “if yes, about which technology did you learn?” [then various technologies would be listed and teachers could check the corresponding box(es)] and finally, it could also include an open-ended question: “Describe what you learned in the methods’ cours(es)/ workshop(s) that you attended”. Consequently, this means that if certain teachers do not use emerging technologies, it is not because they do not have the equipment or the training but because they choose not to use them¹⁵⁴. This may explain why 45% of the practitioners declared that even if they had the necessary equipment and training, they would not use *various* technologies with their students at least twice a week. They may just keep using the Internet which they would deem sufficient for what they intend to do with their students¹⁵⁵.

A second reason behind this choice is that L2 assessment needs to be revisited when using technologies. Unless this is done by the department or school, it means that the teacher will have to take the time to adapt the testing material. Since CALL requires multiple components, practitioners must design multiple assessment criteria.

¹⁵⁴ Teachers could consider them too time consuming or simply not beneficial to promote L2 acquisition

¹⁵⁵ Their use of the web may also be very narrow (i.e., they do not explore all the possibilities of the WWW)

A third reason mentioned by Tognozzi (2001: 487) is intellectual property rights. The lack of control of the tool being used also extends¹⁵⁶ to the issue that many of these technologies belong to the public domain. For instance, podcasts, the Web, blogs and wikis do not all have the option of being locked in for a specific group of users. Therefore, anybody can have access to the students' FL tasks.

Also, even if the practitioners have the necessary equipment and they received proper training, they may not be able anymore to use specific technologies in class. Indeed, technology used in the FL classroom is constantly evolving (Egbert, 2005) and a technology course taken three years ago may not be relevant today. This means that practitioners would need to stay constantly updated with the changes occurring in CALL research.

Finally, FL textbooks do not provide teachers with very specific guidelines on how to design tasks with technology. In addition, the links found on accompanying textbook websites are not always reliable¹⁵⁷. As a consequence, some teachers are at loss for how to develop technology-related activities based on sound pedagogy, and they do not know how they can scaffold students during the tasks. Pedagogies that directly address technology need to be put into place to help teachers. This should be the role of multimedia centers. However, in most post-secondary institutions, staff usually receive technological training only. For instance, an Instructional Computing staff person can

¹⁵⁶ Given that intellectual property rights are not always well defined since they vary with the content and circumstances, a lot of teachers consider it a 'lack of control'

¹⁵⁷ they would need to be constantly updated (at least every month)!

explain how to create a podcast to a teacher, but is not able to tell her/him how to use it in class.

Another unexpected result appeared in the form of item one's answer (item 1: 'I *cannot* think of any technology that could provide my students with practice for speaking', Table 29). Considering that Voice recognition technology is still in its infancy, I was surprised to find that teachers were in most disagreement with item 1. Thankfully, practitioners' open-ended comments on the topic provided much needed clarification. Four categories emerged from the qualitative data. They include *language laboratories* [27% of occurrences] ("lab (recording oneself, speaking with one or more peers)"), *Voice boards* [27% of occurrence] ("recording themselves with instruments like OLE, recording commercials, etc. to get feedback from instructor"), *synchronous CMCs* [20.5% of occurrence] ("chatrooms, msn video conferences, things like that"), the *Internet/WWW* [15.5% of occurrence] ("De voce software, podcasting combined with powerpoint presentation, quick time recordings").¹⁵⁸ Based on these answers, it appears that practitioners had in mind technological tools that mediate the speaking between two human beings in real time (e.g., "skype") or in an asynchronous manner (e.g., voice boards to receive feedback from the instructor later) or just simple tools to practice speaking without any form of assessment (e.g., "recordings"). A few teachers did mention voice recognition technologies but added that they were not very reliable.

To answer the present study research question: teachers do seem to consider that technology in the FL classroom complements the FL textbook. Textbook shortcomings

¹⁵⁸ and 'other' [10% of occurrence]

such as the ones mentioned by teachers in reaction to items 4 and 6 (instructors disagreed with both ‘The textbook I am currently using and its ancillaries are sufficient to develop the students’4 skills’ and ‘the audio CDs that come with the textbook are sufficient in developing my students listening skills’) are counterbalanced by a certain number of technologies. These include, as found in the qualitative data (i.e., second open-ended question asked to teachers), *Discussion board* (used by teachers to generate class discussion, allow students to see everybody’s answers, practice writing and save time), *podcasts* (to make students practice their listening comprehension and for cultural projects), *blogs* (to allow students to see and comment on each other’s work) and *emails* (for pen-pal projects and exposure to informal language¹⁵⁹).

Based on students’ qualitative data, it seems that they have experienced identical emerging technologies in their FL classes for similar reasons. The only two explanations they gave in addition to what teachers stated is that Discussion boards are *helpful* and blogs allow them to *be creative/they are fun*. In general, students want technology to be more integrated in language instruction in order to engage them more in the lesson¹⁶⁰, break up the routine, help them focus their attention simultaneously on form and meaning and facilitate their life as students and language learners. Using a course website and downloading *audio* material on their iPod are a few examples of how technology can facilitate their language learning process. I was astonished to find that students are not as interested in downloading *video* material on their iPod (only 51%). In a replication of the

¹⁵⁹ i.e., everyday spoken French!

¹⁶⁰ ‘to be engaged’ is a recurring theme, as for the authenticity of the tasks both students and teachers said that what was more important for them was to design/perform tasks that *engage* learners (even if they are not so authentic)

present study, it would be interesting to add the open-ended question: “Would you like to download *video* material on your iPod? Whether you say yes or no, please explain”. A number of hypotheses could be made. First of all, one of the reasons students are indeed interested in downloading *audio* material on their iPod is because they can listen to spoken French while they are doing something else, when they are ‘on the go’. With video material, it is very different, i.e., it requires their full attention, so in such case they might as well watch it on their laptop or TV. Also, unless it is a popular French movie or music video clips or American movies dubbed in French, I do not know if all students show much interest and curiosity for videos that are specifically produced to accompany FL textbooks. When these ‘textbook videos’ are shown in class by the instructor, it is different because the teacher can create suspense and show bits of it at key moments during the lesson. Also the instructor can help students to understand what the characters say in each episode. Indeed, without subtitles and/or further explanation, it can greatly frustrate students not to be able to follow the plot of the story.

Finally, students, similarly to teachers, listed numerous technologies, which in their opinion could help them practice their French speaking skills. Except for the voice-recognition computer software, learners also mentioned tools that require human intervention for full practice (assessment) of the language (e.g., online workbook, synchronous CMCs and voice boards). In the end, students even referred to a variety of audio/video materials—the idea being that if they enhance their listening skills, their speaking will automatically improve.

Do teachers and students consider that technology in the FL classroom complements the FL textbook? In summary: based on the current research project, both teachers and students believe that (today) a good language instructor must possess both *practical* and *technical* knowledge. According to practitioners and learners, technology in the FL classroom complements well the FL textbook because it helps to provide a balance between a focus on form and a focus on meaning (which is hard to accomplish with the text alone). Nevertheless, about half of the surveyed teachers said that even if they had the necessary equipment and training, they would not use various technologies with their students more than once a week. Possible reasons for this decision include the preference for using the WWW over additional technologies, the need to adapt L2 assessment, intellectual property rights, the lack of control over the tools being used and the difficulty to keep up with the pace at which technologies evolve. When teachers use technologies to compensate for their FL textbook shortcomings in terms of developing students' four skills, they use discussion boards, podcasts, blogs and emails. Students who enjoy these technologies would like to see even more of them being integrated in their FL classes. 'Emerging technologies' such as iPods, where students could download all the FL textbook audio material, have a promising future according to learners. The reasons why students would like more technology integrated into FL instruction differ slightly from the teachers': to engage them more with the lesson content, break up the routine and facilitate their life as students and language learners. The course

website/CMS¹⁶¹ was highly praised by both teachers and students as a tool that facilitates teaching/learning and students' life.

5.6 Implications for the FL classroom and language teaching materials design

At its core, the results of this study show what an impact the textbook has in the FL classroom and more specifically on students. Their almost 'blind' trust of the language teaching materials is frightening. We often hear people say that students' learning is in the hands of the teacher. The present study shows that it is not only in the hands of the teacher but it is also in the hands of the textbook author. Language teaching materials' developers play a major role in instructed SLA because a majority of students will rely solely on the textbook, whether it is to learn about the target culture, the written and spoken language or just to improve their four language skills. FL textbooks have gone a very long way since the grammar translation era. However the current research project suggests that more improvements can be made, specifically in the area of culture (to include a variety of countries where the TL is spoken), L2 authenticity (to cover standard and everyday spoken language equally), grammar (to eliminate the remaining mechanical drills and reorganize some rules) and technology (why not create podcasts for the textbook audio material which can be more easily accessible by students?).

So, how can FL textbook design be reconciled with SLA research, teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning and students' self-perceived needs? The present study certainly shows that this will not be an easy task. Among only the same group of

¹⁶¹ Course Management System

professionals (i.e., teachers), a wide discrepancy exists, as seen with the issue of which version of the L2 should be taught. Students want to be more engaged with the classroom content whether it is through technology or a variety of textbook tasks. Thus, how can the FL textbook keep them engaged? The amount of grammar and grammatical terminology seem to please both teachers and students. So, does this mean that materials' designers should not make any changes in this area? Well, this is where SLA experts have a say. As Tomlinson (1998) points out, it could be extremely useful to provide learners and teachers with the textbook they want, but it would not be enough. What they want may not necessarily be what promotes their L2 acquisition in the most effective way. A significant number of classroom-based studies of language learning and teaching have been conducted since the late 1980s, and their pragmatic findings have provided consensus among SLA scholars in order for such research to be applied to concise pedagogical principles (Lightbown, 2000).

Textbook authors need to be involved in action-based research with SLA experts and teachers to identify the learning outcomes of language teaching materials. This can only be done if publishers cooperate with language departments to produce and pilot experimental materials. The problem is that this costs not only money, time and effort, but also the learning of the students is at stake and the practitioners need to have some teaching experience to know how to best handle the materials, and time to fill out detailed reports. Nevertheless, most if not all teaching materials are piloted during their development process, though often on a small-scale. Furthermore, within the last decade the Internet and various technologies have made an impact on the FL textbook ancillaries

by adding yet another layer of materials. These ‘digital’ ancillaries present new challenges for piloting as they are expensive to design and more difficult and time-consuming to change.

In addition, action-based research should not only be done for experimental textbooks but could also be conducted on existing language teaching materials. Indeed, we should not measure the success of a FL textbook by its number of editions.

To find ways to cater to the various teachers’ and students’ wants, material developers must conduct needs analyses of both students and teachers prior to developing language teaching materials. Practitioner’s participation in these needs analyses should be part of their ongoing professional development.

From the researchers’ perspective, SLA experts also need to engage in action-based research with practitioners. Studies of instructed SLA must be replicated and their results should be presented not only at major research conferences but also at teachers’ conferences. SLA experts should also publish books on how languages are learned with a wealth of implications for the L2 classroom (and not only a couple of pages in the last chapter). The jargon used should be comprehensible to the entire teaching community.

From an administrator’s point of view, the opinion gap between native and non-native French instructors (regarding the authenticity of the L2 taught) shows that the position of LPD requires more than technical knowledge of the profession. Her/his role extends to awareness of linguistic and cultural differences among her/his instructors and to provide feedback and support when necessary.

When selecting a textbook, the LPD must pay attention not only to the balance it provides between a focus on form and a focus on meaning but also to finding how culture is approached in the text. Most importantly, teachers need to be included in the department/school textbook selection process.

The discrepancy between students and teachers on the role of grammar instruction in the FL classroom calls for more student-teacher-LPD communication. The gap could be narrowed by having teachers assess students' views on concrete pedagogical practices early in the semester and by, in turn, sharing their own position on how languages are learned and explaining their rationale for integrating specific activities. The LPD could organize hands-on sessions for teachers to collaborate in the development of language teaching materials for them to use in the classroom.

To promote the language instructors' *practical* and *technical* knowledge, LPDs must administer language training workshops for faculty professional development. Since technologies are constantly evolving (Egbert, 2005), these should be implemented on a semester basis. The workshops would also allow teachers to discover that numerous technologies besides the Web can be used to promote L2 learning in the classroom. To ensure that their use will indeed be effective, and also to facilitate teachers' preparation, L2 assessment should be an integral element of any workshop that deals with CALL technologies. Finally, language teaching methodologies courses should be offered for pre-service and in-service teachers that include a component on general language teaching materials' design.

All of this being said, it is important to note that LPDs will be able to implement the above measures only if the Department helps them in the process. However, it often happens that LPDs will be considered for promotion and tenure based only on what they publish. As one can deduce from the descriptions above, administering a language program (especially in large institutions) takes a lot of time and energy. Thus, the workload of the LPD creates “holes in [her/his] curriculum vitae” (Dvorak, 1986). Furthermore, in language departments where the faculty is always almost entirely in literature, the LPD’s work is usually perceived as “peripheral” (Dvorak, 1986). It is the role of the Department to better support and value the role of the LPD. The latter should not be forced to choose between doing her/his job well and obtaining tenure. All the above-mentioned measures (supervision of teachers, workshops, etc.) should be included as a legitimate part of the tenure process. The well-being of the department including its faculty and teachers, and ultimately students’ learning, are at stake.

From a teachers’ perspective, it is important that language instructors keep in mind that affect and motivation have a strong influence on L2 development (the authenticity of the tasks in SLA is overrated). In addition, if some teachers choose not to use ‘everyday spoken French’ in their L2 classroom, they should at least expose their students to as much authentic L2 material as possible (e.g., through keypal projects, blogs, radio/television shows, guest speakers, etc.). Moreover, when practitioners discuss culture with their students, they should always teach their students to be critical in regard to the textbook content. Critical thinking should also be emphasized in lower level language courses. In order to compensate for the lack of cultural breadth in their FL

textbook, but concurrently not to spend too much time on it, teachers should collaborate to find extra information. It would also allow the language instructors from a variety of countries to share ideas on specific cultural topics.

From a learners' perspective, students should read and listen to more authentic materials within a wide range of options (e.g., newspaper, various kinds of magazines, music, etc) to expose themselves to not only the standard written language but also its everyday spoken form. While it may be difficult to do so for beginners without the help of their teacher, it is very much possible at the intermediate level. Social events such as *La Table francophone* also allow for exposure to 'authentic' language in a relaxed atmosphere. Next, it may prove useful and engaging for the students/"digital natives" to combine their favorite technology(ies) with French (e.g., download French podcasts found on any French websites on their iPods, use Instant Messaging in French, etc.). Learning a language means taking risks, thus students should not feel threatened by not knowing all the grammatical rules to produce language. Finally, they should feel free to express their own views on how languages are learned to their teacher.

5.7 Limitations of the present study

As with any research study, limitations are present which make the generalizability of the results difficult at times.

The first limitation concerns the research instrument of the present study. By trying to simplify several survey items which were too technical (e.g., input processing) or could lead to several interpretations by students or even teachers (e.g., communicative

activities), I ended up paraphrasing numerous times and adding examples as well. Thus one sentence (e.g., ‘My textbook contains mechanical drills’) would result in three or four clauses (e.g., My textbook contains activities in which there is a complete *control* of the response, and *only one* answer is possible. Also I do not really need to understand what is being said to complete the activity’). As Brown (2001) points out, when designing survey questions, it is important to avoid writing overly long questions because you want your respondents to finish the survey, and short questions will ensure that they do not get discouraged. Unfortunately, I was not able to stay within the question length of twenty words suggested by Stacey and Moyer (1982).

Also, after a few meetings with the specialist in test and questionnaire design, and two piloting phases, several double-barreled questions were split into two items. As a result, the questionnaire was much longer than I had intended, especially given that it contained not only closed-response questions but also open-ended questions. I considered eliminating several items but the research instrument had to cover as many as five research areas (the first research question was split into three topics followed by the other two research questions). The final version of the teacher survey contained 103 closed-response questions and 12 open-ended questions and the penultimate student questionnaire had 102 closed-response questions and 11 open-ended questions. All this being said, it is obvious that the teachers and students who voluntarily completed the online questionnaire may not be a representative sample of the typical language instructor/L2 learner population. Their interest in SLA, teaching methodologies and FL

textbooks may have inflated the results. Nevertheless, the vast number of participants across the four large public institutions in the U.S. make tentative conclusions possible.

Despite the constant effort to avoid loaded questions (e.g., the first category of the questionnaire was not called “Authenticity of the L2, target culture and tasks” but “The French language, culture and activities in textbooks”) some items that could bias respondents’ answers remained. For instance, virtually all students showed agreement with the items stating that ‘on’ replaces ‘nous’ in spoken French, that ‘ne’ can be deleted or that ‘tu’ is used for generic meaning. However, one wonders whether learners would have been able to produce at least two of the three items if asked “What are the specificities of spoken French?” A solution to this problem would thus be to change these closed-response items rated on a Likert scale to an open-ended question. However, this would mean more qualitative data to analyze (the open-ended questions asked of 1071 participants resulted into 3200 statements). Another solution would be to insert several ‘tricky’/false-leading questions as well. However, this would mean more items to answer for the respondents.

One main advantage of using a professional online survey maker is the large range of options that the researcher has to collect data. It can make the process entirely anonymous and the collection of large amount of data in a short time feasible. It reduces the costs of deployment, and most likely increases the return rate (because it seems less-time consuming to complete a survey on a computer than on paper, there is no questionnaire to mail, and since it is on the Web it can be accessed from anywhere there is an internet connection, etc.). An option offered by the professional online survey maker

which I decided to take advantage of was ‘forcing’ the participants to respond to all questions before being able to move on to the next page. Also for ethical/human subject purposes, only fully completed surveys were recorded. For instance, if a respondent would stop filling out the survey (i.e., close the computer window) after the first page, her/his answer would not be saved. The data was recorded only once students clicked the ‘Done’ button on the third page of the online survey. While this method of data collection certainly reduced the number of outliers, it may also have diminished the number of participants in the study. In fact, it is certainly possible that participants who kept being sent back to the first page every time they would omit a question ended up very frustrated and stopped filling out the questionnaire completely (each page contained 33-35 items). In a paper format, they would have had the option to complete the questions in the order of their choice.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that having teachers and students complete a questionnaire on their own personal time (instead of in class) without any monetary incentive¹⁶² would not favor a large number of participants. However, this did not become an issue since four large post-secondary French language programs participated in the study.

In order to collect sufficient data in light of the above-mentioned constraints, I made the conscious decision to only survey large universities. A four-year-liberal arts college or a community college may have brought diverse results. For instance, if the teaching faculty of basic language courses is made up of literature professors instead of

¹⁶² no extra-credits were offered to the students in my home institution and it was at the discretion of my contacts in the other three BLPS to let their instructors offer extra-credits to their students or not

graduate teaching instructors, I wonder whether teachers' views of which French should be taught¹⁶³ would be different. In addition, would there be a distinction between professors specialized in classical literature and those with a focus in modern literature? Would the latter be more open to including everyday spoken French in the curriculum? As far as the learners are concerned, it is important to point out that students in community colleges are usually older than the typical student population in large universities. Furthermore, students in community colleges generally want to learn for practical implications. Does this mean that they would prefer learning everyday spoken French over standard written French? Without a doubt, it would be interesting to replicate the current research project with small four-year colleges and community colleges to examine whether the institutions have an impact on the results.

5.8 Recommendations for future research

A few suggestions for a meaningful and fruitful replication of the present study have already been made in chapters 3, 4 and 5. They will be quickly summarized below before making other suggestions.

As previously mentioned, no open-ended questions were asked on the L2 authenticity part of the survey because of the already large number of items in that section of the questionnaire and also because of the need to obtain some quantitative data in order to determine relevant open-ended questions. Now that ample quantitative data

¹⁶³ standard written French or everyday spoken French?

has been collected on the subject, several open-ended questions could be added while eliminating unnecessary items (e.g., items 1, 3 and 4 in Table 9).

The present research instrument could be further reduced to a smaller number of questions by concentrating on specific areas of interest that emerged from the combination of quantitative and qualitative data. It would thus allow for a more focused and concentrated research. For instance, the present study showed that teachers make little use of “emerging technologies”. Nevertheless, we know that this does not automatically mean that it is due to a lack of proper training. We could actually confirm this hypothesis if we knew whether a technology component was included in the teaching methodologies courses / workshops the participants attended. In a replication of the present study, it would thus be beneficial to include a couple of closed-response questions such as “did you learn about technologies in your methods’ course(s)/workshops?”, “if yes, which technology did you learn about?” [then give a list of various technologies and teachers could check the corresponding box(es)] and finally, it could also integrate an open-ended question: “Describe what you learned in the methods’ course(s)/ workshop(s) that you attended”.

Another result that deserves further investigation in the area of technology is that students are not as interested in downloading *video* material on their iPod as they are with *audio* files. In a replication of the present study, it would be interesting to add the following open-ended questions: “Does your iPod have video capabilities?”; “Would you like to download *video* material on your iPod? Whether you say yes or no, please explain”.

Since differences appeared between native and non-native French teachers (for the question of L2 authenticity), it would be interesting to do a follow-up study with a larger number of teachers in each category to verify previous findings and perhaps investigate other areas (e.g., views on culture, grammar, etc.). Similarly, more practitioners within the native-French teacher category would allow for a direct comparison between teachers from France and teachers from other Francophone countries on the issue of which French to teach.

Furthermore, the current research project suggested that *teaching experience in the U.S.* influenced native-French instructors in their views about specific linguistic items in spoken French and their ability to teach those grammatical features. I would be curious to find out whether *field of study* also impacts instructors. When analyzing the data, I was particularly interested in comparing graduate students (i.e., teachers) who study French literature with instructors who specialize in FL pedagogy. However, there were only two participants of the latter variety while thirty-five studied in the French department, thus making the comparison impossible. If it were possible, a replication of the current research project would ensure an equivalent number of teachers in both literature and FL pedagogy. One of the questions that could then be investigated is: Would the study of literature or FL pedagogy lead graduate instructors to prefer teaching one version of the L2 over the other (e.g., standard written French or everyday spoken French or both)?

While it was certainly the intent of the current research project to select universities that use various FL textbooks, three of the four universities appeared to use the same French textbook at the elementary level (i.e., *Deux Mondes*). Thus, a replication

of the present study would include a variety of FL textbooks not only at the intermediate level but also at the elementary level.

Since the nature and content of the FL textbook is what drives the current research project, a closer look could be taken at American FL textbooks and how they compare with FL textbooks produced in France (e.g., textbooks produced in the U.S. used by American universities vs. textbooks produced in France used by *Alliances Françaises* in North-America). Also, ESL textbooks (based on corpus data of spoken language) could be compared with French textbooks in the U.S.

One of the strengths of this study is that it examined *both* students' and teachers' views of FL textbooks in light of current SLA theory. If we are to reconcile FL textbook design with SLA research, teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning and students' self-perceived needs, SLA experts need to do extensive research that includes all the materials users (not only the teachers!).

Since LPDs play a key role in the textbook selection of most post-secondary institutions, it may also be judicious to include them in a replication of the present study.

Finally, I made the purposeful decision to only use written questionnaires to collect data. Nevertheless, the current dissertation could be replicated using additional research instruments. For instance, textbook writers, LPDs, teachers and students could be interviewed. Also, to gain a wider perspective of how FL textbooks are actually used by practitioners, it would be fruitful to videotape language teachers in action in both the U.S. and France.

5.9 Final word to materials' developers, researchers, teachers and students

The present study by investigating the learners and practitioners' perspectives of teaching materials showed what a powerful tool the FL textbook is. Novice teachers may entirely rely on it; in some schools the textbook *is* the curriculum and for most students it is their only source of input (aside from their teacher) to learn the L2.

Textbook authors need to understand what a major role they play into the lives of L2 learners and those of their teachers. Consequently, materials' developers need, to the best of their abilities, to balance cumbersome marketing constraints with what we know about how languages are learned and students' and teacher's wants and needs.

Researchers need to make the effort to connect more with the FL classroom by providing concrete pedagogical implications. This should not only be the task of applied linguists.

Teachers need to go beyond the FL textbook content whenever they deem it appropriate. *They* are 'the teacher' *not* the textbook. They should always critically examine and use a variety of language teaching materials including various FL textbooks, authentic material from the target culture and technologies that can well complement what lack in the other materials.

Students need to be more critical with any material they use to learn a FL. Perhaps it would be helpful to do multiple activities, where students are asked to locate information on a topic presented in their textbook and then do a compare/contrast activity. They also need to take more responsibility for their own learning. Their success

to learn the L2 culture cannot rely solely on one thing, whether it is the textbook or the teacher.

Despite all what has been previously mentioned, FL textbooks constitute a major component of FL teaching in a very positive way as well. They provide a solid and similar basis for the content of each class in multiple section courses in language departments at the post-secondary level. They provide less experienced teachers with much needed guidance in lesson planning (e.g., today's FL textbooks include a wealth of margin comments, instructor resource kits, suggestions for planning the course, etc). Finally, textbooks are also very useful in saving time for practitioners by supplying them with a great variety of learning resources.

The textbook is important to promote L2 acquisition, but it is not the *key* to its success. In that respect, I will end this dissertation with the intact and unedited comment found on one of the student questionnaires: "Nothing is a replacement for a great French teacher!!! Great French teacher makes up for any crappy book, podcast misuse, etc. Bad French teacher can't be helped by anything. --- This is obvious because, if you think about it, a great French teacher could teach someone French without any materials. Of course, the right materials can always help, but, fundamentally, they are just there to aid the teacher. The teacher isn't there to aid the materials (at least in the case of a language learning)."

APPENDIX A
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Background information
<p>1. I am:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Female <input type="radio"/> Male
<p>2. My age is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 21-25 <input type="radio"/> 26-30 <input type="radio"/> 31-35 <input type="radio"/> 36-40 <input type="radio"/> 41+
<p>3. My status at university is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> French graduate student <input type="radio"/> graduate student in a pedagogy related-field <input type="radio"/> graduate student from another department than French or any pedagogy-related field <input type="radio"/> adjunct, lecturer (non-student) <input type="radio"/> assistant, associate or full professor
<p>4. My native language is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> French <input type="radio"/> English <input type="radio"/> other
<p>5. My country of origin is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> France <input type="radio"/> Switzerland <input type="radio"/> Canada <input type="radio"/> a francophone country in Africa <input type="radio"/> Haiti <input type="radio"/> a francophone country other than the above-mentioned <input type="radio"/> the United-States <input type="radio"/> an other non-francophone country
<p>6. My oral <u>French</u> production is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Advanced low (I can accurately narrate in simple fashion and describe in the past, present, and future time frames, as well as relate facts, such as who, where, why, when, or how much) <input type="radio"/> Advanced Mid (I can readily be understood by native speakers who are not used to dealing with non-natives) <input type="radio"/> Advanced High (I can handle almost any informal and most formal presentations with ease, confidence, and competence. I can compensate for an imperfect grasp of grammar or vocabulary by the confident use of paraphrasing, circumlocution, and illustration) <input type="radio"/> Superior (I can use coherent discourse that does not distract the native speaker or interfere with communication even when I make rare errors in low-frequency structures or formal usages) <input type="radio"/> Distinguished (I can perform the communication tasks of an educated native speaker, although there may be occasional weaknesses in breadth of vocabulary, pronunciation, or cultural references) <input type="radio"/> Native

<p>7. My oral <u>English</u> production is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advanced low (I can accurately narrate in simple fashion and describe in the past, present, and future time frames, as well as relate facts, such as who, where, why, when, or how much) ○ Advanced Mid (I can readily be understood by native speakers who are not used to dealing with non-natives) ○ Advanced High (I can handle almost any informal and most formal presentations with ease, confidence, and competence. I can compensate for an imperfect grasp of grammar or vocabulary by the confident use of paraphrasing, circumlocution, and illustration) ○ Superior (I can use coherent discourse that does not distract the native speaker or interfere with communication even when I make rare errors in low-frequency structures or formal usages) ○ Distinguished (I can perform the communication tasks of an educated native speaker, although there may be occasional weaknesses in breadth of vocabulary, pronunciation, or cultural references) ○ Native
<p>8. As a non-native French teacher, when I started learning French I was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ N/A (I am a native-French speaker) ○ younger than 10 ○ 10-13 ○ 14-21 ○ 22+
<p>9. As a non-native French teacher, the French instruction I received was more:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ N/A (I am a native-French speaker) ○ traditional (teacher-centered, grammar oriented) ○ communicative (student-centered, emphasis on oral production) ○ balanced between grammar and communicative activities
<p>10. As a non-native French teacher, the longest consecutive time I have spent in a Francophone country is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ N/A (I am a native-French speaker) ○ never ○ less than 4 weeks ○ 1 month-6 months ○ 7 months-12 months ○ 13 months-23 months ○ 2 + years
<p>11. As a native-French teacher and/or if my native language is NOT English, when I started learning English I was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ N/A (I am a native-English speaker) ○ younger than 10 ○ 10-13 ○ 14-21 ○ 22+
<p>12. As a native-French teacher and/or if my native language is NOT English, the English instruction I received was more :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ N/A (I am a native-English speaker) ○ traditional (teacher-centered, grammar oriented) ○ communicative (student-centered, emphasis on oral production) ○ balanced between grammar and communicative activities

<p>13. If I am NOT American, I have been living in the United-States for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> N/A (I am American) <input type="radio"/> less than 3 months <input type="radio"/> 3 months -11 months <input type="radio"/> 1 year- 2 years <input type="radio"/> more than 2 years 																																																												
<p>14. I have taken the following number of language teaching methodology courses/workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> none <input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2-3 <input type="radio"/> 4+ 																																																												
<p>15. I have taught French in the United-States for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1 semester <input type="radio"/> 1 year- 23 months (almost 2 years) <input type="radio"/> 2 years- 47 months (almost 4 years) <input type="radio"/> 4 years- 71 months (almost 6 years) <input type="radio"/> 6 + years 																																																												
<p>16. The French textbook(s) I am currently using is/are:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> A</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Contacts</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Entre Amis</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Montages</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Sur le vif</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> l'Aventure</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Controverses</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Explorations</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Motifs</td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> A votre tour</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Debuts</td> <td><input type="radio"/> French in action, Part1</td> <td><input type="radio"/> On y va</td> <td><input type="radio"/> ToutEnsemble</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> A vous</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Destinations</td> <td><input type="radio"/> French in Action, Part2</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Ouvertures</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Vis-à-Vis</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Allez viens</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Deux Mondes</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Horizons</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Paroles</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Voila</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Allons-y</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Bleu</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Images</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Personnages</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Other (please specify):</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Bien dit</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Blanc</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Intrigue</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Quant à moi</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Bien vu, bien dit</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Rouge</td> <td><input type="radio"/> J'veux bien</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Rapports</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Bienvenue</td> <td><input type="radio"/> En bonne forme</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Invitation au monde</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Rendez-vous</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Bon voyage</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Ensemble</td> <td><input type="radio"/> francophone</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Séquences</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Bravo</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Ensuite</td> <td><input type="radio"/> Mais Oui</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/> Chez Nous</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<input type="radio"/> A	<input type="radio"/> Contacts	<input type="radio"/> Entre Amis	<input type="radio"/> Montages	<input type="radio"/> Sur le vif	<input type="radio"/> l'Aventure	<input type="radio"/> Controverses	<input type="radio"/> Explorations	<input type="radio"/> Motifs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> A votre tour	<input type="radio"/> Debuts	<input type="radio"/> French in action, Part1	<input type="radio"/> On y va	<input type="radio"/> ToutEnsemble	<input type="radio"/> A vous	<input type="radio"/> Destinations	<input type="radio"/> French in Action, Part2	<input type="radio"/> Ouvertures	<input type="radio"/> Vis-à-Vis	<input type="radio"/> Allez viens	<input type="radio"/> Deux Mondes	<input type="radio"/> Horizons	<input type="radio"/> Paroles	<input type="radio"/> Voila	<input type="radio"/> Allons-y	<input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Bleu	<input type="radio"/> Images	<input type="radio"/> Personnages	<input type="radio"/> Other (please specify):	<input type="radio"/> Bien dit	<input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Blanc	<input type="radio"/> Intrigue	<input type="radio"/> Quant à moi	_____	<input type="radio"/> Bien vu, bien dit	<input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Rouge	<input type="radio"/> J'veux bien	<input type="radio"/> Rapports		<input type="radio"/> Bienvenue	<input type="radio"/> En bonne forme	<input type="radio"/> Invitation au monde	<input type="radio"/> Rendez-vous		<input type="radio"/> Bon voyage	<input type="radio"/> Ensemble	<input type="radio"/> francophone	<input type="radio"/> Séquences		<input type="radio"/> Bravo	<input type="radio"/> Ensuite	<input type="radio"/> Mais Oui			<input type="radio"/> Chez Nous				
<input type="radio"/> A	<input type="radio"/> Contacts	<input type="radio"/> Entre Amis	<input type="radio"/> Montages	<input type="radio"/> Sur le vif																																																								
<input type="radio"/> l'Aventure	<input type="radio"/> Controverses	<input type="radio"/> Explorations	<input type="radio"/> Motifs	<input type="radio"/>																																																								
<input type="radio"/> A votre tour	<input type="radio"/> Debuts	<input type="radio"/> French in action, Part1	<input type="radio"/> On y va	<input type="radio"/> ToutEnsemble																																																								
<input type="radio"/> A vous	<input type="radio"/> Destinations	<input type="radio"/> French in Action, Part2	<input type="radio"/> Ouvertures	<input type="radio"/> Vis-à-Vis																																																								
<input type="radio"/> Allez viens	<input type="radio"/> Deux Mondes	<input type="radio"/> Horizons	<input type="radio"/> Paroles	<input type="radio"/> Voila																																																								
<input type="radio"/> Allons-y	<input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Bleu	<input type="radio"/> Images	<input type="radio"/> Personnages	<input type="radio"/> Other (please specify):																																																								
<input type="radio"/> Bien dit	<input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Blanc	<input type="radio"/> Intrigue	<input type="radio"/> Quant à moi	_____																																																								
<input type="radio"/> Bien vu, bien dit	<input type="radio"/> Discovering French!Rouge	<input type="radio"/> J'veux bien	<input type="radio"/> Rapports																																																									
<input type="radio"/> Bienvenue	<input type="radio"/> En bonne forme	<input type="radio"/> Invitation au monde	<input type="radio"/> Rendez-vous																																																									
<input type="radio"/> Bon voyage	<input type="radio"/> Ensemble	<input type="radio"/> francophone	<input type="radio"/> Séquences																																																									
<input type="radio"/> Bravo	<input type="radio"/> Ensuite	<input type="radio"/> Mais Oui																																																										
<input type="radio"/> Chez Nous																																																												
<p>17. I have used the following number of elementary French textbooks during my entire teaching career (e.g., high-school, college, university, etc.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4+ 																																																												
<p>18. I have used the following number of intermediate French textbooks during my entire teaching career (e.g., high-school, college, university, etc.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4+ 																																																												
<p>19. The highest number of semesters I have you used the same French textbook to teach is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4+ 																																																												

2. The French language, culture and activities in textbooks	
<i>Instructions: For each of the statements below, please indicate to what extent you agree with the statement, using the following scale</i>	
1. The way I speak French in my daily life with my francophone friends, colleagues, and family is the same as the French found in the dialogues of the textbook I am currently using	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
2. In the francophone country that I know, I would be comfortable orally using some of the expressions proposed by my textbook for formal encounters (e.g., asking for directions, buying a ticket at a travel agency, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
3. When I write informal French emails or letters (e.g., to francophone friends, colleagues, family) it is similar to the French found in the textbook I am currently using	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
4. When I write formally (e.g., job application, letter of complaint, email to my boss, etc.) in French, I use similar expressions to what the textbook I am currently using proposes	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
5. When I speak informally French (e.g., with my francophone friends, family) I more often use 'on' than ' <i>nous</i> ' to express 'we'	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
6. When I speak formally French (e.g., with my francophone boss) I more often use 'on' than ' <i>nous</i> ' to express 'we'	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
7. Double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je le lui ai déjà donné) are rarely used in everyday spoken French	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. As a French native-speaker , it is difficult for me to teach double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je le lui ai déjà donné)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
9. When I speak informally French in my daily life, I often use ' <i>tu</i> ' to express a generic meaning (e.g., « Quand j'habitais en Floride, j'étais près d'un lac. En été, si tu sortais de la maison après 21h, t' étais sûr de te faire piquer par une dizaine de moustiques en moins d'un quart d'heure »)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
10. I often omit the ' <i>ne</i> ' when I say negative French sentences in my daily life (e.g., j'aime pas ça)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
11. However, I try not to forget the ' <i>ne</i> ' when I speak in class in front of my students	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
12. There is a wide gap between written and spoken French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
13. The textbook I am currently using shows a wide gap between written and spoken French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
14. It is important for students to be taught both versions : standard written French and daily spoken French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
15. I do not speak French like the French found in the textbook I am currently using but I should	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD

16. The French used in textbooks is the French that we need to teach our students	SA A D SD
17. The textbook I am currently using presents content that is relevant for students	SA A D SD
18. The textbook I am currently using presents content that is engaging for students	SA A D SD
19. Reading passages in the textbook I am currently using are helpful to introduce cultural information about France	SA A D SD
20. Reading passages in the textbook I am currently using are helpful to introduce cultural information about other francophone countries than France	SA A D SD
21. I rarely question the cultural content of French textbooks because: _____	SA A D SD
22. I found the cultural content of the textbook I am currently using very accurate	SA A D SD
23. I like to add personal anecdotes when I teach cultural topics from French textbooks	SA A D SD
24. I often need to search for text and images to replace the culture topics in the textbook I am currently using	SA A D SD
25. I often search for text and images to add information on the culture topics in the textbook I am currently using	SA A D SD
26. Culture with a small c (daily life behaviors, how people think, etc.) is given too much importance in the textbook I am currently using	SA A D SD
27. I think we should teach culture with a big C (arts, literature, cinema, etc.) before we teach culture with a small c (daily life behaviors, how people think, etc.) because: _____	SA A D SD
28. What I enjoy the most about teaching is the culture in general	SA A D SD
29. When teaching culture with a small c, I find difficult to teach:	
○ Student's life	SA A D SD
○ The relationship of the French to the media (television, internet, press, etc.).....	SA A D SD
○ Family.....	SA A D SD
○ Eating habits/food.....	SA A D SD
○ Attitudes towards clothing.....	SA A D SD

○ The French and their health.....	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
○ City life vs. rural life.....	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
○ Friendship/love.....	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
○ Racism/immigration.....	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
○ Hobbies of young French people.....	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
30. When I teach culture with a big C, I teach:	
○ Music.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ Fine Arts.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ Literature.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ History.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ Geography.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ Cinema.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ Politics.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
○ Education system.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
31. The activities proposed by the textbook I am currently using mirror real-life situations in a Francophone country	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
32. My current textbook provides appropriate WRITTEN activities They are appropriate/inappropriate because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
33. My current textbook provides appropriate ORAL activities They are appropriate/inappropriate because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
34. This textbook contains a majority of communicative activities – Activities designed around a realistic situation and for which there is a meaningful reason for the students to exchange information. Students need to understand the linguistic resources and the sociocultural context to become competent users of the second language. Examples of communicative activities include information transfer, information gap, problem solving, role-playing, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
35. The textbook activities cover the most important tasks students need to know	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
36. It is more important for a textbook to include activities that engage learners even though they may not be what students may encounter in real-life (e.g., fill in the blanks of the lyrics of a song) <i>than</i> to include activities that reflect life in a francophone country but may not motivate students very much (e.g., ask for directions)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD

3. Grammar in French textbooks	
<i>Instructions: For each of the statements below, please indicate to what extent you agree with the statement, using the following scale</i>	
1. Grammar is the central focus of teaching French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
2. Grammar teaching consists of giving explicit rules	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
3. I like teaching grammar	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
4. French textbooks should more extensively treat the use of double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je le lui ai déjà donné)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
5. Students improve their French most rapidly if they practice the grammar	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
6. The textbook I am currently using contains mechanical drills (i.e., activities in which there is a complete control of the response , and only one answer is possible . When performing mechanical drills, learners do not really need to understand what is being said to complete the activity successfully)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
7. The organization of the grammar rules in the French textbook I am currently using does not ensure students' readiness to acquire new grammatical features (i.e., some rules should be presented before others so that students do not get lost)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
8. The textbook I am currently using does not highlight the grammatical items (via italics, bold characters, multiple repetitions, etc.) well enough for learners to notice them	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
9. Beginning students do not need grammar to communicate (they use chunks of words and formulaic speech)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
10. Learners need to have sufficient lexical knowledge to understand the grammatical rules	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
11. The place of grammar is with intermediate learners and up	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
12. Grammar explanations in elementary textbooks should be in French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
13. Grammar explanations in intermediate textbooks should be in French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
14. Awareness is more important than performance (i.e., French textbooks should aim at making students aware of important grammatical concepts instead of expecting accuracy from the students)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
15. French textbooks are overflowing with unnecessary grammatical terminology (i.e., the wording of the rules is too complicated and there are too many unnecessary rules)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD

16. The textbook I am currently using presents grammar in a gradual manner (i.e., logical progression of the rules)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
17. In textbooks, the grammatical structure should first appear in context and then be followed by its grammatical explanation	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
18. The textbook I am currently using includes activities that challenge students by involving them intellectually	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
19. The textbook I am currently using focuses on areas of grammar known to cause problems to French learners	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
20. The textbook I am currently using has a majority of activities that encourage learners to make form-meaning connections (i.e., understand a grammatical concept through a meaningful context)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
21. The textbook I am currently using processes input: - it teaches only one thing at a time - it has activities that are meaningful - it requires students to do something with the grammatical item - it moves from sentences to connected discourse I agree/disagree because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
22. Grammar is given too much importance in the textbook I am currently using	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
23. This textbook recycles grammatical rules (i.e., students can reuse what they learned in following chapters)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
24. Grammar pages should be at the end of each chapter (rather than throughout the chapter)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
Technology and French language teaching materials	
<i>Instructions: For each of the statements below, please indicate to what extent you agree with the statement, using the following scale</i>	
1. I use technology (Internet, the world wide web, computer software, etc.) with my French students at least once a week	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. I rarely use technology because I do not have the necessary equipment	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. I rarely use technology with my French students because I am not comfortable with it	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. The textbook I am currently using and its ancillaries (workbook, audio CD, video, etc.) are sufficient to develop the students' 4 skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
5. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what is available to me at a given time	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what interests students in order to motivate them	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

7. If I use technology, it is primarily to cut on the classroom routine	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
8. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what the students can't do with just the textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
9. When I use technology, I usually base my technological choice on what's new (i.e., on the latest technologies that came out)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
<p>10. In my classes, I have already used:</p> <p>○ Emails (e.g., as part of a project such as having students exchange emails with other learners in a francophone country).....</p> <p>If yes, what did you expect your students to learn?</p> <hr/> <p>○ Discussion boards (from a course management system such as Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.)</p> <p>If yes, why did you choose to use it?</p> <hr/> <p>○ Instant Messaging (IM)</p> <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <hr/> <p>○ Blogs</p> <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <hr/> <p>○ Wikis</p> <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <hr/> <p>○ Podcasts</p> <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <hr/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>		
11. Technology helps to provide a balance between focusing students' attention on grammar and focusing their attention on communication	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
12. If I had the necessary equipment and training, I would use various technologies with my students all the time	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
13. When I do not like the reading passage of the textbook, I go online to see if I can find something more appropriate for my students	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
14. The audio CDs (or video or website) that come with the textbook are sufficient in developing my students listening skills	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD

<p>15. I can't think of any technology that could help my students improve their speaking skills</p> <p>If you said no, which technology do you think could provide your students with practice for speaking in French?</p> <hr/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>16. The only writing activities that I give in class to my students are those found in their textbook</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>17. Computers changed how I approach teaching a foreign language</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>18. I would like/I like to have the workbook (that goes along the textbook I am currently using) online</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>19. Using a course management system (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my teaching</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>20. Using a course management system (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my students' learning</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>21. A good French instructor must possess both practical knowledge (i.e., experienced with the subject matter – French – and with teaching techniques) and technical knowledge (i.e., know how and when to use technology)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>

APPENDIX B
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Background information
1. I am: <input type="radio"/> Female <input type="radio"/> Male
2. My age is: <input type="radio"/> 18-20 <input type="radio"/> 21-25 <input type="radio"/> 26-30 <input type="radio"/> 31+
3. My status at university is: <input type="radio"/> Freshman <input type="radio"/> Sophomore <input type="radio"/> Junior <input type="radio"/> Senior <input type="radio"/> Graduate <input type="radio"/> Non-degree
4. My cumulative GPA at university is: <input type="radio"/> 0-1.9 <input type="radio"/> 2.0-2.4 <input type="radio"/> 2.5-2.9 <input type="radio"/> 3.0-3.4 <input type="radio"/> 3.5-4.0
5. I am taking French to fulfill my: <input type="radio"/> Major <input type="radio"/> Minor <input type="radio"/> Personal interest <input type="radio"/> Foreign Language requirement
6. The grade I expect to receive in my French class is: <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> B <input type="radio"/> C <input type="radio"/> D <input type="radio"/> E/F
7. My native language is: <input type="radio"/> English <input type="radio"/> Spanish <input type="radio"/> other

<p>8. My country of origin is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the United-States ○ a Spanish-speaking country ○ an other non-francophone country than the above-mentioned ○ a francophone country
<p>9. My oral <u>French</u> production is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Novice Mid (I can use two- and three-word answers to give personal information [address, telephone number, nationality, age, family]) ○ Novice High (I can with occasional pauses give a basic description of myself, my family, and other people using simple sentences and phrases) ○ Intermediate Low (I can talk about my needs, wants, and preferences, and certain unfamiliar topics using familiar phrases and gestures, and pausing as I speak) ○ Intermediate Mid (I can narrate accounts of experiences and express feelings and reactions with occasional use of literal translations or false cognates from my dominant language) ○ Intermediate High (I can give clear, detailed descriptions within a wide range of subjects related to my fields of interest. I can use familiar language to talk about unfamiliar topics, occasionally using circumlocution when I do not know a specific word) ○ Advanced low (I can accurately narrate in simple fashion and describe in the past, present, and future time frames, as well as relate facts, such as who, where, why, when, or how much)
<p>10. When I first started learning French, I was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ younger than 10 ○ 10-13 ○ 14-18 ○ 19-21 ○ 22+
<p>11. I received the following amount of French instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 year in junior high/high school ○ 2-3 years in junior high/high school ○ 4+ years in junior high/high school ○ 1 semester in college/at university ○ 2-3 semesters in college/at university ○ 4+ semesters in college/at university
<p>12. The longest consecutive time I have spent in a Francophone country is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ never ○ less than 4 weeks ○ 1 month-6 months ○ 7 months-11 months ○ 1 year -2 years ○ 2 + years
<p>13. Besides French I have formally studied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no other language ○ Spanish ○ German ○ another language
<p>14. I have studied this/these language(s) for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ N/A ○ 1 semester ○ 1 year ○ 2-3 years ○ 4+ years

15. Since I started learning French I have used the following number of French textbooks:	
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4+	
16. The French textbook(s) I am currently using is/are:	
<input type="radio"/> A l'Aventure <input type="radio"/> Contacts <input type="radio"/> Entre Amis <input type="radio"/> Montages <input type="radio"/> Sur le vif <input type="radio"/> A votre tour <input type="radio"/> Controverses <input type="radio"/> Explorations <input type="radio"/> Motifs <input type="radio"/> Tout Ensemble <input type="radio"/> A vous <input type="radio"/> Debuts <input type="radio"/> French in action, <input type="radio"/> On y va <input type="radio"/> Vis-à-Vis <input type="radio"/> Allez viens <input type="radio"/> Destinations Part1 <input type="radio"/> Ouvertures <input type="radio"/> Voila <input type="radio"/> Allons-y <input type="radio"/> Deux Mondes <input type="radio"/> French in Action, <input type="radio"/> Paroles <input type="radio"/> Other (please <input type="radio"/> Bien dit <input type="radio"/> Discovering Part2 <input type="radio"/> Personnages specify): <input type="radio"/> Bien vu, bien French!Bleu <input type="radio"/> Horizons <input type="radio"/> Quant à moi _____ <input type="radio"/> dit <input type="radio"/> Discovering <input type="radio"/> Images <input type="radio"/> Rapports <input type="radio"/> Bienvenue French! Blanc <input type="radio"/> Intrigue <input type="radio"/> Rendez-vous <input type="radio"/> Bon voyage <input type="radio"/> Discovering <input type="radio"/> J'veux bien <input type="radio"/> Séquences <input type="radio"/> Bravo French! Rouge <input type="radio"/> Invitation au monde <input type="radio"/> Chez Nous <input type="radio"/> En bonne forme francophone <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> Ensemble <input type="radio"/> Mais Oui <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> Ensuite	
The French language, culture and activities in textbooks	
<i>Instructions: For each of the statements below, please indicate to what extent you agree with the statement, using the following scales</i>	
1. In my spare time, I read in French (e.g., internet, world wide web, newspaper, novels, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. I know very well somebody who has spent more than 8 consecutive weeks (2 months) in a francophone country	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. I myself spent more than 8 consecutive weeks (2 months) in a francophone country	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. I have francophone friends with whom I exchange emails/ letters	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. I have francophone friends with whom I regularly talk	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. In popular French, 'on' often replaces 'nous' to express 'we'	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
7. Learning about double object pronouns (e.g., Ce livre? Oui je le lui ai déjà donné) is important	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
8. In popular French, 'tu' is often used to express a generic meaning (e.g., « Quand j'habitais en Floride, j'étais près d'un lac. En été, si tu sortais de la maison après 21h, t' étais sûr de te faire piquer par une dizaine de moustiques en moins de 15 minutes»)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
9. In popular French, the 'ne' is often omitted in negative sentences (e.g., j'aime pas ça)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD

10. My current teacher is a French native speaker	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
11. My current teacher speaks like the French in my textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
12. I find surprising that my current teacher does not speak like the French in my textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
13. I intend to travel to a francophone country in the future	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
14. I want to learn the French of the francophone country where I intend to travel in the future	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
15. I want to learn 'authentic' French, i.e., the real French that is spoken among people my age in their daily life in France	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
16. It is more important to learn standard written French than daily spoken French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
17. My textbook presents content that is relevant to me	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
18. My textbook presents content that is engaging to me	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
19. Reading passages in my textbook are helpful to learn about French culture	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
20. Reading passages in my textbook are helpful to learn about the culture of other francophone countries than France	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
21. I trust the cultural content of my French textbook because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
22. I like when my teacher adds personal anecdotes when s/he teaches cultural topics from the textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
23. Culture is given too much importance in my textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
24. We should learn culture with a big C (arts, literature, cinema, etc.) before we learn culture with a small c (daily life behaviors, how people think, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
25. What I enjoy the most is learning about culture in general	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD	
26. What interests me in learning culture with a small c is:					
○ Student's life	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
○ The relationship of the French to the media (television, internet, press, etc.).....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
○ Family.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
○ Eating habits/food.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			

○ Attitudes towards clothing.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ The French and their health.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ City life vs. rural life.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Friendship/ love.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Racism/ immigration.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Hobbies of young French people.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
27. What interests me in learning culture with a big C is:				
○ Music.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Fine Arts.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Literature.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ History.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Geography.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Cinema.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Politics.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
○ Education system.....	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
28. Being tested about culture with a small c is difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
29. Being tested about culture with a big C is difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
30. My current textbook provides appropriate WRITTEN activities They are appropriate/inappropriate because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
31. My current textbook provides appropriate ORAL activities They are appropriate/inappropriate because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
32. My textbook contains a majority of communicative activities – Activities designed around a realistic situation and for which there is a meaningful reason to exchange information. Communicative activities include information transfer, information gap, problem solving, role-playing, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
33. The activities in my textbook cover the most important tasks I need to know	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD

34. It is more important for a textbook to include activities that engage me even though they may not be what I may encounter in real-life (e.g., fill in the blanks of the lyrics of a song) than to include activities that reflect life in a francophone country but may not interest me very much (e.g., ask for directions)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
Grammar in French textbooks	
<i>Instructions: For each of the statements below, please indicate to what extent you agree with the statement, using the following scale</i>	
1. Grammar is the central focus of learning French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
2. Grammar learning consists of receiving explicit rules	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
3. I like learning about grammar	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. French textbooks should more extensively treat the use of double object pronouns (e.g., ce livre? Oui je le lui ai déjà donné)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
5. I improve my French most rapidly if I practice the grammar	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
6. My textbook contains mechanical drills (i.e., activities in which there is a complete control of the response , and only one answer is possible . When performing mechanical drills, I do not really need to understand what is being said to complete the activity successfully)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
7. The organization of the grammar rules in my French textbook does not ensure that I am ready to acquire new grammatical features (i.e., some rules should be presented before others so that I do not get as easily lost)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
8. My textbook does not highlight the grammatical items (via italics, bold characters, multiple repetitions, etc.) well enough for me to notice them	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
9. At the beginning level, I do not need grammar to communicate (beginning students use chunks of words and formulaic speech)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
10. I need to know enough vocabulary to understand the grammatical rules	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
11. The place of grammar is with intermediate learners and up	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
12. Grammar explanations in elementary textbooks should be in French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
13. Grammar explanations in intermediate textbooks should be in French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
14. Awareness is more important than performance (i.e., French textbooks should aim at making me aware of important grammatical concepts instead of expecting me to be accurate)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD

15. French textbooks are overflowing with unnecessary grammatical terminology (i.e., the wording of the rules is too complicated and there are too many unnecessary rules)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
16. My current textbook presents grammatical rules in a gradual manner (i.e., there seems to be a logical order and progression to the presentation of the grammatical rules)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
17. In textbooks, the grammatical structure should first appear in context and then be followed by its grammatical explanation	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
18. My textbook includes activities that challenge me by involving me intellectually	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
19. My textbook focuses on areas of grammar known to cause problems to us, students of French	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
20. My textbook has a majority of activities that encourage me to understand a grammatical concept through a meaningful context (e.g., when the main character of my textbook says that <i>Marie est belle</i> , and that <i>Paul est beau</i> ; with this meaningful context I understand that in French adjectives can be feminine or masculine depending on the subject)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
21. My textbook processes input, which means that it: - teaches only one thing at a time - has activities that are meaningful (I always need to understand what the sentences mean to complete each activity successfully) - requires me to do something with the grammatical structure (e.g., find the solution to a problem, find out what my classmate does, etc) - moves from sentences to connected discourse I agree/disagree because: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
22. Grammar is given too much importance in my textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
23. My textbook recycles grammatical rules (i.e., I get to reuse what I have learned in following chapters)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
24. I would rather have/I like to have grammar pages at the end of each chapter than throughout the chapter	<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> A	<input type="checkbox"/> D	<input type="checkbox"/> SD
Technology and French language teaching materials				
<i>Instructions: For each of the statements below, please indicate to what extent you agree with the statement, using the following scale</i>				
1. I have taken/I am taking a French class when technology (Internet, the world wide web, computer software, etc.) was/is used at least once a week	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No	
2. I have an Ipod	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

3. I use my computer everyday	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. My textbook and the material that comes with it (workbook, audio CD, video, etc.) are sufficient to help me develop my language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
5. When my teacher uses technology, s/he seems to base her/his technological choice on what is available to her/him at a given time	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
6. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what interests me in order to engage me more in the lesson	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
7. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what interests me in order to cut on the routine	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
8. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what we can't do with just the textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
9. When my teacher uses technology, s/he should base her/his technological choice on what's new (i.e., on the latest technologies that came out such as Ipod, wikis, blog, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD
<p>10. In my classes, I have already used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emails (e.g., as part of a project such as having students exchange emails with other learners in a francophone country)..... <p>If yes, what did you expect your students to learn?</p> <p>_____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion boards (from a course management system such as Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) <p>If yes, why did you choose to use it?</p> <p>_____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instant Messaging (IM) <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <p>_____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Blogs <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <p>_____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wikis <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <p>_____</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No </p>

<p>○ Podcasts</p> <p>If yes, what are the benefits/drawbacks?</p> <hr/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>11. Technology helps to provide a balance between focusing my attention to grammar and focusing my attention to communication</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>12. My teacher should use technology more often in class</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>13. The audio CDs (or video or website) that come with my textbook are sufficient in developing my listening skills</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>14. I can't think of any technology that could help me improve my speaking skills</p> <p>If you said no, which technology do you think could provide your students with practice for speaking in French?</p> <hr/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>15. The only writing activities that I do with my teacher in class are those from my textbook</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>16. Computers have changed how I approach learning a foreign language</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>17. I would like/I like to have my workbook online</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>18. The course web site (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my life as a student</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>19. The course web site (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, D2L, etc.) facilitates my learning</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>
<p>20. A good French teacher must possess both practical knowledge (i.e., experienced with the subject matter – French – and with teaching techniques) and technical knowledge (i.e., know how and when to use technology)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> SA <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> SD</p>

REFERENCES

- Allen, H. W.** (in press). Textbook materials and foreign language teaching: Perspectives from the classroom. *NECTFL Review* 62.
- Ariew, R.** (1982). The textbook as curriculum. In T. V. Higgs (Ed.), *Curriculum, competence, and the FL teacher* (pp. 11-33). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Ariew, R. & Dupuy, B.** (in preparation) *Français-Monde. Manuel et cahier d'activités*. Prentice Hall Publishers.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D.** (1974) *Theory in practice, increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Arteaga, D. & Herschensohn, J.** (1998) Diachronic Perspectives on the Teaching of New French. *The French Review*, 71(4), 607-620.
- Ashby, W.** (1992) The variable use of on versus tu/vous for indefinite reference in spoken French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 2, 135-157.
- Asher, J.** (1972) Children's first language as a model for second language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 56, 133-139.
- Aski, J.** (2005) Alternatives to mechanical drills for the early stages of language practice in foreign language textbooks. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 333-343.
- Aski, J.** (2003) Foreign language textbooks activities: Keeping pace with second language acquisition research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 57-65.
- Atlani, F.** (1984) ON l'illusionniste. In F. Atlani (Ed.) *La langue au ras du texte* (pp. 13-29). Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.
- Ayoun, D.** (2004) The effectiveness of written recasts in the second language acquisition of aspectual distinctions in French: A follow-up study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 31-55.
- Ayoun, D.** (2001) The role of negative and positive feedback in the second language acquisition of the passé composé and imparfait. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 226-243.
- Ball, R.** (2000) *Colloquial French grammar: A practical guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Bancheri, S.** (2006) A language teacher's perspective on effective courseware. In R. Donaldson, & M. Haggstrom (Ed.) *Changing language education through CALL* (pp. 31-47). New York: Routledge.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S. & Ellis, R.** (2004) Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243-272.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R.** (2002) Metalanguage in Focus on Form in the Communicative Classroom. *Language Awareness*, 11(1), 1-13.
- Blanche-Benveniste, C.** (1987) Le pronom on: Propositions pour une analyse. In J. Bonnamour (Ed.) *Mélanges offerts à Maurice Molho, 3: Les Cahiers de Fontenay*, 48 (pp. 15-30). Paris: ENS Fontenay-aux-Roses.
- Blyth, C.** (2005) From empirical findings to the teaching of aspectual distinctions. In D. Ayoun, & R. Salaberry (Ed.) *Tense and Aspect in Romance languages* (pp. 211-252). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Burns, A.** (1998) Teaching Speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 102-123.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M.** (1995) Grammar and spoken language. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 141-158.
- Chapelle, C.** (2005) Interactionist SLA theory in CALL Research. In J. Egbert, & G. Petrie (Ed.) *CALL Research perspectives* (pp. 53-64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chapelle, C. & Hegelheimer, V.** (2004) The language teacher in the 21st century. In S. Fotos, & C. Browne (Ed.) *New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms* (pp. 299-316). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chomsky, N.** (1995) *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cook, V.** (1998) Relating SLA Research to Language teaching materials. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 9-27.
- Coveney, A.** (2003) "Anything you can do, tu can do better": Tu and vous as substitutes for indefinite on in French. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 164-191.
- Coveney, A.** (2000). Vestiges of *nous* and the 1st person plural verb in informal spoken French. *Language Science*, 22, 447-481.
- Cunningsworth, A.** (1995) *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.

- Dansereau, D.** (1987) Techniques in the teaching of the Passé Composé / Imparfait distinction in French. *The French Review*, 61, 1, 33-38.
- De Garcia, R., Reynolds, S. & Savignon, S.** (1976) Foreign language attitude survey. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 302-304.
- Deshaies, D.** (1991) Contribution à l'analyse du français québécois: Etude des pronoms personnels. *RQLTA*, 10(3), 11-40.
- Deshaies, D.** (1985) Références personnelles et types de discours en situation d'entre-voie. In P. Léon, & P. Perron (Ed.) *Le dialogue* (pp. 77-91). Ottawa : Didier.
- Dewaele, J-M.** (2005) *Focus on French as a foreign language: Multidisciplinary approaches*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- D'Harvé, G.** (1923) *Parlons-bien*. Bruxelles: Office de publicité.
- Di Vito, N.** (1991) Incorporating native speaker norms in second language materials. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(4), 383-396.
- Di Vito, N.** (1991) Looking at and towards the future in French textbooks. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 250-259.
- Doughty, C. & Varela, E.** (1998) Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Ed.) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C., Williams, J.** (1998) Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Ed.) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197-262). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ducate, L. & Lomicka, L.** (2005) Exploring the blogosphere: Use of web logs in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(3), 410-421.
- Dvorak, T.** (1986) Problems facing the Spanish language coordinator and pedagogy specialist. *Hispania Dialogue*, 2, 217 – 222.
- Egbert, J.** (2005) Teacher development. In J. Egbert (Ed.) *CALL essentials: Principles and practice in CALL classrooms* (pp. 149-162). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Ellis, R.** (2002a) The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In E. Hinkel, & S. Fotos (Ed.) *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 17-34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Ellis, R.** (2002b) Does form-focused instruction affects the acquisition of implicit knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 223-236.
- Ellis, R.** (2001) Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 1-46.
- Ellis, R.** (1999) *Learning a second language through interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ellis, R.** (1994) *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fonseca-Greber, B. & Waugh, L.** (2004) The subject clitics of conversational European French: Morphologization, grammatical change, semantic change, and change in progress. In R. Nunez-Cedeno, L. Lopez, & R. Cameron (Ed.) *A Romance Perspective on Language Knowledge and Use: Selected Papers from the 31st Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* (pp. 99-117). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fonseca-Greber, B. & Waugh, L.** (2003) On the radical difference between the subject personal pronouns in written and spoken European French. In P. Leistyna, & C. Meyer (Ed.) *Corpus Analysis: Language Structure and Language Use* (pp 225-240). Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V.
- Fotos, S.** (1994) Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 323-351.
- Fotos, S. & Ellis, R.** (1999) Communicating about grammar. In R. Ellis (Ed.) *Learning a second language through interaction* (pp. 189-208). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Frei, H.** (1929) *La grammaire des fautes*. Paris: Genthner.
- Gadet, F.** (1997) *Le Français ordinaire*. Paris: Colin
- Gass, S. M.** (1997) *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gratton, M.** (2000) Erreurs et difficultés d'apprentissage: Présentation grammaticale. *Revue Parole*, 13, 39-66.

- Gratton, M.** (1995) Des règles d'erreur aux règles de production ou de la conceptualisation à la description d'une langue étrangère. Le cas des pronoms personnels compléments en français (unpublished doctoral dissertation. Montpellier, France : Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier III).
- Georgin, R.** (1951) *Pour un meilleur français*. Paris: Bonne.
- Glisan, E. & Drescher, V.** (1993) Textbook grammar: Does it reflect native speaker speech? *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 23-33.
- Graden, E.** (1996) How language teachers' beliefs about reading instructions are mediated by their beliefs about students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 387-395.
- Herring, S.** (1996) *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Herschensohn, J.** (2007) L2 functional categories: Syntactic development and morphological mapping. In D. Ayoun (Ed.) *French Applied Linguistics* (pp. 103-129). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Herschensohn, J.** (1988) Linguistic accuracy of textbook grammar. *Modern Language Journal*, 72(4), 409-414.
- Horwitz, E.** (1981) *Beliefs about language learning inventory*. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Horwitz, E.** (1985) Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18(4), 333-340.
- Horwitz, E.** (1988) The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294.
- Hutchinson, T. & Torres, E.** (1994) The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, 48(4), 315-328.
- Joseph, J.** (1988) New French: A Pedagogical Crisis in the Making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(1), 31-36.
- Kane, R., Sandretto, S. & Heath, C.** (2001) Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. *Review of Educational Research*, 71, 177-228.

- Kagan, S.** (1989) *Cooperative learning resources for teachers*. San Juan, CA: Resources for Teachers.
- Kazeroni, A.** (2006) Have we left the teacher out of the equation? Strengthening the link between teacher cognition and task design in CALL. In R. Donaldson, & M. Haggstrom (Ed.) *Changing language education through CALL* (pp. 19-29). New York: Routledge.
- Kern, R.** (1995) Students and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), 71-92.
- Kilickaya, F.** (2004) Authentic Materials and Cultural Content in EFL Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10(7). Retrieved January 2, 2005 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kilickaya-AuthenticMaterial.html>
- Klapper, J., & Rees, J.** (2003) Reviewing the Case for Explicit Grammar Instruction in the University Foreign Language Learning Context. *Language Teaching Research*: 7, 3, 285-314.
- Kramsch, C.** (1993) *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S.** (1999) Seeking a role for grammar: A review of some recent studies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32(2), 245-257.
- Krashen, S.** (1985) *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Krasner, I.** (1999). The role of culture in language teaching. *Dialog on Language Instruction*, 13(1), 79-88.
- Kumaravadivelu, B.** (1993) Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 47(1), 1-12.
- Laberge, S.** (1980) The changing distribution of indefinite pronouns in discourse. In R. Shuy, & A. Shukal (Ed.) *Language use and the uses of language* (pp. 76-87). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Laberge, S. & Sankoff, G.** (1979) Anything you can do. In T. Givon (Ed.) *Discourse and Syntax, Syntax and Semantics*, 12, 419-440. New York: Academic Press.
- Lafford, P. & Lafford, B.** (2005) CMC Technologies for teaching foreign languages: What's on the horizon? *CALICO Journal*, 22(3), 1-32.

- Lam, Y.** (2000) Technophobia or technophilia? A preliminary look at why second language teachers do or do not use technology in their classrooms. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 389-420.
- Larsen-Freeman, D.** (2003) Learning grammar: Insights from SLA research and consciousness-raising. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.) *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring* (Chp.8). Toronto: Thomson/Heinle.
- Lavandera, B.** (1978) Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society*, 7, 171-182.
- Leeman, D.** (1991) On thème. *LInv*, 15, 101-113.
- Leeman-Bouix, D.** (1994) *Les fautes de français existent-elles?* Paris: Seuil.
- Leeser, M. J.** (2004) Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55-81.
- Lemee, I.** (2002) Acquisition of sociostylistic variation in the interlanguage of Irish learners of French L2: The Case of on/nous. *Marges Linguistiques*, 4, 1-12.
- Leow, R. P.** (2001) Attention, awareness, and foreign language behavior. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 113-155.
- Lepetit, D.** (2001) Subjonctif: Descriptions et manuels. *The French review*, 74(6), 1176-1192.
- Levy, M.** (2006) Effective use of CALL technologies: Finding the right balance. In R. Donaldson, & M. Haggstrom (Ed.) *Changing language education through CALL* (pp. 1-18). New York: Routledge.
- Levy, M. & Stockwell, G.** (2006) Computer-mediated communication. In M. Levy, & G. Stockwell (Ed.) *CALL Dimensions* (pp. 84-109). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Levy, M. & Stockwell, G.** (2006) Practice (listening, speaking, reading, writing). In M. Levy, & G. Stockwell (Ed.) *CALL Dimensions* (pp. 178-204). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lighbown, P.** (2000) Anniversary article: Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 431-462.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N.** (2006) *How Languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lodge, A.** (1993) *French: From dialect to standard*. London-New York: Routledge Publishers.
- Loewen, S.** (2003) Variation in the frequency and characteristics of incidental focus on form. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 315-345.
- Long, M.** (1996) The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie, & T. Bhatia (Ed.) *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M.** (1991) Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Ed.) *Foreign language research in cross cultural perspective*, 39-52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Long, M.** (1981) Input, interaction and SLA. In H. Winitz (Ed.) *Native language and foreign language acquisition* (pp. 259-278). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Long, M. & Robinson, P.** (1998) Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Ed.) *Focus on form in classroom language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: CUP.
- Lyster, R.** (2001) Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 265-301.
- Lyster, R.** (1998) Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.
- Mackey, A., & Philip, J.** (1998) Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338-356.
- MacWhinney, B.** (1997) Second language acquisition and the competition model. In A. de Groot, & J. Kroll (Ed.) *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 113-144). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Maley, A.** (1998) Squaring the circle — reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.) *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 279-294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Masuhara, H.** (1998) What do teachers really want from coursebooks? In B. Tomlinson (Ed.) *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 239-260). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mcgrath, I.** (2002) *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McNeely, B.** (2005) Using technology as a learning tool, not just the cool new thing. In *Educating the Net generation* (chapter 4). Educause.
- Meisel, J., Clahsen, H., & Pienemann, M.** (1981) On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. *SSLA*, 3(2), 109-135.
- Menke, D.** (1994) Teacher's views of textbooks and text reading instruction: Experience matters. *Journal of Reading*, 37(6), 464-470.
- Morand, P.** (2001) *Journal inutile 1968-1972*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Moufflet, A.** (1935) *Encore le massacre de la langue française*. Paris: Didier.
- Murphy, E.** (2000) Strangers in a strange land: Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning French as a second or foreign language in online learning environments. (unpublished doctoral dissertation. Université Laval, Canada. Available: <http://www.ucs.mun.ca/~emurphy/strangers/toc.html>).
- Murray, J.** (1997) *Hamlet on the holodeck: The future of narrative in cyberspace*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Nadasdi, T., Mougeon, R. & Rehner, K.** (2005) Learning to speak everyday (Canadian) French. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(4), 543-563.
- Nadasdi, T., Mougeon, R. & Rehner, K.** (2003). The learning of sociolinguistic variation by advanced FSL learners: The case of *nous* versus *on* in immersion French. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 127-1.
- Negretti, R.** (1999) Web-based activities and SLA: A conversation analysis research approach. *Language Learning and Technology*, 3, 1:75-87.
- Nunan, D.** (1989) *Designing tasks for the Communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, E.** (2004) *My so-called blog*. The New York Times. Retrieved April 21, 2007, from www.nytimes.com/2004/01/11/magazine/11BLOG.html
- Paulston, C.** (1972) Structural pattern drills: A classification. In H. Allen, & R. Campell (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second language* (pp. 129-138). New York: McGraw Hill.

- Peeters, B.** (2006) « *Nous on vous tu(e).* » La guerre (pacifique) des pronoms personnels. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 122(2), 201-220.
- Pennington, M.** (2004) Electronic media in second language writing: An overview of tools and research findings. In S. Fotos, & C. Browne (Ed.) *New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms* (pp. 69-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Peterson E. & Coltrane, B.** (2003) *Culture in Second Language Teaching*. Eric Digest EDO-FL-03-09. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Pica, T.** (1994) Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Pienemann, M.** (1989) Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 52-79.
- Pinkman, K.** (2005) Using Blogs in the foreign language classroom: Encouraging learner independence. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 1(1), 12-24.
- Plass, J., Chun, D., Mayer, R., & Leutner, D.** (1998) Supporting visual and verbal learning preferences in a second language multimedia learning environment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(1), 25-36.
- Prezky, M.** (2001) Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon (NCB University Press)*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Richards, J.** (2005) Materials development and research – Making the connection. Paper presented at a colloquium on research and materials development, at the *TESOL Convention*, San Antonio, March 2005.
- Richards, J.** (2001) Needs analysis. In J. Richards (Ed.) *Curriculum development in language teaching* (pp. 51-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.** (1994) Exploring teacher's beliefs. In J. Richards (Ed.) *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 29-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.** (1990) The teacher as self-observer: Self-monitoring in teacher development. In J. Richards (Ed.) *The language teaching matrix* (pp. 118-143). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J., Gallo, P. & Renandya, W.** (2001) Exploring Teachers' Beliefs and the Processes of Change. *PAC Journal*, 1, 41-64.

- Richards, J. & Mahoney, D.** (1996) Teachers and textbooks: A survey of beliefs and practices. *Perspectives*, 8(1), 40-63.
- Richardson, V.** (1996) The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 102-119). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P.** (1995) Attention, memory, and the “noticing” hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 45, 283-331.
- Saville-Troike, M.** (2006) *Introducing second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R.** (1990) The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schneiderman, B.** (1997) Foreword. In R. Debski, J. Gassin, & M. Smith (Ed.) *Language learning through social computing* (pp. v-viii). Melbourne: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.
- Schulz, R. A.** (1996) Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 343-364.
- Scotton, C. & Bernstein, J.** (1988) Natural conversations as a model for textbook dialogue. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(4), 372-384.
- Sharwood Smith, M.** (1993) Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 165-180.
- Skehan, P.** (1996) A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62.
- Stanley, G.** (2006) Podcasting: Audio on the Internet comes of age. *TESL-EJ*, 9(4), 1-7.
- Stewart, M.** (1995). Personally speaking. . . or not? The strategic value of on in face-to face negotiation. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 5, 203-223.
- Swain, M.** (1995) Three functions of output in second language learning. In G.Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Ed.) *Principles and practice in the study of language* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Swain, M.** (1985) Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Ed.) *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-256) . Rowley, MA: Newbury House
- Thérive, A.** (1956) *Clinique du langage*. Paris: Grasset.
- Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R.** (1988) Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thorne, S. & Payne, J.** (2005) Evolutionary Trajectories, Internet-mediated expression, and language education. *CALICO Journal*, 22(3), 371-397.
- Tognozzi, E.** (2001) Italian language instruction: The need for teacher development in technology. *Italica*, 78(4), 486-498.
- Tomlinson, B.** (1998) *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trahey, M., & L. White** (1993) Positive evidence and preemption in the L2 classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 181-204.
- Valdman, A.** (1982). Français standard et français populaire: sociolectes ou fictions? *French Review*, 56, 219-227.
- Van Lier, L.** (1996) Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity. London & New York: Longman.
- VanPatten, B.** (2002a) *From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- VanPatten, B.** (2002b) Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52(4), 755-803.
- VanPatten, B.** (1996) *Input processing and grammar instruction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- VanPatten, B. & Cadierno, T.** (1993) Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 225-243.
- Vetter, A. & Chanier, T.** (2006) Supporting oral production for professional purposes in synchronous communication with heterogeneous learners. *ReCALL*, 18(1), 5-23.
- Vygotsky, L.** (1981) The development of higher forms of attention. In J. Wertsch (Ed.) *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 189-240). New York: Sharpe.

- Vygotsky, L.** (1978) *Mind in Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.** (1962) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Walter, H.** (1994) *French inside out*. New York: Routledge.
- Warschauer, M.** (2005) Sociocultural perspectives on CALL. In J. Egbert, & G. Petrie (Ed.) *CALL Research Perspectives* (pp. 41-51). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Warschauer, M.** (2004) Technological change and the future of CALL. In S. Fotos, & C. Browne (Ed.) *New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms* (pp.15-26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Warschauer, M.** (1997) Computer-mediated collaborative learning: Theory and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 470-481.
- Waugh, L.** (2006) *Indices of Identity and Markers of Ideological Stance by Proficient L2 Speakers in their L1: Evidence from French Conversational Interaction*. Speaker series, September 22, 2006. Center for language acquisition, the Pennsylvania State University.
- Waugh, L. & Fonseca-Greber, B.** (2002) Authentic materials for everyday spoken French: Corpus linguistics vs. French textbooks. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT*, 9, 114-127.
- Wertsch, J.** (1991) *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R.** (1997) *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, J.** (2002) "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *IRAL*, 40, 37-60.
- Wong, W.** (2003) Textual enhancement and simplified input effects on L2 comprehension and acquisition of non-meaningful grammatical form. *Applied Language Learning*, 13(2), 109-132.
- Wong, W.** (2002) Linking form and meaning: Processing instruction. *The French Review*, 76(2), 236-264.
- Wong, W.** (2001) Modality and attention to meaning and form in the input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23(3), 345-368.

- Wong, W. & VanPatten, B.** (2003) The evidence is in: Drills are out. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 403-423.
- Zépher, F.** (2000) Focus on form and meaning: Perspectives of developing teachers and action-based research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(1), 19-30.
- Zhao, Y.** (2004) Recent developments in technology and language learning: A literature review and meta-analysis. *CALICO Journal*, 21(1), 7-27.